

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Part I: Retrospective.....	5
A. L-courses at Southern, 1983-1997.....	5
B. Creation of the Pilot Project.....	8
C. The pilot continues.....	10
D. Deviations from the original proposal.....	11
E. Additional Innovation.....	11
F. Conclusion.....	13
Part II: Evaluation	13
A. Methodology.....	13
B. Charter-specified measuring criteria.....	16
C. National mainstream standards.....	21
Part III: Explanation of Proposal.....	23
A. Guidelines.....	23
B. Procedures.....	24
C. Workshops.....	25
D. Enrollment caps.....	27
E. Independent Studies.....	27
F. Budget commitment from Administration	28
G. 1/3 overload credit for course proposers during 2001-2002.....	28
H. Review of pre-existing L-courses.....	28
I. Nomenclature for Writing Intensive courses.....	29
J. Staffing levels and duties.....	29
K. National Search for Director.....	31
L. Ongoing Assessment.....	32
M. Relationship between Writing Board and Departments.....	32
Conclusion.....	33
Works Cited.....	33
Appendix A: 1983 Guidelines for Teaching L-courses.....	34
Appendix B: Proposal for Pilot Program, 1997.....	36
Appendix C: Southern Writing Program Pilot Charter, 1997.....	41
Appendix D: Writing Board Survey of L-course Instructors, Fall 1999.....	43
Appendix E: Workshop Evaluation Reports, Fall 1999-Fall 2001	44
Appendix F: Mini-workshop topics/participants, Spring 2000-Spring 2001.....	78
Appendix G: Proposed End-of-semester faculty survey, Spring 2000.....	81
Appendix H: End-of-semester student survey, Spring 2000.....	82

Appendix I: Executive Summary, Focus Group Report, September 2001.....	83
Appendix J: Guidelines for Proposing and Teaching an L-course, updated Sept. 2001.....	84
Appendix K: Procedures for Proposing an L-course, updated May 2001.....	86
Appendix L: Complete list of L-courses approved by Writing Board, Fall 1999-Spring 2001.....	88
Appendix M: The “Washington State Handout”.....	91
Appendix N: Guidelines for Independent Studies to Receive L-course Credit, Spring 2001.....	92
Appendix O: Budget Information, 2001-2002.....	94

Time To Teach
A Report from the SCSU Writing Board to the UCF
On the Success of the Southern Writing Program Pilot Project
September 27, 2001

Executive Summary

This report describes and evaluates the measures taken by the Writing Board to reconsider the ways L-courses are proposed, taught, and administered at SCSU. The Writing Board was created through a three-year pilot project sponsored by the UCF and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Part I: Retrospective provides a brief history of the L-course requirement, including reasons for the UCF's approval of the Southern Writing Program pilot: concerns about staffing patterns; absence of oversight, support for faculty, support for students, and financial support; and minimal recognition of L-course instructors' workload. The section then describes the creation and carrying out of the pilot project.

Part II: Evaluation describes the methods used by the Board to evaluate its suggestions, and responds to each of the charter-mandated criteria established by the pilot's sponsors:

- Does the project foster more consistent character and quality of the L courses?
- Does the project provide more effective support and guidance to instructors in the L-courses?
- Does the project improve student writing?
- Does the project support the different qualities of good writing practice in different disciplines?
- Does the structure of the project avoid unnecessary bureaucracy?
- Does the project operate at a reasonable cost which the administration will be prepared to support over time, and which does not compromise other academic needs?

Part II closes with a discussion of how some features of the pilot put the program more firmly within the national mainstream.

Part III: Explanation of Proposal provides the Board's specific recommendations on a number of issues: Guidelines and Procedures; voluntary workshops to support faculty; enrollment caps for L-courses; Independent Studies receiving L-course credit; budget information; overload credit for course proposers during 2001-2002; review of pre-existing L-courses; nomenclature for Writing Intensive courses; staffing levels and duties; a proposed national Search for an SWP Director; suggestions for ongoing assessment of the program; and thoughts about the future relationship between the Writing Board and individual departments. Rationale for recommendations is also provided, along with explanations for how certain items were revised because of input from faculty.

The report also includes 15 appendixes containing documents collected during the pilot.

A Report from the SCSU Writing Board to the UCF
On the Success of the Southern Writing Program Pilot Project
September 27, 2001

Introduction

“It’s the kind of pedagogy that you want, but it takes up all your time.”
-- Comment from participant in SWP focus group, Spring 2001.

Upon completing the third of the focus groups designed to elicit feedback from Southern faculty about the Southern Writing Program and L-courses in general, the facilitator, a professor at the University of Hartford, was asked for her general impressions.

“Oh, my,” she said. “Your faculty is so articulate about teaching. They obviously care about teaching a great deal, and care about students so much.”

Her words were an excellent summary of what the Writing Board has found about Southern faculty in the last three years. In designing, implementing, revising, re-implementing, and re-revising policies and procedures related to L-courses, the Board has had the opportunity to work with instructors, speak with departments, and hear from groups of faculty about teaching and learning, writing and reading. We have found that faculty are indeed passionate about teaching and learning, are very appreciative of support for their teaching, and are also committed to taking a critical stance toward their own teaching, as well as to any possible interference to their teaching.

We have found that faculty responded to the pilot project in a somewhat paradoxical way: while they exhibit a strong impulse toward academic freedom—toward trusting themselves to provide what they believe is best for their students—they also exhibit a strong belief in some sort of oversight—desiring to ensure that all students are receiving a consistently good classroom experience at Southern. Certainly, this dual impulse is not new, and can easily be observed in the larger university, beyond the SWP pilot. For example, while faculty enjoy the benefits of a strong union that ensures our freedom to teach in the ways we feel best, the faculty of most schools have also voted in favor of a school curriculum committee to evaluate course proposals, after those proposals had been approved by departments, and before they had been approved by the UCF.

It is this dual impulse among the broad faculty that the Writing Board met, struggled with, and negotiated through for the last three years. And it is this dual impulse that the Board tried very carefully to balance in creating and revising policies and procedures during the pilot project, and in making recommendations when writing this report to the UCF.

Perhaps our observations about faculty, and our overall attitude about the pilot, are best summed up in our chosen title for this report: “Time to Teach.” This phrase recognizes what emerged as the dominant concern about some features of the pilot: that they took away too much time that faculty hoped to devote to teaching. Certainly, as

members of the faculty ourselves, the Board is sensitive to, and in agreement with, the feeling that faculty at Southern devote much of their time and energy to their teaching, and as such, our report often refers to time considerations in explaining our recommendations.

At the same time, though, “Time to Teach” also recognizes the kind of energy and enthusiasm that we were greeted with when proposing many parts of the pilot, particularly those dealing with support for faculty, such as workshops: faculty embraced our attempts to introduce new options for their teaching and to facilitate conversations about learning, responding with an enthusiastic return to their classrooms. One workshop participant, in response to a written evaluation question on how the workshop would affect her teaching, responded, “I will certainly be applying specific ideas into my class(es). You got me thinking about this coming semester’s courses!” Responses like this have been common: faculty feel energized by having the opportunity to talk with their colleagues about what they have been doing, and want to do, in their classrooms. Of course, such talk often returns to the other “time” issue: finding time to be able to do it.

In this report, we will discuss what we have learned over the past three years about L-courses, their administration, and their teaching. *Part I: Retrospective* provides a brief history of L-courses at Southern: their initial development, the UCF’s desire to evaluate them through the creation of the SWP pilot project, and a narrative of what the SWP completed during the three year pilot. *Part II: Evaluation* discusses the Board’s responses to the evaluation criteria set up by the UCF in the pilot’s charter, and offers additional evaluative measures to supplement them. Finally, *Part III: Explanation of Proposal* includes recommendations offered by the Board regarding L-courses and their administration, a proposal that incorporates elements of the original (1983) L-course guidelines, elements of the pilot project, and new elements developed as a result of receiving feedback from faculty and students.

Part I: Retrospective

A. L-courses at Southern, 1983-1997

In 1983, the faculty voted to establish L-courses as a component of the general education curriculum. The “L” was to stand for “Literacy,” in recognition of students’ need to improve their basic reading and writing skills (see Appendix A, page 34).

The approval of this requirement was fairly “cutting edge” at the time. It is generally accepted that the first Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program had been developed at Beaver College in 1978, and that by 1983, a small but growing number of colleges were requiring writing-intensive courses as part of their general education curriculum. WAC programs, exemplified by Michigan Tech’s program, encouraged teachers to use writing to help students learn course material, and to simultaneously help

students develop their written communication skills¹. As Toby Fulwiler explains, programs generally took either a “writing-to-learn” or “learning-to-write” approach in those days; that is, students either used informal writing (such as journals) to work through course content, or they were expected to focus on learning the writing principles of their particular discipline.² Southern primarily took a “learn-to-write” approach, focusing on the formal written product. In 1985, slightly revised guidelines were approved to help instructors proposing L courses develop their proposals. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) oversaw the L-course process. An L-course proposal was approved if it demonstrated that the proposed course met three criteria: 1) the course required 25 pages of writing; 2) students were allowed to revise papers; and 3) the writing was of a critical or analytical nature.

When the UCF was founded, the University Wide Impact Committee (UWIC) continued to accept L-course proposals from any faculty member. However, once approved, the course could be taught as an L-course by any instructor. While this model has been successful in some ways (certainly, a number of faculty see nothing wrong with the system), by the mid-1990’s, the UCF recognized that L-course students and faculty were meeting with a number of problems:

- *Staffing patterns*

There were several problems related to how instructors were asked to teach L-courses.

Under the current system, faculty had not necessarily been asked if they had any training in teaching writing-intensive courses, or, in some cases, any desire to teach such courses. While some might argue that those who can write well themselves can easily teach writing, research from composition studies suggests otherwise: the teaching of writing involves a number of skills that are different from writing itself.³

In addition, some of the instructors asked to teach L-courses had been brand new faculty, with little experience in the teaching of their disciplines, let alone in the additional burden of teaching a writing-intensive course.

- *Absence of ongoing oversight*

Among the most controversial problems was the lack of oversight

¹ Art Young provides a somewhat personal perspective on the early history of WAC, but an instructive one, in “The Wonder of Writing Across the Curriculum” (*Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 1 (1994): 58-72), in that it speaks to Southern’s program history from a national perspective.

² Introduction to *Programs That Work : Models and Methods for Writing Across the Curriculum*, edited by Toby Fulwiler and Art Young (Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1990)

³ In *Preparing to Teach Writing*, for example, James D. Williams discusses the “product view” of teaching writing, which suggests that being able to identify and produce good writing equates to being able to teach others how to produce it (7). The “pragmatic view,” by contrast, recognizes that writing involves a number of social, cultural, and psychological issues that complicates its teaching, and suggests that teaching writing effectively involves knowing how to present problems to prompt effective writing, and respond to students in ways that encourage them to improve (7-15).

of L-courses. Once a course was approved as an L, it was never revisited by any curricular body. While many L-courses met the guidelines set by the UCIC in 1985, a significant number did not. Each member of the Board, and a good number of faculty members who spoke with the Board, knew of existing L-courses (including, in some cases, their own) that did not meet the L-course requirements. (During the course of the pilot, the Board was asked to consider, and quickly rejected, the suggestion that the Board should “sniff out” these rogue courses; the Board has no interest in serving as “The Writing Police,” in any capacity.) However, such stories came from such a wide variety of sources that the UCF considered them in deciding to reconsider the L requirement.

While students were affected from lack of oversight, so too were instructors: given the staffing patterns above, in which some L-course instructors had not voluntarily sought to have taught L-courses, combined with a lack of oversight, a fair number of instructors knew of only one of the three requirements for L courses: namely that an L course requires 25 pages of writing.

- *Absence of support for faculty*

In addition to a lack of oversight, the original L-course system also suffered from a lack of support for faculty. Particularly given staffing patterns, which meant that many inexperienced instructors taught L-courses, many faculty felt they would benefit from some kind of support for their L course teaching. Even experienced instructors could benefit from hearing about new ideas, or in discussing well-established ideas with other interested faculty.

- *Minimal recognition of extra workload*

In addition to lack support for faculty in the form of workshops or discussions, an additional problem is the lack of recognition that L-courses simply require more work than non writing-intensive courses. While still maintaining the proper amount of course content, instructors also need to, at minimum, read and grade more papers. More helpful teachers also take time to comment on papers in the hopes of receiving revised versions from students (which, in turn, need to be re-read and re-graded). Still other faculty will go a step further and take class time to teach writing concepts to the full class, or to meet with students individually to discuss writing problems. This, again, is done in addition to the instructor’s “regular” work during the course.

And under the current system, such extra work is not recognized, as faculty with little or no training in the teaching of writing may be assigned L- courses. But most egregiously, L courses are given an

exceedingly high enrollment cap of 25 students, far too many for a dedicated teacher of writing to do her job.

- *Absence of support for students*

The Campus Writing Center was created to serve all Southern students, though it is often erroneously thought of as someplace where only 100-level students get help (In fact, fewer than 35% of its clients come from English 098, 100, or 101).

The UCF saw a need to increase student support, as well as publicize currently available support, for students who write as part of their course work, at every level.

- *Absence of institutional financial support*

All of these problems correlate with (and are in part caused by) a lack of financial support for L-courses. While, occasionally, individual instructors would get together to discuss writing, and an occasional Curriculum Development Grant helped facilitate discussion, there has been no systematic and defined financial commitment from the institution to support L course instructors and their students. Without financial support, there can be no oversight or support for faculty.

- *Out of national mainstream*

Despite its “cutting edge” beginnings, the L-course program suffered over time, standing still as the national WAC movement evolved. This no doubt occurred in part because of its lack of oversight and support for instructors—no problems were identified, no help was provided, and so no change occurred. By 1995, however, L-courses were out of step with nationally recognized models, such as Washington State University, Clemson University, and Michigan Technological University, which did provide support and oversight. Most schools with a writing-intensive requirement provided at least minimal support.⁴

B. Creation of the Pilot Project

In light of these problems, the UCF voted in the fall of 1998 to create a pilot project to research and evaluate L-courses, create and implement possible solutions, revise and test those suggestions, and recommend programmatic changes. Appendix B, page 36, contains the proposal to the UCF that created the pilot. The Southern Writing Program was the name given to the project, which included a Writing Board to create policy and an Interim Director to implement policy. The pilot was co-sponsored by the UCF and the Vice President of Academic Affairs; Appendix C, page 41 contains the charter for the pilot.

In responding to the problems identified by the UCF, the pilot’s overarching goal was to create a “culture of writing” at Southern: helping students see the value of writing in their academic careers and beyond, and providing faculty with the means to help students

⁴ Fulwiler and Young’s *Programs that Work* is probably the most widely accepted indicator of what model WAC programs look like, in their many forms. Support for faculty is a key feature of a “program that works.” In addition, Joyce Neff Magonetto and Barbara R. Stout make the same argument in their essay in McLeod and Soven’s *Writing Across the Curriculum: A Guide to Developing Programs*.

see that value.

The co-sponsors of the pilot together selected the Writing Board, made up of nine appointed faculty (three from each of three schools or school groupings (Arts and Sciences; Education and Health and Human Services; and Business and Communication, Information, and Library Sciences), plus several other faculty members who serve as *ex officio* members: a representative of the UCF; the coordinator of English composition; and the director of the writing center. In addition, the Board decided that all meetings would be open to all faculty members; one faculty member has served as a regular participant since the beginning, and a second faculty member has also served during the third year of the Pilot Program.

The appointed members were given staggered 3-year terms. Chosen in the spring of 1999, the original members of the Board were:

School of Arts and Sciences

Kerry Grant (Math)

Mark Heidmann (English)

Carina Vocisano (Psychology)

Courtney McManus (Student)

School of Education and School of Health and Human Services

Beth Taylor (Special Education)

Tony Maltese (Social Work)

Bernadette Madara (Nursing)

Jeff Sousa (Student)

School of Business and School of Communication, Information, and Library Science

Deborah Savage (Economics)

Frank Harris (Journalism)

Frank Tavares (Communication)

Erica Gordon (Student)

Ex officio Members

Tom Ferrucci (Director of the Writing Center)

Sue Ellen Holbrook (Coordinator of Composition, English)

Megan Macomber (UCF Rep., English)

Mark Heidmann was elected by the Board to serve as chair. In 2000, Terri Bennett was appointed to replace Kerry Grant, and Kelly Ritter became the representative of the English composition program.

In the late summer of 1999, the Board sought an interim director for the program. It eventually chose Robert McEachern (English), whose field of expertise is Composition and Rhetoric, and who had previously taught and/or tutored in WAC programs in two other universities.

In the fall 1999, the Board began time-intensive work, meeting weekly for three

hours at a time. During that semester, the Board:

- Drafted Guidelines for teaching an L-course
- Developed procedures for proposing an L-course
- Solicited proposals for L-courses, approving all six that it received
- Developed and offered a one-day prototype workshop for L-course faculty
- Began the ongoing process of seeking feedback from faculty and students throughout Southern

During this semester, and throughout the pilot, the Board also sought information from other programs to discover and possibly implement innovations that would be appropriate for Southern faculty and students. While the widely respected WAC program at the University of Missouri was chosen as an initial model for the pilot, the Board recognized that some of Missouri's policies and procedures were not appropriate for Southern. Therefore, the Board also researched other WAC programs, testing features from many other respected programs, including:

- Washington State University
- Northeastern University
- Michigan Technological University
- Clemson University
- University of Louisville
- University of North Carolina--Greensboro
- Boston University
- Indiana University
- University of Nebraska-Kearney

References to some of these programs appear in the rest of the report, particularly when the Board borrowed from these programs in order to test ideas. Other programs were used to reaffirm that some of the Board's policies were indeed in the national mainstream.

C. The pilot continues

Over the next three semesters (spring 2000-spring 2001), the Board continued to revise its policies and procedures, based on feedback from faculty.

For example, immediately following its one-day prototype workshop in October 1999, the Board voted to expand the workshop to two days, based on feedback from participants. The two-day format has continued as the model (although an attempt to expand to two and a half days, again based on faculty feedback, was attempted in January 2001, and met with only mixed success).

In the spring of 2000, the SWP also began offering a series of mini-workshops of one or two hours each. These workshops were meant to supplement the two-day workshops by offering topics, suggested by faculty, which were either covered too briefly during two-day workshops, or not covered at all. The SWP has offered three or four such workshops each semester since.

