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Executive Summary

This report makes recommendations for the “Next Phase” of Writing Across the Curriculum at Rutgers-Newark. Building on what has already been accomplished in the first three years of the WAC initiative, we offer a specific plan for elevating our program toward a level of excellence comparable to state-of-the-art WAC programs nationwide, while keeping in mind the specific strengths and culture of this particular campus community. Throughout, we support a campus-wide team-based approach, centered on the two basic principles of a unified writing curriculum, and an active culture of writing instruction and practice. Our goal is to articulate a new vision of writing at Rutgers-Newark, and a framework for implementing it on the ground.

Part One A Unified Writing Curriculum

Basic Principle: Writing instruction must be linked and coordinated at every level from developmental writing courses to freshman composition to introductory, intermediate, and advanced writing intensive courses (Writing Up and Down the Curriculum) and in every department (Writing Across the Curriculum). We need a common approach, so that students feel that they have taken a coherent sequence of writing instruction by the time they graduate, not just several isolated courses that assign writing.

Specific Recommendations:

1. Establish and publicize a Unified Writing Curriculum. We propose a graduated scale of skills-based goals for all writing courses, linked in an unbroken sequence from developmental writing through freshman composition to introductory, intermediate, and advanced writing intensive courses. Clarification of objectives and outcomes will help instructors to improve course design and incorporate appropriate pedagogical strategies, and will enable better assessment of performance by students, teachers, and the program as a whole.

2. Initiate a “Sophomore Level Writing Requirement.” Currently we require four writing courses: two freshman composition courses and two upper-level writing intensive courses. Many students currently get no writing instruction at all between freshman composition and WI courses taken during their senior or junior years. In order to fill this gap, this proposal would require that students complete a writing course during their sophomore year, and would increase the number of required writing courses from four to five. If students are required to take developmental writing before composition, then “Preparatory Writing” (Communication Skills 143) would count as one of the five, to be followed by English 101-102 and two writing intensive courses. For students who are not required to take developmental writing (the majority), the number of required writing intensive courses would increase from two to three, and at least one of them would have to be taken during sophomore year.
3. Re-organize the delivery of writing instruction services by
   a) putting the Director of the Writing Program in charge of all levels of writing
      instruction, assisted by specialized Coordinators for developmental writing, freshman
      composition, and WAC;
   b) integrating the Writing Center into this structure, and expanding its mandate to
      all levels of writing, with the Coordinators sharing tutor-training responsibility with the
      Writing Center Director; and
   c) hiring a full-time administrative assistant to be shared by the Writing Program,
      the Writing Center, developmental writing, and the WAC program.

   The goals of a unified writing curriculum would best be served by establishing a unified
   administrative structure for writing instruction, so that developmental writing, freshman
   composition, Writing Center tutoring support, and the WAC Coordinator are all under the same
   administrative roof, sharing clerical support, consulting frequently on curricular and pedagogical
   issues. Once we have established continuous goals-based descriptions of an unbroken sequence
   of writing courses up and down the curriculum, as well as across it, we need to make sure that
   our administrative structure is equally coherent.

Part Two An Active Culture of Writing Instruction and Practice

   Basic Principle: It takes a university to nourish a mature writer, and we need to ensure
   that all writing instructors and all participating support personnel (tutors, librarians,
   administrators) are part of a team devoted to improving the teaching and the learning of writing
   on this campus. The WAC Program is the hub of this wheel, and it needs sufficient resources to
   fulfill this coordinating function.

   Specific Recommendations:

   1. Institutionalize WAC, and dedicate sufficient resources, on an ongoing basis, to
      support program activities. Define the Coordinator’s role, rank, and responsibilities. Provide
      clerical/administrative support, office space, webmaster, computer equipment, etc. Faculty
      training and student support services will also require significant commitment of resources,
      semester after semester, year after year. After the initial round of grants, the WAC initiative went
      entirely unfunded. WAC needs to become part of the regular budget process every year, and
      adequate ongoing funding needs to be secured to implement all of these recommendations.
      Without adequate resources, the “next phase” is impossible.

   2. Institute a revised Course Designation process. The goal should be to promote
      more consultation and exchange, earlier in the planning process, between department chairs, the
      WAC Coordinator, deans, instructors, and the WAC Committee. This will result in fewer
      administrative problems with regard to stop-points and staffing. A collegial, non-coercive
      dialogue between members of the committee and individual faculty will provide an impetus for
      improved course development and design. This course review process will also be a crucial
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program assessment tool, since it will involve collecting syllabi, assignments, course descriptions, and other materials from every writing intensive course taught on this campus.

3. **Improve implementation of WAC in Rutgers Business School, through faculty training, more selective Writing Intensive designation, and enhancing existing courses.** RBS needs to participate in a formal “Course Designation Process” for planning, developing, and reviewing writing intensive courses. Such processes are standard in nearly all WAC programs, and provide essential opportunities for collegial exchanges on pedagogical issues, for curriculum development, for administrative streamlining, and for program assessment purposes.

4. **Provide resources to support student learning.** This would include dedicated WAC tutors in the Writing Center, workshops for writing intensive courses by experienced writing instructors, and embedded curriculum-based peer tutors in particular writing intensive courses. We also should develop an internal guidebook for students, provide access to campus-wide print and online resources for basic writing issues (grammar, anti-plagiarism etc.), and further develop our website to help publicize and support the WAC program and writing intensive courses.

5. **Offer WAC orientation workshops, ongoing pedagogical training, and professional development opportunities to instructors in writing intensive courses.** Attach a modest “Professional Development Stipend” to every WAC Faculty member, which can only be redeemed by attending a certain number of professional development sessions. The basic principle is that faculty should be appropriately compensated for the time that they spend in sessions that might range from an hour-long workshop to a full day colloquium to a week-long summer seminar. Other forms of faculty support would include improved coordination with library research resources, a list of recommended texts to help students with discipline-specific reading and writing issues, and a website with annotated and selected links to the vast array of WAC resources available nationwide.

6. **Explore ways of increasing attention to and respect for undergraduate teaching in general on this campus, and specifically for the teaching of writing.** Faculty documents for tenure and promotion should be revised to include the teaching of writing intensive courses as an important contribution to the university’s overall mission. An outstanding WAC faculty member should receive an annual award. Anything that gives undergraduate teaching a higher profile and importance will be part of WAC’s mission.

7. **Include ongoing assessment procedures in writing intensive courses.** Institute an ongoing WAC student survey in all writing intensive courses. Investigate the feasibility of an online portfolio system for tracking student writing progress over the whole range of a student’s undergraduate enrollment. Use a diagnostic essay in WI sections to gauge student writing achievement, as well as matching learning support services with those students who need them. Stay in contact with instructors through periodic surveys and an annual program colloquium. Use the annual Course Planning / Course Development / Course Review process as a key component of assessment.
Forward: About This Report

In Fall 2001, Rutgers-Newark instituted a Writing Across the Curriculum requirement for graduation: all students must pass two “writing intensive” courses, including one in the department of their major. During the 2003-2004 academic year, the Associate Dean of Faculty appointed me as WAC Coordinator, and asked me to undertake an assessment of the program.

To carry out this assessment, we applied for and were awarded a “Grant to Enhance the Undergraduate Curriculum and Teaching” from the Office of the Rutgers Vice-president for Undergraduate Education. The title of our project is “Writing Across the Curriculum at Rutgers-Newark: Launching the Next Phase.” Our two primary goals have been:

- internal program assessment to see what we have achieved since the program was inaugurated three years ago, and
- long-range planning for developing the program in the future.

This report is thus part of a larger initiative. To assess the progress made by our Writing Across the Curriculum initiative over the past three years, and to chart a course for its future, we have solicited input from WAC Faculty, and the results of the faculty survey, and of formal and informal consultations with members of various departments, have been incorporated throughout what follows.

“Writing Across the Curriculum: Launching the Next Phase” was prepared by Jonathan Hall, the WAC Coordinator. Portions of earlier drafts were presented to the Rutgers-Newark WAC Advisory Committee for consultation, and revised based on their input. Other portions, especially those pertaining to the Unified Writing Curriculum, were presented to the English Curriculum Review Committee, discussed in that context, and some aspects were adopted. These issues and proposals were at the center of the agenda at the “WAC Colloquium,” a day-long conference, conducted with the participation of key WAC faculty, on May 13 to discuss these proposals, seeking consensus on a direction for the program. (This was another function of our grant.)

This document is, and will for the foreseeable future remain, a work in progress. With the dual goals of assessing an ongoing program and planning for its future development, it could hardly be otherwise. On the one hand, I have attempted to provide as coherent a vision as I can of what a successful Writing Across the Curriculum Program should look like when it has been fully implemented. On the other hand, I am acutely aware that many ideal visions end up gathering dust on shelves, and my overriding priority has been to find ways to help actual students in actual classrooms improve their actual writing. We need to seek creative solutions, in times of fiscal limitations, to deliver the necessary services to faculty and students as efficiently as possible.
With many thanks, I would like to acknowledge the essential contributions of:

Annette Juliano, Associate Dean of Faculty
Malcolm Kiniry, Director, Writing Program
Patricia Bender, Director, Writing Center
Charles Russell, Chair, English Department
Lillian Robbins, Undergraduate Coordinator, Psychology Department
Alex Sannella, Accounting and Information Systems

The English Curriculum Review Committee:
Annette Juliano
Malcolm Kiniry
Patricia Bender
Mary Moya, PALS Program
Marne Benson, Writing Program
John Strauss, Writing Program

The Writing Program Assistant Instructors
My home base on campus. In several meetings throughout the year some of these proposals were discussed, and a number of people have offered individual suggestions more informally, especially Jennifer Arena, Marne Benson, and Lorraine Elias.

The WAC Advisory Committee
Many of the movers and shakers from the original WAC implementation committee are back to help out again. Many thanks for their input, and especially for their service in panel presentations at the WAC Colloquium.
Patricia Bender, Director of the Writing Center
Jo Grieder, Classical and Modern Languages
Lisa Hull, Political Science
Mill Jonakait, Biological Sciences
Mal Kiniry, Director of the Writing Program
Lillian Robbins, Psychology
Charles Russell, English
Alex Sannella, Accounting & Information Systems
Jim Schlegel, Chemistry
Paul Sternberger, Visual and Performing Arts
The WAC Fellows:
Experienced WAC faculty who have agreed to serve as resource persons in their departments in the next academic year.

- Ann Cali, Biology
- Alex Gates, Geology
- Jim Goodman, History
- Rachel Hadas, English
- Wendell Holbrook, African-American Studies
- Theresa Hunt, Women’s Studies
- Lisa Hull, Political Science
- Jamie Lew, Education
- Nela Navarro-LaPointe, Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures
- John Randall, Mathematics
- Lillian Robbins, Psychology
- Alex Sannella, Accounting
- Jim Schlegel, Chemistry
- Paul Shane, Social Work
- Robert Snyder, Visual and Performing Arts
- Anna Stubblefield, Philosophy
- Leo Troy, Economics
- Myroslava Znayenko, Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures

The WAC Colloquium
A total of 35 faculty members, including nearly all of the WAC Fellows, along with students, tutors, and other interested faculty and administrators from many departments and from the Dana Library, gathered for a day-long WAC Colloquium on campus on May 13, 2004. During the morning session we discussed pedagogical themes arising out of the WAC requirement, and in the afternoon we focused on policy issues relating to the future development of the program. The stimulating discussions provided essential feedback on some of the proposals in this report, and gave a clear sense of what WAC faculty see as the current issues.

The WAC Survey Respondents
During Spring 2004, the WAC program sent out an extensive (109 questions!) survey to faculty who had taught in the program, requesting their feedback on their experiences, and also their assessment of the current state of student writing and their opinions about how the program should be developed in the future. Many thanks to the faculty who completed it for sharing their insights.

Honors College Research Assistant
Diana El-Neemany, a freshman in the FAS/N Honors College, was instrumental in getting the WAC Survey up and running, and then collating the results when they came in. She also helped with the research on WAC programs elsewhere, and I am very grateful for her contribution.
WAC Faculty:

The National WAC Conference in St. Louis–May 20-22, 2004
With a theme of “WAC From an International Perspective,” the participants in the conference offered a comprehensive sense of where the movement stands at this time. The many workshops and panels addressed the common problems that we face in WAC programs around the world, and provided many glimpses of creative solutions. I would like to thank the many people who answered my questions, and stimulated me to think about things in a different way. Many of the proposals contained in this report have been influenced by these discussions. Travel to this conference was also supported by the grant.

Next: The task of implementing the next phase.

Jonathan Hall, Coordinator
Writing Across the Curriculum Program
June 2004
I. Introduction: Fundamental Principles of the Next Phase of Writing Across the Curriculum at Rutgers-Newark

When a Writing Across the Curriculum requirement for graduation was instituted at Rutgers-Newark in Fall 2001, the purpose was to ensure that all students had opportunities to improve their writing within their upper-level courses, beyond the standard freshman composition requirement. Some 410 courses have been offered so far, which should give students sufficient choices so that they can fulfill the WAC requirement of two Writing Intensive courses, including one in their major. The original Writing Across the Curriculum implementation committee (aided by Dialogues Grants) laid a strong foundation, both in theory and in practice, for this initiative, and many excellent Writing Intensive courses have been developed and taught over the past three years. It is now time to take stock of what we have already accomplished in the first three years of WAC at Rutgers-Newark, and to offer a new vision of writing at Rutgers-Newark for the future.

In order to build on our successful beginning, and to take WAC at Rutgers-Newark to the next level, we need to recognize the contributions that have already been made by WAC faculty, and to solicit their continued commitment and input. The basic principle of the Writing Across the Curriculum movement has always been that the teaching of writing is not and cannot be solely the province of the English Department, and that writing instruction must not end once students have passed their freshman composition courses. Rather, every college teacher in every discipline is and must be a teacher of writing, in addition to the specific content of their own area. We need to recognize that a student who cannot write fluently about the ideas in a course is a student who does not really understand them in an active and sophisticated manner.

Good writing is good thinking, and improving students’ writing skills involves much more than just tinkering with their knowledge of grammar and rhetoric, narrowly conceived; it involves a fundamental engagement with the student’s whole process of comprehension, from basic critical thinking to academic research procedures to active discipline-specific reading skills. At absolute minimum, we need to articulate the standards and goals for students’ skills at every level of writing instruction, from developmental writing courses (for those who need them), through freshman composition, and seamlessly on up to the most advanced Writing Intensive courses, the pinnacle of undergraduate writing at this institution. So the first part of this report will be devoted to describing a unified writing curriculum. This will involve some proposed changes in general graduation requirements and administrative structures having to do with writing instruction, as well as an effort to describe the relation between the various levels of undergraduate writing instruction, as they exist now and as they might evolve in the future.

But a successful Writing Across the Curriculum program needs to be more than just a collection of individual Writing Intensive courses, however well-taught. It needs to be a living, breathing community, in which teachers, students, tutors, and administrators both give and receive the support they need to fulfill their mission of promoting, assessing, and improving writing
instruction in all academic disciplines on campus. The second part of this report will consider what changes and developments need to be made to the WAC Program itself to allow it to fulfill these responsibilities. It is not enough to impose a requirement, though that is the necessary first step. We need to nurture an active culture of writing instruction and practice at Rutgers-Newark. The guiding principle needs to be encouraging faculty to integrate writing into their course design as a fundamental tool of exploration and learning, not as a mere tacked-on adjunct. Once instructors can see for themselves that the judicious use of writing assignments is no mere make-work project, but rather a fundamental enhancement of the student's experience of the course, resulting in a deeper and less regimented engagement with the material, they generally overcome any initial resistance they may have had, and from then on will incorporate writing into their teaching practice voluntarily and enthusiastically.

Ultimately we can hope that the effects of this growing and developing interactive culture will be felt beyond those faculty directly involved in Writing Intensive courses. We can look forward to a day when not only those courses officially designated as “Writing Intensive” will have a significant writing component, but that nearly all courses will stress writing. The potential of Writing Across the Curriculum is to be no less than a transformative educational experience, for both students and faculty. If a comprehensive culture of writing is truly created and brought to life, it will change, for the better, the basic way that we do business with our students. We need to engage with our students at both a higher intellectual level and a more intensive level of individual attention to their writing development. This means that our classes must be smaller, and we must devote more of our resources, both material and mental, to improving our teaching. Our re-commitment, as individual faculty and as an institution, to the next phase of Writing Across the Curriculum is also our fundamental re-commitment to the importance of undergraduate teaching in general.

I.A A Unified Writing Curriculum

The “Across” in “Writing Across the Curriculum” does not merely signify that the doing of writing and the teaching of writing are going on everywhere, in every department–although that’s part of it. The further implication is that writing instruction is linked and coordinated across the campus. We need a common approach, so that instructors in various departments and at various levels are on the same page in terms of expectations of student writing, pedagogical techniques, course structures, goals for student writing skills, and standards for evaluating them.

So WAC is concerned not only with the horizontal breadth of writing instruction (the fact that it’s happening simultaneously in the social sciences, in the humanities, and in the laboratory sciences), but also with the vertical integration of writing instruction at various levels and at various times throughout the whole period of a student’s undergraduate career. The second Writing Intensive course, that is, should build on the first; the first Writing Intensive course should build on freshman composition, which in turn should form a continuous instructional stream with developmental writing courses, for those students who need them.
We need to imagine the experience of a typical Rutgers student progressing, let’s say, from an initial placement into a semester of developmental writing, through the freshman composition courses, on into a Writing Intensive course that also satisfies a general distribution requirement, and then to another Writing Intensive course that is also the Senior Seminar in the student’s major. I will also propose below that we add an additional course to the sequence—the Sophomore-Level Writing Requirement—which would be a transitional course, either the end of the composition sequence, for those who have begun with a developmental writing course, or else the first of what would be three Writing Intensive courses, under this new system.

That’s at least five semesters of writing instruction at the college level. We can assume—or at least we can hope—the student will also be given extensive practice in writing in other academic courses along the way, but we need to make sure that the writing instruction in those five courses is coordinated: that it proceeds in a logically-organized progression in terms of expectations of students’ writing, that it presents critical reading and writing skills in a manner that allows students to master them, and in a succession that allows for practice and internalization. In other words, we want the student to feel that he/she has taken an integrated sequence in writing, in which each course builds on what has come before, not just five random courses in which instructors assign writing.

This is the rationale for what has been called a Unified Writing Curriculum at Rutgers-Newark. (See Section V.D). Up until this point the concept has generally been applied primarily to the proposed merging of the Academic Foundations developmental writing courses with the Freshman Writing Program’s composition sequence—a contentious issue which I will address on its own below—but I will argue that a Unified Writing Curriculum only makes sense if we integrate intermediate and upper-level Writing Intensive courses into the picture. In fact, the whole problem which outside consultants were called in to address—namely the disconnect between developmental and freshman writing in our practice up to this time—can only be resolved if we begin with a clear articulation of our goals for the overall arc of student writing development over the whole course of an undergraduate career.

In Part One of this report, I will examine the function of our WAC program in integrating the teaching of writing at all levels: the developmental writing sequence, the freshman composition sequence, the special needs of transfer students, introductory writing intensive courses fulfilling general education requirements, intermediate writing intensive courses, advanced writing intensive courses, and preparation for writing in graduate or professional school. Perhaps counter-intuitively for some, I will begin at the end of the process, with the highest level of undergraduate student writing achievement, and work backwards from there in describing the necessary preparatory steps that enable that achievement.
I.B An Active Culture of Writing Instruction and Practice

Part Two of this report will address, in as practical a way as possible, exactly what we need to do to encourage the development of an active culture of writing instruction and practice. Specifically, the following areas will be addressed:

**Program Structure, Standards, and Procedures.** How does our WAC program integrate administratively with others who have responsibility for aspects of writing instruction at various levels: the Writing Program, the Writing Center, the developmental writing sequence, ESL initiatives? Inside the program, is there a clear definition of the administrative role of the WAC Committee and other participants? Have reasonable standards for teaching load and class size been set and applied, and what kinds of resource issues do these raise, both overall and for particular departments? Do we need to revisit our criteria for Writing Intensive courses—for example, to make them more specific—or are people happy with them as they are? How can we structure the workings of the Writing Intensive Course Designation Process so that it will function in an efficient and timely manner, and result in a constructive dialogue between the WAC Committee and the proposing faculty member, and thus, we hope, in improved pedagogical design and enhanced writing instruction? What sorts of ongoing assessment and evaluation procedures need to be produced and incorporated for the WAC Program in the future?

**Support for Student Learning:** What do students need to be successful in Writing Intensive courses, beyond what can be provided by individual faculty members? How can we make students more aware of the WAC requirement and Writing Intensive courses, and engage their active (not grudging) participation in the goal of improving their writing? What kind of support can we provide, as an academic community, and how can we best structure its delivery? What varieties of tutoring (including traditional drop-in tutoring, curriculum-based peer tutoring attached to particular courses, e-tutoring, etc.), will provide the most effective supplement to the Writing Intensive teacher’s in-class efforts? How can we empower students to access, in a timely and effective manner, online writing handbooks and other technological resources for help with grammar, ESL-related problems, and other basic writing issues? How can the program coordinate with the library to offer improved instruction in discipline-specific research skills for Writing Intensive courses? How can WAC pedagogical principles, in concert with technology and specific materials developed for the use of WAC faculty, help to reduce student plagiarism?

**Faculty Support and Professional Development:** How can we help faculty in Writing Intensive courses with the difficult task of incorporating writing instruction with traditional course content? What kinds of support would help faculty cope with the workload, and how can we deliver it to them most efficiently? What would be the most useful components to include on the new WAC Website as it develops further? How can we as an institution send the message to faculty that undergraduate teaching matters, and is valued, in tangible and intangible ways, on this campus?

We will proceed from the basic perception that faculty across the board are in need of support for the teaching of writing, and not just in the obvious cases of science departments which have
traditionally emphasized quantitative methods rather than writing, but in the social sciences and humanities as well. Many faculty members can be excellent teachers, scholars, and writers themselves, without necessarily having developed the specialized pedagogical skills necessary to helping students improve their writing. A well-run WAC program can serve as an invaluable resource for improving writing instruction across the board, providing assistance in the form of forums and seminars for exchange of ideas, liaison and coordination with library services to help make research assignments both more meaningful and more manageable, and brief but intensive training opportunities for instructors, both at the beginning and at more advanced levels.
Part One:
A Unified Writing Curriculum
II. Basic Elements of the WAC Program: Proposal for a Sophomore-Level Writing Requirement and Other Possible Adjustments

Since research points to the need for continued practice of writing in the disciplines other than English, successful writing across the curriculum programs build upon newly acquired competencies by requiring a writing intensive course in any discipline before the end of the sophomore year.

–University of Toledo WAC Program, Introduction

Let’s begin with a very brief sketch of the parameters of the Rutgers-Newark Writing Across the Curriculum Program as it is currently on the institutional books. There are basically four official elements: 1) the WAC requirement for graduation in the catalog, 2) the stop-point limit on writing intensive courses (25), 3) the process of designating a course as writing intensive, and 4) the writing intensive criteria. I’ll briefly summarize each of these in turn, offer commentary on the rationale for each element and how well it’s working, and in some cases make a proposal for changes or additional measures.

II.A. Writing Across the Curriculum Requirement (from undergraduate catalog):

Beginning in fall 2001, every student must successfully complete a two-term writing requirement beyond English 101 and 102 (or 121 and 122). Students may satisfy this requirement by taking any two courses designated “W” in the Schedule of Classes. Students must take at least one of these courses within the department of their major, and may choose to take the other as a course that satisfies general requirements, or as an elective.

[Note: For technical reasons, writing intensive courses have never been identified by a “W” in the schedule of classes, but as section 66, 67, etc. I will propose a new designation code below.]

Commentary: Rationale for an Additional Writing Course

Current writing requirements at Rutgers-Newark conceive writing instruction as composed of four courses: a two-course “English Composition” sequence at the freshman level, followed by two “Writing Intensive” courses at the upper level.

The relationship between these sequences has not been very explicitly addressed, however, nor have they even been consistently described as a four-course sequence. The very existence of a WAC requirement testifies that the faculty has been aware that two semesters of freshman composition are not a sufficient exposure to college-level writing instruction to prepare students to compete in the world after graduation, but we need to articulate much more clearly than we
have exactly what we want the freshman writing sequence to accomplish, and how it is related to what we want WAC to do for our students.

One important problem with the current system has to do with a gap in many students’ writing education between freshman composition and Writing Intensive courses. Because we have not articulated the interdependency of the various levels of our writing instruction, we have not required that students *continuously* study writing throughout their Rutgers career. Under the current set of standards, it is possible for a student to take English 101 and 102 during the first two semesters of the freshman year, and then take Writing Intensive courses during both semesters of the senior year, with no writing instruction whatever during the sophomore and junior years. Indeed, some departments have chosen to fulfill the WAC requirement by having students take a two-semester “Senior Project” or “Senior Seminar” sequence as a capstone to their career, with both semesters counting as Writing Intensive. Such “capstone” sequences seem to me to be in the best spirit of Writing Across the Curriculum, and I am far from discouraging them; indeed I would advocate that we set similar goals for all Rutgers students. But an unintended side effect of this laudable effort has been to encourage precisely the two-year gap in writing instruction that I have described.

**Proposals: Sophomore Level Writing Requirement and Continuous Writing Registration**

All students, I believe, require some mandated writing instruction after the freshman year and before the senior year. To address this gap, I propose that we institute a *sophomore level writing requirement*. Instead of the current four-course writing sequence, we need to envision a five-course sequence. The last two courses, as now, will be upper-level Writing Intensives; the first two will be freshman composition. The third course must be taken in the sophomore year.

- If the student has been placed, as an entering freshman, in Communication Skills 143 Preparatory Writing, then the completion of the English 101/102 sequence will carry over into the sophomore year, satisfying the sophomore level writing requirement: the student’s five writing courses will be 143, 101, 102, and two Writing Intensive courses.

- If a student is initially placed in English 101, then the sequence would be 101, 102, and three Writing Intensive courses, one of which must be taken in the sophomore year.

- If a student enters as a transfer student with two acceptable composition courses (B or better) from another institution, then the student would need either to take English 122 and two Writing Intensive courses, or just three Writing Intensive courses, depending on the result of a Writing Program placement examination.

In order for this new system to work, we need to enforce the requirement, which is already on the books but seldom rigorously observed, that freshman composition “must be taken as soon as the student is eligible according to established placement standards at the college. Students who do not fulfill this requirement may be compelled to carry a reduced credit load and to defer their
probable date of graduation.” (Catalog). We need, in fact, to enact and enforce a policy of **continuous writing registration** until the freshman writing requirement is satisfied. There are too many students currently who put off their freshman requirements, sometimes until the final semester of their senior year. Meanwhile they have taken (and passed, somehow) their literature requirements and other courses that theoretically carry prerequisites of English 102/122/104, but obviously have been lax in practical observance. We simply cannot afford to allow students to opt out of taking freshman composition in their freshman year. If first-year students are not registered for a writing course, we should get their attention by having them automatically de-registered from all their other courses, and publicize this requirement widely.