The Board also continued to solicit and receive L-course proposals. In addition to the six it received and approved in fall 1999, the Board also approved 13 in spring 2000,

eight in fall 2000, and five in spring 2001. As of September 1, 2001, the Board had another two proposals waiting for discussion and approval.

D. Deviations from the original proposal

While the Board stuck closely to the original proposal, some elements of that proposal were envisioned as coming into use only if/when the Writing Program became an established part of Southern's curricular structure; thus, for example, the pilot did not hire secretarial help nor employ tutors for as many hours as the proposal mentioned. The Board also encountered a number of problems, as discussed above, and created solutions based on the needs of faculty. It should also be noted that the Chair of the Writing Board discussed most of these changes with the UCF and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

E. Additional innovation

In addition to making changes in response to problems, the Board was also proactive in creating additional innovations that it believed would help it reach the goals established for it by the UCF. It should be further noted that, like many changes made by the Board, some of these innovations came from suggestions from faculty.

These innovations include:

- *Course Development Coordinator.* The Board, in spring 2000, voted to create a new position called the Course Development Coordinator (CDC). This position took over duties from the Interim Director and Chair of the Board that involved the L-course proposal process. The CDC serves as initial contact for any faculty member interested in proposing an L-course; works with the faculty member in developing proposals, including making suggestions for revision when asked to do so; serves as an advocate for the faculty member, should the faculty member not be able to attend a Board meeting at which her proposal is discussed; and serves as liaison with the UCF in submitting necessary paperwork on behalf of faculty members whose courses are approved. The CDC also attends Board meetings, serves on Board committees, and assists the director in preparing and conducting workshops.

The CDC has proven to be an excellent addition to the SWP. The Board sees a central part of its mission to be encouraging the facilitating the teaching of L courses, and the CDC's devotion to the process has helped this mission.

- *Subcommittee review to speed proposal review.* During the first semester that the Board considered proposals (fall 1999), the

entire Board read and discussed each proposal. This, of course, took a great deal of time, and contributed to very long (though productive) meetings. In order to speed the flow of course approvals, the Board decided to divide itself into a number of

subcommittees that would consider course proposals, meet with interested proposers, vote on the proposals, and then make a recommendation to the full Board. By cutting down on the number of people handling the proposal, the Board managed to cut down the time, and the potential bureaucracy, involved in getting courses approved.

- *Writing contest.* In the spring of 2001, the Board completed its first L-course Writing Contest, sponsored by Southern's Alumni Association. Students from three divisions were awarded cash prizes for papers written in L-courses, judged by faculty from the History, Education, and Communication departments.
- *Web site with links.* Another innovation, in keeping with the mission to support faculty and students, was the creation of a web site. The site includes information about workshops, links for faculty and students, and information about the proposal process. The site has proved fairly popular (it had over 200 visitors during the spring 2000 semester, according to the site's counter), and allows the Board to reach faculty who are unable to attend workshops. The URL for the site is <http://www.SouthernCT.edu/committees/writingprogram>
- *Library.* In an effort to provide faculty with print resources that they can employ on their own, the SWP has developed a small but growing library of materials. With about 100 items available, the library offers books, journal articles, and workshop materials dealing with writing across the curriculum, specific issues related to the teaching of writing (including revision, research, argumentation, etc.), and resources focusing on writing within particular academic disciplines. The library is currently housed in the office of the Interim Director.
- *Expanded Relationship with Writing Center.* Because of space limitations, the tutors hired by the Board were initially housed in the Campus Writing Center. However, this "make-do" arrangement evolved into a productive relationship with the Writing Center, in which the SWP and the UWC provide one another with cooperative support. This relationship culminated in the creation of a Liaison Committee, created by the Board and the Writing Center Director, in an attempt to initiate a dialogue among all of the writing programs at Southern, including the SWP, the Writing Center, the Composition Program, the Honors College, SCORE, and others). The goal in this expanded relationship is to, again, strengthen the "culture of writing" at

Southern, and encourage consistency in writing instruction across the university.

- *Rewards for faculty.* Finally, the Board has found ways to reward faculty for the time they invest in teaching L-courses. Lack of time, as the Board knew from its members own experiences, and through conversations with faculty, is a major problem for Southern faculty. Creating L-course proposals and teaching and revising L-courses requires a large investment of time. To compensate faculty, the Board sought and received approval for the following rewards:
 - A \$200 stipend for attending a two-day workshop
 - 1/3 credit for creating an L-course proposal
 - Reduction of the enrollment limits for L-courses, and a further reduction for courses approved by the Board

F. Conclusion

Overall, the Board is pleased with the way it responded to the UCF's charge. The Board proposed and implemented those policies and procedures stipulated by its charter; sought input from faculty during the process; revised its policies and procedures in the interest of faculty and students; and tested its revisions. The Board's evaluation of the program, in accordance with the guidelines established by the UCF, support its view that beneficial changes can and should be made to the way L-courses are proposed, supported, and overseen.

Part II: Evaluation

The SWP's charter specified a number of criteria (listed below) for measuring the success of the pilot program. In this section of the report, the Board first discusses the methods by which it collected data for evaluating the pilot. It then discusses and responds to the specific criteria that the UCF established for its evaluation. Finally, it seeks to broaden the perspective of the evaluation by situating the pilot in terms of the national mainstream of WAC programs.

A. Methodology

In evaluating the pilot program, the Writing Board collected data from a number of sources, beginning soon after the Board was constituted, and ending only a few weeks ago. The means used to collect information included:

- *Faculty survey.* In the fall 1999 semester, the Board mailed surveys to instructors who taught L-courses during 1999, asking them their opinions of L-courses. [See appendix D, page 43, for a copy of the survey]. These comments served as a

basis for the development of guidelines and procedures, and helped determine the content of the initial workshop for faculty.

- *Workshop evaluations.* Over the course of the pilot, the SWP conducted five workshops. The first lasted one full day, and, upon recommendation of participants, was expanded to two days for the rest. Evaluations were very positive, and provided additional opportunities for participants to make suggestions for ways to improve the pilot. [See appendix E, page 44, for full results of all workshop evaluations.]
- *Mini-workshop evaluations.* In addition to the two-day, pre-semester workshops, Southern faculty members were also invited to attend “mini-workshops” of one or two hours, offered three or four times per semester. The workshops offered discussion of topics raised during longer workshops, and also additional topics suggested by workshop attendees. [See appendix F, page 78, for a list of topics and participants for mini-workshops.]
- *Attempt at end-of-semester instructor surveys.* At the end of the spring 2000 semester, the first semester during which L-courses that had been proposed through the pilot were taught, the Board sought feedback from the six instructors who taught such courses by sending them a survey. Before sending a final copy to the six instructors, the Board first sent a draft to them and to a number of other instructors, asking whether the questions were of an appropriate number and type. Based on suggestions from these faculty members, the Board cut the number of questions by half [see appendix G, page 81 for a copy of the final survey]. The Board sent the final version of the survey to the instructors, twice, and received no responses. Realizing that these surveys created additional bureaucracy and took up too much of instructors’ time at a point in the semester when time is at a premium, the Board decided instead to seek feedback from these instructors in other ways, including informal discussions, and through the focus groups.
- *Attempt at student surveys.* At the same time the Board sought input from faculty at the end of the spring 2000 semester, it also asked those faculty to distribute evaluations to their students. The evaluations asked students whether or not they believed their writing improved as a result of taking the “new” L-course. Although the Board did not receive the full number of surveys it sent out, it did receive three classes’ worth, and while three classes do not make a statistically satisfactory return, they did provide a hint as to what students felt about the courses. The Board again decided to, instead, use the focus groups to find out from faculty how they viewed their students’ progress. [See appendix H, page 82, for a copy of the student survey.]
- *Informal discussions.* One very valuable method of collecting feedback was through informal discussions with faculty and students, something that members

of the Board actively attempted to do. At all stages of the pilot, Board members spoke with Arts and Sciences faculty (a principle focus, since A & S was the subject for the pilot), as well as faculty from other schools. These off-the-record discussions allowed faculty to give honest opinions about the Board, its policies, and L-courses in general, and allowed the Board to supplement its sometimes limited formal evaluation process. It was through these informal conversations that the Board received some of its more valuable suggestions for fine-tuning its policies.

- *Meetings with departments.* Throughout the pilot, the Board's Chair and the program's Interim Director visited a number of departments to speak with and, more importantly, listen to faculty members. These meetings allowed the Board to disseminate information, ask and answer questions, and seek feedback. Department visits resulted in the Board receiving input from over 70 faculty members, most of whom had not been reached through workshops.
- *Meetings with larger groups.* At various stages of the pilot, members of the Board were able to meet with larger groups of faculty, including the UCF, the Faculty Senate, the Chairs of Arts and Sciences departments, and the full Arts and Sciences faculty. Often, one or more representatives of the Board met with one of these groups on a regular basis, once again allowing the Board to listen to a large number of faculty's concerns and suggestions.
- *Focus groups.* As a final strategy to elicit feedback from faculty and students, the Board, in Spring 2001, approved a plan to conduct a number of focus groups. The groups targeted five separate populations: 1) faculty who had been to an SWP workshop; 2) faculty who had been to a workshop and proposed a new L-course; 3) faculty who have taught an L-course under the 1985 (non-SWP) guidelines; 4) faculty who had never taught an L-course; and 5) students who have taken an L-course under both the old and the new (SWP) guidelines. The focus groups would last 90 minutes each, and would be conducted by Dr. Sandra Morgan of the University of Hartford's Management Department. Participants would be chosen randomly by Dr. Morgan, from lists provided by Southern's Office of Institutional Research.

Ultimately, however, time considerations once again played a factor, and the five original groups were not able to meet as planned. However, four very productive focus groups containing members from four of the five original populations did meet and provide feedback (the student group being the exception).

The focus groups represented an important opportunity for the Board to hear

from faculty who had not necessarily been able to provide feedback to the Board through some other means. While the focus groups confirmed much of what the Board had already observed, they also provided new information in a number of areas. [See Appendix I, page 83, for the summary from Dr. Morgan's report on the results of the focus groups.]

Overall, the Board was satisfied with the means by which it was able to gather feedback on the pilot, and is satisfied that, given the constraints of faculty and student time demands, the Board had heard from a large segment of the university population. Based on the feedback it received, the Board believes it was able to respond to the UCF's required measuring criteria.

B. Charter-specified measuring criteria

As part of the SWP charter, the UCF asked the Board to focus on six criteria in determining the success of the pilot. Throughout the pilot period, the Board kept the criteria in mind, and continuously sought feedback in response to these questions. Below are the six questions, with the Board's responses to them.

1. Does the project foster more consistent character and quality of the L courses?

Yes.

The Board is fully aware that this question itself is somewhat controversial: a careful definition of "consistency" must be applied and carried out by the Board. Throughout the two years of the pilot, the Board has operated on a broad and inclusive definition of "consistency," being careful not to confuse that word with "conformity." In other words, the Board was careful to ensure that faculty were encouraged to and able to use writing in ways that best served their own teaching, the needs of their departments, and the needs of their students.

This criterion also seemed to carry much weight in the original charter. One of the reasons for the desire to reform L-courses in the first place was to address the perception that not all L-courses were equal, at least in terms of required work from students, as discussed above in Part I.

Although some faculty members object to this idea, there is only one way to ensure that L-courses are taught on a consistent basis (that is, to ensure that all L-courses meet the basic requirements concerning page numbers, revision, and type of writing, as mandated in the 1983 guidelines). In order to ensure consistency, there needs to be some kind of oversight of L-courses: a course needs to be proposed, shown how it meets the guidelines, and then perhaps updated to show it continues to meet guidelines. Further, this consistency can be best met when the course is taught by the faculty member or members who actually proposed the course, a change from the current practice, but very much in line with the original, 1983 policy.

The Board proposed and tested these consistency-ensuring policies, requesting written proposals in which instructors address the issues discussed in the guidelines. The Board wrote, revised, and re-revised a set of Guidelines based on the original 1983 L-

course guidelines [see Appendix J, page 84, for a copy of the most recent version of the guidelines], as well as a series of procedures for proposing an L course, also much revised over two years [see Appendix K, page 86, for a copy of the most recent version of the procedures.]

And so, the Board can say that the proposed changes have resulted in more consistency in L courses. All 32 of the courses the Board has approved have met the

same requirements, while still allowing much freedom for the instructors to teach them in the way that makes most sense for them. [See Appendix L, page 88 for a list of the courses approved by the Board.]

This question, however, asks for evidence for a second criterion: the “quality” as well as the character needs to be more consistent. Comments from faculty indicate satisfaction with the quality of their courses after involvement with the SWP, particularly in the ways they were able to incorporate information from the workshops. One instructor in particular is quoted in the Focus Group report as saying, “You, as an instructor, if you want to go to the Writing Board, they are helpful and I think their goal is to help you run a quality course.” Based on the feedback we have received from faculty, they are pleased with the quality of their courses.

2. *Does the project provide more effective support and guidance to instructors in the L-courses?*

Yes.

In a sense, any support and guidance would have been “more effective,” since before the pilot, there was virtually no formal support for L-course instructors. The pilot provided a number of ways for L-course instructors to receive support.

The primary means of support, in the Board’s opinion, is the semi-annual, pre-semester, two-day workshop. In these workshops, instructors who wish to include writing in their courses are presented with strategies for dealing with such basic issues as assignment design, commenting on student papers, and grading written products. And while the issues are basic, the approaches are not: they are designed to both present a solid foundation for first-time WAC instructors, and at the same time provide new perspectives on these topics for more experienced teachers.

The workshop evaluations in Appendix E (page 44) provide strong evidence for instructors’ satisfaction with the workshops. Participants appreciate the opportunity to not only talk about writing, but, more importantly, to talk about *teaching* with colleagues who are equally passionate about being in the classroom. The Board is especially proud of the success of the workshops.

While the key component of the faculty-support arm of the program, the two-day workshops are only one means of support. There are several others, some mandated by the charter, and others added because of faculty suggestions and feedback:

- Mini workshops (see appendix F, page 78)
- Tutors dedicated to L-courses. Tutors not only meet with students who need help, but also visit classrooms at the invitation of L-course instructors to talk about writing issues with students.
- A web page (www.SouthernCT.edu/committees/writingprogram) that

provides information about workshops, tutors, L-course proposals, and L-course waivers, and also provides useful links for both students and instructors.

- A library of articles and books of interest to L-course instructors.
- Opportunities to consult with SWP staff about writing issues.
- Opportunities to meet with the Course Development Coordinator and other Board members about creating and submitting L-course

proposals.

In addition to the very positive workshop evaluations, the focus groups also yielded positive feedback about the Board's initiatives to support faculty in their teaching (in fact, "support for workshops" was one of the themes identified by Dr. Morgan in her report). According to one participant, "The value [of the August 2000 workshop]—was a 9.5 on a scale of 1-10. First of all, it was very well done, very professional. I didn't feel there was a lot of wasted fill....discussions, voluminous handouts....we got a huge resource...to pick and choose what is appropriate for your own discipline." Another comment on one of the materials provided to all workshop participants: "That text they use is so incredibly useful to give you the tools to be able to do what you can do....I feel that I can contemplate teaching a writing course now because I feel I'm empowered."

3. *Does the project improve student writing?*

Inconclusive.

The Board would like to report that student writing has improved as a result of the pilot, and believes that the writing of students in SWP-supported courses has indeed improved. However, the Board has had a difficult time providing a definitive answer to the question, for several reasons.

As mentioned above, the Board did manage to collect student evaluations from three courses during one semester (see appendix H, page 82). After consulting with faculty, however, we decided that such an evaluation was too obtrusive, particularly on faculty class time, and discontinued it.

The Board briefly considered, and quickly rejected, the idea of collecting samples of student writing and evaluating them. The idea was rejected because it, too, seemed too obtrusive, not on faculty time, but on faculty freedom to teach. The Board has, and would continue to resist vehemently, any notion of its becoming the "Writing Police," and felt any second-guessing, real or perceived, of L-course instructors' evaluations of their own students' work, would be entirely inappropriate.

The Board considered other possible objective means of evaluating student writing, and concluded that there really are no objective means of evaluation. Such thinking is very much in line with current thinking in the field of evaluating student writing.⁵ Even an "objective" test of grammar is ultimately subjective, in that it values grammar above other features of writing, something the program's policies have resisted.

And so, the Board is unable to definitively answer this question. It can say,

however, based on informal interviews with faculty, and on focus group results, that faculty who have taught a Board-approved L-course are more satisfied with the writing that their students are turning in. Ultimately, the Board believes that faculty satisfaction with their students' improvement should be the true measure of success in this area. While the focus group participants reported on several problems they see as they teach L-courses (students' misunderstanding of the reason for L-courses and student complaints about the workload, for example), they also saw L-courses as improving students' writing and thinking, an increasing their confidence, and helping to prepare them for their

⁵ This issue is addressed by several authors in Kathleen Blake Yancey and Brian Huot's collection *Assessing Writing Across the Curriculum : Diverse Approaches and Practices* (Ablex 1997).

careers.

4. *Does the project support the different qualities of good writing practice in different disciplines?*

Yes.

The Board has been careful from the beginning of the pilot to not only support the qualities of good writing in different disciplines, but also to encourage L-course proposals from instructors from disciplines where L-courses are not often taught.

The Guidelines for Proposing and Teaching an L-course (appendix J, page 84) stress in several places the Board's attempts to respect individual departments and disciplines. The following quotes are taken directly from the Guidelines:

The Writing Board wants the L-course program to include courses and instructors in all disciplines; we particularly want to foster L-courses in such previously under-represented fields as applied arts and social sciences, and the technical and quantitative sciences.

Critical (analytical) writing addresses a question for which there is more than one plausible interpretation, explanation, analysis, or evaluation, and thus requires original thought from the student. This original thought both demonstrates and assists the student's mastery of course material. In other words, in L-courses students practice solving discipline-based problems through writing.

Instructors communicate their knowledge of writing in their disciplines to their students through a variety of means such as paper comments, conferences, handouts, and in-class presentations on writing.

The Writing Board recognizes that in some fields, students in lower-level classes are in no position to challenge the maxims of the discipline or to take a stand on unsettled questions. In such fields, students may be required to do critical (analytical) writing in a number of ways: to create a traditional research paper in which a thesis statement summarizes the writer's use and interpretation of studies by experts, to explain the reasoning one could use in solving problems or applying a concept, to write dialogues that represent distinct perspectives on an issue, to articulate the distinction between elegant and inelegant approaches to a project (e.g., designs for an experiment to prove a given hypothesis), or to explain a technical concept to a real or imagined audience of non-experts.

In addition, the two-day workshops attempt to address discipline-specific needs (in ways that are possible in a general, multidisciplinary workshop), for example, by grouping faculty according to discipline to stress the disciplinary differences and similarities of certain teaching practices.

The Board has also begun offering mini-workshops to select groups of faculty based on disciplinary needs, by offering a mini-workshop for faculty in Math, Natural Sciences, and Applied Sciences in January 2001. In accordance with faculty demand, the Board will offer similar workshops to other groups of faculty.

The Writing Contest described above also respected the needs of different disciplines. While writing from such traditionally writing-intensive disciplines as English and Journalism were among the winners, the list also included disciplines like Chemistry and Exercise Science.

Finally, the Interim Director has carefully selected tutors not only for their ability to understand how writing is taught (the SWP's three tutors have also been composition

program adjunct instructors), but also based on their experience outside of the discipline of English. Of its two current tutors, one received an undergraduate degree in Public Administration; the other has worked as a registered pharmacy technician, journalist, and court victims' advocate. Each tutor understands and respects that the writing of different disciplines have different formats, acceptable uses of evidence, and other needs.

5. *Does the structure of the project avoid unnecessary bureaucracy?*

We believe so. However, the Board also recognizes that there are faculty who disagree.

The Board believes that the key word to this criterion is "unnecessary." Given the Board's charge in criterion "a" above ("*Does the project foster more consistent character and quality of the L courses?*"), the Board believes that some oversight, some paperwork, and thus *some* bureaucracy, is necessary.

The Board has also worked hard to eliminate what faculty have reported as, and what the Board agrees to be, unnecessary bureaucracy. Guidelines and Procedures have been revised (see section III below), and other measures have been added to make the L-course proposal process run as smoothly as possible. These additional measures include the addition of the Course Development Coordinator to shepherd proposals through the process; a subcommittee structure to speed up approvals; and a tracking feature on the SWP web site to allow faculty to see at what stage their proposals are in the process.

Still, as the focus groups made clear, faculty are still concerned with the issue of bureaucracy, especially as it relates to the possible review of existing L-courses (see section III part H).

Overall, the Board fits within a well-established model of curricular review. The proposal to the UCF adds no new bureaucracy, except for a one-page update form due approximately every three years, and as a way of supporting consistency in L-courses, as required in criterion #1 above.

6. *Does the project operate at a reasonable cost which the administration will be prepared to support over time, and which does not compromise other academic needs?*

Yes.

The Program actually ran under budget for the course of the pilot. A proposed budget, fully adequate for current needs, has been approved for the 2001-2002 school year. In addition, the Vice President for Academic Affairs has made a commitment to support the Program in the future at necessary levels, including an agreement to conduct a national search for an additional full-time tenure-track position for a Director, if the UCF

votes to approve this report's recommendations (distributed as a separate proposal and discussed in more detail in Part III below); also, see III. K. below for additional budget information.

C. National mainstream standards

In addition to considering the criteria established by the UCF, the Board also

considered the ways its proposals compared to national mainstream standards. In attempting to gauge the mainstream, the Board turned to a number of sources, including published surveys of Writing Across the Curriculum programs from around the country. These surveys are somewhat dated, however, and so were supplemented with more personal contact with directors and instructors from other programs, through discussions on the WAC-L listserv, meetings with WAC personal, and attendance at national conferences on WAC and related topics.

While it is true that every program is unique, and has its own needs, it is also true that certain practices are common because they are based on solid research. The SWP's proposal meets with national mainstream standards in several ways:

1. *Support for faculty*

As outlined in the Fulwiler and Young collection, *Programs that Work*, support for faculty is, in the view of some WAC specialists, what makes a collection of courses into a "program." The addition of support puts Southern firmly in the mainstream.

2. *Limited Bureaucracy*

At a session of the Fifth National Writing Across the Curriculum conference in June, 2001, participants received what has for several years been known as "The Washington State Handout" (see Appendix M, page 91). According to one speaker, whenever it seems anyone wants to discuss programmatic structure, the program at Washington State University is held up as the model. For some, the model is positive; for others, negative. In the Board's opinion, Washington State's program is positive in its efficient structuring of every aspect of students' and instructors' writing lives. The Board also feels, however, that such a model is inappropriate for Southern, and as such has taken a more "hands-off" approach, giving individual instructors more freedom in designing courses and evaluating student writing.

3. *One Instructor per Course*

WAC programs run on a number of models: in some, such as Northeastern University's, the writing-intensive requirement is administered and taught completely by the English department. Others, such as Michigan Tech's, see writing as not only the responsibility of every department, but also as a tool for learning and teaching within every department. Thus, each course is designed according to the individual instructor's needs and beliefs, and is approved as a writing-intensive course on that basis. Descriptions of programs in a number of publications indicate that this one instructor/one course-per-proposal format is the national norm.⁶ Informal discussions with WAC administrators at a number of other schools back up this perception.

4. *Attention to Needs of Individual Departments*

⁶ These publications include Fulwiler and Young's *Programs that Work*; Yancey and Huot's *Assessing Writing Across the Curriculum*; and Herrington and Moran's *Writing, Teaching, and Learning in the Disciplines*.

Similarly, programs that do allow individual departments to offer writing-intensive courses are careful to provide support for those departments and individualized attention to those who request it (see footnote below).

5. *Not requiring workshops*

In the spring of 2001, the Writing Board voted to eliminate its workshop requirement, a change from its original policy, and one that it considered very carefully. One of the several factors that led to the decision was benchmark research it had undertaken earlier in that semester. While there are some WAC programs that require instructors to attend workshop (including Marshall and CUNY), there are more that make the workshops “voluntary, but strongly recommended,” as one program administrator put it. By taking away the requirement, the Board feels the program is more within mainstream models.

6. *SWP as national model*

Finally, our own pilot has been held up as a model in several national contexts.

First, the program was the subject of a panel at the Fifth National Writing Across the Curriculum conference in June, 2001. Faculty from the U.S. and Canada attended the session to hear about the changes that the Board has proposed and revised, to ask advice from the panelists (the interim Director of the program, the Chair of the Board, and a faculty member who has had a course approved by the Board), and to offer suggestions.

Second, the pilot has been mentioned positively in two national publications. In an article entitled, "Writing Intensive Courses and WAC" in *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing-Across-The-Curriculum Programs*, edited by Susan H. McLeod, Eric Miraglia, Margot Soven, Christopher Thaiss, published in 2001 by the National Council of Teachers of English. The pilot is also discussed in an article entitled "Writing Across the Curriculum" in *The Writing Program Administrator's Resource: A Guide to Reflective Institutional Practice*, edited by Stuart C. Brown and Theresa Enos, forthcoming March 2002 by Lawrence Erlbaum Press. Both were written by Martha Townsend, who has co-facilitated workshops for the SWP. The latter publication reads in part, “To this list of successful WAC programs, I would add Southern Connecticut State University, for its thoughtful, deliberate revivification of a previously dormant WAC program...”

Part III: Explanation of Proposal

In accordance with the proposal to establish the pilot program approved by the UCF in 1998, the Board has submitted a separate proposal of recommendations to the UCF [“Proposal to Establish the Southern Writing Program”]. This section provides more background and rationale for those recommendations.

Given that the pilot has met the criteria established by the UCF, and the Writing Board has satisfied itself in creating a program that fits within national mainstream standards, we present the following recommendations for the proposing and teaching of L-courses, and administering of the program.

A. Guidelines

Appendix J, page 84, lists the Board's proposed guidelines for proposing and teaching and L-course.

In developing these guidelines, the Board began with, and remained true to the spirit of, the original (1983) guidelines, which required that an L-course have three elements: students write a total of 25 pages, the writing is of a critical/analytical nature, and the course contains a revision component. The Board did, over the past two years, revise its thinking on several aspects of these three elements, as described below.

- *Page counts/word counts.* The Board decided to change the measurement of the requirement from pages to words, since technology easily allows students to write less by increasing font size and decreasing margin size. However, that same technology allows students to quickly and easily check the number of words in a document. The Board asks that paper lengths be referred to in proposals by words, rather than pages. This will ultimately help ensure the kind of "consistent character" that the UCF expressed concern about in the charter.
- *Number of pages/words required.* The Board decreased the number of total words required from 6,250 to 5,000 (approximately 25 pages to approximately 20 pages of typed, double-spaced, in 12 point font). The decrease was in response to faculty concerns over time: that is, instructors felt they could respond to student writing more thoroughly, and thus could better help students, if there was slightly less writing to respond to. The Board also took faculty time constraints into consideration by suggesting that some revised papers (as opposed to merely edited papers) could count toward the word count requirement.
- *Expanded definition of critical/analytical writing.* In an attempt to allow more courses to be proposed as L-courses (indeed, the Board's attitude is that most courses could potentially be taught as L-courses), the Board offers an expanded definition of critical/analytical writing, one that was revised several times over the course of the pilot, as the Board looked at more and more samples of effective assignments. The Board decided that assignments could

encourage critical thinking as part of the process of the assignment, rather than just the product of the assignment. In other words, since the writing for the course should above all else help students learn the content of the course, an assignment need not result in "traditional," thesis-driven academic writing, as long as students apply or think through the content of the course as part of the writing. This expansion of the definition helped the Board meet the UCF criterion that different disciplines' notions of good writing are recognized.

- *More precise definition of Revision.* The Board also offers a more precise

definition of revision, distinguishing this process from “editing.” Revision involves a reconsideration of “global” writing issues such as thesis or claim, evidence, examples, organizations, and meeting the assignment. Editing, on the other hand, involves “local” issues such as grammar, punctuation, mechanics, spelling, and formatting. While both are important parts of the writing process, it is in the global issues that students apply what they have learned in the content of each course. Furthermore, revision is recognized to be a natural part of the process of any writer (as can be attested by those L-course instructors who regularly write), rather than a sign that the writer has written poorly. Thus, the guidelines make a distinction between revision and editing, and encourage instructors to comment on global as well as local issues, recognizing that revision is a tool for learning, not a punishment for making mistakes.

- *Amount of required revised writing.* In order to encourage students to see revision as a natural part of the writing process and a tool for learning, the Board has required a certain amount of writing be revised in each class. Originally, the Board had required 2500 words [10 pages] of writing be revised. However, in reviewing comments from faculty, the Board has decided to make the language of the Guidelines more flexible, encouraging a “significant amount” of revision, and suggesting 1500-2500 words as a guideline. As with much of the Board’s proposal, the Board carefully weighed the benefit to students that revision can offer, with the needs of faculty. Ultimately, the revised wording can satisfy both sets of needs.

These guidelines represent the Board’s attempt to retain the character of the original L-course requirements, while both clarifying certain terms and expanding certain definitions to make them more inclusive, while still meeting the UCF’s overall criteria for success.

B. Procedures

As with the Guidelines above, the Board has made several changes over the course of the pilot to the Procedures for submitting an L-course proposal, changes that came in response to faculty concerns. And, as with the Guidelines, the Board began with the procedures for proposing an L-course already in place, and then revised them based on feedback from faculty. The full set of procedures is listed in Appendix K, page 86; however, comments on some aspects are necessary:

- *No required workshops.* The procedures in effect during the pilot required L faculty to attend a two-day workshop before teaching an L-course, and attend a mini-workshop during any semester in which they taught an L. The Board has, in its final recommended procedures, dropped both requirements. The motives for these requirements were noble at best, benign at worst: the requirements were an attempt to create a “culture of writing,” since a two-day workshop would allow faculty to begin to share a common vocabulary for discussing writing, one that they could impart to students, and one that they were free to use to disagree with or criticize any aspects of the workshop that

they chose. The Board felt that, in order to meet the UCF's criterion that L-courses have a consistent character, some way of requiring faculty to consider common goals and techniques would be necessary. After much productive discussion amongst Board members and with faculty from across the university, the Board felt that, should the proposal be implemented, there has already been a great enough number of faculty that have taken the workshop (close to 25% of the faculty), that its goal of increasing the conversation about writing has already been quite successful. Further, the Workshops have received such positive evaluations from participants that we believe many faculty will continue to attend.

- *The curing of our "Must"-itis.* The Board also undertook a complete overhauling of the wording for the Procedures, softening the language to make it more collegial. During most of the pilot, the procedures were phrased as a series of "You must" statements in an attempt to make clear what elements seemed key to meeting our charge to improve the consistency among L-courses. Nonetheless, the changes to the recommended version in appendix K (page 86) more accurately represents the Board's relationship with faculty.
- *Flexibility in helping departments resolve scheduling problems.* The Board also added language to the procedures to make clear to departments that, should they encounter unexpected scheduling problems, the Board would work with them to make sure that L-courses would not have to be canceled. This flexibility will be especially useful in ensuring that students who planned their schedules in advance would still be able to complete their degrees on time.

C. Workshops

As mentioned above, workshops have evolved as the principal, and most successful, means of meeting the UCF criterion for supporting faculty. As such, the Board recommends that both two-day and mini-workshops continue to be a regular part of the program. However, the Board also recognizes that, once again, time has been a factor for many instructors who have been interested in attending, but whose August and January schedules did not permit them to attend. Therefore, the Board suggests trying

additional formats to supplement the current workshops. Below are details on how such workshops could be designed and run.

- *Pre-semester workshops.* The prototype for the pre-semester workshop was conducted in October 1999, a one-day workshop co-facilitated by the Interim Director and two recognized experts in the WAC field. Those in attendance agreed that the material needed two days to be discussed adequately. The Board experimented with a third day during the January 2001 workshop, with mixed results. Thus, the Board

recommends the workshops remain two days in length, take place in January and August each year, and be co-facilitated by both the director of the program and an outside expert in the field, recommended by the director and approved by the Board. The Board is reluctant to use this report to recommend a specific agenda or topics for the workshop, preferring to allow the workshop to change as the needs of faculty evolve.

- *Mini-workshops.* The Board also recommends that mini-workshops of one- to two-hours be offered at least three times each semester, more if the Board and the director agree on the need. The mini-workshops conducted over the last three semesters have received very positive evaluations from participants, though they have been uneven in the number of participants, ranging between 2 and 20. Throughout the three semesters, time and scheduling have again proved to be difficult: it is rare that the interim director does not receive a half-dozen e-mails after mini-workshops are announced, from faculty who have a conflict and want to attend but cannot. The Board will continue to experiment with days and times for these workshops, but also recognizes that it is unrealistic to think that they will operate without scheduling conflicts. The Board does agree, however, that the workshops should remain one to two hours long; should focus on topics suggested by faculty; and should attempt to involve Southern faculty from across the disciplines as guest speakers, recognizing both the faculty's expertise in the area and their desire to continue conversations about teaching and learning.
- *Week-long summer workshop.* As a way of expanding opportunities for faculty who may be interested in attending workshops, but who may have time conflicts, the Board will consider a week-long summer workshop, similar in some ways to Southern's own SummerTech, and modeled after a similar program at the University of Nebraska-Kearney. In this format, faculty will spend an intense morning discussing a topic relevant to L-course instruction (such as assignment design or creating grading rubrics), and then spend the afternoon working on a syllabus and proposal for an L-course in consultation with members of the SWP staff and the Writing Board. The workshop would be especially helpful for faculty who have never taught an L-course, and would have as its primary goal the completion of a proposal by week's end.
- *Biweekly workshops during the semester.* Finally, the Board is considering yet another format, one that would offer opportunities to those faculty members who couldn't attend workshops during breaks. In this format, employed at the University of Louisville and other universities, faculty do not attend a two-day workshop totaling 12 hours, but instead meet periodically throughout the semester for a total of 12

hours. At Louisville, for example, participants meet every other Friday for a total of six 2-hour sessions. Similar material is covered over that time as would be covered in a two-day workshop, allowing faculty to have the collegial benefits of the workshops while meeting the needs of their schedules. Ensuring continuity of attendance – and therefore continuity of topics and discussions – would be important to the success of this model.

The Board recognizes that either or both of the additional workshop formats could prove unsuccessful. However, given the success of the workshop formats already in place, and given the desire of the Board to expand opportunities so that more faculty can enjoy the workshops, it seems worth the attempt to offer expanded opportunities.

The Board also wants to stress that the director of the program, in consultation with the Board, should ultimately have final say as to workshop content.

D. Enrollment caps

The Board, with the support of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, has had the enrollment cap for all L-courses lowered from 25 to 23 and, for courses approved by the Board, to 20. The Board recommends further reducing those caps to 21 and 18 and will negotiate with the Vice President for these new caps. As part of preparing for these negotiations, the Board is studying the overall enrollment and staffing implications and the costs of these lower caps. The study will also examine whether giving additional load credit for teaching L-courses is feasible, or whether the chief objectives of this feature of the original Proposal for the Pilot can better be met by significantly reduced enrollment caps.

Obviously, a lower cap means that L-course instructors can devote more time to each individual student (another theme of the Focus Groups report). The Board, once again, submits this proposal in recognition of the time commitment that goes into teaching an L-course.

E. Independent Studies

Appendix N, page 92, presents the Board's recommendations for L-credit for Independent Studies.

The Board debated for some time before coming to agreement on these guidelines. On the one hand, the Board felt that independent studies should meet the same requirements as other L-courses, in line with the UCF's charge that L-courses have a "consistent character." On the other hand, the Board also recognizes that, given the way Independent Studies are often proposed, there would be the potential for "unnecessary bureaucracy." And so, the Board has recommended a streamlined process that allows for some oversight, but still allows freedom for instructor and student to create and evaluate a project that meets their needs.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs has agreed to these procedures and discussed them with the Deans of each School; they were scheduled to take effect in the Fall 2001 semester.

F. Budget commitment from Administration

As mentioned in Part II above, the Board has created and approved a budget for the full 2001-2002 year, and has received a commitment from the administration to continue to fund the program thereafter. Please see Appendix O, page 94, for budget information.

G. 1/3 overload credit for course proposers during 2001-2002

To continue encouraging the development and re-approval of L-courses, the Board has negotiated with the Vice President of Academic Affairs that instructors who propose a course during the 2001-2002 year only will be given 1/3 overload credit, in recognition of the time that needs to be put into developing such a proposal.

H. Review of pre-existing L-courses

As with most elements of this proposal, the Board debated for some time about how to recommend the reviewing of pre-existing L-courses. The Board had no disagreement about the importance of such courses' going through a review process: Given the UCF's "consistency" charge to the Board, it seems necessary that all L-courses, old and new, be considered through the same process. The Board also believes that this entire process should take place over several years, partly so as to not slow the Board's process of examining courses, but, more importantly, to allow faculty adequate time to prepare their proposals.