We should also enact a rule that students can only get credit for one writing course per semester. It completely defeats the purpose of enacting a writing instruction sequence if students take it out of order or try to double up. The effects of writing instruction are cumulative, and they require time and practice to sink in. Under this new system, all Rutgers students will have to take writing instruction in at least five out of their projected eight semesters of enrollment.

Another argument in favor of the sophomore level writing requirement is that it will provide, I believe, a comprehensive and even elegant solution to the whole political problem of transfer placement. If we require everyone to take 5 writing courses (at least two composition and at least two Writing Intensive), then that gives us the perfect answer in case students (or their institutions) complain that we’re not exempting them from our writing courses based on their two composition courses taken elsewhere: quite simply, we require more than two. You may be forced to take English 122, but you’ll fulfill your sophomore level writing requirement for graduation by doing so. We get students into the writing courses that we know they need, and they don’t get the feeling that they’re wasting their time.

Note that this proposal does NOT involve any change in the “one course within the department of their major” requirement; some departments are finding this difficult enough to meet, and this requirement will not result in an additional drain on their resources. But we have plenty of writing intensive courses offered at the introductory/general education level to satisfy the demand.

**II.B. Writing intensive courses must have a stop-point of 25.**

*Commentary: Writing courses are labor intensive, and cannot be taught properly with large enrollments.*

It is essential that writing intensive courses be limited in enrollment; this is only fair to the instructor, and it provides the student with more individualized attention. The current standard of 25 is pretty much at the upper limit of what is seen as optimal in terms of nationwide WAC standards.
Proposals: Enforce current stop-point standard strictly and address resource issues in particular departments.

Ideally, we would have a lower stop-point–say, 15. But I do not currently propose any change in this standard. I do, however, propose that we enforce the current standard strictly. Some departments–and indeed some larger academic units–have been running courses with much higher stop-points, and this is not sound pedagogy. Of course this is basically a resource issue, and needs to be addressed within the context of budgets and departmental priorities toward undergraduate education.

II.C Writing Intensive Course Designation Process:

Initially, Writing Intensive courses were reviewed by the WAC Advisory Committee, but that committee was disbanded, and since then Writing intensive courses have been designated solely at the discretion of department chairs. Writing Intensive courses are currently indicated in the schedule by a section number of “66” (or 67, 68, 69 for multiple sections).

Commentary: A formal course designation process is a standard WAC procedure nationwide.

At most institutions with WAC programs there is a process of course review and development before a course is officially designated as writing intensive. This is useful for pedagogical improvement, for faculty professional development, and for program assessment purposes. The WAC Advisory Committee has now been re-formed by the FASN Associate Dean of Faculty, and is ready to re-institute course review.

Proposal: Re-institute Updated Course Designation Process

In April 2004, the WAC Advisory Committee approved a new “Course Designation” process, to be effective for Spring 2005 courses, that will involve a “Planning” process of consultation between department chairs, the WAC Coordinator, and the FASN Dean’s office; a “Development” process involving a collegial exchange/workshop between the instructor and members of the WAC Advisory committee; and a “Review” process which involves the WAC Committee officially designating (or, in rare cases, not designating) a course as Writing intensive. This is not intended as interference in the prerogatives of instructors to control their own classrooms, but as a resource for faculty to become part of a larger writing instruction team across campus. (See end of this chapter for complete text.)

I will discuss this process in more detail in the second part of this report, when I turn to administrative matters. Here, the most important element is for curriculum development: if there is communication between instructors about what ought to be going on in writing intensive courses, then we can hope and expect that instructors will increasingly feel that they are part of a team, rather than operating in isolation. The course development process will be one of the key
methods of distributing the standards and goals of the Unified Writing Curriculum to grassroots instructors teaching in the program.

Effective Spring 2005, the course designation symbol will most likely be changed from 66 to “Q.” This will allow us to use Q1-Q9 and also QA-QZ, and will solve a problem that has arisen when certain departments offer multiple sections (as many as 12) of the same writing intensive course. A “Q” designation will require the approval of the WAC Advisory Committee.

II.D Writing Intensive Course Criteria

Here are the current criteria for Writing Intensive courses, based on the original proposal authorizing the Writing Across the Curriculum requirement:

Courses designated Writing Intensive must meet the following criteria:
- They call for substantial writing.
- They offer multiple writing assignments.
- They expect revision of work.
- They provide students with learning opportunities through critical feedback.

Commentary: Coordinator’s gloss on Writing Intensive criteria.

The criteria for writing intensive courses were deliberately left flexible by the original Writing Across the Curriculum committee, to provide maximum freedom for innovation and experiment by individual faculty members teaching Writing Intensive courses. Note, for example, that there is no fixed page count: the exact definition of "substantial writing" depends on the instructor and the conventions of the particular discipline.

The requirement of "multiple assignments" is meant to preclude the type of course where a "term paper" is tacked on to the end; a writing intensive course should integrate writing into the heart of the course. Writing across the curriculum means that "writing to learn" is just as important as "learning to write": the purpose of writing assignments is not just to give students practice at writing, although that's very important; well-designed writing assignments can help students to master the course material at a more detailed and dynamic level.

The requirement for "revision of work" is meant to ensure that instructors pay attention to the students' process of writing, not just a final product. There is a broad consensus among researchers and teachers of writing that the most effective writing instruction finds ways of intervening in the incremental stages of students' writing. The requirement for "critical feedback" is related both to this objective of improving the students' writing process, and to the objective of using writing as a
tool for mastering the course material. The instructor needs to complete a feedback loop with the student several times during the semester.

Proposals: Adopt gloss (above) as part of criteria; supplement criteria with outcomes-based goals and professional development opportunities

I do not propose any major changes to these criteria, though I do suggest that we adopt the “commentary” gloss as an official part of the requirements, and also that we supplement them with outcomes-based goals for all writing intensive courses at various levels (see section III).

Based on discussions in the WAC Advisory Committee and at the WAC Colloquium, and on the results of the WAC Faculty Survey, there seems to be a generally high level of satisfaction with these criteria, and not much of an urgent desire to revisit them. Some institutions with similar programs specify a specific page count and/or a minimum number of writing assignments, but, as noted in the commentary, the omission of these was not accidental on the part of the original WAC committee, which recognized that both the forms of writing and the length of writing customarily done can be very different from discipline to discipline, which is the whole point of WAC. WAC directors nationwide generally regard the page count as a relatively unimportant criterion,¹ and our faculty seems to concur. A solid 70% majority of the WAC Survey respondents agreed with the statement that “I am familiar with the standards for Writing Intensive courses and feel that they give me a good sense of the program goals and sufficient guidance for how to approach them.” Respondents were slightly more ambivalent on whether they wanted more specific guidance on page counts, etc. “I think they are fine,” wrote one respondent, “but those in disciplines which do not use writing as a customary means of evaluation - e.g. science and math - probably find them vague.” Several respondents expressed a desire for more of a communal process: “Occasional opportunities to meet with colleagues and writing professionals on how to teach our students to be better writers would be valuable,” suggested one instructor, while another expressed a wish that “I could have attended a meeting prior to the teaching of the course to make sure that my syllabus adhered 100% to the objectives of the course or I would have benefitted from other peers’ experiences in handling the writing assignments.”

Overall, then, the criteria seem to be regarded favorably, though there is a lingering sense that instructors could use more contact with each other regarding standards and practices. Probably this desire will best be met not by changing the criteria themselves, but by providing more opportunities for interchange—for example, by sharing syllabi and assignments in online “banks” in the secure WAC faculty area—and by introducing faculty training and professional development opportunities, as will be discussed in the second part of this report.

II. E Supplemental Material for Chapter II: Text of Course Designation Process

Course Designation Process

I. Course Planning Process
   [This should take place prior to the submission of construction sheets for each semester.]
   
   A. Coordinator calculates rough numerical goals for Writing Intensive offerings, and queries department chairs about their planned offerings for the next semester.
   
   B. Department chairs consult with WAC Coordinator and FASN Dean’s office regarding levels of Writing Intensive offerings in their department, including a discussion of any difficulties they foresee in meeting these responsibilities.

II. Course Development Process
   Once a department chair has declared the intention of designating a particular section of a particular course with a particular instructor as Writing Intensive for a particular semester:
   
   A. The Coordinator contacts that instructor, enclosing an “Orientation Package” of materials concerning WAC standards, resources for teachers, sample syllabi, etc.
   
   B. When ready, the faculty member submits supporting materials (course description, syllabus, sample assignments, etc.) in electronic form to the online WAC Faculty area.
   
   C. Once materials have been submitted, the Coordinator passes them on (electronically) to a subcommittee of two or more WAC Advisory Committee members, who then review the materials, discuss them among themselves, and communicate suggestions to the instructor regarding the Writing Intensive elements.

III. Course Review Process
   
   A. The subcommittee of reviewers makes a recommendation to the overall committee, which can then designate the course as “Writing Intensive” (or not, in rare cases).
   
   B. The Coordinator makes sure that the course is properly listed in the Schedule of Classes, and on the WAC website.
Timetable: It is anticipated that the full designation process as described above, including Course Planning, the Course Development Workshop, and formal Course Review by the WAC Advisory Committee, will be in place for courses to be taught in Spring 2005. For Fall 2004 courses, which have already been planned, there will be an interim, more informal procedure, where instructors will be asked to submit syllabi or other information, and the committee will offer comments and suggestions.

[Approved by WAC Advisory Committee 4/19/04]
III. Writing Up and Down the Curriculum: Proposal for a Unified Writing Curriculum

I do see improvement in student writing over the course of a semester. But because the level of preparation varies widely in a large class, it can be difficult to teach at a level that helps everyone, and it can be hard to work effectively with every student. Occasional meetings for constructive sharing of ideas among colleagues would help. Stronger preparation in the English Composition 101 and 102 sequence would help, also. Too often, we are trying to teach skills and habits of mind that students should have gained years ago.

–FASN faculty member, from the faculty survey

By its nature, a program that depends on Writing in the Disciplines, taught by faculty attached to every academic department in the university, will be somewhat decentralized. It is neither possible nor desirable to impose a rigid, centrally-controlled template on the far-flung diversity of courses offered in so many different subjects in such varied modes by so many idiosyncratic instructors. Our tradition at Rutgers-Newark has always been that there are many roads by which a good teacher can guide students to the same destination.

We do need, however, to define that destination as specifically as we can, so that both students and instructors at every level will be aware of the expectations and goals in a given course in terms of student writing, reading, research, and critical thinking skills. I will offer a preliminary draft of such a roadmap in this section, in which I will describe, in a preliminary way, my proposal for a “Unified Writing Curriculum.” In this section and in those that follow in Part One of this Report, I will attempt to answer the following key questions:

a) Should all Writing Intensive courses be taught on essentially the same level, or can we identify a hierarchy of expectations regarding student skills in critical thinking, reading, writing, and research?

b) How does our WAC program integrate with the teaching of writing at other levels: the freshman composition sequence, the developmental writing sequence, and ESL initiatives? Can we construct a continuous scale of goals for student skills that describes a seamless progression from the lower levels of developmental writing all the way through to the most advanced Writing Intensive courses?

The following represents an attempt at such a scale, a brief outline of a proposed “Unified Writing Curriculum.” In the sections that follow, I will endeavor to fill in the details of the skills expected at each level, and thus the goals of the course.
III.A Proposed Unified Writing Curriculum

Level 1 Developmental Writing

0.5 PALS Program Basic Writing for ESL students
1.0 Communication Skills 142 Basic Writing: Comprehension and Expression
1.5 Communication Skills 143 Preparatory Writing: Exposition and Logical Presentation

Level 1 Final Standard: Rutgers Incoming Freshman Writing Proficiency, equivalent to a well-prepared high school graduate

Level 2 Freshman Writing I: Basic Rhetorical Structures of College-Level Writing

2.0 English 101 English Composition I: Analysis and Argument

Level 2 Final Standard: Rutgers Basic College-Level Writing Proficiency

Level 3 Freshman Writing II: Writing From Complex and Multiple Sources

3.0 English 102 English Composition II: Interpretation and Synthesis
3.5 English 122 Expository Writing: Introduction to College Research

Level 3 Final Standard: Rutgers Sophomore-Level Writing Proficiency

Level 4 Discipline-Specific Writing: Introductory Level

4.0 WAC Workshops (see Section X.B.4)
4.5 Introductory Writing Intensive Course in a Discipline (All depts. 200-299, and some 300-399 courses with minimal prerequisites and many non-majors registered)

Level 4 Final Standard: Ability to produce appropriate analytical prose which demonstrates a nuanced understanding of fundamental terms and concepts of an academic discipline.

Level 5 Discipline-Specific Writing: Intermediate Level

5.0 Intermediate Writing Intensive Course (All depts. 300-399 and some 400-499 intended principally for majors)

Level 5 Final Standard: Ability to produce appropriate analytical prose which demonstrates an active and critical understanding of specialized knowledge within an academic discipline.

Level 6 Discipline-Specific Writing: Advanced Level

6.0 Capstone Writing Intensive Course (All departments 400-499 Senior Seminar/Project)

Level 6 Final Standard: Ability to propose, carry out, and appropriately document an independent investigation within the chosen field, representing an attempt to join in the ongoing process of making knowledge.
III.B Distinguishing Between Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced Writing Intensive Courses

Our WAC approach at Rutgers-Newark is really a hybrid of two important models for program structure. This is partly an accident. The original plan was to require two courses for each student within the department of the major, which would have been a pure version of a “Writing in the Disciplines” program, whereas the final version, which envisions that many students will get their second writing intensive course from a general education requirement or from an elective outside their major, invokes elements of a classic “Writing Across the Curriculum” approach. The two terms are sometimes used interchangeably or linked acronymically (WAC/WID), but Jonathan Monroe argues that they’re really quite different animals: “While WAC emphasizes the commonality, portability, and communicability of writing practices, WID emphasizes disciplinary differences, diversity, and heterogeneity.”2 WAC, that is, believes that it is teaching transferable writing skills, and aims for a general academic analytical language, while WID suggests that there is no such thing as a single scholarly language, only the various specific languages indigenous to particular disciplinary communities.

However serendipitous in its origins, the WAC/WID hybrid that we have created seems to me to mimic, in a positive way, the typical student’s experience of a Rutgers undergraduate education. Writing instruction begins, of course, in freshman composition for most people, although some students—and an increasing number, I suspect—will begin with one or two semesters of a developmental writing course before that. In any case, by the end of the English 101-102 sequence (or English 103-104 for Honors College students or English 122 for transfer students), the quest for the basic conventions of academic analytical writing is well under way. Students then take a variety of general education requirements before concentrating their attention on a major.

Our current criteria make no distinctions between levels of WI courses—they’re all just “writing intensive”—but instructors need to be thinking about where they are on the spectrum of WAC/WID. WAC would conceive itself as an extension of freshman composition, carrying on its approach to that generalized analytical language, but flavoring it more extensively with the content and terminology of a particular academic discipline. This is what I will describe below as the “introductory writing intensive course,” and in fact the majority of the writing intensive courses that are offered now are probably of this type. All courses offer a process of initiation into a particular disciplinary community, but for many students in these introductory WI courses, they’re only going to be visitors, not permanent members of that community. In keeping with the “general education” philosophy of Rutgers and of American academia in general, the purpose of

---

courses like this is to give students a taste of what a field is like, so that they can come back for a full meal if they’re interested.

Before going to specific descriptions of these various levels, let me offer examples of the difference between an introductory, an intermediate, and an advanced Writing Intensive course. The first thing to be said is that I think that there actually are these distinctions, that they already exist in our practice, though they are not currently recognized or distinguished in our writing intensive criteria. I’ll give examples from my own department, English:

**Level 4: Introductory.** I regularly teach Survey of American Literature as a Writing Intensive course, though there are also non-WI sections. Most of the students are taking this to fulfill their general education literature requirements. This is the next direct step from English 102, and we’re trying to get them to transfer the skills that they’ve supposedly developed in that course over to this new context. One of the things we really need to emphasize is that there is supposed to be a *continuity* between composition and WAC. That is, in a Writing Intensive course, particularly at the introductory level, we ought to be able to assume a certain level of competence, yes, and a certain level of familiarity with analytical style and making an interpretive argument. But we also need to remember that writing is like learning to play golf: yes, you’re way better off after your first few lessons. You know the rules, and you have some general tips about how to develop good habits. But you’re a long way from being a real golfer, much less a good golfer. It’s the same with writing. The Writing Intensive teacher has to be willing to go back to composition-level skills, on occasion, for review.

**Level 5: Intermediate.** The English Department has a course called “Foundations of Literary Study” which is required of all English majors, and it’s taught as a Writing Intensive course. But students are supposed to take it relatively *early* in their college career. That is, it provides a fairly systematic introduction to the basic concepts and tools that they’re going to need as English majors, and which wouldn’t necessarily be appropriate for a course that included a lot of non-majors. A lot of departments have similar courses, some of which may be writing intensive.

**Level 6: Advanced.** The next and final level of undergraduate writing would be the advanced or so-called “Capstone” course. In the English department, there is now a new requirement called “Advanced Method and Theory,” which is supposed to be taken near the end of the student’s undergraduate career, and which probably will be designated as writing intensive. The point of these course goals is that this is not just a matter of the content of the courses being different, but that part of what we’re teaching is the way that English majors, in this case, write, in the Foundations course. In the Advanced course, we’re not so much talking about how English majors write so much as how graduate students and professors of English write, so that the upper-level undergraduate majors are on the way to writing the way that professionals in the field do it.

I think that this is something that a lot of us can offer to our students, and not just at the advanced level, though most obviously there: we can show ourselves as writers. We can talk about what we’re working on, we can share our challenges as we’re trying to revise something,
maybe we can even share a draft of something or a part of a draft with our students. Whatever else an advanced course in any field may be, it’s got to be a writing workshop, because, if we’re honest about it, that’s what professionals in most fields do most of the time: they write. Scientists may think, when they begin their training, that they’re going to be working in the lab; they may even go into it for that reason. But if they’re successful at it, they’re going to find that what they mostly do is write grant proposals and articles and various other texts.

One aspect of the WAC Requirement for graduation is that at least one of the two Writing Intensive courses must be in the student’s major. A number of departments have approached this requirement by designating their “capstone” course—often a majors-only advanced “Senior Seminar” or an individualized “Senior Project”—as “Writing Intensive.” If this is done correctly—that is, if there is real writing instruction going on in these capstone courses—this seems to me entirely appropriate. Such advanced courses, in which all the students have significant background in the discipline and familiarity with each other and with the instructor, can provide opportunities for critical reading and writing at the highest level reasonably required of undergraduates. Different departments structure these courses in different ways, but I think that we can safely say that most such courses incorporate—or at least should incorporate—some variation on the principles that are articulated under “Level 6” below.

That’s our standard, where we want our students to be able to go. Indeed, if we could make such a high-level Writing Intensive course a standard practice across the campus, we could speak of a “writing capstone course” as the highest level of WAC instruction—and of undergraduate student writing achievement. I am not proposing that we literally mandate such a procedure; individual departments need to make such decisions internally, and the designation of final expectations for graduating majors is very near the heart of a department’s undergraduate curriculum and even its professional identity. But since every department is already required to offer at least one Writing Intensive course to its majors, we can certainly suggest a model which has the advantage of offering clear guidelines for instructors in terms of goals for writing, critical thinking, and understanding, and which calls upon all departments to expect and to demand an ambitious—but attainable—level of writing proficiency from their graduating majors.

Once we know where we’re going, everything in our undergraduate writing curriculum can be calibrated backward from there. Even if it is not universally adopted, this description of an undergraduate “writing capstone” course in the major discipline can be used as a model for describing the goals and expectations of all courses that involve writing instruction across the curriculum, at all levels. If we are able to define what we want our students to be able to do by their last undergraduate semester at Rutgers, then we can construct a better paradigm for all earlier writing courses. The basic goals of everything from developmental writing through freshman composition and earlier levels of Writing Intensive courses can be described as variations on these final goals, a set of graduated steps designed to allow students to progress incrementally toward where they need to be. Therefore, perhaps counter-intuitively for some, I will start with our ultimate goal—the capstone writing intensive course—and then work my way backward through the student’s career, through intermediate and introductory writing intensive courses, then freshman composition, then developmental and ESL courses.
III.C Supplemental Material for Chapter III: Articulating Outcomes-Based Goals for Writing Intensive Instruction

III.C.1 Advanced (Capstone) Level Writing Intensive Courses

Level 6 (Writing Intensive Capstone Course)—Any Department’s Highest-Level Undergraduate Writing Course: Senior Seminars, Honors Seminars, Senior Projects, Advanced Independent Study or Internships

Critical Thinking—Level 6: Actively Contributing to the Process of Making Knowledge. Students should strive to interact with their sources and their instructor in a way that demonstrates provisional membership in the disciplinary community, and an attempt to contribute, at however minimal a level, something valuable to current debates and issues within the field.

Reading—Level 6: Advanced discipline-specific critical reading skills. Students must be able to read, analyze, understand, and respond in writing to complex, professional-level documents in their chosen field of study. At this level the instructor should feel free to assign, for example, current articles from specialized peer-reviewed journals, in the expectation that, with the aid of the instructor’s guidance in class and in office hours, these graduating seniors will be able to gain a reasonable comfort with and understanding of this level of discourse.

Writing—Level 6: Ability to produce near-professional quality documents in discipline-specific genres using appropriate specialized language and formats. It is, of course, only the very rare undergraduate senior thesis that is readily “publishable” as is, but that is the ideal toward which we should strive. At minimum, a graduating senior should be familiar with the types of writing customarily produced by professionals in the field, and be able to produce something that at least approximates the diction, the conventions, the structures, and the ways of thinking that are endemic to the discipline.

Research-Level 6: Ability to conceive, propose, carry-out, and write a specific self-defined research project within the context of the course and the standards and procedures of the particular disciplinary field. Students are encouraged to pursue their own intellectual interests, within the purview of the particular course. The canned “writing assignment” that might be necessary at earlier levels should be avoided here. Students are now assumed to be “self-starters,” having internalized the ways of thinking and codes of behavior expected of professionals in the field, and within the limits of available time (one semester, or sometimes two), they propose a topic or set of experiments or method of inquiry, which is then approved by the instructor, and carried out by the student under the instructor’s supervision.
III.C.2 Intermediate Level Writing Intensive Courses

Level 5 (Discipline-Specific Writing: Intermediate Level)–All Departments 300-399 (those courses intended primarily for majors), and also many 400-499 courses (not “capstone”): Intermediate Writing Intensive Course

Critical Thinking–Level 5: Awareness of the Making of Knowledge. Ability to make specialized distinctions within key concepts, and to identify ongoing issues/areas of tension within the discipline.

Reading–Level 5: Intermediate Discipline-Specific Critical Reading Skills. Students should be able to read scholarly review articles describing the state of knowledge in the field, as well as articles distilling specialized knowledge for a general audience.

Writing–Level 5: Ability to produce non-technical but discipline-informed mixed-mode documents. Ability to make an informed argument about current issues in the field using appropriate analytical language which incorporates some specialized terminology along with the student’s own voice.

Research–Level 5: Becoming familiar with the current state of knowledge on a particular topic. With the guidance of the instructor and the librarian, students should be able to describe what is known, what is not known, and what is in dispute about a particular assigned topic.

III.C.3 Introductory Level Writing Intensive Courses

Level 4 (Discipline-Specific Writing: Introductory Level)–All Departments 200-299 and Some 300-399 Courses (those with minimal prerequisites and many non-majors registered): Introductory Writing Intensive Course in a Discipline

Critical Thinking –Level 4: Absorbing Knowledge and Making It One’s Own. Students need to actively master the material of the course, and be able to put it together in different formats, not just reciting memorized facts on exams.

Reading–Level 4: Elementary Discipline-Specific Critical Reading Skills. Students must demonstrate ability to understand key basic concepts of a field, and manipulate them in different intellectual contexts.

Writing–Level 4: Ability to express and explore key basic concepts of field. Students must use their own words, appropriate analytical language, and carefully-defined technical terms to write about their understanding of course material.
Research–Level 4: Tracing Knowledge Back to Original Sources. Students should get beyond the textbook presentation of the field and demonstrate a familiarity with some of the key historical sources upon which modern distillations of specialized knowledge are based.

III.C.4 Writing Program Courses–Composition

Level 3 (Freshman Writing II)–English 102 English Composition II: Interpretation and Synthesis

Critical Thinking–Level 3: Accommodating complexity and ambiguity. Students need to develop the ability to hold complex or ambiguous ideas in the mind long enough to explore their ramifications in a nuanced way, without prematurely oversimplifying them.

Reading–Level 3: Intermediate “Culturally-Aware Citizen” Lifetime Critical Reading Skills. Students can demonstrate through close textual readings an awareness of ambiguous levels of meaning in language; can articulate a critique of a current movie or book more sophisticated than “liked it”/”hated it”; can profitably read literary fiction and complex essays.

Writing–Level 3: Ability to produce essays that analyze complex texts, and defend a student’s own interpretation of ambiguous layers of meaning. Students should develop the ability to articulate how various sources disagree with, partially agree with, build upon, take off from, re-apply the insights from other sources, and to do the same in their own writing. Students may be writing about fiction, poetry, literary nonfiction, or challenging expository essays, but they will always be supporting their own interpretive points with appropriate evidence from the text, carefully analyzed and tied to their thesis.

Research–Level 3: Synthesizing Multiple Voices: Students should be able to find and apply appropriate sources to supplement their assigned readings, and to gain a deeper understanding of their assigned subject matter using the insights of various disciplinary communities. Students must consider and interact with alternate interpretations of their chosen texts, or with sources that provide historical or other context.

Level 2 (Freshman Writing I)–English 101–English Composition I: Analysis and Argument

Critical Thinking–Level 2: Analysis and Argument. Students must be able to recognize strategies of persuasion, in their own texts and those of others, and learn how to address the underlying assumptions and values which are at stake in order to construct a coherent and convincing argument.
Reading–Level 2: General “Educated Citizen” Lifetime Critical Reading Skills: Students can recognize an author’s argument in an essay of intermediate complexity, and identify its principal underlying assumptions, appeals to audience’s values, and rhetorical strategies; can participate intelligently in ongoing political and cultural debates; can profitably read such publications as The New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Atlantic Monthly, New Yorker, etc.