The Board could not, however, agree on the mechanism and the schedule for that process. The Board agreed that it would be best to let the UCF decide how existing L-courses would be reviewed. As a more representative body, the UCF will be able to make a fair decision.

The Board does, however, offer some suggestions for possible processes:

- The UCF may use the current schedule of department self-evaluations. The departments scheduled for self-evaluation would also submit proposals for L-courses during the semester their report is due. Having a department's proposals due during the same semester would allow the Writing Board and SWP staff to concentrate its efforts, providing proposal workshops and other support tailored to the needs of individual departments, if requested.
- The UCF may use the current schedule of departmental self-evaluations, but expect departments to submit proposals during the year *after* their self-evaluation reports are due. This option would have the same advantages as the option above, with the additional advantages of (1) not overburdening faculty already involved in the self-evaluation process, and (2) allowing L-course proposals to be shaped according to the department's needs, as identified by the self-evaluation.
- A third option might be to allow individual departments to determine when they would submit L-course proposals. The UCF would establish a

maximum time period (say, three or four years), after which time any non-re-approved L's would no longer be offered.

- The UCF may, of course, consider other possibilities as well.

The Board recognizes that writing an L-course proposal does present a time demand on faculty. However, faculty who have submitted proposals for courses they have previously taught as L's have reported that they spent, on average, between one and two hours preparing the proposal. The Board feels that the two hour time commitment is reasonable, especially considering the UCF's charge for consistency in L-courses.

I. Nomenclature for Writing Intensive courses

The Board recommends that the nomenclature for writing-intensive courses be changed from "L" ("Literacy") to "W" ("Writing-intensive").

This recommendation is presented for two reasons:

First, "literacy" does not fully capture the nature of the courses. Literacy, in its current usage, implies both reading and writing, and while reading is an important part of any college course, and goes hand-in-hand with writing, students are not graded separately on their reading ability. In addition, "literacy" connotes a set of basic skills that seem far below the kinds of rich, critical writing that the Board has seen assigned by L-course faculty during the pilot.

Finally, "W" is more in line with national mainstream. Few, if any, programs refer to their courses as "literacy" courses. The "W" designation would be more widely recognized by other schools that students might transfer to, and by graduate schools who might look more favorably upon a student with so much writing experience.

There was some concern that registration software might not be able to handle the "W" designation, since it is used to designate something else on student transcripts. However, the Board has been assured that such a designation would be possible.

J. Staffing levels and duties

In order to carry out the duties of the SWP, including approval of courses and designing and implementing support for L-course faculty, a number of personnel will be

required, including members of the Writing Board and an SWP staff. Below are the Board's recommendations for staffing the program:

1. Writing Board

The Writing Board was established by the UCF as an independent committee to establish policy and procedures for L-courses and to oversee the approval of L-course proposals. The Writing Board acts autonomously within these areas, unless proposing a major change in the program, which must be approved by UCF.

The Writing Board consists of nine members, three from each of three schools or school groupings (School of Arts and Sciences; School of Education and School of Health and Human Services; and School of Business and School of Communication, Information, and Library Sciences), plus several other faculty members who serve as *ex*

officio non-voting members: a representative of the UCF; the coordinator of composition; and the director of the writing center. The appointed members are appointed jointly by the UCF and the VP of Academic Affairs, and serve staggered 3-year terms.

The Board recommends that there be a general understanding that ordinarily faculty will be limited to two consecutive three-year terms, so that rotation among faculty is assured.

Members of the Board will serve on committees and subcommittees of the Board, as determined by its members.

2. *Chair of Writing Board*

The Chair of the Writing Board will be elected annually from among the nine regular faculty members of the Board. In addition to serving on the Board, the chair will also perform the following duties:

- Identify and prioritize the decisions that the Board must make, and provide information and resources for those decisions.
- Monitor the budget for the program
- Serve as a regular contact person and resource between the Board and the UCF, faculty senate, academic departments, the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and other university bodies.
- Appoint Board members to subcommittees.
- Serve as a publicly visible spokesperson for the L-course requirement in general university discussions.

3. *Director of the Southern Writing Program*

The SWP director will be a full-time faculty member, ideally with training and/or experience in writing-across-the-curriculum program administration and/or its teaching. The director will receive 6 - 9 credits of reassigned time per semester. The director is not a voting member of the Writing Board, but does contribute his or her expertise during relevant discussions. The director performs the following duties:

- Implement policies established by the Writing Board on behalf of UCF.
- Work directly with faculty who use writing in their courses, supporting their efforts to improve the writing of their students.
- Coordinate the planning of discussions, presentations, and workshops to enhance writing instruction.
- Help faculty assess the success of their courses and prepare applications for approval of Writing Intensive courses.
- Cooperate in the selection, training, and supervision the tutoring staff in the Writing Center.
- Gather statistical and other measures of Writing Intensive course success, as directed by the Board.
- Represent the Board at activities concerning writing in academic courses, including periodic attendance at meetings of the Faculty Senate, the UCF, the Dean's Council and meetings of Department Chairs.

4. Course Development Coordinator

The Course Development Coordinator will be a full-time faculty member, ideally with training and/or experience in writing-across-the-curriculum program administration and/or teaching. The CDC will receive 3 credits of reassigned time per semester. The CDC is not a voting member of the Writing Board, but does contribute his or her expertise during relevant discussions. The CDC performs the following duties:

- Works directly with faculty as they inquire about, prepare, and submit L-course proposals
- Represents faculty at subcommittee meetings at which their proposal is being considered
- Serves as a liaison with the UCF staff in coordinating proposals and reporting approved L-course proposals
- Manages any other aspects of the L-course proposal and approval process as necessary

5. Tutors

The Board recommends that tutors be hired each semester to support L-course faculty and students. Tutors are to be housed in the university writing center until additional space and program support is obtained as the University building program moves on to Phase Two. Tutors work 10 hours per week, meeting individually with students. They are also available to meet with faculty to discuss writing issues, and to visit classrooms to assist L-course faculty in teaching writing.

The Board also recognizes that the qualifications, number, and duties of tutors remain flexible, determined annually by the director, in accordance with the needs of L-course faculty and students.

K. National Search for Director

The Board recommends that, upon approval of its proposal, a national search for a new director take place. The Board recommends that the following parameters be considered:

- The search committee should be made up of five members: two from the Writing Board, and three more appointed jointly by the VP of Academic Affairs and the UCF.
- The committee will be expanded to include representatives from the candidates' disciplines' departments, once candidates have been identified. Because part of the director's load will involve teaching within a department, those potentially affected departments need to be represented on the search committee.
- The director's appointment should begin August 2002.
- The search committee should make every effort to find candidates outside of the discipline of English, in keeping with the interdisciplinary spirit of the pilot. However, the Board also recognizes that the great majority of candidates for WAC director positions come from English departments.

L. Ongoing Assessment

The Board asserts its commitment to ongoing assessment of its policies and procedures. Of particular interest will be to ensure that the program is providing adequate support for faculty, and that it is sticking to procedural simplicity. The Board was pleased with the results of the focus groups it conducted in the spring 2001 semester, and has planned to continue such groups on an annual or biennial basis.

M. Relationship between Writing Board and Departments

The Board is actively considering its relationship to academic departments in an effort to ensure that its policies respect the needs of individual disciplines. Being considered are recommendations to encourage students to take L-courses within their majors; strategies to encourage each department to offer a writing-intensive capstone course; and perhaps turning over some of the approval process.

Conclusion

The Board would like to thank the UCF for the opportunity to consider changes to the way L-courses are proposed, taught, and overseen. We believe that recommendations presented in this report will serve the needs of Southern faculty and students by ensuring a more consistent character across L-courses; supporting faculty and students in their efforts to improve writing ability; and doing so without unnecessary bureaucracy.

The Board would also like to thank the many, many members of the Southern community who offered their thoughts, suggestions, and criticisms over the past three years.

Works Cited

- Fulwiler, Toby and Art Young, editors. *Programs that Work : Models and Methods for Writing Across the Curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH : Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1990.
- Herrington, Anne and Charles Moran, editors. *Writing, Teaching, and Learning in the Disciplines*. New York : Modern Language Association of America, 1992.
- Magnetto, Joyce Neff and Barbara R. Stout. "Faculty Workshops." *Writing Across the Curriculum: A Guide to Developing Programs*. Edited by Susan H. McLeod and Margot Soven. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992. 23-34.
- Williams, James D. *Preparing to Teach Writing*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1989.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake and Brian Huot, editors. *Assessing Writing Across the Curriculum: Diverse Approaches and Practices*. Greenwich, Conn. : Ablex Pub. Corp., 1997.
- Young, Art. "The Wonder of Writing Across the Curriculum." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 1 (1994): 58-72.

Appendix A:

1983 Guidelines for Teaching L-courses

(As published in *Faculty Handbook*, “Academic Policies and Procedures” section APP496 page 3.6)

L-Courses Requirement. To ensure that all students continue to strengthen their ability in written language, they are required to select and pass a minimum of three L-courses. These courses are taken only after the student has passed English 100. L-courses are specifically designated and are offered in various departments as electives, part of major programs, and as options to fulfill all-University requirements. Students who transfer between 60 and 90 credits must pass two L-courses, while students who transfer more than 90 credits must pass one L-course.

The following requirements were developed by the Undergraduate Curriculum and Instruction Committee (UCIC) to implement the faculty referendum on L-courses approved spring semester 1982.

L-courses shall include several writing requirements with student producing a minimum of twenty-five pages of material. A page is about 250 words. The number and length of the assignments will be determined by the nature of the subject matter and the course level. Assignments must be presented as an integral part of the course.

Students will be informed that clarity of thought, coherence in organization, correctness in grammar, punctuation, and spelling will be considered in determining the grade for the paper. Students will be required to rewrite poorly written papers.

The papers should be more than book reports or collections of quotations from various sources, and should require original critical thinking on the part of the student.

The instructor of an L-course or section is expected to correct and comment on the following qualities in students' writing:

Clarity of focus: The writer's point of view or purpose is limited and clear.

Content: The thesis (point of view) is developed with good supporting details.

Diction, Idiom, Level of Usage: The writer chooses words and idioms that are appropriate to the topic and the audience.

Audience Awareness and Writer Awareness: The writer establishes his own identity and is sensitive to possible questions and objections from his reader.

Organization and Style: The ideas are organized in a logical, sequential order. The paragraphs are fully developed and unified with smooth transitions between paragraphs. Sentences are reasonably varied.

Mechanics: The writer exhibits good command of standard English grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Appendix B:

Proposal for Pilot Program, 1997

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A CAMPUS WRITING PROGRAM AT SCSU

We have had 10 years of generally successful experience with requiring L-courses for students at SCSU. Now we see an opportunity to increase the visibility, participation, rigor, and satisfaction of such courses.

Put generally, we want to set the L-course requirement at the center of our pedagogical strategies for the liberal education of our students. Unfortunately, many students now encounter L-courses as individual hurdles, placed randomly on the CPER landscape, over which they must jump. We want to create a curricular structure and educational environment in which writing can be encountered as a tool of discovery across the curriculum.

More specifically, therefore, we propose that SCSU transform its present vision of L-courses into a well-planned and well-supported Southern Writing Program (SWP). The UCF, representing the faculty in matters of curriculum, plays the central role in this transformation.

We propose that UCF create the Southern Writing Program with three major elements:

- I. A Campus Writing Board to supervise L-courses;
- II. Professional staff to support faculty and student participation in L-courses;
- III. Rewards for successful faculty participation.

I

Campus Writing Board

- A. The Academic Vice President, in consultation with UCF, will appoint a board of 12 faculty and three students, selected from successful teachers of writing-intensive courses and representing three basic faculty units (three faculty and one student from each of the following units:
 1. School of Arts and Sciences
 2. School of Education and School of Professional Studies

Information, 3. School of Business and School of Communication,
and Library Science

The Chair of the Campus Writing Board will be elected by the board from among the nine faculty members.

- B. The Board will also include as *ex officio* non-voting members the English Department's Coordinator of Composition, the Director of the Writing Center, and a member of the UCF University-Wide Impact Committee.
- C. The Board, in consultation with the UCF and the Academic Vice President, will supervise L-courses by implementing policies developed by the appropriate faculty bodies.
- D. The Campus Writing Board will approve L-course proposals at each offering.
- E. The Campus Writing Board will oversee the activities of the SWP staff.

II

Professional Staff

- A. There will be a full-time Director of the Writing Program.
 - 1. The Director will have faculty rank on a tenure-track appointment.
 - 2. The Director will conduct bi-annual workshops for present and potential L-course faculty; attendance at one workshop annually will be required for all L-course faculty.
 - 3. The Director will consult with L-course faculty at least twice each semester during an L-course.
 - 4. The Director will conduct structured interviews with all faculty at the conclusion of each L-course.
 - 5. The Director will gather student evaluations, using methods developed specifically for this purpose, after each L-course.
 - 6. The Director will supervise workshop or tutoring activities for students during the semester.
- B. There will be three half-time writing consultants available during the semester.
 - 1. These consultants will be at least graduate students in an academic field related to their assigned responsibilities.
 - 2. They will also have demonstrated skill at writing in their fields, and will have participated in training sessions conducted by the Director.

3. Each consultant will be available to assist faculty during the semester.
 4. Each consultant will tutor students enrolled in L-courses in one division.
- C. There will be at least half-time secretarial support for the SWP.

III

Rewards for Faculty Participation

- A. Each faculty member who participates in an L-course workshop (II. A. 2 above) will receive an honorarium of \$100.
- B. Faculty who teach L-courses will have the assistance of a quarter-time Teaching Assistant for every 20 students after the first 20, if methods for offering L-courses effectively to larger class sections can be developed.
- C. Faculty who teach L-courses successfully will have this service to the University noted appropriately during Promotion & Tenure or Professional Assessment proceeding.
- D. Faculty who have successfully taught L-courses three times will receive three overload credits.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

If the UCF votes this semester to authorize a pilot version of the Southern Writing Program for writing-intensive courses, we anticipate proceeding on approximately the following schedule:

1. During the remainder of the Fall Semester, and during the inter-session, we will identify faculty members and students who have the experience and commitment to serve as members of the Board for the pilot program.

We will also prepare preliminary estimates of how many tutors we may need by analyzing enrollment figures for the last ten years of writing-intensive courses and consulting with other schools about their experiences.

2. At the beginning of the spring semester we will hold formal consultations with the designated representative(s) of the UCF, and make the appointments of faculty and student Board members.

3. During the first two months of the Spring semester the Board will establish procedures, timetables, and appropriate forms.

We will also begin to develop a job-description and qualifications for an interim Director and for one or more tutors.

We will be in contact with the University-wide Impact Committee during both these tasks through the committee representative on the Writing Board. When we have developed the documents we intend to use during this first test phase, we will submit them to the entire Committee for discussion.

Both of these tasks will be supported by assistance from the Quality Management Institute staff, process and budget; we expect to meet with one or more faculty who supervise writing programs at other universities.

We will also notify faculty of Arts & Sciences that proposals for new Writing-Intensive courses will be considered by the Board during the last month of the Spring semester and the first month of the Fall semester: these will be courses to be taught in the following Spring semester (2000).

Immediately following the Spring semester, we will hold the first workshop on managing writing-intensive courses; we expect to invite an experienced presenter from another school. We will invite all interested SCSU faculty members to attend, both experienced and prospective teachers of writing-intensive courses. The \$100 honorarium will be paid.

We will submit a report on this workshop to the UCF at the beginning of the following (Fall 1999) semester.

4. Based on our experiences with the process thus far, and with the oversight of the UCF, we will begin during the Fall semester (1999) to undertake the review and re-authorization of existing Writing-Intensive courses in Arts and Sciences.

5. During the Spring semester (2000) the Board will examine the policies and procedures developed thus far, and, *in consultation with the UCF and Academic Vice-President*, will make changes as appropriate. The Quality Management Institute will be asked to provide support for this process.

A special priority will be to evaluate the effectiveness of the support given to faculty and students involved with writing-intensive courses.

6. During the Fall (2000) and Spring (2001) semesters the Board will administer the program as developed thus far, monitoring all aspects for strengths and weaknesses.

If the program has developed successfully, the Board may return to the UCF

for authorization to extend the pilot program to writing-intensive courses in other schools of the university.

7. During the first month of the following semester (Fall 2001) the Board will submit a formal report on the pilot program to the UCF. This report will include the Board's recommendations for how to supervise Writing Intensive courses across the curriculum of the university.

Appendix C:

Southern Writing Program Pilot Charter, 1997

SCSU WRITING PROGRAM PILOT PROGRAM CHARTER

1. Name of Project and Sponsors
 - SCSU Writing Program (SWP)
 - Sponsors: Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF), in partnership with the Vice President for Academic Affairs
2. Organizational Goals or Objectives to be Addressed
 - Improved administration and improved outcomes of existing L-course policy to develop student writing skills.
3. Locational Boundaries of the process (what departments and offices are affected)
 - a. Academic Affairs
 - b. departments in School of Arts and Sciences
 - c. UCF
4. Improvement Targets and Measures
 - a. review features of proposed pilot program (developed by Mark Heidmann) to determine their feasibility at SCSU
 - b. develop a procedure and measures for assessing the effectiveness of a pilot program
 - c. implement the pilot program in phases, as outlined in the Heidmann proposal
 - d. assess the pilot efforts and make desired adjustments in the plan
 - e. include the following factors in the assessment:
 1. does the project foster more consistent character and quality of the L courses?
 2. does the project provide more effective support and guidance to instructors in the L courses?
 3. does the project improve student writing?
 4. does the project support the different qualities of good writing practice in different disciplines?
 5. does the structure of the project avoid unnecessary bureaucracy?

6. does the project operate at a reasonable cost which the administration will be prepared to support over time, and which does not compromise other academic needs?

f. report to the sponsors (UCF, VP) each semester on the progress of the project, including recommendations for implementation of changes beyond the pilot project

5. Resources

- a. the SWP pilot project team will be composed of members as stipulated in sections I.A and I.B. of the proposal and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Members will be selected by the Academic VP in consultation with the UCF.
- b. facilitation by the Quality Management Institute will be provided by the administration to the extent requested by the sponsoring parties and the pilot program Writing Board.
- c. the Academic VP will provide operational funding and staff resources to conduct the pilot operation, as proposed, in the amount not to exceed \$50,000 as part of SCSU's strategic plan objective 1.1.
- d. the University Wide Impact Committee of the UCF will serve as the point of contact for the pilot program team whenever they want or need to consult.

6. Constraints

Regular reports (once each semester) on progress, problems and proposed solutions in pilot project to UCF and the Academic VP.

The pilot program will not be expanded or made permanent until it is

- a. reviewed by all sponsoring parties
- b. approved by all appropriate faculty bodies and administrative offices authorized to change university-wide curriculum.

7. Time Frame

Project will follow the schedule in Heidmann proposal.

8. Strategies

Committee process, supplemented by quality planning methodology, as desired by

the Writing Project pilot project team.

Inclusion of the project in SCSU's annual spending plans and budgets for the period of the pilot project.

Sponsors' Signatures:

UCF (Chair) _____

VP for Academic Affairs _____

Appendix D: Writing Board Survey of L-course Instructors, Fall 1999

SOUTHERN WRITING BOARD SURVEY OF L-COURSE INSTRUCTORS—1999 CLASSES

1. What is your general experience teaching L-courses?
2. Would you teach L's in the future? Why or why not?
3. What do you find difficult about teaching an L-course?
4. What have you found rewarding about teaching L-courses?
5. When you teach L's, how do revisions fit in, if at all?

Appendix E: Workshop Evaluation Reports, Fall 1999-Fall 2001

Evaluation Report SCSU Faculty Writing-Intensive Workshop October 8, 1999

Co-Facilitators

Bob McEachern, Interim Director, Southern Writing Program
Martha Townsend, University of Missouri
Martha Patton, University of Missouri

Participants

David Levine, Art History
Camille Serchuk, Art History
Jason Stenzel, Chemistry
Polly Beals, History
Dana Sonnenschein, English
Michael Ryan, Sociology
Jim Dolan, Physics
Troy Paddock, History

Writing Board members

Mark Heidmann, English
Carina Vocisano, Psychology
Beth Taylor, Special Education
Bernadette Madara, Nursing
Tony Maltese, Social Work
Debora Savage, Economics
Frank Harris, Journalism
Sue Ellen Holbrook, English
Tom Ferrucci, English
Megan Macomber, English
Mike Shea, English

Courtney McManus, student
 Jeff Sousa, student
 Erica Gordon, student

Participants represented 12 departments from 5 different schools within SCSU

**Evaluation
 SCSU Faculty Writing-Intensive Workshop
 October 8, 1999**

Participants responded to questions 1 through 20 by circling the appropriate number, as described below:

NA (0)= Not applicable or don't know. The statement doesn't apply to the workshop, or you simply aren't able to give a knowledgeable response.

SA (4)= Strongly Agree. You strongly agree with this statement as it applies to this workshop.

A (3)= Agree. You agree more than you disagree with the statement as it applies to this workshop.

D (2)= Disagree. You disagree more than you agree with the statement as it applies to this workshop.

SD (1)= Strongly Disagree. You strongly disagree with this statement as it applies to this workshop.

Total evaluations: 19

	<u>NA</u>	<u>SA or A</u>	<u>SD or D</u>
1. The workshop's objectives were clear. Additional comment: I remember hearing about the objectives, but a review as part of the workshop would have been helpful.	3	15	1
2. It was easy to remain attentive Additional comment: Yes, but I flagged at the end of the day Additional comment: A short break in the afternoon is absolutely necessary.	0	18	1
3. a) The content of the workshop was worthwhile	0	18	1
b) The content of the handouts is worthwhile	0	18	1
c) Bean's <i>Engaging Ideas</i> is worthwhile Additional comment for (a): Somewhat uneven, not in quality, but in relevance to particular disciplines. Additional comment for (b): All overheads should be made into handouts.	5	13	0

4. I would have preferred other methods of presentation	1	2	16
5. The presenters did <u>not</u> synthesize, integrate, or summarize effectively	1	1	17
6. Some things were <u>not</u> explained very well. Additional comment: A bit short on time on some parts (peer review) Additional comment: Explained well, but little time to reflect	1	1	17
7. The workshop encouraged developed new viewpoints and appreciations.	1	16	2
8. The workshop provided opportunities to apply learned experiences to demonstrate understanding	2	16	1
9. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop Additional comment: Re-stimulated.	0	19	0
10. The information presented seemed timely and up-to-date.	1	18	0
11. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right. Additional comment: too quick sometimes	1	11	7
12. Time was wasted by the presenters by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material.	0	3	16
13. The workshop raised challenging questions or problems for discussion.	0	19	0
14. During the workshop, I felt free to ask questions or present my opinion.	0	19	0
15. The scope of the workshop was too limited; not enough material was presented. Additional comment: Different levels of expertise, engagement, I-know-it-allness in this group.	0	17	2
16. I will be able to use some of the ideas from the workshop in teaching my course(s). Additional comment: But then I already do.	2	17	0
17. The workshop acknowledged the connections			

- 5 between writing, reading, and thinking. 0 14
- Additional comment: Didn't make reading/writing link strongly enough.
Additional comment: But needs even more on thinking and reading
18. The workshop offered practical advice about responding to student writing. 0 16 3
Additional comment: But need a practicum of some longer duration to be helpful.
19. The workshop offered practical advice about grading student writing. 0 15 4
Additional comment: But need a practicum of some longer duration to be helpful.
20. I would advise colleagues to take future workshops. 0 19 0
21. If I were to grade this workshop on a scale from 1 to 100 points, I would assign it _____ points as an overall grade.
- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|--|
| Average of all who responded: | 86.88 | |
| Number grading 90-99: | 9 | |
| Number grading 80-89: | 6 | |
| Number grading 70-79: | 1 | |
| Number grading 60-69: | 1 | |
| Number grading below 60: | 0 | |
| Number who did not respond: | 2 | |

22. How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?

- The workshop has had an impact on my teaching, but it is too early to explain exactly how I will change my teaching.
- I will adopt some of the Bean suggestions.
- I will use some of these ideas to refine assignments (and create them).
- I think the workshop will help me to develop better writing assignments, grade these assignments more quickly and effectively, and improve student writing.
- Provided additional ideas to supplement Bean's book.
- I will talk to colleagues more about specific policies.
- I will revise current writing assignments -- more problem oriented, and develop rubrics for more assignments. I will change my comments on papers.
- Through the awareness that faculty in various disciplines are as strongly involved with student writing. My focus in composition classes will often refer to the expectations of these other faculty.
- I will give better assignments, save time when grading, and integrate papers better with course.
- Restructure assignments. Will consider teaching an L-course for the first time.
- This particular workshop seemed focused on identification and characterization of problems, without offering the sort of structure and examples that could be completed in my courses. It will have an impact in the quality of my reflection and introspection (which is good) and probably result in change through time and increased colleague contact.
- It will help me offer better comments to students on their papers.
- It gives me confidence in my various approaches.
- It has stimulated my thinking of creative ways to present writing assignments.

- This workshop has affirmed all of my practices in writing-intensive courses. It has encouraged me to use them in majors' courses as well as composition and sophomore literature.
- Will help me to improve my writing assignments and evaluation of papers.

23. This workshop was intended to serve as a model or prototype for future SCSU workshops. What might have been included that wasn't (or) what should be left out next time around?

- Discussion on grading and peer reviews would help. Most help would have been some discussion of how one balances the need to cover a certain amount of material and teach writing.
- A two day workshop would be more beneficial. Having more time to focus on each topic would be beneficial. There was too much to do in a short period of time. Having actual examples of graded papers from 1 or 2 courses would [increase] the focus. The examples should be A - C - F papers graded by the same person.
- Samples of the rubrics should be handed out.
- More practice on editing. More on writing in technical courses.
- Hand-outs of all overhead presentations. More time devoted to presentation of the facilitator's ideas. More focus on issues/problems with applying the model to L-courses at SCSU.
- More interaction within small groups; less lecture-type presentation.
- Perhaps drop WI scenarios or go directly to a large group problem solving/discussion. This would leave more time for peer review/conferencing piece.
- Will need to be shorter for some of our faculty -- not sure how.
- Difficult to know at this point. Probably plenty given for one day, before teaching an L-course. Follow-up workshops, to be determined.
- Never shrink 20 hours of material into six. All of the material deserved a lot more time for interaction in both small group and large group exercises. Choose some part and do it appropriately and avoid overviews in this format.
- Issues with students who have more deficits in terms of grammar, ESL, etc
- Everything was worthwhile
- Move groups around -- don't depend on table partners alone. Keep allowing people to put their observations in their own words, even if it's repetitive.
- Hard to answer. For me, this was a beginning/introduction and was useful for instructors just beginning to teach L courses.
- I like all the elements or sections and the combination of lecture and small group work.
- Please get back to me on this one.

24. What should SCSU do now to follow through with further assistance for you?

- It is too early for me to comment.
- Hold 1 hour workshop on each topic. Hold different levels of workshops for faculty who already teach L courses, English/Composition faculty, and faculty who have never taught an L course.
- Make people available to critique the L instructor's approach.
- List of interesting web sites? Links to others in our disciplines?
- Lower maximum class size to 20. Lower the minimum page requirement in the guidelines to 20 instead of 25.
- Perhaps have further discussion of ideas and challenges shared by other faculty.
- Sponsor interactive colloquia/workshops dealing with teaching writing.
- Focused topic meetings would be useful.

- Allot sufficient funds for and attention to writing support programs.
- Keep entire faculty aware of plans, Writing Board membership, and actions taken. Do NOT depend on word of mouth to do this!!!
- Handouts on 5 minute workshops, modeling, etc. Personal copy of Bean.
- Provide this sort of format for exchange. Provide technical writing experts. Create definite physical space, with books and manuals, for peer-review sessions.
- Continue dialogue about writing and teaching strategies.
- Workshops that focus on evaluation of courses/content.
- I strongly endorse the Writing Board project.
- Possibly allow certain L courses to be awarded 4 hours credit for students and instructors. Beef up Writing Center with people experienced in my discipline.

25. Any other comments you care to add?

- The Martys were very good.
- The room was too hot, the pace was too fast. The "average" rating for [my] evaluation is not meant to be a reflection on the "Martys" -- just the pace of the workshop. I really did learn much important information. Thank you.
- Thanks! You worked hard, and it showed.
- Both Martys were informed and congenial. Room was way too warm. I needed a couple more breaks -- I felt like I was doing E.S.T.
- Very worthwhile. I learned techniques that I can use immediately and encountered ideas that I will try to work through over time.
- Good choice of presenters.
- Excellent.
- I'll happily attend other sessions. I find the conversations very stimulating and encourage an academic environment at SCSU. I thought entirely too much time was devoted to areas that this audience already knew to the sacrifice of the kinds of feedback that I want.
- As a student, I discovered that the faculty at SCSU is committed to helping students write better and with more purpose.
- Great conversation about writing! I've never heard such a productive discussion of writing on this campus in the 15 years I've been here.
- A lot of material to absorb. A more narrow focus would be useful.
- Compressing the workshop into one day forced (?) one of the presenters to cut off or not apparently attend to our ideas so that she could pop up transparencies with predetermined lists on them. Avoid this.

Evaluation Report
SCSU faculty Writing-Intensive Workshop
January 18 & 19, 2000

Workshop Leaders:

Bob McEachern, Interim Director, Southern Writing Program
Martha Townsend, University of Missouri
Ben Schwarz, University of Missouri

Attendees

Jon Bloch, Sociology/Anthropology
C.B. Coleman, Theater
Kay Corbett, Education
Maria Diamantis, Education
Nancy Disbrow, Library Science/Info. Technology
Jerry Dunklee, Journalism
Peggy Gallup, Public Health
Patty Kahlbaugh, Psychology
Tom Malchodi, SCSU Writing Center
Virginia Metaxas, History
Nancy Noell, SWP Writing Center
Liz Owen, Art History
Christine Petto, History
Lisa Rebesch, Nursing
Kathleen Skoczen, Sociology/Anthropology
Cindy Stretch, English
Anne Szeligowski, SWP Writing Center
Beth Taylor, Special Education
Chuck Weider, Art History
Jodi Williams, Library Science

Participants represented 12 departments from 4 different schools within SCSU

Faculty Panel

Troy Paddock, History
Liz Owen, Art History

Evaluation Report
SCSU faculty Writing-Intensive Workshop
January 18 & 19, 2000

Participants responded to questions 1 through 19 by circling the appropriate letter(s), as described below:

NA = Not applicable or don't know. The statement doesn't apply to the workshop, or you simply aren't able to give a knowledgeable response.

SA = Strongly Agree. You strongly agree with this statement as it applies to this workshop.

A = Agree. You agree more than you disagree with the statement as it applies to this workshop.

D = Disagree. You disagree more than you agree with the statement as it applies to this workshop.

SD = Strongly Disagree. You strongly disagree with this statement as it applies to this workshop.

Total evaluations: 20 (though one did not complete questions 15-25)

	<u>NA</u>	<u>SA or A</u>	<u>SD or D</u>
26. The workshop's objectives were clear.	0	20	0
27. It was easy to remain attentive	0	20	0
28. a) The content of the workshop was worthwhile	0	20	0
d b) The content of the handouts is worthwhile	0	20	0
e c) Bean's <i>Engaging Ideas</i> is worthwhile	2	18	1
Note: one evaluation marked "c" as both SA and SD			
Additional comment for (c): Yes! [with SA circled]			
Additional comment for (c): Not carefully read			
Additional comment for (c): It really would help to get materials on the January 7 th date, or even earlier -- I know you're working on it....			
Additional comment for (a), (b), and (c): Absolutely!			
29. I would have preferred other methods of presentation	0	3	17
30. The presenters did <u>not</u> synthesize, integrate, or summarize effectively	0	2	18
31. Some things were <u>not</u> explained very well.	0	1	19

32. The workshop provided opportunities to apply learned experiences to demonstrate understanding Additional comment: Not enough time [with a D circled]	2	16	2
33. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop Additional comment: Very much so!	0	19	1
34. The workshop encouraged/developed new viewpoints and appreciations.	0	19	1
35. The information presented seemed timely and up-to-date.	0	20	0
36. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right. Additional comment: We got bogged down, but that's our fault	0	17	3
37. Time was wasted by the presenters by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material. Note: One evaluation had both "A" and "D" circled and included the comment "It could have been more efficient" Additional comment: I enjoyed the tangents--helpful to see issues other professors are dealing with.	0	2	19
38. During the workshop, I felt free to ask questions or present my opinion. Note: One evaluation had both "A" and "D" circled	0	20	1
39. The scope of the workshop was too limited; not enough material was presented. Additional comment: Actually, I feel the opposite. I dislike grading assignments that we lack context for--it seemed a useless exercise and major waste of time.	0	0	20
40. I will be able to use some of the ideas from the workshop in teaching my course(s). Additional comment: Yes.	0	19	0
41. The workshop offered practical advice about responding to student writing. Additional comment: Could have been more.	0	19	0
42. The workshop acknowledged the connections between writing, reading, and thinking. Additional comment: [Reading was] the missing link Additional comment: [Reading was] not really brought up	0	16	3

Additional comment: [Reading was] not so much [discussed]

43. I would advise colleagues to take future workshops. 1 18

1

Note: One evaluation had both "A" and "D" circled and included the comment "Undecided"

Additional comment: It's required [with "NA" circled]

44. The workshop raised challenging questions
or problems for discussion. 0 19 0

Additional comment: Yes [with "challenging" underlined]

45. If I were to grade this workshop on a scale from 1 to 100 points, I would assign it
_____ points as an overall grade.

Average of all who responded: 91.87

Number grading 90-100: 17

Number grading 80-89: 0

Number grading 70-79: 2

Number grading 60-69: 0

Number grading below 60: 0

Number who did not respond: 1

46. How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?

- Provide practical advice on teaching writing as well as re-orient my approach to writing
- The workshop gave me excellent ideas for creating some exciting assignments and "breathing life" into the term paper model.
- It will help me to better design assignments. It will help me to explain assignments to students.
- Immediate effect on my revisions on courses; will apply some of this information to my spring 2000 SCORE course, too.
- I will certainly revise writing assignments and give more careful feedback to students.
- Presentations have stimulated my thinking further of how to develop student critical thinking and writing
- I will further revise assignments. I will alter the way I comment on student papers. I will develop rubrics for some of my assignments. I believe I will submit an L-course proposal (for the first time ever).
- Improve it. I am coming away with many new ideas for all of my courses.
- It gave me very good ideas but I think they may be presented in, e.g., short workshops that don't take a chunk out of important prep time. The end of the semester might be better.
- Right now my head is spinning....I thought I had a sound course proposal with various assignments and writing guidelines. I just need to take a deep breath and not revise everything right now.
- In reality, very little.
- Direct application to my instructional approach to course content, assignments, etc.
- It will affect the development of more problem-based assignments.

- It gave me an "excuse" to dedicate 2 days to thinking about my own methods. I'm changing the way I sequence assignments and adding more and more meaningful informal writing.
 - Commenting on essays--more is not necessarily better.
 - I would like to review the Bean text and then work in new approaches in my teaching and writing to see what would work in my classes.
 - Refocus some writing assignments. Re-evaluate my methods of grading.
 - I believe that the workshop will help me to incorporate and further develop assignments in L-courses which I teach. The examples provided and the discussion were great!
 - Rethink and redesign assignments. Plus I'm going to incorporate some of the other suggestions (peer review, short paragraphs, etc.) into the course.
47. This workshop was intended to serve as a model or prototype for future SCSU workshops. What might have been included that wasn't (or) what should be left out next time around?
- I would like to know about peer review--the practical applications and problems. I like the mix of lectures and activities. Please add times to agenda.
 - Asking faculty, in groups, to create new assignments, not just bring old ones. That means more time for processing during workshop.
 - I liked the variety of presenters' backgrounds and their individual input.
 - Group discussion of specific challenges faced by "L" course faculty along with proposed solutions.
 - If possible, more time for 5-minute workshops (e.g., run through one as would be done in class)
 - Perhaps more focus on specific projects developed by SCSU faculty. I would have loved feedback on the specifics of what I do now and what I plan to do later.
 - I don't know if you need to bring in outsiders. I think you should condense it to one day.
 - It would help to hear or see concrete examples our own faculty. For example, as the semesters go by Troy could give us a copy of his 3rd assignment and give us feedback on how it worked. We just need to get some of the "L" courses going the "new" way and then we will have more to say.
 - It could be done in an afternoon.
 - It would have been helpful to eliminate some of the norming and evaluation procedures. We got a little bogged down. Otherwise -- great!!
 - We should expect participants to actually read Bean so that presentations could go beyond summary.
 - More attention to how the Writing Center and tutors can be a valuable resource.
 - A little more time given to evaluating L-assignments that exist. Take time to rewrite existing L assignments, then critique them.
 - I think that a little more context could be provided for the examples and the papers given.
 - A section on how to handle the "problem" student--perhaps this may involve some coaching/suggestions from the L-course tutors (?). I also liked the panel set-up--perhaps switching panels on day 2 to share ideas with other profs.
48. During the course of the semester, we will be offering one- to two-hour "mini-workshops" on topics relevant to teaching L-courses. Are there particular courses you would like to see covered?