Writing–Level 2: Ability to produce essays that observe the basic rhetorical conventions of academic writing. Students must demonstrate the ability to make a continuous argument, with proper transitions between points, and a thesis announced and defended in introductions and conclusions. They must use appropriate supporting evidence, usually in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases from the text, to support their points. Their essays must be analytical rather than employing merely narrative or summary.

Research–Level 2: Acknowledging the Work of Others. Students must demonstrate the ability to fairly represent the work of others, through summary, paraphrase and quotation; to carefully separate the ideas of others from the students’ own contributions; to give formal credit by using MLA documentation style correctly.

III.C.5 Developmental Writing Courses

Level 1.5 (Developmental Writing)–Communication Skills 143–Preparatory Writing: Exposition and Logical Presentation--

Critical Thinking–Level 1.5: Ability to Explain Abstract Ideas Fluently, and Combine Them Creatively. Students need to have an active grasp of the ideas that are being presented in class and in their readings, and be able to put their own spin on them.

Reading–Level 1.5: Basic “High School Graduate” Lifetime Critical Reading. Students must be able to identify the main idea of an essay of basic to moderate complexity, and to recognize the types of materials from which the author has constructed the essay.

Writing–Level 1.5: “High School to College” Transitional Writing. Students must demonstrate the ability to sustain a consistent argument about a subject of general interest, making fair use of appropriate assigned sources as a springboard for their own responses. They must work on avoiding logical fallacies and gaps in reasoning, on organizing paragraphs around a single topic, and on employing appropriate sentence structures. They must use correct standard English in all writing assignments, and should set a goal of extinguishing most grammatical error patterns from their writing, reviewing basic concepts as necessary.

Research–Level 1.5: Presenting information in students’ own words, while acknowledging sources and quoting, paraphrasing, and summarizing correctly. Students must
achieve a separation from their source while using multiple modes to give a nuanced account of the content of an assigned reading.

*Level 1.0 (Developmental Writing) Communication Skills 142 Basic Writing: Comprehension and Expression—*

**Critical Thinking—Level 1.0: Comprehending Abstract Ideas from Readings and Discussions.** Students should show the ability to go beyond just repeating the words; they need to be able to extract underlying assumptions and generalizations.

**Reading—Level 1.0: Approaching Basic “High School Graduate” Lifetime Critical Reading Skills.** Students must work on improving reading comprehension through assigned short readings, and demonstrate the ability to extract and manipulate information from their sources.

**Writing—Level 1.0: Expression** Students will work extensively, both independently and under instructor’s guidance, on reviewing basic grammatical concepts and moving toward extinguishing errors. Students must learn to use writing as a means of understanding difficult concepts, and of exploring and expressing complex thoughts and emotions.

**Research—Level 1.0: Presenting information in students’ own words, while acknowledging sources and summarizing correctly.** Students must achieve a separation from their source while giving an accurate account of the content of an assigned reading.

### III.C.6 PALS Program Courses

*Level 0.5 (Developmental Writing)—Basic Writing for ESL Students—*

**Critical Thinking—Level 0.5: Thinking and Writing in Standard English:** Students must be able to think at an abstract level in English, without translating first from their first language.

**Reading—Level 0.5: Intensive English Language Reading Skills for ESL Students.** Students must work on improving reading comprehension through assigned short readings, and demonstrate the ability to extract and manipulate information from their sources. They should learn to avoid translating readings into their first language in order to concentrate on improving their reading in English.

**Writing—Level 0.5: Correctness and Smooth Flow in Standard English.** Students will work extensively, both independently and under instructor’s guidance, on reviewing basic grammatical concepts and moving toward extinguishing errors, with special attention to
the types of errors frequently made by non-native writers. They will work on improving their personal self-expression in both written and spoken English.

Research–Level 0.5: Basic Expectations of U.S. Academic Institutions. ESL students frequently experience conflicts between the conventions of writing and general intellectual traditions of their original cultures, and the new ones they must adapt to in their chosen American institution. Instructors will pay particular attention to issues of authority/individuality, intellectual property, etc., and help students adjust to new norms as quickly as possible.
IV. Proposed Revisions to the Freshman Composition Sequence

IV.A The Unified Writing Curriculum and the English Composition Sequence

Under a unified writing curriculum, WAC and the freshman composition sequence—and before that, for those students who need them, the developmental writing courses—are intimately intertwined. WAC proponents are constantly and justifiably re-asserting the inarguable principle that writing instruction is not only the responsibility of the writing program or the English department. It is essential that faculty in all disciplines let go of that displacement of responsibility, and take up full ownership of their charge as writing intensive instructors (and, indeed, in their non-WI courses as well): yes, teaching writing is your job, too.

Salutary as that reminder of shared responsibility may be to the overall purposes of WAC, it remains equally inarguable that the composition sequence forms the indispensable foundation for a student’s success in upper-level writing courses. Therefore I will offer an analysis of the current freshman composition curriculum, its relation to WAC, and then, in the next section, address the need for adjusting the administrative structure governing both.

IV.B Student Populations and the T-Workshop System

Students come into the freshman composition sequence with a great spectrum of abilities and preparation. These are notoriously difficult variables to measure, and even if we make a correct initial placement, there is no guarantee that the student will progress in improving writing skills at the pace that we would expect, or for which our courses have been designed.

The Writing Program currently addresses this variability in several ways. First of all, some students are placed in English 101, but with an additional required workshop, English 100, which gives them extra work on basic writing skills and generally makes 101 into a more intensive experience in writing instruction. A second track for some students who require extra attention is to sign up for weekly peer tutoring at the Writing Center; instructors in 101 (and 102) often recommend this path to students early in the semester, after an initial diagnostic essay reveals weaknesses in basic writing skills. Both of these seem to me to be excellent alternatives for many students, and they have a track record of being helpful to many of them.

The controversial exit exams also identify a subset of students making variable progress through the composition sequence, and thus may be far more useful as placement instruments than they are in determining passing or failing in a particular course. They identify a population—those who have been doing at least borderline work in the course but who failed the final exam—who could benefit from further attention to their writing process before—or, better, as—they move on to the next level. Currently, if students fail the first re-take exam, they then enter a system of “T-grade workshops” (so named because most of these students are carrying TD’s or TF’s on their
transcripts at this time), or else intensive tutoring, especially for students with continuing ESL problems, both held in the semester following the one in which they failed to pass the exam. The students in these workshops receive attention to their test-taking skills and to their writing in general in non-credit workshops that meet once a week, taught by faculty similar to those who teach the freshman composition courses (PTLs and Assistant Instructors). Students who attend workshops or tutoring regularly are eligible for two further re-take attempts during the semester. If they pass, then they exit the workshop and receive credit for the course; if they fail, then they must take the course again.

This, it seems to me, is far from an ideal situation, but it is about the best that can be done within the limits of the current two-course composition requirement. The only power that the Writing Program has to insist upon its proficiency standards for student writing is to withhold the passing grade of C or better in the required freshman composition course. But the effect of the workshops is to put undue emphasis upon the exam as exam; students are filled with anxiety that they will have wasted an entire semester’s work, for which they will receive no academic credit unless they pass the exam, and an entire second semester in which they faithfully attended workshops but still failed the re-take examinations. So the focus of the workshops inevitably becomes the short-term goal of passing this exam rather than the long-term goal of improving the student’s writing for future upper-level courses and lifetime writing responsibilities.

These students would be better served, I believe, by a system that accepts that the exam results are a rather blunt instrument: they tell us that the student needs more work in the skills associated with a particular course. Rather than facing the prospect of getting no academic credit after all the hard work of writing papers and coming to class all semester, these students would be better off if their final exam were treated not as affecting the grade that they are going to get in the course that they have just completed, but rather as an indication of what they will be required to take next. In other words, rather than an exit exam, as under the present system, I propose that the final exams in English 121, 101, and 102 be treated as a Placement Adjustment exam.

**IV.C Placement Adjustment Outcomes Based on Final Exam Performance**

Under this proposal, the current T-grade workshops and all re-take exams would be eliminated. Instead, students who get a 2 on the final exam but are otherwise passing the course will enroll in the next course, and enroll concurrently in a separate workshop that will concentrate on reviewing/developing skills appropriate to the previous course, the one where the final exam was failed. Satisfactory classroom performance in the 1-credit workshop course will result in a TD in the previous course being changed to a passing grade.
This is the way it is supposed to work: A student fails the English 101 exam with a 2. The next semester, the student keeps her place in English 102 on condition that she must enroll in the English 110 workshop. The 110 focus on in-class writing skills and close analysis of sentence-level features, including grammatical review, will be equivalent to an extra half-semester of 101, and will indirectly benefit the student’s current 102 work. If the student wants direct help with 102 issues, we should make drop-in tutoring resources available.

**IV.D Proposed Workshops for Writing Courses**

I’ve proposed that we replace these non-credit T-grade workshops, which delay the student’s progress by a full semester even if they eventually pass a re-take exam, with a 1 N-credit full-semester workshop course that would be taken *concurrently* with the next course. These workshops would not lead to a re-take exam, but would be a self-contained course in themselves, focusing on specific skills that are *tied to the course where the exam was failed*. 
What would these workshops themselves look like? They would build on our current 101 attached workshops and also on our T-grade workshops (both of which they would replace), but would differ in several important ways:

First, unlike the 101 workshops, they would not be tied to a particular section; instructors would be pursuing an independent syllabus in these once-a-week workshops, so students could enroll in any available workshop section with the appropriate number, as shown in the table above.

Second, also unlike the 101 workshops, they would not be directly supporting the course in which students are currently enrolled, though obviously there would be benefits as students improve their skills; instead, the workshops will be reviewing and developing skills appropriate to the previous course, since the reason students are here is that they need more work on those skills.

Third, like the T-grade workshops, these new workshops will serve many students who have failed final exams, and will stress in-class writing, but unlike the T-grade workshops, they will not be teaching directly toward an imminent re-take, though obviously this approach will help students prepare for the midterm and final exam in the co-enroll course. This should allow instructors to focus on development of basic student writing skills in a more general way, rather than “teaching to the test.”

Probably the best way to think about these workshops would be as an extra half-semester of the previous course, in terms of their goals in critical thinking, reading, and writing. The obvious difference is that students will not be assigned major essays or research projects; they will be concurrently enrolled in another course that will be doing that, and we don’t want the workshops to get in the way. Rather, instructors will be encouraged to take advantage of the small class size—limited to 10 students—and lack of exam pressure to focus on helping students to develop more sophisticated sentence-level strategies, both for writing and for critical reading. This is the kind of detailed and personalized work which instructors in larger classes and with a different agenda often just do not have the time to do.

These workshops will be designed to stand on their own, rather than duplicating the work of the 101/102 instructor. They will not be directly focused on helping students get organized with current assignments in the co-enrolled course—this is a useful function that Writing Center tutors often engage in with students—but rather are focused on long-term skill development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Taken by students co-registered in</th>
<th>Stressing skills appropriate to</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[3rd weekly meeting of Basic Writing]</td>
<td>Basic Writing</td>
<td>[Pre-Basic Writing]</td>
<td>All Basic Writing students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3rd weekly meeting of Preparatory Writing]</td>
<td>Preparatory Writing</td>
<td>Basic Writing</td>
<td>All Preparatory Writing Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 110 Composition Workshop I</td>
<td>English 101</td>
<td>Preparatory Writing</td>
<td>Incoming placement group 4 and most students from Preparatory Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 111 Composition Workshop II</td>
<td>English 102 or English 122</td>
<td>English 101</td>
<td>TD students from English 101 and transfer placement group T4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences 200 WAC Workshop</td>
<td>A literature course, or Level 4 Writing Intensive course</td>
<td>English 102 and English 122</td>
<td>TD students from English 102 and English 122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Proposals for Re-organizing the Writing Program to Incorporate the Writing Center, Developmental Writing, Freshman Composition, and WAC

Once we have established continuous goals-based descriptions of an unbroken sequence of writing courses up and down the curriculum, as well as across it, we need to make sure that our administrative structure is equally coherent. The goals of a unified writing curriculum would best be served by establishing a unified administrative structure for writing instruction, so that developmental writing, freshman composition, Writing Center tutoring support, and the WAC Coordinator are all under the same administrative roof, sharing clerical support, consulting frequently on curricular and pedagogical issues.

V.A The New Writing Program or “Writing Council”

My proposals for re-organizing the administrative structure surrounding writing are very simple. They all follow from a single premise: put all the writing instruction administration under one structure. Specifically:

- Make the Director of the Writing Program truly the director of the Writing Program, not just the freshman composition sequence. Put him or her at the top of the administrative structure, reporting to the Associate Dean for Instruction of FASN, and to the Chair of the English Department.

  The Director of the Writing Program would be assisted by four second-level administrators—the Writing Center Director, and three specialized Coordinators, all of whom would also be teaching either in the Writing Program or in another department, with some degree of release time for their administrative duties.

- The Director of the Writing Center would now report to the Director of the Writing Program, with the Writing Center itself incorporated into this expanded Writing Program structure. The Writing Center director would be responsible for recruiting, training, and supervising the work of all the peer tutors and faculty tutors supporting courses in developmental writing, freshman composition, and writing across the curriculum, with the assistance of the specialized coordinator in each of those areas.

- The Coordinator of Developmental Writing would also be the Assistant Director of the Writing Center, and, in addition to supervising the workings of the developmental writing courses (CS 142 and 143), would assist in tutor training, especially of tutors for developmental courses.

- The Coordinator of Freshman Composition would have primary responsibility for focusing on English 101, 102, 121, and 122. This would be similar to the current Assistant
Director of the Writing Program position, except that, with the Director of the Writing Program now responsible for a wider portfolio, the Coordinator would be more fully in charge of the day-to-day operation of freshman composition courses. The Coordinator would also work with the Writing Center Director on tutor training for composition courses.

- The Coordinator of the Writing Across the Curriculum Program would oversee the designation of writing intensive courses, and would be responsible for faculty training and professional development, tutoring and workshops for students in writing intensive courses, and other support services relating to WAC. The Coordinator would work closely with the Writing Center Director on WAC tutor training.

Together, these five people would form the Writing Council: between them they should have a handle on everything that is being done in the name of writing instruction all across the campus, and, working together, can take the necessary steps to implement the Unified Writing Curriculum.

**V.B Need for Administrative/Clerical Help for Expanded Writing Program/Council**

We should also hire for the Writing Program:

- A full-time administrative assistant who would assist the Director of the Writing Program, the Director of the Writing Center, and the Coordinators of Developmental Writing, Freshman Composition, and Writing Across the Curriculum.

If we are going to provide adequate support services for such a wide array of courses, a full time administrative assistant is a must. I would propose eliminating the current Writing Program part time secretary position and replacing it with this full time position with multiple shared responsibilities.
Part Two:
An Active Culture of Writing Instruction and Practice
VI. The Transformative Potential of Writing Across the Curriculum at Rutgers-Newark

Writing Across the Curriculum involves examining and supporting undergraduate teaching as a serious and high-priority enterprise, which is something that goes against the grain of contemporary academic culture. We spend a lot of time teaching. We spend a lot of time complaining about how much time it takes to grade student papers. We spend a lot of time thinking about it by ourselves. But we don’t often focus on teaching as a team-based activity across the campus, involving not only other instructors but also support staff of various kinds. That’s what WAC asks us to do.

Specifically, WAC demands that we think hard about the teaching of writing, and even more specifically about the teaching of writing at the sophomore level and higher. Officially our WAC requirement at Rutgers-Newark is nothing more than two “Writing Intensive” courses that every student must take to graduate, one of which must be in the major. But that’s just the surface.

I think that something significant and even potentially profound happened at this institution about three years ago when the WAC requirement was approved. I think that the faculty of Rutgers-Newark decided that action needed to be taken. Our undergraduate students were not getting enough writing instruction. It was not that the Writing Program was doing a bad job; it was, rather, that no freshman composition program can be a sufficient location for a student to learn everything that he or she needs to learn about such a fundamental skill as writing. It’s something that needs to be practiced continuously. It’s something that needs to be part of a sequence. It’s something whose importance needs to be reinforced in every course that a student takes. And I think that WAC was a wake-up call to every department saying: we need to teach writing, and we need to teach it not only intensively but extensively. Because writing is thinking, and we owe it to our students to take their thought-processes on paper seriously. We need to affirm the centrality of writing—not just grammar and form, but in an extended sense involving critical thinking, discipline-specific reading, and college-level research—to the educational experience, for ourselves, for our colleagues, for this institution, and most of all for our students. This is the basic premise of Writing Across the Curriculum, and it applies not only to those courses officially designated as “writing intensive,” but to the entire instructional enterprise across campus.

So that’s my hope, in fact: it’s that WAC will spread. The danger, of course, is always that the teaching of writing will remain confined to freshman composition and the scattered writing intensive course. I suppose that’s better than not having any upper-level writing instruction at all, but I think that the potential of WAC is much bigger than that. I think that it can be a transformative experience, both for our students and for us, in relation to them. By putting the teaching of writing at the center of our undergraduate educational program here, we as a faculty and as an institution are, in fact, making a fundamental recommitment to undergraduate teaching.
The reward structure for faculty, of course, does not currently encourage this emphasis on teaching, but perhaps even that will change, with time. What we are offering is a new vision of writing at Rutgers. We need to work toward a time when not only Writing Intensive courses but nearly every course we teach will have a significant writing component, because that leads to much more dynamic and satisfactory learning for the student.

Hillary Clinton popularized an African saying a few years ago: “It takes a village to raise a child.” Well, my version is: it takes a university to nourish a mature writer. The central interface in writing instruction, of course, is between individual teacher and individual student, in the classroom, in conferences, in formal and informal feedback on student writing. But teaching and learning do not take place in a vacuum, and the broader context of the university as a whole must support and encourage that crucial interaction. We need a supportive culture of writing that gives both the student and the teacher what they need.

It is the central purpose of this report to talk about how to do that, in a very down to earth and practical way. When I began to research this document, my first job was to do an “assessment” of the Writing Across the Curriculum Program at Rutgers-Newark, an evaluative look at something that had been in existence for two academic years at the time I began this process, three academic years now as I complete it. But what I quickly realized is that, quite frankly, there has not been much of a program until recently. There have been, to be sure, over 400 courses taught with a “Writing Intensive” designation, and the first cohort of students who must fulfill the WAC requirement for graduation are rapidly approaching the end of their Rutgers career. But those students—and the faculty who teach them—have been operating in relative isolation from each other. We have many excellent teachers on our faculty, and a good number of them have applied their general pedagogical skills to the problem of teaching Writing Intensive courses, and have come up, on their own, with sound models of course design. They have pulled us—and their students—through.

But a mature Writing Across the Curriculum program involves more than individual faculty doing good work on their own. It involves more, even, than the direct interaction between those faculty and their students. It involves a recognition that the teaching of writing is a team effort. It is not only the task of the freshman writing program—though of course the composition courses must lay the indispensable foundation—but of every department, and every faculty member, on the campus. It involves a sense that we are all in this together—and “we” in this case includes faculty, students, administrators, tutors, librarians, and other support personnel. We have not offered training programs for teachers whose expertise is not in the teaching of writing, we have not developed a proper orientation procedure, and we have not provided enough professional development opportunities for faculty. We also have not designed or implemented adequate support services for student learning, especially tutoring and workshops.

The first step, which I have already addressed in Part One, involves setting our goals and standards for writing intensive courses, and fine-tuning our writing curriculum so that it is unified from developmental writing all the way to the most advanced writing intensive course. The second part involves WAC proper, and in the sections that follow I will be mainly
WAC at Rutgers-Newark

concentrating on the practical details of building a WAC program that fits this particular campus. But first I want to briefly indicate some of the fundamental principles of any WAC program, and to suggest how I think that they apply to Rutgers-Newark.

VI.A What Is Writing Across the Curriculum?

The Writing Across the Curriculum movement, in one form or another, has been around since the 1970s, and so its principles are by now fairly well understood, and have been implemented in many varied and creative ways by numerous institutions across the country—and indeed internationally as well. As relative latecomers to this approach—our WAC requirement dates only from Fall 2001—we have some catching up to do, but we also have the benefit of the extensive experience of other programs.

The Writing Across the Curriculum movement has been influencing American education, at all levels, for over thirty years now. WAC has survived and flourished where so many fashionable trends in education have come and gone, because WAC was never simply a product of its particular historical moment and political environment. Rather, it represents a serious and systematic response to some of the most persistent problems in modern American society in general and academic culture in particular: the dumbing down of America, the de-emphasis on critical thinking, the assembly-line approach to learning. More positively, it stresses the development of core competencies—not just writing per se, but also advanced discipline-specific reading skills, college-level research skills, and critical thinking—which centrality to the mission of any serious educational institution is obvious and undisputed.

A practical assessment and planning document like this is not the place for an extended history of WAC, or for a thorough theoretical treatment. Nevertheless, it is necessary to place our experience on this campus in a wider context in order to understand what we have accomplished, and what still remains to be done.

VI.A.1 The Goals of WAC Pedagogy

First of all, WAC has always been a pedagogical movement. This emphasis on improving undergraduate education, in itself, places it in a sometimes oppositional, even contentious relationship with the current academic environment, whose reward structure for faculty tends to de-prioritize good teaching, and where fiscal pressures increasingly lead universities to favor models of education that are less labor intensive. With its central principles of assigning more writing and paying more attention to the specific writing processes of individual students, WAC is inherently more labor intensive. Smaller class sizes are a must for true WAC implementation, as our own Rutgers-Newark standard of 25 students per writing intensive section recognizes.

If efficiency is what you’re looking for, then the information-transmission model of the modern lecture hall—also known as stuff, test, and forget—leads to getting more students “taught” with
fewer expensive teacher hours involved. Of course, this assumes that efficiency is determined by
going through the textbook; the lecturing professor feels that the job is done if all the material
gets “covered” and the scantron sheets are filled in. But WAC has always been opposed to the
informationalization of American culture. At many institutions, teachers in upper-level writing
intensive courses—in the sciences, especially—repeatedly report the experience of encountering
students who have managed straight A’s in their introductory courses, but basically do not have
any usable knowledge. They may be able to spout some facts about biology—or at least they were
able to do so on the final exam date—but they have not fundamentally learned how to think like a
biologist, and still less how to write like one. WAC has argued persuasively for several decades
that such “learning” is worthless, and that students who have a dynamic understanding of the
course material—and especially those who have a keen sense of how to understand something in
the field—will be better off than those who have superficially “covered the material” in a given
course. WAC is about process rather than information; it is about finding out how to fish, rather
than about being induced to swallow a huge fish dinner that you cannot possibly digest.

More specifically, WAC pedagogy is often described along a continuum of “writing to learn” vs.
“learning to write.” “Learning to write” is an ambiguous term, and is used in several different,
sometimes conflicting ways. Often it serves as an abbreviation for “learning to write in the
disciplines” (see “Program Structure” below), but there are at least two other meanings.

The most immediate sense of “learning to write” is the one that often persuades reluctant faculty
and administrators to go along with a WAC program in the first place. Often the initiative is
fueled by a perception that students in upper-level courses require more writing instruction than
they have been getting, that their basic academic “writing skills” are poor. If Johnny still can’t
write after several very expensive years of college, that is certainly a cause for alarm, and often
provides the impetus for action on WAC. This crisis-based model of “learning to write” played a
role in the initial conception of the program here at Rutgers-Newark. There was a general
concern that students were graduating who still had serious writing deficiencies, and that transfer
students were being excused from freshman composition who still needed extensive writing help,
and part of the rationale for WAC was to address this problem. Our WAC faculty are still very
worried about students’ preparedness: in our 2004 survey, a whopping 80% of instructors agreed
that a significant number of their upper-level students lack even basic writing skills.

Simply by offering more opportunities to write, and by providing significant feedback on student
writing, WAC will, in fact, lead to an improvement in “writing skills,” especially if there is
provision for adequate student support services such as tutoring or workshops. A central tenet of
WAC initiatives is that writing cannot be left just to the English department, or to the freshman
writing program. But this conception of WAC as basically an extension of freshman
composition, perhaps even as a remedial program for those who managed to get through that first
year writing program without really being able to produce serviceable analytical prose, is a
rather limited one, in relation to WAC’s overall transformative potential for undergraduate
education as a whole, and it is generally not the aspect that is emphasized by WAC practitioners.
It is perhaps the most attractive aspect of WAC to those on the outside, but it suffers from the
assumption, which most WAC advocates would vigorously contest, that writing is a separable
set of “skills” that may be ultimately mastered, rather than a way of life, a continuously evolving way of thinking and being and discovering that is intimately bound up with critical thinking and reading in specific fields.

Perhaps most often “learning to write” is paired with “writing to learn” in describing the two key polarities of WAC pedagogy. “Writing to learn” exercises and assignments emphasize the use of writing, often in an informal or improvisatory way, to aid students in the understanding of course material, while “learning to write,” in this context, is more focused on the final product, though it also will incorporate numerous revisions in the process. This version of “learning to write” is sometimes also called “writing to communicate,” because it emphasizes the public nature of discourse and the necessity of addressing a defined audience.

VI.A.2 Program Structure

Structurally, the Rutgers-Newark WAC program has been influenced by two very prevalent models. In its original conception, the WAC Advisory Committee settled on a “Writing in the Disciplines” model, in which every department would need to offer “Writing Intensive courses” designed to help students learn the conventions associated with a particular academic disciplinary community, and thus gain provisional membership within it. The first proposal was that every student would need to take two Writing Intensive courses in his or her major in order to graduate, but this was eventually cut back to at least one course in the major and one possibly outside, at the behest of several departments who saw the other model as too burdensome on their teaching resources. The second course might also be in the major, and departments retain the option of requiring this, but in many cases students will satisfy the second Writing Intensive course as they fulfill their general education requirements.

So our program is a hybrid: the requirement of a course in the major fits with the “Writing in the Disciplines” model, while the introductory writing intensive courses associated with general education requirements evokes the classic “Writing Across the Curriculum” program that seeks to expand writing instruction out beyond the bounds of freshman composition. One of the purposes of the “Unified Writing Curriculum” that I offered in the first part of this report was to articulate the differences, in approach and course goals, between an introductory writing intensive course, which would include a number of non-majors, and an intermediate or advanced writing intensive course which would, to varying degrees, assume a certain background in the subject and commitment to more permanent membership in the disciplinary community. The types of writing assignments that would be given in these three types of courses are quite different, and so it is important that instructors have a clear idea of which kind of course they are teaching so that they can design it appropriately.

I don’t think that the hybrid structure of our program is a problem. If anything, it’s a strength, because it lays the groundwork for an expansion of the use of writing to learn far beyond the bounds of official “writing intensive” courses.
VI.B Writing Across the Curriculum “Best Practices” and the Rutgers-Newark WAC Program

What I intend to offer, in this second part of the report, is a model of where I think the program needs to go in the next few years. I will evaluate where we are in relation to what are considered “best practices” in the national WAC/WID community, and attempt to craft a plan that fits with the specific culture, needs, and circumstances of Rutgers-Newark. In doing so, my general goal will be to present a vision of what such a program should look like in a few years if we are doing things the right way.

Let me begin by articulating some basic characteristics of successful, state-of-the-art programs operating on the Writing Intensive model, and offering a capsule evaluation of where we are at Rutgers-Newark in relation to them.3

1. Strong philosophical and fiscal support from institutional administrators, coupled with their willingness to avoid micromanagement. Both top-down and bottom-up support are necessary.
   This gets to the crux of our problem at Rutgers-Newark: WAC has not been institutionalized. There has been “philosophical” support, in a general sense, for the principles of WAC, but not regular funding. The WAC Colloquium expressed a strong consensus that this is the most important factor that they see as missing from the program: regular budgetary support for the WAC Program.

2. Strong faculty ownership of the WI system: faculty development precedes curricular change.
   What the WAC Colloquium revealed is that there is a large degree of faculty ownership of WAC—a perhaps surprising degree, given that there has not been a lot of institutional support. There have been no faculty workshops, at least since the end of the first round of WAC grants, and no way of orienting new faculty to basic WAC pedagogical principles or procedures. The faculty who have been teaching it seem to understand what is required, but they have been operating without support. I will discuss faculty training and professional development more specifically later in this report. Developing faculty support and professional development opportunities is one of the major priorities for AY 2004-2005.

3 The following principles are adapted from Susan McLeod’s “The Principles for Planning a WAC Program” (panel presentation at WAC 2002 Conference, Rice University) and Martha Townsend’s “Writing Intensive Courses and WAC” (In Susan H. McLeod, Eric Miraglia, Margot Soven, and Christopher Thaiss, ed. WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Programs. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 2001: 242-245). All of the italicized language comes directly from Townsend, McLeod, or some combination of their overlapping points.
3. Support systems for students as well as for faculty are necessary.  
We are only now putting into place, in Fall 2004, a pilot program to offer WAC support,  
in the form of tutoring and workshops, for students. I will discuss this further in its own  
section. This is another high-priority item for AY 2004-2005 and beyond.

4. A reward structure that values teaching.  
In common with many universities with a research mission, Rutgers-Newark does not  
tend to emphasize excellence in undergraduate teaching as a primary consideration in  
tenure or promotion decisions. Elevating the undergraduate teaching mission to a position  
of equality and partnership with the research mission would require a long-term cultural  
change, and WAC can be an important element in that evolution; however, there are  
things that can be done—some with very low or no cost—to give faculty the feeling that  
their service in WI teaching is appreciated by the institution, and I will discuss some of  
these proposals in the section on faculty.

5. A program needs a program director: knowledgeable, diplomatic WAC personnel.  
During its inception period, WAC was guided by a WAC Committee; when that  
committee was disbanded, it was in danger of becoming a collection of unsupported  
courses. We now have a WAC Coordinator, but that position needs to be defined more  
specifically and formally integrated into the administrative structure; I will discuss this  
more specifically in the next section. The WAC Committee has been re-formed, but we  
should keep in mind the observation of a “savvy dean” quoted by Townsend: “WAC  
programs and WI courses don’t run by committee; they need somebody who knows  
what’s going on and who worries about them all day every day.”

6. Program assessment provides a feedback loop for improvement. Regular internal assessment  
procedures combined with periodic external program review.  
We’ve conducted a faculty survey, and discussed current issues in the WAC Advisory  
Committee and at the WAC Colloquium. We are preparing to institute a new course  
review procedure, which will include course planning by department administrators  
consulting with the WAC Coordinator and the Dean’s office, course development  
between instructors and WAC Committee members, and course review by the WAC  
Committee. We also need to formalize student input, through surveys, focus groups,  
study of student papers, or by other means.

7. A low student-to-WI-instructor ratio, along with TA help if necessary.  
Our Writing Intensive courses are supposed to be capped at 25 students, which is on the  
high end of the spectrum of acceptable stop-points, but we can live with this if it is  
actually enforced. I’ll discuss this further below.
8. Integration of WI assignments with course goals and instructor’s pedagogical methods.
   I have addressed in Part One the need for a Unified Writing Curriculum that will clearly articulate course writing goals in tandem with goals for critical thinking, reading, and research.

9. Flexible but sound WI criteria.
   I have already discussed this in Part One: our faculty seem fairly well satisfied with our criteria, but I have proposed some additions/clarifications.

10. Symbiosis with other institutional programs/missions.
    We need to work closely with the Writing Program (see part One), with the Writing Center (see Student Support Chapter), with the library, including the new “Information Literacy” requirement (see Student Support Chapter), and with the various departments.

In summary, I think that the underlying points about our program here are very much in keeping with the strong consensus expressed by the faculty who attended the WAC Colloquium in May 2004. Basically, the feeling at that day-long gathering of WI instructors was that the big mistake that was made the first time around with WAC was that it was not institutionalized. The WAC Committee did some good things under the grants that they got, but when the grants ran out, there was no hard money to follow. There was no WAC Coordinator, there was no administrative or clerical support, there was no teacher training, there was no tutoring specifically dedicated to WAC. And there was not enough specific attention to the problems that the WI requirement might cause for particular departments, or resources to help overcome those constraints. There were a number of references made to the idea that promises of resources had been made during the early discussions, which were then not forthcoming. It was clear that there was a certain degree of bitterness left from the experience of the past, but also a commitment to try to make this work in the future. Several participants described it as a crossroads moment for WAC: it's a time for the proper resources to be put into the program, so that it will be truly a program, and not just a scattered collection of individual courses.

VI.C The Trees Are Shaking: Raised Expectations for WAC

Despite these ongoing problems, one very basic and significant piece of good news is that the program has functioned perhaps surprisingly well despite its lack of institutionalization. Sufficient numbers of Writing Intensive courses, at least on paper, have been offered so that students’ graduation plans are not being impeded by the requirement. Departments, by and large, have behaved responsibly, and many talented instructors have responded with creativity and dedication. It has been, however, a somewhat lonely, unsupported, and unrecognized enterprise for those who have been involved, whose rewards have had to be intangible and personal.

Another piece of good news is that we have already begun to make some of the necessary changes. By re-initiating a WAC assessment and appointing a WAC Coordinator, we have begun to address some of these issues, though we still have a long way to go. As someone said to me
during the course of this past year: the trees are shaking. We have raised expectations for WAC, and we need to make sure that we follow through with concrete measures. We have an opportunity to "re-start" the program with a new energy and attitude, building on what has already been accomplished.
VII. WAC Program Structure and Standards: Assessment and Recommendations

_I have been tossing the problems of writing across the curriculum in my mind for quite a few years... This is a difficult subject, one that entails serious engagement on the part of many faculty, that demands substantial changes in current behavior, probably requires a significant influx of new resources, and certainly calls for a strong assertion of administrative leadership._

–Charles Russell, English Department, memo to FASN Dean of Faculty, 10 December 1999

A successful Writing Across the Curriculum program will not be an out-of-the-box, one-size-fits-all paradigm imposed from without, but rather an organic evolution that builds on the particular strengths of a given faculty and benefits from the intellectual culture of a particular institution. Now that I have briefly articulated some of the fundamental principles of the Writing Across the Curriculum movement, I will turn to some of the practical questions that have arisen here at Rutgers-Newark with regard to implementing these principles in a functioning instructional system. Every institution is different, of course, in its educational philosophy and its administrative structure, but there are certain fundamental issues about WAC that need to be raised in every case.

For this purpose I will adopt as a template, with a few modifications to suit Rutgers-Newark, a very simple document which was originally designed for use in the University of Hawaii system, which has one of the most extensive, best articulated, and most respected mature WAC Programs in the country. (The original form is reproduced in the Appendix.) In its original context, the form serves as a basis for an annual report by the WAC Director on each of several decentralized campuses about the administrative structure and basic functioning of the WAC Program. Such an annual report seems like a good idea in general, and as the WAC Coordinator at Rutgers-Newark, I intend the following to serve, in part, a similar function: an evaluation of where we are in our implementation of WAC at the present time. But I will also use the template as an opportunity to articulate what I take to be the core WAC values implied in the very good questions that the Hawaii document poses, and to make recommendations for bringing our practice more fully in line with those WAC values.

VII.A Is there a clear definition of the administrative role of the WAC Committee, the WAC Coordinator, and other participants? Do all of these entities have the support that they need?
VII.A.1 (Hawaii I.1) Is the program directed by a person who has been appropriately appointed and given appropriate released time to supervise the program?

Until this academic year, there was no WAC Coordinator at Rutgers-Newark. During the extensive planning process and throughout the first year of implementation (AY 2001-2002), the WAC Committee co-chaired by Mill Jonakait of Biology and Mal Kiniry of the Writing Program, oversaw the initial phase of the program. In 2002-2003, the Committee was disbanded and the Writing Program Director informally continued to be the face of WAC, but he was given no additional released time from his extensive duties overseeing freshman composition courses and teaching in the English department undergraduate and graduate programs.

By the summer of 2003, it was clear that WAC needed additional attention. After conversations between Dr. Kiniry, English Department Chair Charles Russell (a long-time advocate of WAC on this campus), and Associate Dean of FASN Annette Juliano, the decision was made to appoint Dr. Jonathan Hall, an Assistant Instructor in the English Department who had served as a teacher, a tutor, and a seminar speaker in the WAC Program, and who had volunteered to help out, to coordinate the program. He was given a one-course release each semester from his four-course Assistant Instructor teaching load.

VII.A.1.a) Released Time

The Hawaii evaluation document appends a gloss to its own question:

Note: For the last few years, the Committee has interpreted "appropriate released time" as "support that is appropriate for the program's current size and state of development."

This seems a reasonable standard, though obviously one that may be difficult to interpret precisely in practice. At other institutions, the amount of released time has varied widely, with some Directors being full-time administrators, and others carrying a full teaching load, or nearly so, depending on the responsibilities and the structure of the program.

My recommendation on released time is that the position of Coordinator at Rutgers-Newark, at its present level of development, is one that requires fairly intense activity; the more time available, the more will be built and accomplished. I would recommend a half-time release. [Note: As of Fall 2004, this has now been done.]

VII.B (Hawaii I.2). Who assists the director in supervising the program? (Faculty Board, Student Assistant, Other)
It is extremely important to involve a broad base of faculty and administrators from across the campus in the process of WAC governance, and not attempt to dictate everything from a centralized executive. Most institutions have some form of faculty committee or “board” to assist the WAC Director in overseeing the program and making policy decisions.

In Spring 2004, the Associate Dean of FASN appointed a “WAC Advisory Committee” with ten faculty members drawn from departments across the humanities, social sciences, and sciences. The Committee will play a key role in long-term planning and policy for the WAC Program, and will also participate semester-by-semester in the Course Development process: providing feedback to faculty on proposed Writing Intensive courses, and assisting in ensuring that designation criteria and guidelines for Writing Intensive courses are being adhered to in all departments.

The WAC Coordinator reports regularly to the Associate Dean of FASN, and also consults frequently with others who have responsibilities for writing instruction, such as the Writing Center Director and the Director of the Writing Program. The Coordinator also has periodic discussions and/or correspondence with department chairs who have questions about program requirements or issues.

At the WAC Colloquium in May and during AY 2004-2005, the “WAC Fellows Program” will involve long-term WAC classroom faculty in discussions about developing the program, and in mentoring new WAC faculty in their own or adjacent fields.

During the Spring 2004 semester the Coordinator was also being assisted by an Honors College Research Assistant, a freshman student who helped to publish the faculty survey to the web and to correlate the results, with research on WAC programs across the country, and with logistical tasks associated with the WAC Colloquium. This appointment may possibly be renewed for next year.

For the most part the necessary structures are either already in place or are in the process of being put in place. The key administrative development that is necessary are getting department administrators involved earlier in the process of Course Designation, so that there is a process of joint planning between the individual department chairs, the WAC Coordinator, and the FASN Associate Dean, as to the appropriate level of Writing Intensive offerings in each department each semester, including the resolution of either short-term or long-term resource issues.

VII.B.1 (Hawaii I.3). Do the director and board members have adequate professional / secretarial / clerical assistance to support their work and maintain records necessary for articulation of Writing Intensive courses?

VII.B.1.a) Office Space Requirements
The most pressing need is for the WAC Program to have a modest office of its own. This not only would let the Coordinator function more efficiently, but it would also provide a separate address for all concerned parties to be aware of as the place to go with WAC concerns.

VII.B.1.b) Clerical Help

Currently the only direct clerical assistance the Coordinator has is the Honors Research Assistant, a freshman student employed for 5-7 hours per week. For certain specific functions, such as setting up meetings or administering grant money, the Coordinator has been assisted by administrative assistants in the FASN Dean’s Office and the English Department, but obviously they have other responsibilities and work for other people and such assistance is necessarily limited. It would be useful to have some ongoing clerical resources dedicated to WAC. As WAC grows, especially as it begins offering more workshops and other support services, the need for such assistance will only grow.

In the last chapter of Part One, I discussed a possible re-organization of the Writing Program that would involve, among other things, a full-time administrative assistant who would be shared by the Writing Program, the Writing Center, the Developmental Writing Coordinator, and the WAC Program. Whether or not the Writing Program is re-organized as I described, the need for administrative and clerical assistance is very real.

VII.B.1.c) Computer and Website Needs

As much as possible, the Coordinator’s work, and that of the WAC Program in general, will be carried on online, ranging from routine communication to assessment instruments to the entire course development process. It is important that the Program have reasonably up-to-date computer equipment, including a printer and a scanner.

Currently we have a webmaster, Housen Maratouk, who was paid out of a former “Dialogues” grant to design the WAC website, and who now maintains and updates the site on an informal basis. Since he is also the campus administrator for the Blackboard course system, he has been able to help us use this existing technology to quickly and efficiently set up two private, password-protected online areas, one for the WAC Advisory Committee and for WAC Faculty in general. But this webmaster also has another full-time job, and in fact he’s only been able to help us get up the rudiments of a website. We are going to need someone to help us with this on an ongoing basis, perhaps a work-study student.

VII.C Have reasonable standards for teaching load and class size been set and applied, and what kinds of resource issues do these raise, both overall and for particular departments?
VII.C.1 (Hawaii I.5) Are classes designated as Writing Intensive limited to [25] students so that effective interaction between instructor and student can occur?

VII.C.1.a) Current stop-point of 25

Our current standard stop-point for Writing Intensive courses is 25 students, which has been in effect since the program began in Fall 2001. This seems to be in line with our current standards for writing instruction at Rutgers-Newark, since freshman composition sections, which are the lead-in to Writing Intensive courses, are currently capped at 22. If courses are truly capped at 25, this seems to me to be an appropriate and workable number.

The key question of course, is whether, in fact, all of our Writing Intensive courses are running at 25 or fewer students. The short answer is No. In the early days of the WAC Program, enrollments in Writing Intensive sections were generally low, probably because students who were grandfathered out of the new requirement were avoiding taking sections that promised extra work. Now, however, almost all current students are required to take Writing Intensive courses in order to graduate, and this is bound to exert some pressure on enrollment, especially if our level of offerings declines, as it has somewhat in recent semesters.

There really is no substitute for a meaningful stop-point for a Writing-Intensive course. I personally have taught some Writing Intensive courses that were inadvertently not capped at 25, and while I did my best to pay attention to students’ writing process, my ability to do so was definitely not what it would have been with a smaller enrollment. Stop points at other institutions range from 15 to 25, in my investigation, so we are on the upper edge of the nationwide standard.

I do not recommend any change in the official stop-point of 25. I think that it is reasonable, if it is real. What I do recommend is that we enforce it. I don’t mean “enforce” in a punitive sense: as I’ve suggested, there often is a good reason for these stop-points, if only that departments don’t have the funds or the faculty lines to staff their Writing Intensive courses at appropriate enrollment levels. But we cannot just pretend that these huge sections are really “Writing Intensive” when some of them clearly cannot be taught that way.

VII.C.1.b) Stop-point Problems with UC Courses, certain departments w/resource issues, RBS courses

A check of department scheduling construction sheets submitted for Spring 2004 and Fall 2004 has shown that while some–perhaps even most–Writing Intensive sections were capped at 25, the exceptions were conspicuous. Often this turned out to be just inadvertent on the part of department administrators–when they were contacted, many simply asked that the coding be changed.
Other times, however, the designation of higher—sometimes much higher—stop-points for courses officially designated as Writing Intensive reached a level that made it difficult to see how an instructor could possibly teach it in a truly “WAC” way, with multiple assignments, feedback, revision, etc. Either instructors would heroically attempt to deal with significant writing from 60 or 70 or 100 students, or—more likely—the Writing Intensive nature of the course would be severely compromised, to the extent that some sections may be Writing Intensive in name but not in substance.

These much-higher-than-25 stop-points for officially Writing Intensive courses were much more likely to occur under any of the following conditions:

a) the course was a University College course, taught at night or on weekends
b) the course was in a department that customarily teaches very large sections of most courses and has expressed serious concern about resource issues surrounding WAC
c) the course was in the Rutgers Business School.

Further investigation has sometimes revealed that departments have attempted to compensate for these large enrollments in various ways: by hiring graders separate from the faculty giving lectures or running laboratories, for example. But these are obviously not optimal solutions to this problem, which is clearly resource-driven, at base.

### VII.C.1.c) Revised Course Planning Process

I would address these kinds of problems through the first part of the “Course Designation Process,” which I’ll call the “Course Planning Process,” which is related to but logically different from the “Course Development Process.” The latter, which I’ll discuss in more detail later, is basically a teacher-to-teacher pedagogical workshop in which WAC Advisory Committee members give feedback to a classroom instructor on a proposed Writing Intensive course.

The “Course Planning Process” is an administrative one. Basically we will be asking all academic department chairs to consult with the Coordinator, as early as possible in the course-planning process, regarding short-term, medium-term, and long-term goals for Writing Intensive sections. The Coordinator should calculate rough numerical targets for each department’s level of offerings, based on the number of students majoring in the department and on the department’s previous offerings. In the great majority of cases, the Coordinator and the department chair will be on the same page from the outset with regard to the level of offerings and the stop-points of offered sections.

If, however, the department chair identifies a problem in meeting these goals for Writing Intensive offerings, then a more intensive consultation is called for. Sometimes simply shifting a few sections around may make all the difference, while sometimes more creative solutions are called for.
If there are resource issues involved, either short-term (need to hire another PTL for a non-WI course in order to free up full-time faculty for Writing Intensive sections), medium-term (several faculty members on leave next academic year) or long-term (chronic structural under-funding), then the Associate Dean of FASN needs to be brought into the picture, or some other appropriate administrator.

In most cases the Course Planning Process will be as simple as this:

1) Coordinator e-mails each department chair: What Writing Intensive courses are you planning to offer next semester? E-mail includes reminders: text of Writing Intensive criteria regarding stop-points, pre-requisites, program staffing preferences for Writing Intensive courses (i.e., non-PTLs), etc.

2) Department chair e-mails back with a list of projected courses and instructors.

3) Coordinator then contacts the instructors on the list to request course descriptions/syllabi for the WAC Committee to consider and comment upon.

**VII.D (Hawaii I.6) Are teaching loads of instructors such that courses can be planned for and carried out in a way that is true to the spirit of the Writing Intensive guidelines and that does not add unreasonably to the overall workload of the instructor?**

*VII.D.1 Full-time faculty are the most appropriate Writing Intensive instructors, and the teaching load for them should be reasonable as long as courses are actually capped at 25 students.*

Rutgers-Newark teaching loads for tenure-track and tenured faculty are not onerous; these faculty should be able to teach writing in their field to a classroom of 25 or fewer students without an undue call upon their time. These faculty are the preferred staffing solution for Writing Intensive sections. Full-time faculty at lower ranks, such as Assistant Instructor, have a harder time, but are accustomed to a higher load, and such courses, if properly capped, are not appreciably more work than, say, the freshman composition courses they might otherwise teach, so it is not inappropriate, in some cases, to staff Writing Intensive sections with Assistant Instructors, who are often experienced writing teachers and also well-integrated into the Rutgers-Newark way of doing things.

The WAC principle involved is that Writing Intensive courses are intended to be taught by faculty who are experts in their fields, and who have made a concerted effort to train themselves in state-of-the-art best practices of writing instruction. That usually means full-time faculty, at most institutions with WAC programs.
VII.D.2 Part-time adjunct faculty should generally not be teaching Writing Intensive courses

What should be avoided, if at all possible, is staffing Writing Intensive sections with part-time lecturers or other adjunct faculty, especially in departments where the teaching of writing has not been a customary practice or a high priority. It simply isn’t fair to ask such part-time faculty to do not only the extra work involved in grading papers, etc., but also the additional professional development required to be effective teachers of writing as well as expert lecturers in their subject.

Some PTL’s, perhaps, may be sufficiently well-prepared to take on this responsibility, or else some departments may simply have no other options. In these cases, I would recommend an additional stipend, over what PTL’s would make for a non-Writing Intensive course. This would compensate them for their additional time and effort, and it would also send the message that we value the teaching of writing in all the disciplines, and we are willing to reward it appropriately.

VII.E What special administrative issues are raised by University College and Rutgers Business School?

VII.E.1 University College Issues

Issues concerning WAC in UC are just a subset of larger issues facing UC in general. Evening offerings in many departments have been cut back in recent years, some sections have been over-enrolled beyond their optimal size, and in some departments full-time faculty seldom teach at night.

The Coordinator, WAC Committee, and FASN Associate Dean need to carefully monitor the workings of the UC sections, to determine how much writing instruction is actually going on in each of them.

VII.E.1.a) Number of Writing Intensive Courses Offered

Writing intensive courses have been regularly offered in the evening since the inception of the program, and most departments are in compliance. But certain departments that have evening programs in UC are not offering sufficient Writing Intensive sections for their majors to complete their WAC requirement.

Departments should assess themselves using the numerical “Standard” for Writing Intensive courses offered in the section on “Program Procedures.” The spreadsheet offers a separate breakdown for day and evening programs, and departments should make sure that they are meeting both of them. Individual departments are in a better position than outside administrators
to know whether students are having difficulty getting the Writing Intensive courses that they need.

The Coordinator should also monitor the number of offerings being planned every semester, and communicate regularly with department chairs and with the FASN Associate Dean regarding levels of UC course offerings.

**VII.E.1.b) Class Size**

Some departments are offering evening sections, but are placing such a high stop-point on them that a true Writing Intensive course will be difficult or impossible to implement. Either instructors will be unfairly overburdened, if they attempt to give the kind of individual attention to student writing that the spirit of WAC envisions, or else they will compromise the serious writing component in the interest of maintaining a workable load of paper-grading and other feedback on student writing.

The WAC standard stop-point for Writing Intensive courses is 25, and this should be adhered to whenever possible. In fact, it’s usually better to use this standard in almost all cases, and have instructors add any truly desperate students by means of special permission numbers when the semester begins, because this is an effective way of indicating how much pent-up demand exists for Writing Intensive courses in a given department. If enrollment patterns persistently indicate that there is more demand than current department resources can reasonably meet, then these long-term issues need to be addressed in consultation with the Dean of Faculty, or internally within the department, in terms of their allocation of resources between day and evening programs, or between teaching and research.

**VII.E.1.c) Part Time Faculty**

Some departments also make extensive use of PTLs or other adjunct faculty in their evening courses, whereas the WAC Standard strongly prefers full-time faculty members teaching these sections.

**VII.E.2 WAC in the Rutgers Business School: Issues and Proposals**

**VII.E.2.a) WAC in the Business School: The Current Situation**

There appear to be two fundamental challenges faced by WAC in RBS:

**WAC Basics.** It appears that there is not a great deal of understanding among business school faculty about either what Writing Across the Curriculum is in general, or what it means in terms of the requirement here in particular. We need a faculty training and professional development
program to address this need, and this would best be developed by RBS faculty themselves, in consultation with the WAC Coordinator and others.

**Resource Issues.** The problems with WAC in RBS are not solely a function of philosophy or pedagogy; they also have to do with a lack of people with the correct training, and the dollars to pay for them. RBS courses, including many that are officially declared as Writing Intensive, are running with very high stop-points: 70-100 in some cases. Dean Kerman has indicated that his enrollment has rapidly escalated in recent years without a corresponding increase in faculty lines.

**VII.E.2.b) Immediate Proposals**

The following seems to me to be a sensible program for dealing with these problems:

1. **Faculty Education and Training.** To infuse RBS with an active culture of writing instruction and practice will obviously be a long-term process of education and dialogue. As a first step, at the invitation of Alex Sannella, I addressed the end-of-semester faculty meeting of RBS in May 2004 on WAC issues. It was clear from the reaction there that WAC has not been a frequent topic of discussion among business school faculty, to say the least. In July 2004 I met with Dean Kerman and discussed some of these issues. I invited RBS faculty to participate in our professional development opportunities, and, among other things, we agreed that RBS would look into setting up its own training and professional development program.

2. **More Selective Course Designation.** On paper, RBS is offering a very high number of offerings, more than sufficient for all its students to fulfill not only the required single course in their major, but the second as well. But given that many of these courses are less than optimal Writing Intensive models, this may be a situation in which less is more. That is, RBS should perhaps designate fewer courses as Writing Intensive, but try to put their resources into ensuring that the ones they do designate really fit the bill. It’s built in to the system that students can fulfill one of their Writing Intensives through their general education requirements, which must be fulfilled before they begin the specific RBS curriculum. If RBS urges students to take a Writing Intensive literature course in their sophomore year, for example, then there will be less pressure on RBS to declare courses as Writing Intensive that don’t really fit the criteria.

3. **Improve existing courses.** Some RBS offerings have the potential to be true Writing Intensive courses–even advanced ones–but they are not taught that way at present. For example, RBS currently declares their student internships as writing intensive courses. It is true that students in this course do have to write a paper describing their on-the-job experiences, but this paper is never worked on in conjunction with a faculty member, or revised in response to feedback. Instead, it is just turned in to the director of the Career Center, whose principal job is not to examine the writing but to determine that the student did enough work to receive credit. This is definitely not Writing Intensive–but it could be, with a little tweaking. The key would be to get a faculty member in the loop, and run it as a writing project, not just a work project. This
would not necessarily be onerous in terms of the workload on the faculty member or the student: an exchange of e-mails, outlines, partial and complete drafts periodically, with comments and feedback, could give the student more of a sense that this is, in fact, a course and not only a job, and could improve the final written product—and the student’s writing skills—as well.