- Maybe peer review
- New and interesting assignments; what worked what didn't
- Rubrics, grading
- 5-minute workshops; peer editing techniques, including worksheets for focused peer review.
- More hands-on with particular assignments could be useful (both development and giving feedback to)
- Perhaps a workshop on various styles -- MLA, APA, Chicago; perhaps a science prof. might demonstrate how he/she uses "L" courses.
- Two hours is a long time--keep short. Keep open to questions from participants.
- Peer reviews
- Peer review; teaching students to develop good "thesis statements"
- I'd like to present on the purpose and use of a Writing Center.
- Have someone from the tutoring staff give a sample presentation of what he or she would do when invited to your classroom.
- More on feedback/constructive criticism/ grading (covered on day 2 of workshop)

49. What should SCSU do now to follow through with further assistance for you?

- Maintain funding for the Writing Board!
- Keep the Writing Board
- Think about ongoing conversations between instructors currently teaching L courses.
- Provide updates about SCSU Writing program activities via e-mail messages. Perhaps, tip of the month?
- What you have planned seems great. I will want to develop my L course this semester for certification/evaluation.
- Relieve the paperwork.
- It sounds as if you already have it planned through: 2 workshops in Aug/Jan; mini workshops; meetings with Bob; Writing Center
- Unless some unforeseen question or problem emerges, I can't think of anything. Once the semester starts, it will be hard to have much time to delve into all the issues in-depth, so I expect to work on my own, as with other courses.
- Be available for further questions -- perhaps an e-mail query?
- Upgrade the Writing Center
- Continue building student and faculty support structures: develop and expand Campus Writing Center, for example; reduce class size to allow implementation of workshop's suggestions.
- Take suggestions, questions, and comments from this and past workshops and use them for discussion in future ones.
- As mentioned in the workshop, look into absorbing testing costs for students with learning disabilities.
- It might be helpful for us to get some feedback from the other workshop participants on what they adopted/alterd from suggestions, what is working, what isn't, or if anyone here at SCSU has built a better mousetrap.

50. Any other comments you care to add?

- Thanks a lot, folks -- good job!
- Thanks for the growth! This has been a workshop of confirming on my beliefs and making me feel good about what I do.
- This was a well-designed workshop. The text was very helpful and will be a great reference as I work on writing assignments for my courses.
- If the Writing board has authority over L-courses & that authority is construed as "faculty" control, maybe WB members should be elected, not appointed.
- I learned more the second time around -- the 2-day format seems to work.
- While I realize that "L" courses have often been taught irresponsibly and "lazily" over the years, I feel the degree of micromanagement now being offered is too far in the other direction.
- Thanks for a revealing 2 days. I plan to strongly encourage other faculty in my department to participate in future writing workshops.
- I'm glad SCSU is paying attention to writing and to enriching our students' experience (and mine).
- Thanks.

Evaluation Report

SCSU Faculty Writing-Intensive Workshop

August 28 & 29, 2000

Workshop Leaders:

Bob McEachern, Interim Director, Southern Writing Program

Martha Townsend, Director, Campus Writing Program, University of Missouri

Participants

Therese Bennett, Mathematics (Board member)

Cathy Berman, Library Science

Mary Brown, Library Science

Debby Carroll, Psychology

Kathy Connors, Art

Charlie Dellinger-Pate, Communication

Bob Eldridge, Economics & Finance

Jacque Ensign, Education

Jane Feng, Biology

Lynn Hidek, Library Science

Shirley Jackson, Sociology

Steven Judd, History

Marisa Kammerling, Library Science

Steve Larocco, English

Tony Maltese, Social Work (Board member)

Doris Marino, Exercise Science

Sandy Minor, Public Health

Sharon Misasi, Exercise Science

Jeff Mock, English

Wes O'Brien, Communication

Rob Page, Management

Paul Petrie, English

Jiongdong Pang, Chemistry

Kate Reynolds, Modern Language

Frank Tavares, Communication (Board member)

Barbara Worden, Social Work

Jin-Jin Yang, Exercise Science

Participants represented 17 departments from 5 different schools within SCSU

Faculty Panel

Liz Owen, Art History

Troy Paddock, History

Cindy Stretch, English

**Evaluation Report
SCSU Faculty Writing-Intensive Workshop
August 28 & 29, 2000**

Participants responded to questions 1 through 16 by circling the appropriate letter(s), as described below:

NA = Not applicable or don't know. The statement doesn't apply to the workshop, or you simply aren't able to give a knowledgeable response.

SA = Strongly Agree. You strongly agree with this statement as it applies to this workshop.

A = Agree. You agree more than you disagree with the statement as it applies to this workshop.

D = Disagree. You disagree more than you agree with the statement as it applies to this workshop.

SD = Strongly Disagree. You strongly disagree with this statement as it applies to this workshop.

Total evaluations: 26 [though one did not respond to 3c]

	<u>NA</u>	<u>SA or A</u>	<u>SD or D</u>
51. The workshop's objectives were clear.	0	26	0
2. It was easy to remain attentive Additional comment: First day [with A circled]	0	26	0
3. a) The content of the workshop was worthwhile	0	26	0
b) The content of the handouts was worthwhile	0	26	0
c) Bean's <i>Engaging Ideas</i> was worthwhile	0	25	0
Additional comment for (b): If not repeats of Bean [with A circled]			
Additional comment for (b): Some missing [with A circled]			
Additional comment for (c): *** [with SA circled]			
Additional comment for (c): ! [with SA circled]			
4. The presenters synthesized, integrated, or summarized effectively		0	26
0			
5. Some things were <u>not</u> explained very well.	1	2	23
6. The workshop provided opportunities to apply information and ideas	1	25	0
Additional comment: Need more of this [with A circled]			
7. My interest in this topic has been stimulated			

as a result of this workshop	0	26	0
8. The workshop encouraged new viewpoints	0	26	0
9. The information presented seemed timely and up-to-date.	2	24	0
10. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right. Additional comment: 1 st day, not 2 nd [with A circled] Additional comment: Could have used more time [with A circled]	0	24	2
11. Time was wasted by the presenters by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material. Additional comment: 1 st day [with SD circled]	1	1	25
12. During the workshop, I felt free to ask questions or present my opinion. Additional comment: Too much at times [with SA circled]	0	26	0
13. The scope of the workshop was too limited; not enough material was presented.	1	1	24
14. I will be able to use some of the ideas from the workshop in teaching my course(s). Additional comment: *** [with SA circled]	0	26	0
15. I would advise colleagues to take future workshops.	0	26	0
16. The workshop raised challenging questions or problems for discussion	0	26	0

Note: One additional comment near the top of a page: “I’m answering most for 1st day as 2nd not as useful, organized for my needs. Needed less chat in Am and PM and more on evaluation, rubrics that few know how to do.”

17. If I were to grade this workshop on a scale from 1 to 100 points, I would assign it _____ points as an overall grade.

Average of all who responded:	94.37
Number grading 90-100:	26
Number grading 80-89:	0
Number grading 70-79:	0
Number grading 60-69:	0
Number grading below 60:	0
Number who did not respond:	0

Additional comment: [with a grade of 100] I did feel we could have used more time to discuss at times. I felt rushed--I enjoyed the discussions and the exchange of ideas. Additional comment: [with a grade of 97] or I wouldn't actually grade it; rather, I'd have the presenters do some metawriting....

18. How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?

- Second Time taking the workshop. Have utilized several ideas in my seminar.
- By incorporating more writing assignments in all courses. By revising how assignments are worded.
- In very many ways. (1) Assignments. (2) Grading. But an overall enthusiastic attitude toward teaching an L course.
- It will make me scrutinize all of my assignments, even those in non-L courses.
- It will help me change some of my courses into L courses, and to understand what an L course actually entails.
- I have gleaned many new ideas for creating better writing assignments. I plan to implement some of them (e.g. giving problem-based assignments) this coming semester.
- I will write more clear assignments. My grading process will be more helpful to my students. I will write problem-based assignments.
- I will certainly take more care and interest (yes, interest!) in planning and designing my course assignments.
- (1) I will change the nature of my assignments--make them more clear and concise. (2) Will use more informal writing. (3) Will change my way of commenting on student papers.
- I will present students with more info and detailed assignments. I will improve my grading. I will structure classes and papers differently.
- I am planning on adding a few new ideas to my class assignments. More specific in instructions and grading criteria.
- Enhance my course assignment clear and focus. Provide more ways to conduct writing assignments in order to enhance students' learning and writing skills.
- I will become much more specific in my critical thinking assignments and assessment. I will use Bean as a reference to improve the course syllabus and assignments.
- Clearer assignments and rubrics. More process.
- New ideas for getting my students to become more involved and better thinkers.
- I will be preparing assignments which will better connect with the course goals, will be more challenging and interesting for my students.
- It will improve my way of grading.

- I can use more problem-based assignments to enforce the learning of complex subject matter. I will assign more frequent writing assignments than just one long term paper.
 - Stimulate a more thoughtful and purpose-oriented approach to creating and evaluating assignments.
 - Immediate changes in how I write assignments--especially in giving criteria to students. Will make me focus more on what my specific goals are for each assignment.
 - I have new ideas for types of writing assignments to try in my courses. I also got a lot of new information about ways to minimize time in grading and on giving feedback to students.
 - More ideas for wider varieties of writing assignments and assignment purposes.
 - I think that my writing assignments will be clearer to students.
 - (1) I will write better assignments. (2) I will write more varied assignments. (3) I will stop editing student essays; instead, I'll use minimal marking and ask more questions.
 - I think I will assign better writing projects as well as receive better papers due to the students' ability to decipher exactly what I wanted from them.
 - It will help me design more effective assignments, integrate writing more fully into my students' learning, and respond to student writing more accurately.
19. This workshop was intended to serve as a model or prototype for future SCSU workshops. What might have been included that wasn't (or) what should be left out next time around?
- Writing Board should consider focusing on other specific issues and bring in different presenters.
 - The panel presenters were dull. This could be shortened. We needed more time in small groups to discuss issues—and less time belaboring obvious points in large groups.
 - More time devoted to practicing concepts; send materials to participants more in advance of workshop; Tell participants to read all important chapters (ch 12, 13, 15) ahead of time.
 - I could have stood a slightly faster pace, but otherwise it was good.
 - An agenda handed out prior to the workshop so attendees would know what to expect. I think time might be better used by having attendees do individual readings prior to the workshop and coming prepared for group discussions.
 - I would add a practice session on grading papers.
 - I thought it worked out well. I don't think I would change anything (at least not anything I can think of now).
 - Give us more examples of informal writing assignments which show student's progress in the writing process.

- It would be better if workshops could focus on one related set of disciplines, rather than university-wide.
 - I feel the topics covered were fine. Just needs to be a bit longer workshop, 2 1/2 to 3 days.
 - This workshop may include more examples of how to grade the papers and give the score.
 - Include each professor's example of a student-completed assignment and how they graded the best and worst papers/assignment.
 - I would love to look at syllabi--"before" and "after"--to examine in a detailed way how professors implemented change.
 - The discussions on L-course guidelines was boring.
 - More potato salad, less tuna salad.
 - Writing is often seen as a teaching tool to be used in humanities courses. I appreciated the effort made to include scientific examples of writing assignments. However, it would have been helpful to have a panelist that taught an L-course from a different discipline than humanities. All 3 of their courses had a similar focus--history in some discipline.
 - Discussions of relationship between Freshman Composition requirement and L course requirement.
 - I think the workshop was quite good as it stands. In the future, if numbers increase, it may be appropriate to separate into different disciplinary groups for part of the workshop.
 - ?
 - More time on grading and rubrics. More on conceptual expansion through writing.
20. During the course of the semester, we will be offering one- to two-hour "mini-workshops" on topics relevant to teaching L-courses. Are there particular topics you would like to see covered?
- Rubrics and grading philosophies.
 - Journal keeping—journal assessment—writing a journal assignment.
 - Please include tricky points of English grammar for professors.
 - Preventing plagiarism; specific methods for helping students with particular writing problems.
 - Coaching students to improve writing skills (grammar, punctuation, spelling); Creating effective grading rubrics; peer review.
 - Peer reviews; what changes have been made in commenting on student paper assignments after attending the workshop.
 - Forming thesis statements; avoiding plagiarism; balancing evidence and interpretation.
 - Time-saving strategies for grading. Interesting new approaches by colleagues. Case method assignments.
 - Rubrics, another closer look at assignments.
 - How to deal with students who don't want to deal with the writing (attitude).
 - How to help students identify what is a thesis/problem issue or statement.

- Journal writing and evaluating.
 - Invite science faculty members who teach L-courses to talk about their experience.
 - "How to teach students to write a scientific paper" might be a good topic for science faculty.
 - More time spent on evaluation, grading, writing comments.
 - Peer review' grading rubrics (since we did not have enough time); perhaps one on using "technical" writing as a teaching tool.
 - (1) Motivating student writers, particularly in General Education requirement courses. (2) Peer review.
 - Teaching students how to document/footnote their sources.
 - Grading rubrics (more than the handout). Assignment workshops (each semester).
 - Plagiarism; topic development; peer review.
 - Conceptually expansive assignments; getting students to self-invest in writing; evaluation; dealing with grammar/mechanics effectively; preventing premature closure in writing assignments.
21. What should SCSU do now to follow through with further assistance for you?
- Take this to Deans/Chairs.
 - Keep dialogue going. Make sure I get updated on changes.
 - Perhaps have a workshop in L-course proposal writing? L-course self-assessment?
 - Some help with load allocation for professors who teach L courses would be appreciated (as discussed).
 - Continue faculty support; maintain access to material; maybe have "reunions" to see how techniques worked.
 - Continue exactly what you are doing so that the majority of faculty will have also had this workshop experience. This will make my job easier.
 - (1) Keep promoting the 'culture of writing.' (2) Perhaps doing departmental workshops--or norming sessions or grading and rubrics for evaluation of work. This might speak to grade inflation.
 - Increase the stipend.
 - Assist with recertification of present L; support with any problems/questions that may come up as I change a few items on my course outline.
 - Provide more materials about how to enhance student writing.
 - In addition to the mini-workshops, assist faculty with peer review of his/her assignment when they request assistance.
 - Seems good support on web and in office if I contact, so feel no need for more effort on your part.
 - Continue with mini-workshops and perhaps a "reunion" of this class to discuss changes/improvements as a result of the class [workshop].
 - Department meetings for those of us who teach L courses; creation of a listserv for those of us grads of the program.

- Workshop is a good idea. More group discussions on teaching experiences.
- Periodic touching base with those who attended to see if they're applying anything, even if they don't propose an L-course.
- Support teachers of L courses with additional credit, tutors, grading assistants (a great way to support our graduate students!).
- Workshops; Frequently updated web site with useful teaching resources.
- A visit to L course sections from a Writing Center tutor might encourage students to use these services.
- ?
- As Bob already stated, just be available for questions, speaking to departments and for feedback.
- Continued workshops.

22. Any other comments you care to add?

- This workshop illustrates education in general; you get out of it what you put into it. I was very interested in this workshop and found it very helpful. I learned so much from large group discussions, too. I'm glad you let us ask questions and learn from each other.
- I am thoroughly enervated! Thank you!
- Perhaps more physical movement interspersed in participants practicing concepts.
- Thanks.
- The information included in the workshop will benefit teachers in any course—not just L courses. I found the group discussions [unfinished].
- Thank you!
- This workshop seemed to be more informative than the one some of my colleagues attended last year. I feel much more informed and eager to try out the new things I learned.
- Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.
- Surprisingly interesting, relevant, and worthwhile.
- I am really glad I attended. I think Bean's text will make a great resource and the material/knowledge gained will make my course better for students.
- Very good for me to attend. I'll begin the first day with a short (1 paragraph) assignment!
- Great writing program and workshop!
- Expand discussion on issues of general interest. Eliminate discussion on questions of administrative nature (boring!)
- Good to hear positive comments from Marty re: what we're doing--outsider perspective. Important to have non-SCSU co-presenter to provide the outside perspective.
- I greatly appreciated the time given by Bob and Marty. This was a well-run workshop, and I feel I gained a lot of information that will be useful in all my courses, not only those designated as L sections.

- A listserv would be great for questions to other class [workshop] members or suggestions as to what assignments worked well.
- Thanks!

23. [Participants were asked if the workshop should be expanded to 2 ½ or 3 days.]

- Length of workshop is good (2 days). More than that would not be as effective.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Considering point #19 [pace could have been faster], it would be good to go longer if it were more intensive. Although, I must say, I spent a lot of time coming for 2 days. This was a real challenge in time management for me.
- Perhaps.
- No. I think the follow-up mini-workshops will fill in the gaps. If the workshop were 3 days some faculty may decline.
- Maybe one more hour would have been nice. I wanted to learn more about peer reviews.
- Expand workshop another 1/2 day. Sometimes I felt rushed.
- Yes, absolutely. I disagreed with the pace [on question #10] and gave the workshop a 95 because we rushed through rubrics/grading at the end.
- Yes.
- No--make better use of the second day. Many questions were repetitive or better handled individually on logistics of registering L-courses. Activities in AM too long and groups ended up chatting a lot.
- Yes!
- 2 1/2
- Yes.
- Probably not--2 days is as much as I can "afford."
- Yes, if the workshop could be scheduled during a different week. What about doing it the same week as the summer tech workshop?
- Yes.
- I think 2 days is sufficient.
- Unsure.
- 3 days. The more covered the better!
- Yes.