4. Lecture/Recitation Model: Let’s say that an RBS course customarily has an enrollment of 100, and we want to run it as a true Writing Intensive course. The RBS faculty member would give a lecture once a week, and students would meet in a “writing recitation” for the other weekly meeting. If WAC is truly functioning properly, the writing component will not be just an add-on, but rather will be integrated into the course. The assignments, that is, will be designed to help students learn course material. Some kinds of material are best delivered in the lecture format, while other kinds work better in “writing to learn” exercises. The faculty member in charge, in consultation with the T.A.s, would design all the writing assignments, and the recitation sections would be part of the course itself, not just an added-on “Workshop.” Nor would the T.A.s just be “graders,” though that would in fact be part of their job. They would be teaching partners in the course, working with the professor.

So let’s say that on Monday there’s the weekly lecture. All 100 students, and the T.A.s, attend the professor’s lecture. On Wednesday, they meet in their recitation sections. For 100 students, there would be 3 T.A.s, so that there would be four recitations of 25 students each (the professor would also lead one of them personally). (In Saturday or once-a-week evening courses, the time could simply be divided between lecture and recitation.) These recitation sections would use writing to address course content—“writing to learn” exercises—and also offer discussions of the writing process and activities designed to help students improve their writing—“learning to write” exercises.

In addition, each T.A. would run a workshop. Not all students would be enrolled in this workshop, which would carry an additional 1 N-credit above the course itself. This would be a third meeting per week for selected students who need additional help with their writing, and would be limited to 10 students each. So under this scenario, up to 30% of the students in the course would be getting additional support for their writing, on a regular weekly basis, over and above the writing recitation.

So the workload for a T.A. would be:

1) lead a recitation of 25 students once per week.
2) grade 25 papers every time there’s an assignment due (the professor is also responsible for 25 papers)
3) lead a workshop of 10 students once per week
4) attend the weekly lecture and meet with the professor as necessary
VIII. WAC Assessment Procedures: Summary and Recommendations

Changes in writing ability depend, we know, on a dizzying array of factors—among others, the student’s readiness, openness, and willingness; the teacher’s careful planning, theoretical and pedagogical knowledge, good timing, and even showmanship; and careful design of and timing in the curriculum. Even then...the effects may take years to manifest—at which point, they are hard to connect with any single class, teacher, or learning experience...And as difficult as the teaching of writing is, assessing writing involves yet another layer of difficulty. How much more complicated, then, is the enterprise of assessing writing across the curriculum?

—William Condon

The mission of the Writing Across the Curriculum program is to promote, support, and assess the teaching of writing at Rutgers-Newark, in all academic departments. Most visibly, the Writing Across the Curriculum Program oversees the designation and offering of "Writing Intensive" courses in all academic departments. In the future, we'll be expanding our activities to include many kinds of training, tutoring, information resources, and other support for both student writers and their instructors at Rutgers-Newark.

Beginning in Fall 2003, the Associate Dean of Faculty asked the Coordinator to initiate a preliminary internal assessment of the impact of WAC on the Rutgers campus, gathering data and opinions from faculty, students, and administrators. The present report is one of the fruits of that ongoing effort. In this section I will report on our activities during academic year 2003-2004, indicate some priorities for assessment in the coming academic year 2004-2005, and also suggest what kinds of continuing assessment procedures will need to be part of our routine procedures in the future.

Assessment is often undertaken under the banner of “accountability” That is, there is a real or perceived necessity to justify the operation of a particular program to an outside audience, such as politicians who control overall funding, administrators who control priorities within the

---

university, or entities such as the Middle States commission who control an institution’s accreditation. And certainly such external motivations for assessment cannot be discounted.  

But we should also think of assessment as part of a wheel that rolls the program forward. One of the fundamental principles of WAC pedagogy is that there needs to be a feedback / revision loop between the instructor and the student writer. The most obvious version of this is that comments from the instructor on a paper are responded to in the next draft of that paper, or incorporated into the student’s writing process as the next writing project is undertaken. But in a well-run classroom, of course, the feedback goes in the other direction, as well: the instructor uses the experience of grading and responding to student papers, as well as other types of measures of student achievement, to adjust the ongoing course to reflect what students are learning (and not learning).

The same is true, or should be true, of a WAC program as a whole: we need to set up a feedback/revision loop so that we know both what is going on in the actual classrooms across campus in courses designated as writing intensive, and how effective that instruction is. In order to do that, we need to gather data, opinions, and materials from administrators, faculty, and from students. Once we have gathered it, we analyze it and plow it back into the program again.

VIII.A An Overview of Assessment Activities: Completed, Projected, Ongoing

Here is a brief summary of WAC Program assessment activities that have already been completed, those which are underway, those which are scheduled for the next academic year or projected for some time in the future, and also those which will need to become a routine part of the program in the future. After this overview, I will discuss each of these phases in more detail.

VIII.A.1 Assessment Phase I (Fall 2003): Numbers Across the Curriculum.

Key Questions: How many Writing Intensive courses have been offered? Do some departments need to add more? Are there enough sections so that students can fulfill their WAC requirement for graduation?

Activities: Compiling lists of courses offered by department, calculating roughly how many courses each department should offer to satisfy the needs of their own majors, comparing this “standard” to actual courses offered, getting a picture of the overall level of offerings

---

5 See Condon’s discussion of the need to adapt assessment and “accountability” to the needs of different audiences (31-32).
**Preliminary Conclusions:** Most departments are in compliance. Only Physics has not offered any writing intensive courses as of yet, and all other departments have offered at least three. Some departments were offering courses that they considered to be writing intensive, but not getting them properly designated in the schedule of classes. Some departments are running them with stop-points in excess of the WAC standard of 25. Overall, sufficient courses are on the books so that students can get a course in their major, and a second one either in the major or in a general education course.

**VIII.A.2 Assessment Phase II (Spring 2004): Soliciting Faculty Input**

**Key Questions:** What do grassroots faculty in the writing intensive trenches think is important about WAC, both as it exists now, and as it might develop in the future? What can the program do to make WI teaching both less burdensome and more effective?

**Activities:** Faculty survey (see Appendix for results), WAC Advisory Committee meetings, WAC Fellows program, WAC Colloquium

**Preliminary Conclusions:** WAC Faculty have generally done a good job of applying writing intensive criteria even though they have not been specifically trained or supported by the program. They have pulled us through, but they need our support, both in terms of faculty training and professional development, and in terms of tutoring and other support services for student learning. There also need to be more incentives to participate in the program, and more recognition for the hard work that it takes to do so. Overall, faculty are committed to the program, but they are restless about the lack of resources to support WAC.

**VIII.A.3 Assessment Phase III (first round Fall 2004-Spring 2005, then ongoing): Review and Analysis of All Writing Intensive Courses**

**Key Questions:** What is happening in actual Writing Intensive classrooms? Are Writing Intensive criteria being understood and applied? What do individual departments need, in terms of resources and support services, to do a better job?

**Activities:** The Course Designation Process, approved by the WAC Committee, which will include:

- Course Planning: dialogue between Coordinator, department chairs, and other administrators to head off problems before they appear;
- Course Development: collegial workshops between course instructors and members of the WAC Advisory Committee regarding principles of WAC pedagogy
- Course Review: WAC Committee designating (or, rarely, refusing to designate) courses as writing intensive; analysis of materials submitted by instructors (syllabi, assignments, course descriptions, sample student papers, etc.)
VIII.A.4 Assessment Phase IV (Fall 2004-indefinitely): Soliciting Student Input and Measuring Student Outcomes

Key Questions:
1. How do students view their own writing education, both in particular Writing Intensive courses, and overall throughout their undergraduate experience? Do they see the connections? What do they see as major turning points or moments of progress?
2. Are faculty and students on the same page regarding WAC/Writing in the Disciplines principles? Do students agree that what they’re getting is an initiation into a particular discourse community, or does it seem to them random or arbitrary, a matter of figuring out “what the instructor wants”?
3. How can we measure student writing outcomes over time? Is there a way to implement, for example, portfolio review without ending up in logistical nightmares?

Activities:
1. Writing Intensive Student Exit Survey. We will request all instructors in all writing intensive courses, Fall 2004 and possibly ongoing, to assign this to students, perhaps in conjunction with the usual TEC course evaluation): In an effort to combine a quantifiable response with a more nuanced texture, we will ask students
   - to pick which of 7 possible descriptions of a student’s writing education at Rutgers-Newark is CLOSEST to their own and
   - to WRITE a few paragraphs in which they modify or qualify their chosen description, and offer examples from their own experience, from composition or developmental writing through the present writing intensive course.

2. If we decide that we need more detail than the Survey can provide, we can follow up with individual interviews or focus groups.

3. The best way to measure students’ progress across the whole of their undergraduate career would be to compare samples of work from various points in that process. However, both collecting and evaluating this material present serious practical difficulties. First, the problem of sorting and storing large amounts of paper, or, equally arduous, converting it to digital form. Even if this could be accomplished, it would still take significant numbers of faculty hours to evaluate the students’ progress. Nevertheless, some form of portfolio system is desirable and we should look into the options.
IX. Support for Student Learning: Assessment and Recommendations

Do we have a writing center staffed with tutors who are available to work with WAC students who need remedial or elementary writing instruction? I had thought we did, but a colleague informed me that our writing center is open only to students currently enrolled in composition classes. If so, that's nuts. In every class I've taught I've taught writing, and in every class I taught there are at least a few students who are in need of remedial tutoring. I can teach students who already know the basics how to write better, in some cases much better. But I am not trained to teach writing from scratch, and I honestly do not know how. I suspect that I am not alone.

–FASN Faculty Member, from the faculty survey

If it takes a village to raise a child, it also takes a university to nourish a mature writer. The central interface in writing instruction, of course, is between teacher and student, in the classroom, in conferences, in formal and informal feedback on student writing. But teaching and learning do not take place in a vacuum, and the broader context of the university as a whole must support and encourage that crucial interaction. What do students need to be successful in Writing Intensive courses, beyond what can be provided by individual faculty members? What kind of support can we provide, as an academic community, and how can we best structure its delivery?

In general, support for student learning, as I’m using it here, refers to learning opportunities for students that are outside the classroom or the immediate context of the course (that is, beyond the professor’s office hours). Sometimes the “help” may simply be access to various reference resources, whether in print (a handbook, a practice exam), online (grammar exercises, treatment of other writing questions, library resources, file-sharing with other students for peer critiques, etc.). Most usually, though, support will involve student interaction with university personnel who are charged with the task of aiding students in their learning (tutors, reference librarians, workshop leaders, etc.) These personnel may be accessed in a variety of venues, ranging from a formal classroom setting (attached workshops) to the library bibliographic instruction classroom and/or reference desk, to the Writing Center (ongoing or “drop-in” tutoring) to online (e-tutoring) to more informal interactions with embedded “curriculum-based peer tutors.”

The key to working together as a team, in any endeavor, is close and frequent communication, and that is one of the fundamental principles of an active culture of writing instruction and practice. With regard to support for student learning, this means that there must be coordination, interaction, and a common sense of purpose, among teachers, tutors, students, librarians, and administrators. We all want the same thing: for students to learn the course material better, to
improve their writing skills, and to gain a deeper understanding of the world that they live in, in a way that will enable them to make a difference in it.

IX.A (Hawaii I.11): Can students who need help on writing problems get help?

The Hawaii question frames it starkly, simply, and, I think, correctly. The bottom line is whether students who need additional help get access to it in a timely manner, or whether they fall through the cracks. This simple question, however, gives rise to a number of complicated issues, both theoretical and practical. It seems to me that there are several processes here which need to occur almost simultaneously, and yet are interdependent by definition.

IX.A.1 Identifying Students Who Need Support Services

We can say that in theory all students could use additional help, beyond what individual instructors can provide in the context of a particular course, but a) not all students want formal help or would take advantage of it and b) trying to mandate universal tutoring, for example, would stretch our limited resources in a way that would dilute the worth of it for the students who need it most. So we need to find ways of identifying students who are most acutely in need of tutoring, who are most likely to benefit from it, and who are willing to engage in the often time-consuming process.

Sometimes this can be done even before the course begins, through the placement process. If we have ongoing communication with the Writing Program, for example, and students are given appropriate exit advice when they are finishing English 102, then they will end up in a writing intensive course that is suited to their interests and their current level of writing achievement, and they will also be encouraged to seek additional support services as necessary. For example, students who have passed 102 but who still need additional work on discipline-specific reading skills might be advised to sign up for Arts and Sciences 200, the WAC Workshop, or to a course that has an attached workshop or curriculum-based peer tutoring, or to a particular instructor who is known to work particularly well with WAC tutors.

What kinds of writing problems require help? At one level, a “writing problem” is whatever a particular student considers a “writing problem.” If a student asks for help, we should do our best to find some help, because such self-motivated students are those most likely to show up regularly and to work hard on improving their writing, and thus most likely to succeed at doing so. But we cannot simply rely on self-identification as the sole means of recruiting students for additional help. There are other students who could benefit from it, but will not do so unless it is strongly recommended to them, most usually by an instructor in the course. Part of this will involve properly training the instructor in the course to recognize students who would benefit from additional help. This will require, at minimum, that a diagnostic essay be given early in the semester, and that as a result instructors refer students for help. We should develop a formal application for student support services, a referral form that may be filled out by instructors and given to the student, and which would include some indication of why the instructor is making
the referral. This kind of information would be of great use to a tutor or a workshop leader in carrying out an individual instruction plan for a particular student.

But what kinds of “writing problems” call for such an intervention? Without training, instructors tend to focus on surface errors in grammar or diction, which is certainly one kind of writing problem, but not necessarily the most important kind, especially if the student is not a native English speaker; such students often will retain some irregularities in their use of the English language while otherwise operating quite competently within it. Some kinds of apparent “writing problems” are actually reading problems: students have difficulty handling complex texts, and the problems with their “writing” often disappears once they have received additional instruction and practice in strategies of approaching discipline-specific texts. We need to define, as specifically as we can, at what population our support services are directed, so that we can develop appropriate services.

Once we have identified students who need help, we need to match them appropriately with available resources. Different students have different strengths and weaknesses in their writing, and different personalities and backgrounds which make them more likely to respond to different types of interventions. Here the input of the instructor is crucial, because no one knows the student better, and an instructor in a relatively small class such as writing intensive section is in the best position to make such a judgment. Certain students will benefit most from individual tutoring, for example, while others may be better served by a group workshop on particular topics, such as those offered by the Writing Center, or by specific online exercises. In some cases we will have an attached workshop staffed by a PTL or Assistant Instructor, while in others a “curriculum-based peer tutor” will be embedded in a particular section, or perhaps a student might need training in research skills moderated by a librarian. Sometimes students need the help of a tutor, sometimes of the instructor, sometimes of a librarian, sometimes of a program administrator, sometimes of all of the above working in a coordinated fashion. Once again, the instructor needs to function as the friendly and knowledgeable gatekeeper for access to appropriate services. We need to encourage instructors to assign diagnostic essays early in the semester, and, based on the results, to recommend to students immediately that they seek the proper forms of additional support.

**IX.B WAC Tutoring**

The most obvious form of “help” for student learning is tutoring, which can take a number of forms. One of the two areas in which our current program most falls short of state-of-the-art programs around the country is in the area of support for student learning (the other is in faculty training and professional development). The best WAC programs are closely integrated with their Writing Centers. There are WAC-specific tutors on staff, and students from writing intensive courses--or indeed from any course that includes writing--will be matched with a tutor who has some expertise in their field, or at least in a related area or “group”: social sciences, humanities, natural sciences, business, etc. Some programs go further than this, and incorporate “curriculum-based peer tutoring”: trained student tutors who have some background in the content of a course, and who attend the lectures, meet with the professor to become familiar with
assignments, often make specific appointments with some or all students to go over drafts of a particular assignment.

Many programs also offer specific workshops, taught by experienced writing teachers, designed for students in Writing Intensive courses, some tied directly to particular courses and assignments, others covering more general issues in academic writing.

Before making specific recommendations about WAC tutoring, let me first lay out what I take to be fairly self-evident principles about tutoring in general, and about the place of tutoring in the overall mix of services supporting student learning.

**IX.B.1 Principles of WAC Tutoring**

1. **The student needs to be committed to improving his or her writing.** Enforced tutoring is a contradiction in terms; the student must actively want to be there, and to be positively engaged in the process. Tutoring is often a long and time-consuming process, and a reluctant student, or one who will not perform the necessary work to improve writing skills, is wasting both his or her own time, and that of the tutor. So WAC tutoring must be voluntary, not mandated, though certainly all instructors should strongly recommend tutoring for those students who, in their judgment, both need it and would benefit from it.

2. **Close communication between instructors and tutors is a must.** In every tutoring interchange, there are three implicit presences, even if only two are physically there: the student, the tutor, and the course instructor. In many cases, the instructor will be represented only by a piece of paper describing the assignment that a student is working on, and by what the student tells the tutor about how the instructor has explained the assignment and its objectives in class. Sometimes this is sufficient, but whenever possible it is advantageous for tutors to have a more detailed idea of instructor expectations of student writing.

One approach might be to provide tutors who frequently deal with students from a particular course with access to password-protected course websites such as Blackboard. This can give the tutor more of a sense of the culture of a course and the voice of a particular instructor. The tutor should also be encouraged to contact the instructor directly via e-mail, telephone, or office hour visit if there are any questions about a particular assignment or about course writing expectations.

Beyond this, actual in-person meetings with particular instructors, either before the beginning of a semester or shortly thereafter, can be an important means of ensuring that instructor and tutor function as a team, and that they are not working at cross-purposes in helping students with their writing. Certain instructors may also have particular preferences about issues that they want tutors to address—or in some cases not to address—with their students, and this can be communicated in such an early-semester meeting, which could either be individual to individual,
or in a group setting, perhaps as part of a departmental re-orientation program, or as part of tutor training sessions.

3. **Student confidentiality must be protected, but more information is better.** The tutor and the instructor are part of a team addressing different aspects of a student’s writing process, and their roles frequently overlap. Many instructors, for example, do “tutoring” themselves in individual conferences with students, while tutors are often in the position of needing to explain feedback that instructors have written on a returned paper. If that feedback is ambiguous, then further communication between student and instructor, or between instructor and tutor, would help to clarify; if instructors begin to address an issue in a student conference or in a comment on a paper, it would be useful to communicate that priority specifically to a tutor, who could then follow up on it. Especially when the tutor is a peer tutor, as opposed to an experienced writing instructor, the benefit from conversation and guidance about how to approach a particular student’s writing would be correspondingly greater.

Often students themselves will be the couriers of such information, telling the tutor that the instructor had stressed, say, paragraph development in a recent conference or end-comment on a paper. But we need to develop avenues for direct communication between instructor and tutor about a particular student. In order to protect student confidentiality, it might be necessary for a student to sign a voluntary waiver allowing the sharing of such information, probably as part of the initial referral process, but I believe that we should investigate this possibility in the interest of helping students. Students may have the right to opt out of having the instructor involved, but if they make this choice they are shooting themselves in the foot. The instructor and the student are already in a confidential professional relationship, to which tutoring is a supplement. Seeking tutoring is not a shameful activity that should be hidden from the instructor, but rather demonstrates a commitment to improving one’s writing, which is what everybody—student, teacher, tutor, and the university as a whole—wants. And it will work much better if it is out in the open, with direct communication between all three people involved.

4. **A written Individual Instruction Plan (IIP) for every student referred to tutoring should be developed in consultations between the student, the tutor, and the course instructor, and carried out under the supervision of the Director of the Writing Center.** Ideally, an early semester in-person meeting between the student, the tutor, and the instructor will result in a written Individual Instruction Plan (IIP), setting out the goals for the semester and the basic techniques to be applied for addressing them in the tutorial. As the experienced educational professional monitoring the student’s progress in the course, the instructor must be involved, informed, and ultimately responsible for the shape of this plan, and for making adjustments as necessary, based on the student’s work in the course as the semester goes on, and on input from the tutor. The tutor is responsible for the implementation of the plan, and for keeping in frequent consultation with the instructor. The Director of the Writing Center is responsible for supervising the tutor’s work, discussing with the tutor particular pedagogical strategies for fulfilling the goals of the IIP, and helping the tutor to improve as a beginning teacher. The student is responsible, quite simply, for improving his or her writing, taking advantage of the learning opportunities presented.
The logistics of such three-way IIP meetings are difficult to arrange, and in some cases they may be done by e-mail or telephone, or sometimes tutors will have to work just from the written referral from the instructor. But the relevant principles are that the instructor and the tutor must work together in a coordinated fashion, and that the tutor’s role is to serve as an extension of the instructor and the course, carrying out a supplemental instructional program with particular defined goals, under the supervision of a professional teacher.

5. The closer tutors are to being qualified instructors themselves, the better. Peer tutoring has certain advantages—an immediate rapport between tutor and student is more likely, for example, since they share a common enterprise of being enrolled students—but it also carries considerable disadvantages. For one, students who are still in the process of learning how to write at a college level themselves may not be the most useful candidates to instruct those who are acutely struggling with similar issues. Second, student tutors may be less clear than instructional professionals about exactly what their role is, and may move from appropriate activities such as helping students to clarify their own thought processes and urging them to revise their own writing, to instead providing proofreading services or even re-writing in ways that exceed permissible collaboration. Third, writing intensive courses are by definition more advanced than freshman composition courses, and so the greater the background in writing instruction of the tutor, the better the advice they will be able to offer.

For budgetary reasons, and also because of some of the advantages named above, we will certainly make extensive use of student peer tutors—indeed, the writing center is currently based on this model—but whenever the situation permits, we should preferentially staff WAC tutoring with graduate students, or, even better, with assistant instructors or PTLs.

IX.B.2 Tutoring for Writing Intensive Courses: Recommendations

In Part One of this report, I described a “Unified Writing Curriculum,” which would integrate our approach to teaching writing at all levels from developmental through advanced writing intensive courses. For the present discussion, the most pertinent aspect of that description is the distinction between different levels of Writing Intensive courses, which I think can form the basis for a diversified approach to the problem of delivering tutoring services to such a dispersed population of students in such a wide variety of courses as are encompassed by the WAC program. Specifically, I would make the following recommendations:

1. For Introductory Writing Intensive courses—Level 4: These courses are often general-education courses that have few prerequisites and do not assume a lot of specialized knowledge coming in. These sorts of courses are perhaps best supported using a model similar to that currently applied to the Writing Program courses: a group of tutors in the Writing Center who are available to work with particular students on a regular weekly basis, and some provision for drop-in tutoring on an as-needed or one-shot basis. The type of training that they would require would, at one level, be similar to that for Writing Center tutors at present, since they will be dealing with many of the same basic writing problems, such as grammar, organization,
transitions, etc. But WAC tutors should also receive additional specialized training in the types of writing appropriate to courses in various disciplines. Perhaps some tutors, depending on their own background and training, might specialize in humanities courses, or social science courses, or laboratory science courses, since each of these have very different requirements.

2. For Intermediate Writing Intensive Courses—Level 5: In these courses, we can assume that the population is principally students who intend to major in the subject, but who are still relatively early in their college career. This seems like a good situation in which to experiment with embedded tutors in the course, what is often called “Curriculum-based Peer Tutoring.” These tutors would operate out of the Writing Center, but would also attend classes that they are tutoring for, and work closely with instructors in those courses. In Level 5 courses, welcoming students into a disciplinary community is a high priority, and an excellent way to do that is to have an upper-level student from the discipline serve as a dedicated tutor; not only are such students familiar with the type of writing assignments and reading materials that students are likely to encounter, but they’ve probably taken the course themselves in the past, and are in a position to put a friendly face on the discipline.

This model might also be useful in departments which have had to run courses at larger than the customary 25 students, for budgetary reasons; the presence of tutors might help to mitigate this unfortunate situation, though they would not be an overall cure for a chronic shortage of resources. In other cases where a PTL or Assistant Instructor is available, an attached workshop model, similar to the successful approach to English 101, might be employed.

3. For Advanced Writing Intensive courses—Level 6: These courses assume more background and more specialized knowledge, and are likely to be sticklers for the rhetorical conventions and documentation practices native to a particular discipline, and thus would be difficult for outsiders to tutor. Here the process of identifying appropriate tutors is best done by individual departments: most likely they would be, at minimum, an advanced undergraduate student, one who, for example, has already demonstrated an ability to successfully produce the sorts of documents required in a particular 300-level Writing Intensive course. For level 6 courses, the most appropriate tutors would be graduate students or teaching faculty such as assistant instructors or PTLs. For tutors in courses at this level, the Writing Center could offer some general tutoring training, but the tutors would basically operate within a particular department and would work closely with individual instructors.
IX.B.3 Challenges for WAC Tutoring

In all three of these groups of tutors, the participation of the Writing Center in the training and supervision of tutors, and in matching students who need help with appropriate tutors, will be essential. The Writing Center has been the only source of writing support for writing intensive courses up to this time, and, as the above recommendations indicate, I envision Writing Center tutors as being at the center of the WAC tutoring effort, especially for Level 4 courses.

One of the unavoidable major issues, both for the Writing Center in particular and for WAC support services in general, is that of making provisions for sufficient resources. The sheer size of the WAC program presents a challenge. With 40 to 50 total Writing Intensive courses offered every semester, WAC is as large as the freshman writing program, but it does not have the same centralized decision-making authority. Once we have identified a particular group of students who need additional help, we can begin to budget for tutoring resources. But with this high number of Writing Intensive courses, dispersed across campus and taking place in every department, it is obviously impracticable to assign individual tutors to every section, and yet simply having a central cadre of generalized “WAC tutors” will not be sufficient.

Another obvious challenge, even assuming that we had sufficient resources to compensate tutors, would be recruiting appropriate ones for WAC. The needs of students in each Writing Intensive course are demonstrably different. One of the basic assumptions of Writing in the Disciplines programs, such as we have here, is that students need to learn how to become a member of a disciplinary community, which thinks, writes, and researches according to its own formal and informal customs. And this assumption has important consequences for the delivery of WAC tutoring. Students who are taking an upper-level economics course, for example, would ideally require a tutor who has some understanding of economics, both in terms of the ideas that are being discussed, and in terms of the customary format and rhetorical conventions that are assumed and practiced by professionals in the field, but which may not be immediately apparent to an outsider.

Thus: if we are using peer tutors, we need to recruit students who a) are fairly advanced in their field, b) who are good writers, within that discipline, themselves, and c) who have the correct temperament for helping others with their writing. These three characteristics do not necessarily go together: students who are good at mastering content may themselves have problems with their writing, while good writers may be impatient with those who have more difficulty. Ideally we should strive for either advanced seniors or else graduate students in the field as WAC tutors.

Once we have managed to attract the right kind of tutors, we need to train them in an appropriate way. Writing Across the Curriculum, by virtue of its dispersal of the responsibility for writing instruction throughout the campus, presents a challenge for the delivery of tutorial services that is in some ways similar to but in other ways fundamentally different from the tasks associated with providing tutoring for freshman composition courses. In the latter case, there are many sections of a few basic courses, and a fairly homogenous student population, at least in terms of their level of preparation and the stage of their college career. In the case of Writing Intensive
courses, students may be anywhere from third-semester sophomores to last-semester seniors, and
the courses that they are taking may range from introductory courses in various disciplines that
satisfy general education requirements to more advanced seminars that presuppose extensive
specialized knowledge of particular subject matter.

WAC tutors need to begin with the same basic training as current Writing Center tutors, but then
may require additional training in the conventions appropriate to writing in particular disciplines
or disciplinary groups (humanities, social sciences, laboratory sciences). Students who come in
for tutoring will be assigned a tutor based on the general category of the course that they’re
taking (philosophy in humanities, geology in science, etc.) This is the usual model of the “WAC
Writing Center” as it is practiced nationwide.

The specific modalities of tutoring that will be available in any given semester or to any
particular student applicant (traditional drop-in tutoring, ongoing weekly tutoring by
appointment, attached workshop, curriculum-based peer tutoring, e-tutoring, etc.) is best left to
the Writing Center, in consultation with instructors and other administrators. The key is to match
students to resources that will draw on their particular strengths while offering them the
opportunities for improvement that they need.

IX.B.4 Support Services Network For Student Learning in Writing Intensive
Courses: Fall 2004 Pilot Project

The program that we put forth below is designed to address the problem of remedial tutoring:
students who are in upper level writing intensive courses who still have serious problems with
their basic writing skills.

[The following is an implementation plan for the Fall 2004 semester of a pilot project designed
to provide support services for students enrolled in Writing Intensive courses. It was developed
through consultations between Patricia Bender, Director of the Writing Center; Jonathan Hall,
Writing Across the Curriculum Coordinator; Mal Kiniry, Director of the Writing Program; and
Annette Juliano, Associate Dean of FASN, and was discussed at the WAC Colloquium.]

Support Services Network For Student Learning in Writing Intensive Courses:
Fall 2004 Pilot Project

Introduction

In the past, Writing Intensive instructors have sometimes felt overwhelmed and helpless when
confronted with a student who clearly needs additional help with his or her writing before being
able to complete the assigned work in the course at an appropriate level. This support plan is
meant to address that difficulty, and to ensure that students get the help that they need.
In order to get this system to function efficiently, we need to ask for the cooperation of instructors in Writing Intensive courses to help us to identify early in the semester those students who need additional help, so that we can match them with appropriate resources.

For this pilot phase, we are targeting “Introductory Writing Intensive Courses,” 200 and 300-level courses that have minimal prerequisites (usually English 102 or 122). Those courses that depend upon extensive preparation within a discipline will require more specialized services than we can provide at this time.

What we are able to offer, for Fall 2004:

a) We will train two Writing Center tutors who will be specifically dedicated to students enrolled in Writing Intensive courses. One of these tutors will be available in the evening for University College students in Writing Intensive courses. Depending on demand, we hope also to be able to offer some “drop-in” tutoring, where your students can make an appointment to meet with a tutor to go over a particular writing assignment in your course.

b) We will offer two sections, limited to 10 students each, of a new workshop, tentatively called Arts and Sciences 200: WAC Workshop. This workshop, which will carry 1 N credit and meet once a week, will begin in the 3rd week of the semester, and will be taught by instructors who will be trained to support Writing Intensive courses in the disciplines. The workshops will probably be taught during the Monday and Wednesday free periods to allow maximum student access.

At this time the workshops will not be specialized by discipline, though in the future we may be able to offer workshops focused on supporting courses in the social sciences or in the laboratory sciences, for example. Instead, we will assume that the students who will be referred to these workshops will be those who, despite having either passed 102/122 or (in the case of transfer students) having been exempted from that requirement, still require additional work to bring their writing up to the level expected in the 200 or 300-level Writing Intensive course. The workshops, then, will focus on reviewing Level 3 (Freshman Writing II) writing and reading skills on the Unified Writing Curriculum, as well as helping students with their specific writing assignments in their co-enrolled course. (See following workshop description)
WAC Workshop

Practice in analytical writing skills based on short nonfiction readings from various disciplines. Emphasis on in-class writing, and on the development of arguments and the ability to write about readings in relation to one another.

Limited to 10 students each section. Meets once a week. Non-credit.

Population:

1) Students enrolled in a Writing Intensive course (numbered 200-300, especially those which are customarily open to non-majors) who self-identify as wanting more help with their writing.

2) Students enrolled in such a Writing Intensive course who are recommended for the workshop by their Writing Intensive course instructor based on a first-week diagnostic, and who accept the opportunity.

Course activities:

1) Grammar review and sentence level development (10%)
2) Practice in critical reading skills with short readings from various disciplines (30%)
3) In-class writing practice, focusing on sentence and paragraph level (10%)
4) Detailed work on writing projects from the co-enrolled course (50%)

Course Procedures:

1) Workshops will begin to meet in the third week of the semester, and so will meet 12 times. But instructors will have training meetings during the first two weeks of the semester. The first one will go over course procedures and general orientation. The second one will address a more specific issue, such as a common approach to grammatical issues for all workshop sections.

2) Mid-term evaluation: Workshop instructors will fill out a brief mid-term evaluation form for each student that will be forwarded to the instructor of the co-enrolled course and then returned with comments. This exchange will help instructors to adjust their approach to individual students.

3) Last meeting of the term will be devoted to taking stock with each student of what has been accomplished in terms of improving the student’s writing, and what remains to be done in the future.

IX.C How can we empower students to access, in a timely and effective manner, resources for help with grammar, ESL-related problems, documentation formats, and other basic writing issues?
Up until now we have been discussing labor-intensive interventions that involve interactions with staff, such as tutors or workshop leaders, whom we need to recruit and compensate. But some problems can be approached using a mixture of old-fashioned books and new-fangled online technology. These can be integrated by professors as part of a course (probably the most effective model), or they can be assigned or recommended by tutors who are helping students with particular problems (grammar, etc.), or they can be accessed by students themselves who are seeking references that will help them with common writing problems. The role of the WAC program here will be to help instructors to identify these resources, to make them available to students (through purchase, site license, etc.), to offer training sessions and other in-person support when necessary, and to publicize that availability both to students and to instructors.

**IX.C.1 Adoption of a Common Handbook**

For many years the Writing Program has required a common handbook for all of its English composition courses. Until recently it had adopted the *St. Martin’s Handbook*, but in academic year 2003-2004 it switched to the *Longman’s Handbook*. The use of such handbooks is a traditional tool in teaching basic writing courses. Generally they provide references on various writing issues. They tend to provide extensive reference materials having to do with basic grammatical concepts, from parts of speech through the sentence and paragraph levels, and to contain equally exhaustive treatments of various formal documentation systems, such as MLA, APA, and others. That coverage has been extended over the past several decades to include more sophisticated concepts such as the components of the writing process; common forms of rhetorical structure; principles of argument, appeals to audience values and logical fallacies; and increasing attention to writing from sources and the entire research process.

Handbooks can be a valuable reference resource for students, and they can be extremely useful for tutors in helping to develop individual study plans for particular students. Having a standard one has proved useful in the context of the Writing Program, though there have been some concerns expressed about the cost of the handbooks chosen (often in the vicinity of $50), especially when many instructors do not make extensive assignments out of them, but use them for general reference and individual assignments to students who have shown that they need more attention to particular writing areas. But having a single standard textbook required for all levels of freshman writing, from developmental through English composition, has helped to avoid the needless expense of multiple handbooks, and has given instructors and tutors enough time to get used to the organizational principles of a particular handbook so that students can be given individual assignments in a meaningful way.

What I would recommend is that the WAC Program adopt the same handbook for all Writing Intensive courses, and require—or strongly recommend—that all sections of Writing Intensive courses list the current handbook on the syllabus as a required text, in addition to whatever else is assigned in the course. This will result in hardly any additional expense to students, since most of them will already have the book from their freshman writing courses (the only exception being a few transfer students who were admitted at an advanced level), but it will offer a useful
tool for instructors and tutors, and knowledge of this requirement will prevent students from selling this useful reference once they have finished with their English 102 requirement.

On the faculty survey, WAC Faculty strongly supported the adoption of a common handbook.

**IX.C.2 Online Handbook Resources**

Another advantage to adopting a common handbook for WAC is that this would give all students in writing intensive courses access to the online resources that go along with these handbooks. These can be extensive, and are sometimes more useful than the printed book itself. Certainly these ancillary services were a major factor in the current choice of the *Longman’s Handbook*. Most obviously, these online sites offer easily accessible versions of the handbook itself, with extensive exercises on grammatical issues, diagnostic tests (the results of which can be e-mailed to instructors to see that students are keeping up), anti-plagiarism tutorials, opportunities for students to exchange papers for peer critiques, and even, in some cases, online tutoring provided by the publisher. We need to explore what services are available when we make future decisions about handbooks, and we need to invite representatives of the publisher to come to campus to demonstrate these ancillary online resources for instructors, tutors, and students, and to train us in how to use them most effectively ourselves. Currently these resources are already available, at no additional cost to students or to the institution, but most instructors don’t know how to use them themselves, much less how to instruct students. We need to ensure fuller and more efficient access to these currently-underused resources.

Perhaps in the future we will decide that we do not need the printed version at all, but will contract with a vendor for site-licensed access to the online resources, at a reduced cost to students, in a manner similar to the way that the library has “Rutgers-only” access to many specialized databases. This should be a subject of continuing review, involving frequent communication between the Director of the Writing Program, the Director of the Writing Center, the WAC Coordinator, the Developmental Writing Coordinator, the WAC and Developmental Advisory Committees, and anyone else concerned with the teaching of writing on this campus.

**IX.C.3 Locally--our own internal Student Guidebook?**

Another possibility in the future would be the development of our own internal student guidebook, giving course procedures and tips for writing courses at all levels. This could be combined, through custom publishing, with a traditional handbook—some institutions have done this already—or else the publication could be a free-standing booklet focusing narrowly on our own procedures. A similar project is already underway for composition and developmental writing courses, which we could perhaps use as a partial model. Or the whole thing could be done online, as part of the WAC website or a larger online writing effort at Rutgers-Newark.

**IX.C.4 The WAC Website**
We currently have up a preliminary prototype of a WAC website, but in the future we hope that it will grow to include numerous resources for both faculty and students. We don’t need to re-invent the wheel in this regard, since there are numerous online writing labs, grammar resources, and specific WAC sites already on the web. I envision the role of our WAC website to be two-fold. First, we need to offer resources that are specific to this campus and to the particular needs of our faculty and students. Some of this may be pertinent to a general audience and would be available on a general website. Some of it would be confidential, and would be available only on the special password-protected WAC faculty area that has already been created.

The process of deciding what should be on a WAC website can itself be a useful bonding experience for various constituencies in the program. We can ask for contributions from individual faculty members, from students, from tutors, from librarians–from anyone, in short, with anything to give to the program. We already offer listings of all Writing Intensive courses that are offered each semester, and we hope shortly to incorporate course descriptions for all of these into the mix. We have posted general information about the WAC program and its requirements, and put up specialized pages addressed to faculty, students, and department administrators. We will attempt to conduct much of the business of the WAC advisory committee and of the program as a whole online.

IX.D WAC and Library Services

As a research university, Rutgers-Newark has made an implicit commitment to ensuring that its students can handle multiple sources in their own writing, and will be able, by the time they graduate, to design and carry out an independent research project, including writing up the results in a rhetorical format appropriate to the discipline. For this type of research to be possible, the cooperation of library staff is essential.

At the level of freshman composition, the Writing Program has mandated that all students in English 102 be offered at least one bibliographic instruction course taught by library staff. More than the traditional “library tour,” this presentation incorporates basic search techniques and helps students to become comfortable with accessing modern resources. Dana library reference librarians are currently developing an online tutorial to cover the most basic of library services. Once this is in place, and instructors require it of students, the actual class conducted during the library visit can be conducted at a higher level, focusing on more sophisticated search strategies and on the key skills of source evaluation. Many students believe that access to the Internet is all that they need to conduct research, but it’s a lot more complicated than that, and instructors in Writing Intensive courses need to build on the foundation that was laid at the freshman level.

Many of the advanced resources provided by the library are not being used by students, or even by their professors. Training in these resources needs to be part of the WAC mandate. In most cases, the best way to do this will be for individual instructors to contact library staff to arrange an advanced bibliographic instruction class appropriate to their particular discipline, course, and
even individual assignment. Perhaps there will be certain standard modules that will be 
appropriate to WAC as a whole, or that will be useful for WAC faculty training purposes, or as 
general resources for professional development. In any case, Dana library and its staff provide an 
important resource for Writing Intensive courses, and Writing Intensive instructors should be 
urged to make use of it as students pursue the research-writing aspect of their education.

**IX.E Anti-plagiarism education initiatives.**

In the long run, the WAC Program will need to take the lead in developing an anti-plagiarism 
program here at Rutgers-Newark. Student plagiarism is a problem in all academic disciplines, and 
Writing Across the Curriculum programs are ideally situated to provide campus leadership against 
it, both conceptually and practically. WAC should avoid getting bogged down in futile searches for 
a technological magic bullet, because what we have to offer is both a more nuanced way of thinking 
about plagiarism, and a set of pedagogical approaches to preventing it.

WAC programs have a responsibility to encourage serious re-examinations of plagiarism, through 
campus forums, faculty seminars, scholarly conferences, web-based discussions, or any other 
means. A good place to begin, I believe, is with the idea, emphasized by Writing in the Disciplines 
initiatives, of the specificity of academic disciplinary cultures, with their own subject matters, 
methodologies, conventions of writing and documentation, and codes of behavior. All students, 
whatever their cultural origins, are immigrants into such discourse communities, and each course is 
a process of initiation: into a group of writers in a particular classroom, into broader practices of a 
given discipline, and into the values and responsibilities of the academic enterprise as a whole. 
Plagiarism is perhaps best conceived as a failure of that initiation, on any or all of those levels.

Detection-based anti-plagiarism strategies can create an adversarial relationship between teachers 
and students, but WAC initiatives offer the possibility of prevention. The basic principles of the 
WAC classroom–integrating writing with learning course material, nourishing the feedback/revision 
loop, intervening in incremental stages in the composition process–are precisely those best suited to 
head off plagiarism by engaging students in the specific language of a particular course. The 
promise of Writing Across the Curriculum is that instructors will construct their courses in ways 
that will authentically welcome the participation of new arrivals to the disciplinary conversation, 
and will reward them with fledgling membership in their communities.
X. Faculty Support and Development: Assessment and Recommendations

Occasional opportunities to meet with colleagues and writing professionals on how to teach our students to be better writers would be valuable.

Our students, even in my department, do not get enough practice in writing. I'm not interested in workshops or seminars in pedagogy. I know how to teach writing to students who have basic competence. They should acquire this basic competence in English comp. Those students who have not achieved basic competency must have tutoring services available to them...I don't think we really need a writing-across-the-curriculum "program" or a newsletter any more than we need a breathing program or newsletter: Writing should be an integral part of every student's college education, but since it isn't, the writing-across-the-curriculum requirement is the least we can do.

I wish I could have attended a meeting prior to the teaching of the course to make sure that my syllabus adhered 100% to the objectives of the course or I would have benefitted from other peers' experiences in handling the writing assignments.

–Three comments from the FASN faculty survey

If we provide resources to support student learning, as I have just proposed, we are also, of course, supporting faculty in writing intensive courses by taking some of the burden off of them, especially when it comes to remedial instruction in basic writing skills, which many faculty in the disciplines feel unprepared to deal with, even if they had the time to concentrate on it, which they don’t. The other resources for students are resources for faculty as well as they design their courses: they know that students will possess a common handbook and an internal program guide; they can count on students having access to campus-wide print and online resources for basic writing issues (grammar, anti-plagiarism etc.); they can refer students to the WAC website for more information about the WAC program, graduation requirements, and student support services.

Writing Across the Curriculum, by its very nature, is asking faculty in the disciplines to do what many of them have never done before: teach writing. Or at least they think that they have never done it before. Actually, any time that they have challenged a student to analyze a problem and back up conclusions with evidence, they have been teaching writing, because critical thinking is intimately bound up with writing. Any time they have helped students to work through a difficult passage in an assigned text, they have been teaching writing, because developing close reading skills is part of building that intimate relationship with language that is at the heart of writing. So
sometimes, when asked to teach a Writing Intensive course, an instructor may react by asking, “Who, me? I’m not a writing teacher.” But yes, you are.

The reason that we are teaching writing in the disciplines, and not just in freshman composition, is that the thought processes, as well as the writing processes, are different as we move across the curriculum. It goes a lot deeper than whether one is allowed to say “I,” or whether students should quote or paraphrase, or whether they should use MLA or APA documentation style. Writing in a discipline is a fundamental expression of an approach to thinking and a way of being, a particular concept of how the world works, a specific definition of what counts as knowledge.

That said, there is more to the problem of teaching writing than just realizing the interrelatedness of various skills and competencies. It is important to conceive writing broadly enough to include these larger issues, because otherwise we might fall into the trap of focusing on mere grammatical correctness or conformity to a particular format as the be-all and end-all of academic writing. This reductive conception of writing is one of the most frequent traps that new writing teachers fall into, and it’s one of the things that a good WAC faculty support program can help them to avoid.

What we need, as writing teachers in every discipline, is a common framework for approaching the question of student writing. We need access to the latest research from composition studies, ESL pedagogy, psychology, and elsewhere on what works and what doesn’t work in terms of helping students improve their writing. Especially for new Writing Intensive teachers, we need not only an orientation to our particular program, but also an introduction to the basic principles of WAC pedagogy, and of writing pedagogy in general, as they’ve been developed over the last thirty years. The teaching of writing is a serious intellectual enterprise, and it is the responsibility of the WAC program to support our faculty as they undertake it.

Many faculty members can be excellent teachers, scholars, and writers themselves, without necessarily having developed the specialized pedagogical skills to help students improve their writing. Faculty in the disciplines thus will usually require additional training in the pedagogy of teaching writing, in which most have no specific background. Most successful WAC programs offer some form of faculty support in this area, and here the possible formats are many: orientation workshops, ongoing pedagogical training, and professional development opportunities to instructors in writing intensive courses.

One common component of all of these formats is that they should include appropriate compensation for the time that faculty spend in sessions that might range from an hour-long workshop to a full day colloquium to a week-long summer seminar.

Other forms of faculty support would include improved coordination with library research resources, a list of recommended texts to help students with discipline-specific reading and writing issues, and a website with annotated and selected links to the vast array of WAC resources available nationwide.
Even more basically in terms of increasing faculty ownership of WAC, we need to explore ways of increasing attention to and respect for undergraduate teaching in general on this campus, and specifically for the teaching of writing. Some of these will carry a price tag, sometimes a hefty one, but others are relatively simple and even cost-free. Faculty documents for tenure and promotion, for example, should be revised to include the teaching of writing intensive courses as an important contribution to the university’s overall mission. An outstanding WAC faculty member should receive an annual award. Anything that gives teaching a higher profile and importance will be part of WAC’s mission.

(Hawaii I.4): Is there a network of support for WAC Faculty? What kinds of support would help faculty in Writing Intensive courses both cope with the workload, and improve writing instruction?

X.A The WAC Workshop and Other Methods of Faculty Training and Development

One of the basics of any WAC program, since the beginning of the movement in the 1970s, has been the “WAC Workshop.” As the movement itself has expanded and changed and linked up with other developments in higher education over the last several decades, “the workshop” has also gradually evolved to include a multitude of formats. But what they all have in common is the goal of acclimating the faculty member in the disciplines, who may not have been trained as a writing teacher, to find creative ways to incorporate writing into courses where it may not have been extensively used before.

X.A.1 Alternate Models of Faculty Orientation Training and Professional Development

When a WAC program is first initiated, the principal need, across the institution, may be for education of faculty in fundamental WAC pedagogical principles: writing to learn, learning to write, etc. This need will never fully go away, because of course new instructors will cycle into the program all the time, and they will require extensive background in basic writing pedagogy and fundamental WAC principles. While these basic orientation and initial training activities continue, a second audience for professional development begins to emerge as a WAC program matures: those who are veterans of multiple writing intensive courses need to be addressed at a more advanced and sophisticated level to help them further hone their skills and take WAC to the next level.

So a WAC program needs to tailor its training and professional development activities to the state of WAC development, to the specific culture of an institution, and to the sometimes idiosyncratic preferences of a faculty. Just to get a feeling for the diversity of approaches and formats to the contemporary WAC workshop, here are a few examples taken from successful programs around the country:
Ongoing Faculty Workshops (Texas A&M Writing Center): Frequent detailed workshops ranging from 1 ½ hours to 3 hours, held regularly throughout the semester. Topics range from detailed procedural orientation (e.g., process by which Writing Intensive courses are approved) to teaching techniques (e.g. “Using Peer Response for Feedback”).

Learning the Disciplines Through Writing (Grand Valley State University): One-day seminar focusing on WAC Basics: Writing-to-Learn, Learning to Write, Writing in the Disciplines.

Writing in the Disciplines Workshops for Faculty (University of Houston): “1 ½ day faculty workshops in the opening weeks of every semester...A series of group and breakout sessions...”

Teaching with Writing: Assignments and Assessment: A Faculty Workshop (Washington University): A three part workshop series, 2 hours each, held once a semester on consecutive Monday evenings.

Writing Across the Curriculum Extended Workshop. (University of North Dakota): Six MWF morning sessions 8:30-noon daily held in May after end of semester. Participating faculty receive stipends of $600.

Communication Across the Curriculum: Faculty Seminar (University of Pittsburgh): Every other Wednesday throughout the semester. In the off week, participants meet individually with instructional designers. 15 faculty receive $1000 fellowships to redesign an undergraduate course to better use writing and speaking to promote student learning in their disciplines.

This collection of alternate models hints at the complexity of the training task, and at the multifarious possibilities for approaching them. The bottom line, of course, is ensuring faculty participation. Partly this involves making it convenient: are brown bag lunches going to be better attended than evening seminars? Would people rather meet three times for two hours or just one six-hour session?

But it also involves, as some of our examples indicate, making it worth the faculty member’s time. They need to get credit for professional development activities when it comes to tenure or promotion decisions, and they also need, not to put too fine a point on it, to get paid for their time. Sometimes these will involve significant sums of money, but more often they will be symbolic, relative to the number of hours that will be put in: they are a measure of the commitment of the institution to making WAC an important element of the academic culture. Initiatives that are not funded are initiatives that are not taken seriously; this is the reality, perhaps sad but certainly true, of contemporary American life, and the university is no exception.
X.A.2 Recommendations for WAC Faculty Training at Rutgers-Newark

The precise form that WAC workshop training takes will be dependent on local factors at each institution. So what, then, of Rutgers-Newark? What existing resources do we have to draw upon, and what will we have to create from scratch? What elements of our campus culture will dictate one approach rather than another?

X.A.2.a) For New WI Instructors: Ongoing Workshops on the Teaching of Writing

One important existing resource that we can use to build our WAC training component upon is a major “professional development” initiative that has been designed and put in place by the Writing Program, beginning in June 2004. Roughly once a month all year round, there will be a “workshop” or presentation by an experienced writing teacher in the program. Although they are initially and most directly addressed to new instructors in the writing program, these workshops should be of very practical interest to anyone who is involved in teaching a writing intensive course, as well, because they involve key issues in course design, assignment design, and course workload management. They would be of special utility to anyone in the process of designing or revising a syllabus for a writing intensive course.

This model would be similar to the first one on the list of examples: ongoing faculty workshops. The pros and the cons of this format are fairly clear. These workshops are currently scheduled to go for 2 1/2 hours, which, while not an inconsiderable commitment of time in itself, is also not enough for a novice writing teacher to get a full sense of the pedagogical issues and techniques involved. The Writing Program is requiring all of their new hires to attend at least three of these presentations over the course of the academic year, which seems reasonable. (They are being paid for this requirement, of which more below.)

Here are the announced topics for the first year, running from June 2004 through April 2005:

Writing Program Workshops for Faculty

“Grading and Commenting on Student Essays”
“Constructing and Sequencing Writing Assignments”
“Reverse Outlining and Revision”
“Critical Reading”
“ESL Issues in Non-ESL Classes”
“The `Three Voices’ of Research Essays”
“The Fundamentals of English 102”
“The Challenge of Plagiarism”
“Writing Events”

Some possible future topics: handling the paper load; working with non-native speakers (a huge issue, of course, here at Rutgers-Newark); connecting reading, speaking, and writing (especially
in the sciences); developing evaluation criteria (rubrics, etc.); understanding composing processes; writing online; classroom research to assess the impact of new assignments.

The WAC Program also hopes to add a couple of workshops that will be specifically aimed at WAC audiences and issues. I’ve already been using the WAC e-mailing list to recommend these workshops strongly to anyone who will be teaching a writing intensive course in the coming academic year, and I’ll continue to send out reminders.

Thanks to Mal Kiniry and Jennifer Arena for setting up this series.

_X.A.2.b) For Both New and Ongoing WI Instructors: Faculty Seminars_

When WAC was being developed and first implemented, the WAC Committee sponsored a series of presentations concerning issues in WAC. Sometimes this involved outside speakers who were invited to come and share their experiences and their theoretical perspectives on WAC, and this was supplemented by opportunities for Rutgers-Newark faculty members to meet with their colleagues and to present and exchange ideas about how writing fits in to various disciplinary environments.

These seminars were useful, though attendance varied. The most important element, I believe, is that they approached WAC pedagogy as an important subject, with intellectual substance, something that needed to be thought about seriously and debated in the same way that other topics in various disciplines routinely become the object of scholarly concern.

These seminars pretty much dried up, however, as soon as the original grant money was exhausted. I think that we should try to bring these back as time goes on, making use of both external guests and the internal Rutgers speakers. To ensure attendance, we will need to compensate faculty (see below).

_X.A.2.c) For Advanced WI Instructors: The WAC Colloquium_

The WAC Colloquium is a gathering of faculty involved in the teaching of writing intensive courses, for the purpose of exchanging experiences and ideas, and also for formulating a general direction for the program for the next year. It is thus a cross between a scholarly “conference” on Writing Across the Curriculum, with the presentation of papers and panels, and a program retreat for members of the WAC Faculty—a term that I use to include anyone who has ever taught or might teach a writing intensive course.

There have actually been two WAC Colloquia since the beginning of the program. (Both programs are in the appendix.) The first one, one, October 20, 2001, was entitled “Writing Across Campus.” The WAC requirement was a new one at that time, and so the emphasis was on 1) implementation (there was a “roundtable” featuring representatives from various departments
discussing how their departments had approached the requirement and 2) workshops on basic writing instruction.