Evaluation Report
SCSU Faculty Writing-Intensive Workshop
January 16 & 17, 2001

Workshop Leaders:

Bob McEachern, Interim Director, Southern Writing Program
Martha Patton, Associate Director, Campus Writing Program, Univ. of Missouri

Participants

Beena Achhpal, Education
Shelley Bochain, Nursing
Christine Broadbridge, Physics
Rich DeCesare, Math
Sharleen Dickinson, English/SWP Tutor
Brian J. Huschle, Philosophy
Bennett Kottler, Science Education
Patricia Olney, Political Science
Jason Stenzel, Chemistry
Bill Sherman, Psychology

Participants represented 10 departments from 3 different schools within SCSU

Faculty Panel

Kathy Connors, Art
Deborah Carroll, Psychology
Mia Kammerling, Library Science

Evaluation Report
SCSU Faculty Writing-Intensive Workshop
January 16 & 17, 2001

Participants responded to questions 1 through 16 by circling the appropriate letter(s), as described below:

NA = Not applicable or don't know. The statement doesn't apply to the workshop, or you simply aren't able to give a knowledgeable response.

SA = Strongly Agree. You strongly agree with this statement as it applies to this workshop.

A = Agree. You agree more than you disagree with the statement as it applies to this workshop.

D = Disagree. You disagree more than you agree with the statement as it applies to this workshop.

SD = Strongly Disagree. You strongly disagree with this statement as it applies to this workshop.

Total evaluations: 26 [though one did not respond to 3c]

	<u>NA</u>	<u>SA or A</u>	<u>SD or D</u>
52. The workshop's objectives were clear.	0	10	0
2. It was easy to remain attentive	0	10	0
3. a) The content of the workshop was worthwhile	0	10	0
b) The content of the handouts was worthwhile	0	10	0
c) Bean's <i>Engaging Ideas</i> was worthwhile	1	9	0
4. The presenters synthesized, integrated, or summarized effectively	0	0	10
0			
5. Some things were <u>not</u> explained very well.	0	0	10
6. The workshop provided opportunities to apply information and ideas	0	9	1
7. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop	0	10	0
8. The workshop encouraged new viewpoints	0	10	0
9. The information presented seemed timely and up-to-date.	0	10	0

10. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right.	0	10	0
11. Time was wasted by the presenters by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material.	1	0	9
12. During the workshop, I felt free to ask questions or present my opinion.	0	10	0
13. The scope of the workshop was too limited; not enough material was presented.	1	0	9
14. I will be able to use some of the ideas from the workshop in teaching my course(s).	0	10	0
15. I would advise colleagues to take future workshops.	0	10	0
16. The workshop raised challenging questions or problems for discussion	0	10	0

17. If I were to grade this workshop on a scale from 1 to 100 points, I would assign it _____ points as an overall grade.

Average of all who responded:	93.00
Number grading 90-100:	8
Number grading 80-89:	2
Number grading 70-79:	0
Number grading 60-69:	0
Number grading below 60:	0
Number who did not respond:	0

Note: One respondent gave "85-90" as the grade; in calculating the average, the number 85 was used.

18. How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?

- I will certainly be applying specific ideas into my class(es). You got me thinking about this coming semester's courses!
- Positively--more apt to assign writing assignments.
- It will help me avoid possible burnout with grading papers. It will also help me to create more effective assignments.
- It gave me specific suggestions about the nature of assignments, how to develop scoring guides, and suggestions about assessment and evaluation.
- Perhaps the most important way is in helping me standardize grading procedures.
- I may be open to trying journals in large classes. I may develop better questions for assignments. I may better develop grading guides.

- It has given me new ideas on assessment, and writing problem-based assignments. I have already begun to rewrite assignments for the spring.
- It will sharpen the linkage between the quality of the assignments I give and the work my students return.
- I will apply information from the workshop immediately. For example, I will design and implement more effective and efficient evaluation/feedback methods.
- The concrete techniques of evaluation of work and design of problems will be used to amend the laboratory manual that I have written for my course. The informal writing assignments studied will be implemented regularly during lecture time.

24. This workshop was intended to serve as a model or prototype for future SCSU workshops. What might have been included that wasn't (or) what should be left out next time around?

- Could have us write a grading rubric or actually grade a paper using one.
- Better attention to group dynamics as a strategy for learning
- Reduction in # of reading exercises during the session. Increase in time (total duration of the workshop). Peer review -- a session to help faculty learn how peer review can be incorporated.
- More time could be devoted to developing assignments specific to the classes taught.
- No immediate ideas come to mind.
- Difficult to say--the workshop was well-paced and extremely informative. Probably a good idea would be to ask participants, after they have taught an L-course, what they might have wanted included.
- I would strongly recommend keeping this format.

25. During the course of the semester, we will be offering one- to two-hour "mini-workshops" on topics relevant to teaching L-courses. Are there particular topics you would like to see covered?

- Grading rubrics.
- Maybe attention to in-class writing assignments as a means for class learning.
- Creating a syllabus for an L-course
- Creating rubric/evaluation guidelines
- I would like to see more on technology--using web pages, putting courses on WebCT or e-college.com, etc.
- Journal use in class
- No special topics, but perhaps include some examples of student writing from SCSU courses.
- Nothing in particular.

26. What should SCSU do now to follow through with further assistance for you?

- I like the idea of mini-workshops.

- Impress upon L-course professors the importance of referring students to the Writing Center.
- Perhaps a follow-up workshop so we can see how the others are using ideas in their L-courses.
- No.
- The school should maintain the workshop format and ensure an abundance of space and staff for the writing center.

27. Any other comments you care to add?

- Very nice to meet and work with faculty I've not met before!
- No

Evaluation Report

SCSU Faculty Writing-Intensive Workshop

August 21 & 22, 2001

Workshop Leaders:

Bob McEachern, Interim Director, Southern Writing Program
Susan McLeod, Director of Writing, University of California-Santa Barbara

Participants

Samuel K. Andoh, Economics and Finance
Jean M. Breny Bontempi, Public Health
Marga Brockhagen, Foreign Languages
Laura Burleson, Public Health (GTA)
Jennifer Coburn-Engquist, Communication
Christopher Dean, English
Sandra DiFrancesco, Communication
Deane Hetric, Foreign Languages
Bunny Madeira, Nursing (Writing Board member)
Vara Neverow, English
Mark Orner, Communication
Pina Palma, Foreign Languages
Luisa Piemontese-Ramos, Foreign Languages
Demian Pritchard, English
Kelly Ritter, English
Olive Santavenere, Nursing
Camille Serchuk, Art
Moses Stambler, Social Work
Michele Vancour, Public Health

Guest

Leah Stambler, Education, WCSU

Participants represented 8 departments from 4 different schools within SCSU

Faculty Panelists

Debbie Carroll, Psychology
Charlie Dellinger-Pate, Communication
Mike Shea, English

Evaluation Report
SCSU Faculty Writing-Intensive Workshop
August 21 and 22, 2001

Participants responded to questions 1 through 16 by circling the appropriate letter(s), as described below:

NA = Not applicable or don't know. The statement doesn't apply to the workshop, or you simply aren't able to give a knowledgeable response.

SA = Strongly Agree. You strongly agree with this statement as it applies to this workshop.

A = Agree. You agree more than you disagree with the statement as it applies to this workshop.

D = Disagree. You disagree more than you agree with the statement as it applies to this workshop.

SD = Strongly Disagree. You strongly disagree with this statement as it applies to this workshop.

Total evaluations: 18 (including one from non-SCSU guest participant)

	<u>NA</u>	<u>SA or A</u>	<u>SD or D</u>
1. The workshop's objectives were clear.	0	18	0
2. It was easy to remain attentive Additional Comment: "My problem, not the workshop's" [with "A" circled].	0	18	0
3. a) The content of the workshop was worthwhile	0	18	0
b) The content of the handouts was worthwhile	0	18	0
c) Bean's <i>Engaging Ideas</i> was worthwhile Additional Comment: "Very [SA]" [with "SA" circled].	0	18	0
4. The presenters synthesized, integrated, or summarized effectively 0		0	18
5. Things were explained very well.	0	18	0
6. The workshop provided opportunities to apply information and ideas Additional Comment: "Would have liked more time with Assignments" [with "A" circled]. Additional Comment: "Very [SA]" [with "SA" circled].	0	18	0
7. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop Additional Comment: "It was already quite high" [with "A" circled].	0	18	0

8. The workshop encouraged new viewpoints Note: One participant circled both "A" and "D" with the comment, "Felt there was a lot of domination and judgment of 'right'."	0	18	1
9. The information presented seemed timely and up-to-date.	0	18	0
10. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right.	0	18	0
11. Time was well-spent by the presenters; they did not dwell on insignificant, irrelevant material. Additional Comment: "Absolutely—well done" [with "SA" circled].	0	18	0
12. During the workshop, I felt free to ask questions or present my opinion. Additional Comment "Felt some participants had <u>the answers</u> " [with "A" circled] Additional Comment: "Yes!" [with "SA" circled]. Additional Comment: "Thank you!" [with "SA" circled].	0	17	1
13. The scope of the workshop was about right; enough material was presented.	0	18	0
14. I will be able to use some of the ideas from the workshop in teaching my course(s). Additional Comment: "Absolutely" [with "SA" circled].	0	18	0
15. I would advise colleagues to take future workshops.	0	18	0
16. The workshop raised challenging questions or problems for discussion	0	18	0

17. If I were to grade this workshop on a scale from 1 to 100 points, I would assign it _____ points as an overall grade.

Average of all who responded:	96.67
Number grading 90-100:	16
Number grading 80-89:	2
Number grading 70-79:	0
Number grading 60-69:	0
Number grading below 60:	0
Number who did not respond:	0

Note: One respondent gave "85-90" as the grade; in calculating the average, the number 85 was used.

18. How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?

- I have given more thought to how I design writing assignments. For many, though, I

will still not be as “constricted” because I feel it limits creative thought.

- I will incorporate [many of these ideas into] the courses I am teaching.
- Greatly. I will (I hope) increase clarity in both assignment description and evaluation. I will also invite feedback from colleagues outside of my discipline (but fellow L-workshop attendees) for feedback.
- I will be able to improve on my existing writing assignments to help my students get more out of them. I also have additional tools to help me grade and evaluate my students’ writing. Finally, I am clearly aware of the writing resources available on campus.
- I will be creating new assignments for each of the courses I teach. I anticipate a better response from students to these assignments. I also expect the learning process to be strengthened as a result.
- In too many ways to respond here. Evaluations will take on a whole new approach.
- It will help to focus course outlines on goals and to plan from the start writing assignments addressing these goals. I have learned much from the presenters’ and colleagues’ experiences how to assign writings more precisely and effectively and how to evaluate them better for student learning.
- I think that I will be a bit more explicit with my students re: the assignments’ goals in regards to critical thinking and writing. Further, I will be a bit more clear on assignments and add a grading rubric (I already give extensive comments). I am especially glad to see so many teachers in disparate disciplines interested in the teaching of writing.
- It will cut down on my grading. I’ll be able to justify better the grades I give to students.
- It will help me develop rubrics for grading and spend less time editing. And design better assignments.
- My teaching will become more effective because of the techniques that have been discussed here—particularly with reference to assigning precise work (and assessing students’ works).
- I think I will be better able to formulate assignments to make students learn what I want them to. I also think the workshop has given me good ideas for grading that will move me away from marking every spelling mistake at the expense of giving valuable commentary on style, content, etc.
- I plan to finally use (pt. Specific) rubrics for essays. Finally, I’m convinced.
- I think it reminded me of how specific I should be with my students about my goals, my objectives, and their evaluation.
- I am now more mindful of the clarity or lack thereof of assignments I give.
- It has given me some food for thought for my own methods.
- I provided me with ideas towards my students’ writing. It encouraged me to propose an L-course.
- Positively. Good ideas from Bean.

19. This workshop was intended to serve as a model or prototype for future SCSU workshops. What might have been included that wasn't (or) what should be left out next time around?
- I would have liked more in-class opportunities to work on assignments (20 minutes). The assignment I chose to share needed more work (revision) than I expected.
 - Need to consider this question.
 - How to prevent plagiarism (but a mini-workshop on the topic was announced).
 - I liked all of the topics on the agenda. Though I hate to request adding more time, as a new professor, I would have liked more input in evaluating my own assignment. The practical “real life” scenarios were great.
 - More facilitation of encouraging other participants’ ideas and thoughts. Seemed we listened to how things “should be done” by a few participants and that there was little listening to other views.
 - Additional input from the SCSU education department. I think the ed. Dept. would be happy to contribute.
 - More time with assignment feedback session...obviously, I found this incredibly valuable.
 - That’s a hard question. I do think it was very well done. The only thing that comes to mind is that several people seemed disappointed that although we revised assignments a.t. comments from people yesterday, we did not get to revisit those same people for an evaluation of our changes. I think this is the only thing I’d add.
 - I thought it was fine just the way it was presented.
 - Tended to drag a bit after lunch on the second day. Also, it’s the third time I did the norming stuff—it doesn’t age well. Maybe more SCSU-based stuff so it seems closer to home.
 - Seems about right to me.
 - Maybe break-out sessions for disciplines on the second day? Some people may have had more discipline Q that couldn’t be answered here.
 - I loved it all. I’d love, in the next go round, to have even more time to talk to colleagues in other disciplines.
 - More discipline specific workshops?
 - More on rubrics would be helpful.
 - The workshop was excellent. I particularly liked the presentations by colleagues from other fields.
20. During the course of the semester, we will be offering one- to two-hour "mini-workshops" on topics relevant to teaching L-courses. Are there particular topics you would like to see covered?
- Would like more hands-on with assignments written by participants. Maybe examine other ways to design an effective writing assignment.
 - Something that would encourage #19 [more time with assignment feedback

session]—maybe even a session that does just that.

- I am not (yet) an L-course instructor, but as an instructor with many writing assignments, I would like more on grading and responding to students' writing. Also, perhaps something targeted to graduate students' theses.
- I'd like to learn more about the peer review process.
- Sharing course assignments with faculty across the various disciplines.
- Possibly "time saving grading methods." We did some—yes, you can never learn that too well. And plagiarism prevention—great idea.
- Peer review. Essay exam questions.
- The ones mentioned today are all relevant.
- A workshop on making peer revision work in L courses.
- I think people may want guidance on non-graded writing (like how to direct in-class writing, use it more) and maybe on essay exam prompts?
- I'd like to see talk, if not a workshop, around electronic writing.
- Going over some of the topics—grading, appropriate rubrics for different disciplines.
- Not at this time.
- I would like to see a mini-workshop dedicated to foreign languages.

21. What should SCSU do now to follow through with further assistance for you?

- Keep us updated on mini-workshops, etc. Also, SCSU should implement this as a fully supported program.
- Keep me posted! Help me with my department! I would like to incorporate rubrics and other Public Health general writing rules, but, that would be difficult. I would like to have our faculty more involved with writing programs and ??????.
- From what I have learned, you are already available to help in many ways. I'm looking forward to accessing these services at a greater extent (Writing Center).
- Continue on with this approach.
- Maintain limit on enrollment in L-courses, or even lower it.
- I'm honestly not sure yet.
- Just send me e-mail notices of future workshops.
- Keep me posted on new ideas floating around—strategies that work that appear in scholarly literature on rhetoric that I can't keep up with.
- Continue to have a strong "writing" support.
- Give me (and others) a handout re: the writing center, including hours, exact location, etc. suitable for sharing with students.
- Four credits for composition.
- Keep me connected to the faculty. I'm looking forward to this listserv, and I was wondering about setting up an electronic bulletin board as well.
- Some, or as many of the materials as possible, should go on the website.
- Be available for assistance for input and student support.
- Perhaps work with the foreign language faculty to talk about issues in writing.

22. Any other comments you care to add?

- Keep up the good work.
- Thank you. Extremely valuable.
- If it is not yet obvious, I enjoyed and got a lot out of this workshop. I need a week to process it all. This kind of information requires constant revisiting. I hope we can continue the dialogue.
- I don't think instructors should be allowed to teach L courses without this workshop. Thanks.
- Time well spent.
- Good timing for this workshop. Thanks to the English department and the organizers.
- It was extremely well done. Thank you. I do think this should be a staple event. Especially useful was the opportunity to discuss teaching with people from different departments/disciplines.
- Thank you.
- An excellent faculty development event.
- It is nice that the workshop builds connections among faculty members from different disciplines.
- This was by far the most productive and useful workshop I ever attended at SCSU.
- Thanks for letting me attend. I learned a lot.
- Y'all rock harder than Judas Priest, Black Sabbath, and the Ramones.
- Good job.
- It was a worthwhile workshop.
- Thank you. This has been a very worthwhile workshop.

Appendix F:

Mini-Workshop Topics and Participants, Spring 2000-Spring 2001

Spring 2000 Mini-Workshops

March 2000: Peer Review

Facilitator: Bob McEachern (SWP Interim Director)

April 2000: Creating Problem-Based Writing Assignments

Facilitator: Bob McEachern (SWP Interim Director)

Guest Speaker: Christine Petto (History)

May 2000: "How Did it Go?": Reflections on Teaching Writing-Intensive Courses at SCSU

Facilitator: Bob McEachern (SWP Interim Director)

Guest Speaker: Troy Paddock (History) and Elizabeth Owen (Art)

Participants:

Ingrid Grants, Recreation & Leisure

Shirley Jackson, Sociology & Anthropology

Christine Petto, History

Liz Owen, Art

Ed Jankovic, Economics & Finance

Michael Ryan, Sociology & Anthropology

Jacque Ensign, Education

Camille Serchuk, Art

Hugh Davis, History

Charles Stoddard, Buley Library

Fall 2000 Mini-Workshops

October, 2000: Developing Grading Rubrics

Facilitator: Bob McEachern (SWP Interim Director)

October 2000: Rhetorical Approaches to Revision

Facilitator: Susan Wall (Northeastern University)

November 2000: Problems with Plagiarism

Facilitator: Bob McEachern (SWP Interim Director)

Participants:

Karen Benson, English
Jon Bloch, Sociology
Kay Corbett, Education
Hugh Davis, History
Sharleen Dickinson, English
June Dunn, Women's Studies
Shirley Jackson, Sociology/Anthropology
Rod Lane, Dean, School of Education
Steve Larocco, English
Doris Marino, School Health
Sharon Misasi, Exercise Science
Jeff Mock, English
Vara Neverow, English
Elizabeth Owen, Art
Robert Page, Management
Jiongdong Pang, Chemistry
Pat Rukowicz, School Health
Carol Shieh, Nursing
Samuel K. Andoh, Economics and Finance
Michael Beetham, Psychology GA
Cathy Berman, Library Science
Al Bradshaw, Public Health
Jackie Bradway, Psychology GA
Sandy Bulmer, Public Health
Judith Buzzell, Elementary Education
Debby Carroll, Psychology
Charlie Dellinger-Pate, Communication
Bob Eldridge, Economics and Finance
Harvey Feinberg, History
Lynn Hidek, Library Science
Will Hochman, English
Mia Kammerling, Library Science
Mary Lang, English
Jean Mee, Exercise Science
Paul Petrie, English
Cindy Stretch, English
Frank Tavares, Communication
Barbara Worden, Social Work

Spring 2001 Mini-Workshops

April 2001: ESL Students in University Writing Courses
Facilitators: Kate Reynolds (Foreign Languages) and Lorrie Verplaetse
(Foreign Languages)

April 2001: Using Peer Review Effectively
Facilitators: Bob McEachern (SWP Interim Director), Nicole Henderson
(English) and Carra Hood (English)

[March workshop on “Designing Effective Assignments,” to have been facilitated
by an outside speaker, was cancelled and could not be rescheduled.]