The second colloquium, May 15, 2004 was entitled “Writing Across the Curriculum at Rutgers-Newark: Launching the Next Phase.” Obviously, since that is also the title of the present report, (and of the grant that supported both of them) there was a close connection between the proposals presented here and what was discussed at the colloquium. The morning session included panels on the introductory writing intensive course and the advanced writing intensive course, and also a panel of students and tutors to present the experience of WAC from the other side of the desk. In the afternoon we discussed WAC issues such as student support issues, administrative and budget issues, faculty training, etc. The overall consensus was that WAC needed to be institutionalized, and that it needed to be supported with sufficient funding.

This second colloquium was better attended (39 people), partly because funds from the grant were able to support stipends—very modest, in fact symbolic ones—for every department to send a “WAC Fellow”: a representative who had been teaching writing intensive courses on a regular basis, and who also agreed to serve as a “resource person” in their own department during the upcoming academic year.

I think that the general consensus was that the colloquium was a success. There was a lot of positive energy in the room as teachers got together to talk about teaching, to share their experiences and perspectives with each other. The policy discussions revealed some discontentment with the chronic underfunding—in fact the non-funding—of the WAC Program, and there were passionate calls for more resources.

The colloquium should become, I think, an annual event. The time of year was appropriate: the day after the end of finals. Although people sometimes had to duck out to turn in their grades, it was a time when people were still on campus, and in the mood to think about teaching. And if the Colloquium is able to reach consensus on certain directions, there is time to try to implement them over the summer. Perhaps in the future it will have a more specific theme. (One idea for May 2005: plagiarism.)

The Colloquium is both an occasion for discussing writing intensive courses on a relatively advanced and sophisticated level—since the WAC Fellows in attendance are, by definition, the people who have been most involved with teaching it. It is not, then, an orientation or a training in basic pedagogy, but rather an occasion for experienced writing intensive instructors to recharge their batteries and reconnect with each other.

X.A.2.d) The WAC Fellows Program: Informal Mentoring in the Departments

Currently this is a grant-funded program. The WAC Fellows are paid a symbolic stipend to attend the WAC Colloquium and to serve as a “resource person” for others in their department. Obviously this mentoring would be done one-to-one, and in a very informal way. In this way we hope to distribute the expertise of our most experienced writing intensive instructors. At the age
of three, our program is now developed enough that we have such people available, and the WAC Fellows program is a way of making use of them, without unduly burdening them or requiring others in their departments to jump through hoops to get assistance; they can just ask the colleague down the hall to look over their syllabi.

The WAC Fellows program should become a regular hard-funded part of the WAC Program once the grant runs out.

X.A.2.e) For All WI Instructors: The Course Development Process

I have already discussed the “Course Designation Process” as an administrative matter. Its three parts—Course Planning, Course Development, and Course Review—are bound up together, but have logically separate functions. The Course Planning step is primarily administrative, intended to address both short-term and long-term problems in meeting WAC requirements in particular departments as early in the process as possible, when there is still time to do something about them. The third part, the Course Review process, is intended as an assessment tool: it allows the WAC Advisory Committee to see what has been proposed as writing intensive courses in a given semester, allows them to review them, to see what is happening in actual classrooms, and thus to see where we are as a program.

The middle part of this trilogy, the Course Development process, is intended as a collegial workshop for the benefit of the writing intensive instructor. Although the information that is submitted—syllabus, assignments, sample papers, etc.—is essential to the course review process, the feedback that the instructor gets from the members of the WAC Committee is intended to be not a matter of “do this or else we won’t approve it” but rather, “have you thought of doing this?” They will generally be suggestions; the committee is not in the business of sending orders to instructors or trampling on their academic freedom. It’s just the job of the committee to determine that writing intensive criteria are being adhered to, and to give the instructor some ideas. In that sense, the Course Development process fits in with our other instructor education initiatives that I have been describing in this section.

X.A.2.f) Professional Development Stipend

Rutgers-Newark faculty members are very busy people, with full teaching schedules, research projects, committee meetings, etc. If we want their time for WAC, we are going to have to pay for it. This is not because they are hard-nosed or primarily driven by a desire for cash: if that were the case, they would not be in academia at all, but in the private sector.

Rather, putting some money behind these professional development initiatives is a signal from the administration that we want them to take these responsibilities—including their teaching responsibilities—seriously. That has not always been the message that has been coming from the administration of this university, in which respect, of course, it is not unique among research universities in this country. But WAC is supposed to be a challenge to all that, and so the funding of WAC—and payment for attendance at WAC workshops, etc.—is a tangible sign that the
administration is serious about transforming the way that we do business both with our faculty and with our students.

There are, of course, other ways to pay faculty, other than cash on the barrelhead. Even more than money, faculty members need time: if we give them released time, if we give them graduate assistants, if we give them embedded curriculum-based peer tutors, if we give them more computer equipment, we can make their lives easier, and they will be more likely to put more effort where we want them to.

Even a very modest stipend can have an important effect, and that’s what I propose here. I suggest that we appropriate enough money so that a certain amount—a minimum of $100—is attached each year to each faculty member who teaches one or more writing intensive courses, as a “Professional Development Stipend.” The $100 (or whatever amount) would not be automatically paid, but only if the faculty member attends a certain number of professional development events.

This idea has already been implemented among PTLs and Assistant Instructors in the Writing Program, where the going rate is about $25 an hour for attending workshops, etc., with a minimum of three workshops being required. We also have already, in the WAC Program, paid WAC Fellows $100 for attending the WAC Colloquium (that’s actually less than $25 an hour, since it went all day.) I propose that we do something similar for writing intensive instructors.

This, of course, would cost some money. We customarily run about 40 writing intensive courses in the fall semester and 50 in the spring. (These are FASN and UC figures only; the Business school is a special case, and its training needs will need to be addressed separately, as discussed above in the administrative section.) Thus the raw figure would be 90 courses * $100=$9000. But it would actually not be that much because a) the stipend attaches to the faculty member, not to the course, and some faculty members teach writing intensive courses in both the fall and the spring; they wouldn’t get a second stipend, and b) participation in the professional development program would be voluntary, and not everyone would do it. Of course, there are also costs associated with putting on the training sessions themselves: the workshop instructors need to be compensated for developing their presentations, sometimes food is provided, etc. The WAC Colloquium had its own relatively modest expenses, which were paid out of grant money. So yes, it would cost some money—probably about $10,000 a year for faculty development. But it would be a good investment in improved teaching.

X.A.2.g) Possible future directions

In the future we may want to look into some more extended workshops and seminars, such as those described toward the bottom of the list of models. Probably for this we would need to get a special grant to support faculty attendance. But for the immediate future, I think that if we fully implement the measures described above: the Faculty Workshops on Teaching Writing, the Faculty Seminars, the WAC Colloquium, and the Course Development Process—and if we
manage to fund them with a “Professional Development Stipend”, we will have a full plate for now.

X.B Other forms of support available to faculty

In addition to the several types of workshops described above, to the informal one-on-one consultation available through the WAC Fellows Program, or to the more formal feedback arising out of the Course Development Process, we need to provide additional materials and resources that faculty can easily access on their own, as they educate themselves about Writing Across the Curriculum, and as they design their syllabi and writing assignments.

X.B.1 Print Resources

X.B.1.a) Books: WAC Library

The WAC Program already owns, thanks to an earlier grant, a number of books pertinent to WAC theory and practice in general, and, perhaps more useful for individual faculty members, various guides to writing in particular disciplines. Currently these books are housed in the Writing Center, where they are available for consultation any time the Center is open. A list of these books is available on the Writing Center website.

Once the WAC Program has a space of its own, and administrative/clerical help, we will probably re-locate these volumes there, where they will be available for faculty to consult and check out. We also hope to expand this collection, not only by adding additional books about WAC, but also by soliciting publishers to send us examination copies of books that might be useful for adoption by individual faculty members. After consultation with the WAC Committee and other interested faculty members, we will draw up a list of recommended texts by discipline, and post this on the WAC website.

We will also be working with Dana Library personnel to expand the library’s collection of pertinent materials, including subscriptions to pertinent journals.

X.B.1.b) Faculty Orientation Package and Program Guidebook for Faculty

At the WAC Committee meetings during Spring 2004, there was a consensus that an important element of the course designation process would be the development of an “orientation package” that would be sent to the instructor of a writing intensive course, especially an instructor new to the WAC Program, once the department chair has announced the intention to designate the course. That instructor will be asked to submit a syllabus and other materials for feedback from the committee, and the suggestion from the committee was that the instructor ought to have some sort of written guidance about how to proceed before submitting that first draft.

Elements of such a package might include:
• A description of the procedures in the Course Designation Process
• A brief description of the WAC Program and definition of writing intensive courses
• Writing intensive criteria and unified writing curriculum guidelines
• Examples of successful syllabi and writing assignments
• A narrative description of a typical writing intensive course from the instructor’s point of view
• Handouts/articles on basic WAC pedagogy: writing to learn, learning to write, etc.
• References for further study

Respondents to the faculty survey also declared themselves strongly in favor of the proposition that “Rutgers-Newark should develop an in-house guidebook for faculty teaching Writing Intensive courses, describing procedures and standards, offering hints about techniques and course structure, etc.” Once such a guidebook (I call it a guidebook to distinguish it from the commercial handbook for students—Longman’s—that I’ve proposed adopting earlier) has been developed, it would obviously be ideal as an “orientation package.”

So there seems to be a strong consensus among faculty in the program that some form of guidebook for the program ought to be published, and development of such a publication will need to be one of the WAC program’s activities during the next academic year. This will go hand-in-hand with the production of a student guidebook, as discussed in the previous section, because some content will overlap. Some of this material can also be made available more efficiently and economically online, but it seems clear that faculty believe that there should be something on actual old-fashioned paper as well.

**X.B.2 Online Resources**

**X.B.2.a) Public WAC Website: wac.newark.rutgers.edu**

We now have the beginnings of a website up at wac.newark.rutgers.edu. It was designed by Housen Maratouk, operating under a previous grant, and Jonathan Hall. I have discussed above the need to have someone with web skills on a more regular basis to get things online more expeditiously, since Housen’s work with Blackboard has been overwhelming him.

As it expands, the website will have several areas:

• General program information: mission statement, WAC requirement for graduation, writing intensive criteria, procedure for course designation, statistics about course offerings, contact information for WAC personnel, etc.

• List of current Writing Intensive courses, with course descriptions provided by instructors (during the Course Designation Process). This will be one of the most important functions, since the paper version of the schedule of classes, which customarily
contained a list of WI courses each semester, is being discontinued. We hope to link our
list directly to the online schedule of courses, which is where most students get their
information.

- **Resources for students.** This will be a directory of where students can go for additional
  help if they’re finding it difficult in their writing intensive courses. We will be able to
  refer them locally to services such as the Writing Center for WAC tutoring, or to the
  online resources associated with the common WAC handbook, and also to the many
  excellent online writing labs nationally that provide comprehensive reference on
  grammar, etc.

- **Resources for faculty.** There are hundreds of WAC programs nationwide, and most of
  them have their own websites. Some of this is information of general utility, often very
  helpful to faculty designing their own courses, while other material is only pertinent to a
  particular campus. We will try to weed out the useful from the not-so-useful. My own
  experience in researching this report is that there are a lot of links collections out there
  that just list every program that there is, but this is not very useful. I favor more of an
  annotated and selective approach: not every program, and not even every page of the
  programs that I select, but only the ones that seem particularly interesting, innovative, or
  of general interest. I hope to get another Honors Research Assistant to help with this part
  of the project.

We hope that the references in faculty resource section will challenge our faculty to engage with
each other and with the ideas of WAC faculty elsewhere. We also encourage individual faculty
members to get involved in contributing materials or references that they have come across to
the website. Ultimately, we would like to have specific areas devoted to resources for science,
for example, and the involvement of faculty in the disciplines will be critical to that endeavor, as
we will need to draw on their expertise.

**X.B.2.b) WAC Faculty Area: Restricted Access**

Using a Blackboard shell, we now have a password-protected area where WAC Faculty can
exchange ideas freely. We have a discussion board enabled already, and we encourage faculty to
begin using it.

One of the prime uses of this faculty area will be the submission of syllabi, writing assignments,
course descriptions, and other materials descriptive of particular writing intensive courses as
part of the Course Designation Process. All WAC faculty will be authorized to post materials on
this site, and the Blackboard format makes it very easy to do so.
As time goes on, we will have a constantly expanding bank of syllabi and writing assignments available for other instructors to consult. The initial purpose of this posting will be to enable the course development and review process, and to allow the WAC Committee to offer feedback to the faculty member. But we anticipate that this material will remain available indefinitely, and that other instructors can use their colleagues’ course designs and assignments as reference points and inspiration for their own efforts in their writing intensive courses.

[Note: We are assuming that most instructors will not object to having their materials available within the password-protected WAC Faculty Area for other Rutgers-Newark faculty to consult. But if a particular faculty member prefers that such materials not be available, there will also be an alternate method of submitting material electronically to the WAC Committee: via the “digital dropbox” on the Blackboard site. Material submitted through this alternate method will not be posted on the WAC Faculty site, and only the WAC Committee members will have access. We encourage faculty to make their materials available in a collegial way, but of course respect anyone’s desire for confidentiality.]

### X.B.2.c) WAC Committee Area: Confidential Access

A similar password-protected Blackboard area has been created for the use of the WAC Committee members. This will enable confidential communication between members discussing materials submitted by faculty members as part of the course development process. It can also serve as a site for deliberation on matters that arise in between meetings via the online discussion board (it may even eliminate the need for some meetings). Drafts of various WAC documents can be posted for the committee’s examination, as has already been done with parts of this report in their earlier incarnation.

### X.B.3 Communication within the Program

#### X.B.3.a) WAC E-mail List

One of the advantages of the online WAC Faculty Area is that it is now very easy to send e-mail to everyone involved in the program, or potentially interested in WAC material. It has already been used to announce changes in procedures, to solicit participation in the faculty survey, and to announce particular upcoming events (workshops, etc.) We promise not to bombard WAC faculty members with excessive numbers of messages! Of course, anyone has the option to opt out.

#### X.B.3.b) WAC Newsletter

In Spring 2004, the WAC Program published its first newsletter, cleverly called the “Rutgers-Newark Writing Across the Curriculum Program Newsletter.” It announced some of the new initiatives of the program, including the awarding of the grant, the appointment of a coordinator, the membership of the WAC Advisory Committee, and other news and procedures of interest to
WAC Faculty and administrators. We will be adding schedules of workshops and other events in the future, as well as short articles on pedagogy and other issues of interest to WAC Faculty. Currently the newsletter is being published in electronic format only, and sent to the WAC mailing list, as well as being posted on the WAC website. We anticipate that the newsletter will come out probably once a semester, or more often if events warrant.
XI. Conclusion: Funding the Revolution–WAC as a Regular Budget Item

Among the arguments against WI designations are these: Budget-wary administrators often view them as a cheap, easy fix to students’ writing “problems.” Promised support doesn’t materialize, or, as budget cuts become necessary, WI courses are easy targets. One recent horror story ... involved administratively mandated WI classes with no resources, no WAC director, no budget, no programmatic support, no criteria for designating WI classes, and no faculty workshops... 

Proponents claim that WI requirements, when properly implemented, can cause faculty to realize the importance of writing, feedback, revision, well-designed assignments, and thoughtfully constructed assessment in the curriculum. The WI requirement, with the supporting apparatus that accompanies it (e.g., faculty workshops, consultation with WAC personnel, informal meetings of WI teachers to discuss problems and results), can serve as a catalyst for more writing across the curriculum in all courses whether WI or not...Writing program personnel at various institutions report that WI influence has “bubbled up” to the graduate level, that talk about the importance of writing to learning has turned up in unexpected campus committee meetings, and that once faculty have experienced success in their WI teaching, they can’t “go back” to their previous methodologies.

–Martha Townsend

The two quotations above paint a stark picture, a tale of two programs. The first program attempts to do Writing Across the Curriculum on the cheap, as though just putting a requirement on the books were all that was required. This institution recognizes that its students require more writing instruction, but attempts to create that instruction just by waving a magic wand. Unfunded mandates like this are bound to create resentment. They raise very real logistical issues for many resource-strapped individual departments who are already struggling to get their curriculum taught. They create nightmares for teachers who may find themselves faced with the impossible task of focusing on the individual writing processes of 60, 70, even 100 students. Beyond these very practical concerns, there is also the symbolic message that an unfunded or underfunded WAC program sends. In American universities, as in American society as a whole, what does not have money attached to it does not get taken seriously.

The other program, on the contrary, recognizes that quality writing instruction is going to require a significant investment of university resources, both at the beginning of the program and on an ongoing basis, semester after semester, year after year. WAC programs need a “supporting apparatus,” as Townsend puts it, that includes not only the support for faculty development that she mentions, but also tutoring and other support for student learning. These things cost money. But as Townsend suggests, the benefits of such investment will “bubble up” across campus in unexpected places. The payoff to the investment will not always show up on the bottom line financially, but it will show up in the bottom line of student learning.

The WAC Program at Rutgers-Newark has unfortunately been operating, up to the present time, closer to the first category than to the second. Unlike the description, we have always had well-designed “criteria for designating writing intensive courses,” but we haven’t had a process for publicizing them or for working with faculty on creative ways to employ them in actual classrooms. As of this year, we do have a Coordinator. Otherwise, we have been uncomfortably close to the Brand X description. After the original WAC Committee set up the program, supported by Dialogues grants, they basically disbanded, and there was no regular financial support for the program in the budget.

The Rutgers-Newark WAC Program thus stands at a crossroads. Through the efforts of individual faculty, we have the beginnings of a new approach to undergraduate teaching at this institution. But they need to be supported, with professional development and student support services, and with a fundamental recommitment to the importance of undergraduate education.

What would it take? Let’s consider, first, how much we have already invested in the program. Every semester we teach between 40 and 50 writing intensive courses. Almost all of these are taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty: that’s the most expensive kind of teaching time that we have. So we are teaching a number of courses roughly comparable to the freshman Writing Program, and we are using a staff that is much more expensive. It doesn’t show up that way on balance sheets, of course, because it’s all dispersed to the individual departments.

So I would submit that a reasonable budget to support a program in which we have already invested so many resources should be at least comparable to what we spend to support freshman composition. There, we have a staff: a Director who is an Associate Professor, a part-time Assistant Director, and a part-time Program Secretary, all of whom have year-round appointments, offices, computers, office expenses, etc. We have a Writing Center full of tutors to support composition courses, a Director to train them and supervise them, and a dedicated space for them to operate in, with computer equipment, etc. We have also recently added a “professional development” component to the Writing Program, with a full schedule of monthly workshops all year round and direct compensation for instructors who attend.

I have tried in this report to offer a new, positive vision of a culture of writing at Rutgers-Newark. I have described this “next phase,” and the steps and programs needed to create and promote it, in as much detail as I could muster—perhaps too much detail, at times, but my overall effort has been to show that such a culture is within the realm of the concretely possible, here on
this campus, and in the near–not the distant–future. I hope that my readers will be ready to embrace the general outline of this vision enthusiastically, to offer revisions, major and minor, to specific aspects, and, most importantly, to support the steps necessary to its implementation. But nothing will happen without adequate funding for the program, and a communal will to put it into practice. This will require both tangible support from the administration, and a common sense of purpose from the grassroots WAC faculty. The WAC Colloquium suggests strongly that the faculty is firmly on board, and in fact has already been implementing WAC to the extent that it is possible without the supporting apparatus. This section is about the tangible support.

XI.A Toward a WAC Program Budget

Here are the proposals and recommendations I have made in this report that will cost money. I am not a full-time administrator, so I do not know exactly how much some of these items that I will enumerate will cost, but my general sense is that we should be able to fund the entire WAC program for about what it would cost to hire one tenure-track assistant professor, or maybe two. That seems like a reasonable price to pay to support such an important program.

XI.A.1 Personnel

XI.A.1.a) Coordinator

Currently the Coordinator is an Assistant Instructor in the English Department with a two-course annual release. The recommendations are that
   a) the release time should be half-time
   b) the position should be a year-round appointment, since many program functions need to go on during the summer and
   c) there should be a stipend associated with the position, if not (and this would obviously be preferable) an appointment at a rank and salary more appropriate to a position that includes long-term planning responsibilities.

XI.A.1.b) Administrative Assistant

This full-time administrative assistant would support not only WAC but also the Writing Program (including developmental writing) and the Writing Center (which currently has no dedicated clerical support, which is untenable even at its present size, not taking into account plans for expansion to support WAC and developmental writing). The present part-time Writing Program secretary position would be replaced with this full-time position with multiple responsibilities.

XI.A.1.c) Webmaster

The WAC website will need to be expanded and updated frequently, and our current webmaster has too many other duties. This role might be served by a work-study student with appropriate
skills. This could also be shared with the Writing Program, which is also in the process of developing a site.

**XI.A.2 Other Program Expenses**

XI.A.2.a) Computer Equipment
Coordinator needs up-to-date computer equipment. So does the Administrative Assistant.

XI.A.2.b) Office Expenses

Program functions such as the student survey in Writing Intensive courses, and the processing of the diagnostic essay with its cover sheets will cost a small amount in photocopying and clerical costs. General office expenses for the functioning of the shared administrative assistant would of course be necessary.

**XI.A.3 Support for Student Learning**

I have proposed that introductory writing intensive courses be supported in a manner similar to current Writing Program offerings: with some students having regular weekly appointments, and others making use of “drop-in” tutoring for specific assignments. We currently have a pilot project for WAC tutoring in the writing center underway.

**XI.A.3.a) Writing Center**

The Writing Center will now be asked to support not only the Writing Program freshman composition courses, but also WAC courses and, probably, developmental tutoring as well. All of these new tutors will need to be recruited, trained, and supervised, and that will carry administrative costs. I have proposed that the new developmental coordinator also be appointed as Assistant Director of the Writing Center, to aid in tutor training, and I have suggested above that the Writing Center needs a share of the time of the new administrative assistant. This will obviously require a major expansion of its budget, and the allocation of new space.

Bottom line: In the not too distant future, the Writing Center budget will need to be at least DOUBLED.

**XI.A.3.b) Curriculum-based Peer Tutors in Intermediate Writing Intensive Courses**

For intermediate writing intensive courses, I have proposed the use of curriculum-based peer tutors. Some have suggested that this model might eventually be applied to ALL writing intensive courses, so that all WAC Faculty would be assisted by a tutor dedicated to their particular course and assignments. I have not proposed this currently, but it is a long-term
alternative to consider, though not a cheap one: tutors cost roughly $1000-$1200 a semester, including training, so if every writing intensive course had one, that would be $90,000-$100,000 a year for WAC tutoring.

What I would propose for the short term is that we begin experimenting with various models of tutoring, including curriculum-based peer tutoring, which, as I’ve suggested, might work best in intermediate writing intensive courses: intended for potential majors near the beginning of their career. The CBPT would then be an upper-level student in that major, who is known to be a good writer and to have the proper personal traits for tutoring.

**XI.A.3.c) Workshops for students taught by experienced writing instructors**

We have a pilot project for Fall 2004 in place: two workshops taught by experienced writing teachers. At present these will be non-credit workshops, and we hope to recruit students (a maximum of 20 total) who will be identified by means of diagnostic essays given by WAC instructors during the first week of a WI course. These will be students who otherwise might have a difficult time negotiating the writing requirements of the course.

**XI.A.3.d) Online Resources for Students**

When students purchase a handbook such as the Longman’s, they receive (assuming they purchase it new) a code that may be used to access online resources. We will need to look into how long these codes will be active; we would like students to have access to these resources throughout their undergraduate career, so that WAC Faculty can count on this technological back-up as a reference for students who may have basic writing issues. As we make a decision to adopt a handbook, we may need to negotiate with the publisher for access, and perhaps there may be a site-license fee involved.

**XI.A.4 Faculty Training and Professional Development**

**XI.A.4.a) Professional Development Stipend for Each WAC Faculty Member**

I have proposed that every WAC Faculty member have a small stipend available for professional development, which could be redeemed by attending faculty training workshops sponsored by WAC or the Writing Program, WAC faculty seminars or visiting lecturers, or the WAC Colloquium. I would propose that new Writing Intensive instructors should have a larger stipend, with a correspondingly more rigorous requirement for attendance at orientation and training sessions. The minimum would be $100 per WAC Faculty member, or a maximum of about $9000 a year; ideally, this would be about three times that much, and $300 seems reasonable for new WI instructors.

**XI.A.4.b) Compensation for Faculty Workshop Leaders and Visiting Lecturers**
We will also need a small budget to compensate Rutgers-Newark faculty who lead specialized workshops for their colleagues, and to pay visiting lecturers or workshop leaders from outside.

**XI.A.4.c) Travel for Coordinator and Visiting Lecturers**

In order to keep up with changes in the WAC movement, the Coordinator (and other interested personnel) should attend national conventions (currently every other year). The travel expenses of visiting lecturers, of course, would also need to be paid.

**XI.A.4.d) Expanding the WAC Library**

We currently own some books on WAC; we could expand this collection, especially once we have a new place to put it after an administrative assistant is hired.

**XI.B Additional Funding for Particular Departments and Schools**

Up until now, I have been discussing the WAC Program itself, and its financial needs. Individual departments, though, are the heart of Writing Across the Curriculum, and some of them are finding their already scarce resources further stretched by the demands of the reduced class size required by writing intensive courses. These departments will require additional resources to help them meet their obligations under the WAC Requirement.

During the Course Planning Process, we need to discuss with department chairs exactly what it would take to let them implement writing intensive courses properly.

The Rutgers Business School is a special case which I have discussed in some detail above (see section VIII.E.1).

**XI.B.1 Departments with Known Difficulties in Meeting WAC Requirements**

The Physics department has not offered any writing intensive courses, and their students have had to receive waivers to take two writing intensive courses elsewhere. Fortunately, this is not a large number of students—less than 10 Physics majors at any one time—but in the long run we would like to help them develop a writing intensive component to the physics curriculum.

The Psychology department has also expressed concern about its ability to teach writing intensive courses in a truly writing intensive way. Some of its upper-level courses have, in fact, been taught in a true WI fashion, but its principal in-major WI course is its experimental methods course, and the current arrangement of this course—one PTL giving lectures, another running the laboratory, a third grading papers—seems far from optimal. This will have to be the subject of long-term discussions. Ultimately the only solution is for the department to get more teaching
resources, either through re-allocating its resources from research and graduate teaching, through general increases, or through dedicated WAC subsidies, or some combination of the above.

**XI.C Resources, Resources, Resources: Committing to WAC**

It’s not too often in life that we get a second chance. WAC at Rutgers-Newark was not sustained financially or programmatically after the first round of activity surrounding the approval of the WAC requirement for graduation. But the program has survived, and even thrived, on the back of overworked and undersupported faculty who have insisted that their students deserve writing instruction in their disciplines, and managed to give it to them through their own efforts.