Participants:

Mary Brown, Library Science
Kay Corbett, Education
Harvey Feinstein, History
Jay Halpern, English
Brian Huschle, Philosophy
Mary Lang, English
Mia Kammerling, Library Science
Steve Larocco, English
Bob McEachern, Interim Director, SWP
Windy McGlinsky, Writing Center
Jeff Mock, English
Paul Petrie, English

Appendix G:

Proposed End-of-semester faculty survey, Spring 2000

Southern Writing Program End-of-Semester Faculty Survey Spring 2000

Please respond to the following questions.

If you would like to receive this survey as a Word file, contact Bob McEachern at 2-5526, or e-mail "McEachern."

1. What do you think the overall goals of an L-course should be?
2. How well do you think your course met these goals?
3. Do you think your students understand why Southern requires them to take L-courses? That is, do the students know why you are teaching the course this way?
4. Which of your assignments worked best at encouraging students to think critically? Which was least effective?
5. What type of feedback did students receive during your course (instructor comments on drafts; instructor comments on final versions; one-on-one conferences; peer reviews; writing center tutorials)? How effective was each type?
6. What knowledge/information/feedback do you have about writing tutors?
7. How do you evaluate student writing?
8. How successful have students been in revising their work?
9. Will you be making any changes next time you teach this course? What? Why?
10. Overall, do you think the revised L-course requirements help students *learn* better? What evidence do you have for your response?
11. Overall, do you think the revised L-course requirements help students *write* better? What evidence do you have for your response?
12. Why do you teach L-courses? What do you get out of the experience? Personally? Professionally?
13. What could the SWP do to improve our operation?
14. Any other concerns/comments not covered here?

Appendix H:

End-of-semester student survey, Spring 2000

Southern Writing Program Student Evaluation for L-Courses

Course _____ Instructor _____
Date _____

Using the following scale, respond to questions 1 through 5. Consider only this class. "Writing ability" refers to the general skill of producing effective writing; it does not refer just to grammar or punctuation.

- (A) Strongly Agree
- (B) Agree
- (C) Disagree
- (D) Strongly Disagree
- (N/A) Not Applicable

1. My writing ability was improved by receiving feedback (either oral or written) from the teacher about writing I did for this class.
2. My writing ability was improved by revising at least one draft of a writing assignment for this class.
3. My writing ability was improved by doing a variety of writing assignments (short and long; formal and informal) for this class.
4. Overall, my **writing ability** was improved by doing the writing assignments for this class.
5. Overall, my **understanding of the subject matter** was improved by doing the writing assignments for this class.
6. What do you believe would most improve your writing skills? Even if they are already good, in the space below please take a sentence or two to explain what could help you write even better.

Appendix I:

Executive Summary, Focus Group Report, September 2001

Evaluation of Guidelines, Workshops, and Delivery of L Courses at Southern Connecticut State University

Sandra Morgan, Ph.D.
September 14, 2001

Executive Summary:

Focus groups conducted on campus in May and June 2001 included faculty from four groups:

- 1) Faculty who took a workshop and had an L course approved
- 2) Faculty who took a workshop and have not yet proposed an L course
- 3) Faculty using the old guidelines to teach L courses
- 4) Faculty never involved with L courses

Analysis of focus group transcripts shows that

- There is strong support for both L courses and the workshops.
- Faculty members have made numerous improvements to their courses as a result of the workshops.
- There is mixed feeling about the role of the Writing Board.
- There are inequities related to the selection of faculty to teach the L courses, class sizes, and pay.
- There are concerns about possible abridgement of academic freedom by the Writing Board or other group related to L course administration.

Recommendations for continuation and/or changes in the L course process are outlined in detail in this report. The primary recommendations include

- Continue workshops and consider offering them more frequently
- Review political issues and inequities among departments
- Review the use/pay of adjuncts teaching L courses
- Be very aware of the academic freedom issue when making changes; include representatives of all affected parties in the decision-making and action planning

Appendix J:

Guidelines for Proposing and Teaching an L-course, updated September 2001

Southern Writing Program

Guidelines for Designing and Teaching L-Courses

Updated September 2001

L-courses use writing as a vehicle for learning, requiring students to express, reformulate, or apply the concepts of an academic discipline. Current research has shown that revision is a necessary part of writing. Therefore, the emphasis on writing in L-courses is not intended primarily to give students additional practice in basic composition skills, but to encourage students to think more clearly and express their thoughts more precisely. L-courses take a two-pronged approach to learning, with the students addressing subject matter via written assignments and the instructor aiming to improve the quality of written performance by giving feedback and requiring revision.

The Writing Board wants the L-course program to include courses and instructors in all disciplines; we particularly want to foster L-courses in such previously under-represented fields as applied arts and social sciences, and the technical and quantitative sciences.

The following guidelines are not inflexible, but they describe the sort of course the Board envisages. Alternative means to the same end will certainly be considered.

1. A significant portion of the writing for the course should be critical (analytical) writing.

- Critical (analytical) writing addresses a question for which there is more than one acceptable interpretation, explanation, analysis, or evaluation, and thus requires original thought from the student. This original thought both demonstrates and assists the student's mastery of course material. In other words, in L-courses students practice solving discipline-based problems through writing.
- Instructors communicate their knowledge of writing in their disciplines to their students through a variety of means such as paper comments, conferences, handouts, and in-class presentations on writing.
- In addition to formal papers, the critical (analytical) component may include short, unrevised papers, essay exams, and in-class writings.

- The Writing Board recognizes that in some fields, students in lower-level classes are in no position to challenge the maxims of the discipline or to take a stand on unsettled questions. In such fields, students may be required to do critical (analytical) writing in a number of ways: to create a traditional research paper in which a thesis statement summarizes the writer's use and interpretation of studies by experts, to explain the reasoning one could use in solving problems or applying a concept, to write dialogues that represent distinct perspectives on an issue, to articulate the distinction between elegant and inelegant approaches to a project (e.g., designs for an experiment to prove a given hypothesis), or to explain a technical concept to a real or imagined audience of non-experts.
- Courses that are writing-intensive by their nature (e.g., journalism, technical writing, creative writing) may be certified as L-courses. However, writing in these courses must include a critical component: students must write about writing (for example, by explaining how they have applied concepts or by evaluating published professional pieces), in addition to practicing the genres of the subject.

2. The critical (analytical) writing component should emphasize revision.

- "Revision" implies making substantive changes to writing: rethinking the thesis, organization, support, or content, rather than simply correcting surface errors.
- Instructors may encourage revision in a variety of ways, e.g., written comments on drafts, one-on-one conferences, and in-class peer workshops.
- To encourage revision, instructors' comments should suggest changes and explain reasons for the suggestions.
- In most courses, instructors should require that at least two assignments totaling 2500 words be revised and turned in again for additional response (comments and grade).

3. L-courses should, in general, require students to write 5000 words over the course of the semester.

- Given the nature of revision, which necessitates rethinking the content of a piece of writing (see #2 above), revised versions of earlier papers may be part of the total word count. When the final draft will merely be a corrected version of the preliminary draft, the pages in the preliminary draft should not be considered as part of the total word count
- The writing should be spread throughout the semester, in a minimum of three (3) assignments, which may be separate or related to one another. Because extensive revisions are encouraged, students need time to revise, and instructors need time to comment.
- To help assess students' writing skills, one assignment of at least 250 words might profitably be assigned and evaluated in the first week of the semester. In addition, because writing is a tool for learning, further writing assignments should be incorporated into the class as early in the term as possible.
- Written assignments should be a major part of the course grade. The Writing Board suggests that out-of-class papers count for 50% or more of the semester

grade, though in certain fields, other percentages may appropriately be applied.

Appendix K: Procedures for Proposing an L-course, updated May 2001

Southern Writing Program (SWP)

Procedures for Proposing an L-Course

NOTE: These procedures are effective Fall 1999 and apply to new L-course proposals and to existing L-courses seeking re-approval.

- 1) **An L-course proposal originates from the faculty member who will be teaching the course.** Because the success of an L-course depends on the teacher's professional commitment to incorporating critical (analytical) writing and revision into classes, the Writing Board considers courses that are proposed by individual faculty members, rather than courses merely assigned to instructors. The Writing Board discourages proposals from faculty members in their first year at Southern.

NOTE: This represents the usual procedure. However, the Writing Board recognizes that unforeseen scheduling difficulties may occur occasionally, and the Board will cooperate with Departments to ensure both that courses can be taught when scheduled and that they will meet regular L-course Guidelines.

- 2) **L-course faculty attend a semi-annual workshop before they teach an L-course for the first time.** Attendance at this workshop is voluntary and highly recommended, because it introduces faculty to SWP staff, to colleagues who share a commitment to using writing to enhance students' learning, and to multiple ways to incorporate writing into their courses. In every case, discussions center on how to leverage faculty time and effort to increase student learning most efficiently.
- 3) **L-course proposals should be sent to the Chair of UCF, who will route them to the Board for consideration.** In order to be included in the University's printed Schedule of Classes, proposals must be received no later than April 1 for classes that will begin the next January, and no later than November 1 for classes

that will begin the next September.

- 4) **Each proposal includes the following items, either as part of the syllabus or in a separate attachment:**
- The completed proposal cover sheet (available in the Office of Academic Affairs, EN 125, or from the Southern Writing Program web site: www.southernct.edu/committees/writingprogram).
 - A copy of the course outline or syllabus
 - An explanation of how the writing assignments for this course fulfill the expectation that "A significant portion of the writing for the course should be critical (analytical)" (see Guidelines for Designing and Teaching L-Courses, item #1)
 - An explanation of how this course's "critical (analytical) writing component [will] emphasize revision" (see Guidelines for Designing and Teaching L-Courses, item #2)
 - An explanation of how this course will "require students to write 5000 words over the course of the semester" (see Guidelines for Designing and Teaching L-Courses, item #3)
 - A description of what percentage of the final grade will come from writing assignments
 - A description of how grades on revised papers will be weighted

NOTE: Sample proposals will be available as models.

- 5) **a. L-course faculty members are encouraged to attend one or more mini-workshops during the semester in which they are teaching an L-course.** These workshops, usually one or two hours in length, will be held at various times during each semester and will include presentations and discussions with SWP staff and faculty colleagues on suggested topics of shared interest.
- b. Faculty members submit the Writing Board's Update Form before teaching the L-course for a fifth time or before the third year (whichever is sooner).** The one-page form collects basic demographic information and asks for a very brief update of plans for the course.. The SWP staff will provide assistance in completing the form.

Appendix L:

List of L-courses approved by Writing Board, Fall 1999-Spring 2001

L-Courses Approved By Writing Board (as of May 2, 2001)

Art 303 -- Art of East Asia

Liz Owen

Art 306 -- History of Medieval Art

Camille Serchuk

Art 311 -- History of Chinese Art

Liz Owen

Art 312 -- History of Japanese Art

Liz Owen

Com 440 -- Cultural Influences on Communication

Charlene Dellinger-Pate

Eng 213 -- Major American Authors

Paul Petrie

Eng 217 -- Themes in Literature (Political Imagination)

Cindy Stretch

Eng 304 -- Technical Writing and Communication

Bob McEachern

Eng 316 -- Writing for Business and Industry

Bob McEachern

Eng 342 -- Shakespeare I: 1564-1601

Mike Shea

Eng 405 -- Techniques of Teaching Composition

Sue Ellen Holbrook

Exs 380 -- Sport Psychology

Sharon Misasi

Geo 498 -- Special Topics in Geography (Geographies of Resistance)

Lee Berman

His 236 -- Origins of Modern Germany

Troy Paddock

His 237 -- Modern Germany

Troy Paddock

His 252 -- Roots of Modern America: 1828-1865

Hugh Davis

His 253 -- The New Nation: 1865-1918

Hugh Davis

His 304 -- Renaissance and Reformation

Christine Petto

His 306 -- 18th Century History (1715-1789)

Christine Petto

His 318/Wms 318 -- Women in American History, 1620-1890

Virginia Metaxas

His 319/Wms 319 -- Women in American History, 1865-Present

Virginia Metaxas

His 336 -- Nazi Germany

Troy Paddock

His 340 -- The Crusades

Stephen Judd

His 398 -- Special Topics in History (Race and Segregation in South Africa)

Harvey Feinberg

His 438 -- Evolution of Science to 1900

Christine Petto

Jrn 240 -- Race and the News

Frank Harris

Lit 302 -- Literature of New Testament

Mark Heidmann

Lsc 300 -- Literature for Children

Mary Brown

Soc 211 -- Social Problems in the U.S.

Shirley Jackson

Soc 480 -- Sociological Theory

Jon Bloch

Soc 490 -- Seminar in Sociology

Shirley Jackson

Thr 310 -- Playwriting

C. B. Coleman

Appendix M: The “Washington State Handout”

Appendix N:

Guidelines for Independent Studies to Receive L-course Credit, Spring 2001

L-COURSES AND INDEPENDENT STUDY

In the best of all possible worlds, the interests of students as developing writers and scholars would best be served if independent studies were not used to meet L-course requirements for the following reasons:

a. Independent study courses often require written work. However, they are not designed to provide the same level of support of writing skill development as regular L-courses. Logically they are meant to serve well-prepared students, who are capable and mature enough to carry out extended work on their own with consultation with a professor.

b. It would be most advantageous to students if independent studies were not undertaken until they had completed the L-course requirement. That would enable students to enter independent studies with stronger writing skills, ready to focus on the critical aspects of research and analysis at an advanced level.

c. Fairness to faculty suggests they should not be burdened with the task of developing independent study proposals with students who have to meet the extra guidelines for L-courses, especially at the last minute. Faculty should not be in the awkward position of trying to meet students' needs for L-courses and offering independent study as a convenience to the students, rather than as a legitimate learning opportunity.

That being said, some students may want to take an independent study and need an L-course opportunity, and some faculty members may want to offer an opportunity to do independent study for L-credit to students in their departments.

Therefore the following policy shall govern approving Independent Study Proposals for L-course credit:

- **A student may take one independent study as an L-course if the student has already taken at least one L-course at Southern. (Preferably the student would have taken two L-courses prior to an independent study as an L-Course.)**

Oversight of this policy shall be the responsibility of the Dean.

Independent Study as an L-course Agreement Form

I, _____, am aware of the critical writing component (minimum 20 pages) of the requirements. I have described how critical writing will be part of my independent study in the independent study proposal.

I understand that substantial revision (not simply correction of mechanical errors) is a requirement in L-courses. I agree to undertake substantial revision of my work in the course of this independent study. If the basic product that I am responsible for submitting to fulfill the written requirements for this independent study is one long paper, I agree to submit it in stages to my professor so that feedback and revision can take place.

I have demonstrated to my sponsoring faculty member that I have already taken and passed at least one L-course at Southern Connecticut State University.

Signature of the independent study student: _____

Date: _____

Signature of the sponsoring faculty member: _____

Date: _____

This form of agreement is to be attached to the student's independent study proposal before the dean signs off on the proposal.

Note: Critical (analytical) writing addresses a question for which there is more than one plausible interpretation, explanation, analysis, or evaluation, and thus requires original thought from the student.

Appendix O: Budget Information, 2001-2002

Southern Writing Program
Proposed Budget: 2001-2002

UA (University Assistants)		
2 tutors per semester	12,500	
UA	6,500	
		19,000
NTA (Non-teaching adjuncts)		0
USW (University Student Workers)		0
DP (Discretionary Personnel)		
Workshop Co-facilitators (stipends, meals, travel, etc.)	6,500	
Outside facilitators (for follow-up focus groups)	5,000	
		11,500
OE (Operating Expenses)		
Workshop space rental/food	2,500	
Faculty Honoraria	10,000	
Bean Books	2,000	
Supplies	500	
		15,000
		=====
Total		45,500

Time To Teach

A Report from the SCSU Writing Board to the UCF
On the Success of the Southern Writing Program Pilot Project

September 27, 2001

September 27, 2001

Members of the Undergraduate Curriculum Forum:

The Writing Board is pleased to present to you “Time to Teach: A Report from the SCSU Writing Board to the UCF On the Success of the Southern Writing Program Pilot Project.”

Both the report and the pilot project it describes involved the work of many, many dedicated Southern faculty members. We want to thank all of those who proposed and taught L-courses, attended workshops, and provided encouragement and criticism during public and private meetings with representatives of the Board. The Board worked hard to balance all of the suggestions given to us, and we are proud to make the recommendations contained herein.

There are several features of the report, described in more detail, that we would like to highlight:

- Guidelines for Proposing and Teaching L-courses that build on existing (1983) guidelines, offering further definition and explanation.
- Procedures for Proposing L-courses that minimize bureaucracy while still encouraging “consistent character and quality” across L-courses, as specified in the pilot’s charter.
- Voluntary workshops and other support for any instructor who wishes to use writing as a part of her classes.

Most of all, the Board has enjoyed the vigorous debate that has occurred over the last three years, as various parts of the pilot project have been implemented and revised. Discussions about the amount and kind of writing, the frequency of writing assignments, the uses and purposes of writing-intensive courses, and the very value of the L-course requirement, have become regular events for many members of the Southern faculty. If, ultimately, the purpose of the pilot is to begin to create a “culture of writing” at Southern, based on dialogue about the place of writing in the classroom and the curriculum, then we feel we have been successful.

Finally, the Board would like to thank the pilot’s sponsors, the UCF and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, for encouraging this conversation. We look forward to the conversation that will occur as a result of this report.

Sincerely,

Members of the Writing Board