Now we have a second chance to do it right, to “re-start” the program with the apparatus of support that it should have had in the first place. I have suggested that WAC can have a profound, even radically transformative potential for the basic way that we do business with our students. If we fully implement WAC, then we are on our way to re-committing ourselves, as an institution and as individual faculty members, to the centrality of undergraduate education to our mission as a research institution.

WAC needs to be a regular budget item in the regular university budget. It cannot any longer exist as just a soft-funded extra. The original WAC Committee did some very good work with the Dialogues grants that they got, in terms of planning the program, offering workshops, bringing in guests, attending conferences, etc. But there was never enough support for student learning, and anyway the grants dried up after a while, and were not succeeded by new hard funding. Once again, the program is currently supported by an internal Rutgers grant to improve the undergraduate curriculum, and that grant may possibly be renewed, but we need more resources than that, first of all, as I’ve tried to indicate above, and second, we need to make sure that the program is never left high and dry again.

Of course, the bottom line is what the bottom line always is: we need to put our money where our mouth is. If we want our students to improve their writing, then we have to put the resources into supporting that effort. If we want our faculty to put the effort into teaching students to write in the disciplines, then we need to support them, too, in both tangible and intangible ways. Nobody came into academia in order to get rich, and one of the things that most faculty find most rewarding is the exchange with the richly complicated and diverse collection of people who are our students at Rutgers-Newark. We need to make sure that we re-arrange our priorities, in terms of funding and otherwise, to put those students first.

Our students will be watching.
XII. Appendices

XII.A Writing Intensive Courses Offered By Department: Fall 2001-Spring 2004

Note: In the following spreadsheet, the “Standard” is a rough calculation that would allow every student majoring in a given department to get one slot in one writing intensive course (capped at 25 students) over the course of a four-year career. It assumes that such sections will only be half full; thus meeting the standard might result in some extra slots for non-majors.

“Status” simply shows where the department currently is with regard to the “Standard” at the present time. Negative numbers suggest that the department needs to offer more sections; positive numbers indicate that the department is contributing to the overall need for writing intensive courses for non-majors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>SUB</th>
<th>Fall 01</th>
<th>Spr 02</th>
<th>Fall 02</th>
<th>Spr 03</th>
<th>Fall 03</th>
<th>Spr 04</th>
<th>Sub. Dept.</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afro American Studies</td>
<td>O14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>O70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology (incl. Bot., Zoo., CLS)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical &amp; Modern Languages</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science/Info Systems</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology (incl. Geo. Eng.)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (incl. Applied)</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary (STS, Env. Sc.)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (NCAS, UC)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS SCHOOL</td>
<td>O29</td>
<td>Fall 01</td>
<td>Spr 02</td>
<td>Fall 02</td>
<td>Spr 03</td>
<td>Fall 03</td>
<td>Spr 04</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td># Majors</td>
<td>* Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>O10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Studies</td>
<td>O11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Economics</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Business Environ</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Business</td>
<td>O06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (RBS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>3614</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Standard" assumes 1 section per 12.5 enrolled majors every 4 year cycle (prorated as of Spring 2004).
** "Status" shows actual offered sections minus Standard
--- Data on # Majors as of 2001-2002
2004 WAC Colloquium

Writing Across the Curriculum at Rutgers-Newark: Launching the Next Phase

Thursday, May 13, 2004
Robeson Center, Room 226
8:30 a.m.-4:00 p.m.

Morning Session

8:30 Breakfast, Conversation, Sign-in

9:00 Introductory Remarks
   Annette Juliano, Associate Dean, FASN
   Jonathan Hall, Coordinator, Writing Across the Curriculum Program

9:30-10:30 Panel I
   “But I’m Not Really a Writing Teacher”: Developing a Writing Intensive Course in the Disciplines

Mal Kiniry, Director, Writing Program (Moderator) “The Segue From Composition: Strategies for the Introductory Writing Intensive Course”

James Schlegel, Chemistry, “How Do Chemists Write?: Building a Writing Intensive Course from Scratch”

Lisa Hull, Political Science, “But I’m Not Really a Writing Teacher”: Adapting an Existing Course to Include Writing Instruction”

Rachel Hadas, English, “All English Courses Are Writing Intensive, Right?: Assigning Writing vs. Teaching Writing”

Many faculty members can be excellent teachers, scholars, and writers themselves, without necessarily having developed the specialized pedagogical skills to help students improve their writing. In this panel, instructors share their experiences in using “writing to learn” strategies to help students master course content, and discuss what kinds of pedagogical training and professional development might be helpful to instructors about to undertake a Writing Intensive course.
10:40-11:40 Panel II
Learning From Our Students

Patricia Bender, Director, Writing Center (Moderator)

Deborah Lilton, Writing Center Tutor

Charles Oh, Rutgers Business School Student

James Schlegel, Chemistry Professor

Priya Singh, FASN Student

A look at the WAC Program from the other side of the desk, as a panel of students and tutors share their experiences. What do students need from their instructors, tutors, librarians, and administrators? What would help students better understand the goals of the WAC requirement and Writing Intensive courses, and engage their active participation in the process of improving their writing?

11:50-12:50 Panel III
Toward Excellence in Student Writing: Research and the Advanced Writing Intensive Course

Jonathan Hall, Coordinator, WAC (Moderator), “Including the Process of Knowledge: Strategies for the Advanced Writing Intensive Course”

Roberta Tipton, Dana Library, “Opportunities for Advanced Research at Rutgers-Newark”

James Goodman, History. “Reading and Writing in the Discipline: The Advanced Student and the Senior Seminar”

John Gunkel, Director, Honors College, “Toward Excellence in Student Writing: The Capstone Research Experience”

Discussions about student writing tend to focus on the lower levels, and we too often end up settling for mere competence rather than insisting on excellence. In this panel, we will address the other end of the spectrum: how can we challenge our best students to stretch themselves intellectually as well as rhetorically in “capstone” writing intensive courses such as Senior Projects, Senior Seminars, and lists will discuss how to encourage advanced students to apply the specialized knowledge and writing skills that they have developed over their college career to the task of integrating research into their projects.

12:50-1:30 Lunch
Afternoon Session

1:30-2:00 Coordinator’s Report: The Next Phase

Jonathan Hall

Fundamental principles of the proposed next phase of WAC at Rutgers-Newark: a unified writing curriculum and an active culture of writing instruction and practice.

Also: Discussion of faculty surveys. (Thanks to Diana El-Neemany for compiling the results.)

WAC Program Planning Discussions

2:00-2:25 Proposals for a Unified Writing Curriculum

Facilitators: Mill Jonakait, Mal Kiniry

How does our WAC program integrate with the teaching of writing at other levels: the freshman composition sequence, the developmental writing sequence, ESL initiatives, graduate-level writing? Do we need to revisit our criteria for Writing Intensive courses—for example, to make them more specific—or are people happy with them as they are? How do we define the goals of our Writing Intensive courses in terms of student skills for reading, writing, research, and critical thinking? Can we distinguish between introductory and advanced Writing Intensive courses? Do we need to require more than two Writing Intensive courses?

2:25-2:50 Support for Student Learning

Facilitators: Patricia Bender, Paul Sternberger, Roberta Tipton

What do students need to be successful in Writing Intensive courses, beyond what can be provided by individual faculty members? What kind of support can we provide, as an academic community, and how can we best structure its delivery? Topics might include: varieties of tutoring (including traditional drop-in tutoring, curriculum-based peer tutoring attached to particular courses, e-tutoring, etc.), access to online writing resources; library training in research skills.
3:00-3:25 Faculty Orientation, Training, and Professional Development

Facilitators: Lillian Robbins, Lisa Hull, James Schlegel

What kinds of support would help faculty in Writing Intensive courses both cope with the workload, and improve writing instruction? Topics include: Training and Orientation Workshops for Faculty, Seminars on Issues in Writing Instruction, Mentoring via the WAC Fellows Program, Establishment of an Online Assignment and Syllabus Bank, Discussion Board, WAC Website development.

3:25-3:50 Administrative and Resource Issues

Facilitators: Jo Grieder, Charles Russell

Is there a clear definition of the administrative role of the WAC Committee and other participants? Have reasonable standards for teaching load and class size been set and applied, and what kinds of resource issues do these raise, both overall and for particular departments? How can we structure the Writing Intensive Course Planning and Designation Process so that it will function efficiently and result in constructive dialogue between the WAC Program and the proposing department? What ongoing assessment procedures need to be incorporated into the WAC Program in the future?

3:50-4:00 Closing Remarks

This colloquium has been supported by a “Grant to Enhance the Undergraduate Curriculum and Teaching” from the Rutgers Office of the Vice President for Undergraduate Education, and by the office of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

Thanks to the WAC Fellows for all the hard work they have done in Writing Intensive courses in the past, and for their continued contributions, today and in the future.

Writing Across the Curriculum Advisory Committee:
Patricia Bender, Director of the Writing Center
Jo Grieder, Classical and Modern Languages
Lisa Hull, Political Science
Mill Jonakait, Biological Sciences
Mal Kiniry, Director of the Writing Program
Lillian Robbins, Psychology
Charles Russell, English
Alex Sannella, Accounting & Information Systems
Jim Schlegel, Chemistry
Paul Sternberger, Visual and Performing Arts
XII.C Results of Faculty Survey

Thank you for participating in this Faculty Survey about your experience teaching Writing Intensive courses at Rutgers-Newark. Your feedback and suggestions are crucial to the future development of the Writing Across the Curriculum Program.

Here are the results.

PART I. YOUR BACKGROUND IN THE WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM PROGRAM

1. Your academic rank (at time of most recent Writing Intensive course taught)
   - 35% Professor
   - 29% Associate Professor
   - 0% Assistant Professor
   - 21% Assistant Instructor
   - 0% Part-Time Lecturer/Other Adjunct Faculty
   - 0% Teaching Assistant

2. How many SECTIONS of Writing Intensive courses have you taught since Fall 2001? (Include any sections that you know you will be teaching in Fall 2004.)
   - 14% 6 or more
   - 7% 5
   - 14% 4
   - 7% 3
   - 7% 2
   - 36% 1

3. How many major writing assignments (for grade) do you usually assign in your Writing Intensive course?
   - 28% 6 or more
   - 14% 5
   - 7% 4
   - 28% 3
   - 7% 2
   - 0% 1

4. How many pages of writing do you usually assign in your Writing Intensive course?
   - 0% More than 40
   - 28% 30-40
   - 36% 20-30
   - 14% 10-20
   - 7% Less than 10

5. How did you get involved in teaching Writing Intensive courses? If you formerly taught Writing Intensive courses but do not currently, please indicate why not.

   1. As a professor of journalism and media studies, I believe that all my courses should be emphasize writing.

   2. I am teaching regular composition instead, due to scheduling conflicts.
3. It was a natural evolution from teaching both in the Writing Program and literature courses.

4. I wanted to offer another alternative to students majoring, minoring or taking courses in Spanish to improve their writing and analytical skills. This semester I chose the course on “Slavery, Race and the Black Experience in Latin American Literature” and I do think we all are enjoying the class.

5. Format of course just happened to satisfy writing intensive requirements

6. I was assigned the course by our department chair.

7. The department needed to designate some courses as Writing Intensive, and I told them that the required criminal justice course titled Ethical Foundations of Criminal Justice would be most appropriate for a writing intensive course.

PART II. TEACHER OPINION OF STUDENT WRITING SKILLS

6. Build a paper around a main idea or thesis.
   - 0% I’m VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
   - 50% I’m SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
   - 28% I’m SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
   - 7% I’m VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
   - 0% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

7. Use paragraphs appropriately.
   - 7% I’m VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
   - 35% I’m SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
   - 43% I’m SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
   - 0% I’m VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
   - 0% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

8. Develop an argument.
   - 0% I’m VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
   - 50% I’m SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
   - 7% I’m SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
   - 21% I’m VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
   - 7% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

9. Critically analyze complex texts.
   - 0% I’m VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
   - 36% I’m SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
   - 29% I’m SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
   - 28% I’m VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
   - 7% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

10. Incorporate material from sources smoothly into the flow of the student’s own writing.
    - 0% I’m VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
    - 43% I’m SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
    - 21% I’m SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
    - 14% I’m VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
    - 0% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course
11. Synthesize information from multiple sources.
0% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
43% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
21% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
28% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
7% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

12. Separate fact from interpretation and/or opinion.
0% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
43% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
14% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
7% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
14% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

13. Paraphrase appropriately.
0% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
21% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
28% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
21% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
7% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

0% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
50% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
21% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
14% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
0% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

15. Quote appropriately.
14% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
29% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
21% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
14% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
0% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

16. Comment on quotations and other supporting evidence to show what point they're supporting.
0% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
35% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
21% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
21% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
7% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

17. Use correct grammar and syntax.
0% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
29% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
35% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
21% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
0% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course
18. Employ correct mechanics (spelling, punctuation, etc.)
0% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
50% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
14% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
21% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
0% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

19. Use transitions to tie successive points together.
0% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
43% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
28% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
14% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
0% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

20. Give cues to readers to help them follow the development of the essay.
0% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
36% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
28% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
14% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
0% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

21. Improve essay through revision after feedback.
21% I'm VERY SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
43% I'm SOMEWHAT SATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
21% I'm SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area.
0% I'm VERY DISSATISFIED with my students' skills in this area
0% Not applicable to the assignments I give in my course

PART III. YOUR EXPERIENCE IN THE WRITING INTENSIVE CLASSROOM

22. In my department, students are assigned a considerable amount of writing in almost every course, whether “Writing Intensive” or not.
21% Agree strongly
28% Agree somewhat
14% Not sure or no opinion
14% Disagree somewhat
0% Disagree strongly

23. In my department, students produce little or no writing in non “Writing Intensive” courses.
0% Agree strongly
14% Agree somewhat
14% Not sure or no opinion
21% Disagree somewhat
36% Disagree strongly

24. Strategies for improving student writing are a frequent topic of discussion among faculty in my department.
28% Agree strongly
21% Agree somewhat
0% Not sure or no opinion
14% Disagree somewhat
21% Disagree strongly
25. The general level of student writing has declined in the time I’ve been teaching here.
   14% Agree strongly
   21% Agree somewhat
   21% Not sure or no opinion
   21% Disagree somewhat
   7% Disagree strongly

26. I am worried that a significant number of upper-level students lack even the basic writing
    skills.
   52% Agree strongly
   28% Agree somewhat
   0% Not sure or no opinion
   21% Disagree somewhat
   0% Disagree strongly

27. I am confident that graduating majors in my department have an adequate grounding in
    reading and writing the kinds of documents customarily produced and used by
    professionals in my field.
   14% Agree strongly
   43% Agree somewhat
   14% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   7% Disagree strongly

28. Entering transfer students are significantly less prepared in terms of writing skills that
    “homegrown” students who have taken Rutgers-Newark freshman composition.
   28% Agree strongly
   7% Agree somewhat
   43% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   0% Disagree strongly

29. Ideally, almost every course should have a significant writing component.
   57% Agree strongly
   7% Agree somewhat
   0% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   14% Disagree strongly

30. Students coming to my Writing Intensive course generally have a solid foundation in the
    basics of the academic writing process from their freshman composition sequence.
   0% Agree strongly
   57% Agree somewhat
   7% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   21% Disagree strongly
31. In general, my students come into my Writing Intensive course with an appropriate understanding of the WAC requirement and the goals that are behind it.
   - 7 % Agree strongly
   - 7 % Agree somewhat
   - 43 % Not sure or no opinion
   - 7 % Disagree somewhat
   - 14 % Disagree strongly

32. I have not had more than 25 students enrolled in any of my Writing Intensive courses.
   - 50 % Agree strongly
   - 7 % Agree somewhat
   - 0 % Not sure or no opinion
   - 14 % Disagree somewhat
   - 21 % Disagree strongly

33. My Writing Intensive courses have taken much more time and effort on my part than my other courses.
   - 28 % Agree strongly
   - 43 % Agree somewhat
   - 7 % Not sure or no opinion
   - 7 % Disagree somewhat
   - 0 % Disagree strongly

34. I usually have an individual conference with my student in my Writing Intensive course at least once a semester.
   - 7 % Agree strongly
   - 35 % Agree somewhat
   - 7 % Not sure or no opinion
   - 14 % Disagree somewhat
   - 22 % Disagree strongly

35. I have found grading student papers in Writing Intensive courses to be a useful tool for communicating with students about their writing problems.
   - 28 % Agree strongly
   - 29 % Agree somewhat
   - 0 % Not sure or no opinion
   - 14 % Disagree somewhat
   - 7 % Disagree strongly

36. I wish I had more feedback on my syllabus and approach to Writing Intensive goals from the WAC Committee.
   - 14 % Agree strongly
   - 7 % Agree somewhat
   - 14 % Not sure or no opinion
   - 36 % Disagree somewhat
   - 21 % Disagree strongly
37. I know whom to contact for answers to my questions about WAC standard and procedures.
   35% Agree strongly
   21% Agree somewhat
   14% Not sure or no opinion
   0% Disagree somewhat
   14% Disagree strongly

38. I am familiar with the standards for Writing Intensive courses and feel that they give me a good sense of the program goals and sufficient guidance for how to approach them.
   28% Agree strongly
   43% Agree somewhat
   7% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   0% Disagree strongly

39. I wish that the standards for Writing Intensive courses gave more specific guidance about page count, number of assignments, etc.
   7% Agree strongly
   7% Agree somewhat
   28% Not sure or no opinion
   36% Disagree somewhat
   7% Disagree strongly

PART IV. SUPPORT FOR STUDENT LEARNING

40. I wish that I had more tutoring support for students who need additional help with basic writing issues.
   57% Agree strongly
   29% Agree somewhat
   7% Not sure or no opinion
   0% Disagree somewhat
   7% Disagree strongly

41. I would welcome a “curriculum-based peer tutor” who would attend my course, meet with me regularly, and provide feedback to students as they work on their assignments.
   14% Agree strongly
   43% Agree somewhat
   21% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   14% Disagree strongly

42. I know where to direct students for web-based instruction in writing, grammar, documentation, etc.
   14% Agree strongly
   14% Agree somewhat
   7% Not sure or no opinion
   28% Disagree somewhat
   21% Disagree strongly
43. It would be useful to adopt a standard campus-wide handbook (such as Longman’s or St. Martin's Handbook), j with supporting websites and exercise, for students in all writing courses, from developmental writing through WAC.

50% Agree strongly
14% Agree somewhat
21% Not sure or no opinion
0 % Disagree somewhat
7 % Disagree strongly

44. Rutgers-Newark should develop an in-house handbook for students taking Writing Intensive courses.

21% Agree strongly
29% Agree somewhat
36% Not sure or no opinion
0 % Disagree somewhat
7 % Disagree strongly

45. Plagiarism is a major concern in my courses.

28% Agree strongly
43% Agree somewhat
0 % Not sure or no opinion
7 % Disagree somewhat
7 % Disagree strongly

46. Plagiarism is an issue best left to the individual instructor and student.

7 % Agree strongly
43% Agree somewhat
7 % Not sure or no opinion
14% Disagree somewhat
14% Disagree strongly

47. I usually submit cases of blatant plagiarism to the campus judicial system for further action.

14% Agree strongly
7 % Agree somewhat
14% Not sure or no opinion
28% Disagree somewhat
22% Disagree strongly

48. The WAC Program should make the development of a campus-wide antiplagiarism initiative a high priority.

43% Agree strongly
14% Agree somewhat
21% Not sure or no opinion
7 % Disagree somewhat
0 % Disagree strongly

49. Anti-plagiarism detection software should be a component of any campus-wide anti-plagiarism program.

43% Agree strongly
7 % Agree somewhat
29% Not sure or no opinion
7 % Disagree somewhat
0 % Disagree strongly
50. If Rutgers-Newark should subscribe to anti-plagiarism software, I would require all written work to be submitted in electronic-form and routinely have it submitted for checking.
   14% Agree strongly
   7 % Agree somewhat
   28% Not sure or no opinion
   14% Disagree somewhat
   14% Disagree strongly

51. I feel that I have a fairly up-to-date sense of which techniques for teaching writing have been shown to be most effective through research.
   21% Agree strongly
   14% Agree somewhat
   7 % Not sure or no opinion
   14% Disagree somewhat
   7 % Disagree strongly

52. I have a fairly clear idea of the current state of research on teaching writing in my specific discipline.
   21% Agree strongly
   21% Agree somewhat
   21% Not sure or no opinion
   22% Disagree somewhat
   0 % Disagree strongly

53. Rutgers-Newark should develop an in-house handbook for faculty teaching Writing Intensive courses, describing procedures and standard, offering hints about techniques and course structure, etc.
   50% Agree strongly
   28% Agree somewhat
   7 % Not sure or no opinion
   7 % Disagree somewhat
   7 % Disagree strongly

54. I feel that I spend more time than is appropriate on grading papers, and would welcome suggestions on how to do it more efficiently.
   14% Agree strongly
   28% Agree somewhat
   7 % Not sure or no opinion
   21% Disagree somewhat
   14% Disagree strongly

55. I would regularly read a WAC newsletter that would address specific teaching issues.
   14% Agree strongly
   28% Agree somewhat
   14% Not sure or no opinion
   7 % Disagree somewhat
   28% Disagree strongly
56. I would subscribe to a WAC Listerv and/or visit a WAC Discussion Board for faculty.
   21% Agree strongly
   14% Agree somewhat
   14% Not sure or no opinion
   14% Disagree somewhat
   29% Disagree strongly

57. I would contribute to an online “Syllabus Back” and/or “Assignments Bank,” accessible only to faculty, so that instructors of Writing Intensive courses can compare their approaches and get new ideas on alternate approaches to the teaching of writing.
   28% Agree strongly
   7% Agree somewhat
   28% Not sure or no opinion
   14% Disagree somewhat
   14% Disagree strongly

58. I wish that there had been more opportunities for in-service training on the teaching of writing before I undertook my first Writing Intensive courses.
   14% Agree strongly
   28% Agree somewhat
   21% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   28% Disagree strongly

59. I would attend intensive workshop on the teaching of writing.
   21% Agree strongly
   35% Agree somewhat
   7% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   29% Disagree strongly

60. I would attend a series of lunch-time lectures/discussions on the teaching of writing.
   21% Agree strongly
   43% Agree somewhat
   0% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   21% Disagree strongly

61. I would attend a “journal club” discussion with other faculty about a current research article on the subject of WAC and the teaching of writing in general.
   14% Agree strongly
   21% Agree somewhat
   21% Not sure or no opinion
   14% Disagree somewhat
   21% Disagree strongly

62. I would welcome an opportunity to consult with a “WAC Fellow” with expertise in the teaching of writing in my field.
   21% Agree strongly
   21% Agree somewhat
   21% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   21% Disagree strongly
63. I would attend a yearly one-day conference/retreat on the state of WAC at Rutgers-Newark.
   28% Agree strongly
   14% Agree somewhat
   28% Not sure or no opinion
   0% Disagree somewhat
   21% Disagree strongly

64. I feel that the work I have undertaken in my Writing Intensive courses has been recognized and appreciated within my own department.
   21% Agree strongly
   21% Agree somewhat
   36% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   0% Disagree strongly

65. I want to actively participate in the development of the WAC website providing resources for faculty and students.
   7% Agree strongly
   14% Agree somewhat
   21% Not sure or no opinion
   7% Disagree somewhat
   36% Disagree strongly

PART VI. WHAT KINDS OF WRITING DO YOU ASSIGN IN YOUR WRITING INTENSIVE COURSES?

66. Academic essay based on an assigned text.
   36% One of my mainstays
   21% Use fairly frequently
   7% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   14% Never use

67. Academic essays using library research.
   43% One of my mainstays
   14% Use fairly frequently
   28% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   0% Never use

68. Documents like those written on the job
   7% One of my mainstays
   0% Use fairly frequently
   28% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   50% Never use
69. E-mails, web board postings, etc.  
14% One of my mainstays  
7% Use fairly frequently  
7% Use occasionally  
7% Used in the past, but discontinued  
50% Never use

70. “Free-writing” or “brainstorming” exercise  
0% One of my mainstays  
7% Use fairly frequently  
35% Use occasionally  
0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
43% Never use

71. Graded in-class essay exam questions  
14% One of my mainstays  
7% Use fairly frequently  
28% Use occasionally  
0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
36% Never use

72. Informal in-class writing  
0% One of my mainstays  
0% Use fairly frequently  
58% Use occasionally  
0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
21% Never use

73. Journals  
7% One of my mainstays  
0% Use fairly frequently  
14% Use occasionally  
7% Used in the past, but discontinued  
58% Never use

74. Lab reports  
7% One of my mainstays  
0% Use fairly frequently  
0% Use occasionally  
0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
78% Never use

75. Personal Essay  
7% One of my mainstays  
7% Use fairly frequently  
21% Use occasionally  
0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
50% Never use
76. Personal Responses to Assigned Readings  
- 29% One of my mainstays  
- 28% Use fairly frequently  
- 0% Use occasionally  
- 7% Used in the past, but discontinued  
- 21% Never use  

77. Reviews of the Professional Literature  
- 7% One of my mainstays  
- 14% Use fairly frequently  
- 29% Use occasionally  
- 0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
- 35% Never use  

78. Study Question Responses  
- 14% One of my mainstays  
- 7% Use fairly frequently  
- 7% Use occasionally  
- 0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
- 57% Never use  

79. Summaries of Assigned Readings  
- 14% One of my mainstays  
- 7% Use fairly frequently  
- 28% Use occasionally  
- 0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
- 35% Never use  

80. Ungraded “writing to learn” exercises to help students master course content  
- 7% One of my mainstays  
- 14% Use fairly frequently  
- 21% Use occasionally  
- 0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
- 36% Never use  

81. Web Pages  
- 0% One of my mainstays  
- 14% Use fairly frequently  
- 14% Use occasionally  
- 0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
- 50% Never use  

82. Writing directed toward a non-academic audience  
- 7% One of my mainstays  
- 0% Use fairly frequently  
- 21% Use occasionally  
- 0% Used in the past, but discontinued  
- 58% Never use  

---  

**PART VII. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING TECHNIQUE FOR TEACHING WRITING DO YOU APPLY IN YOUR WRITING INTENSIVE COURSES?**
83. Spend class time discussing the writing process (pre-writing, drafting, revision)
   14% One of my mainstays
   28% Use fairly frequently
   43% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   7% Never use

84. Spend time in class discussing documentation (MLA, APA style, etc.)
   14% One of my mainstays
   28% Use fairly frequently
   36% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   14% Never use

85. Spend time in class discussing basic writing skills (grammar, etc.)
   7% One of my mainstays
   43% Use fairly frequently
   21% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   21% Never use

86. Spend time in class discussing plagiarism and ways to do avoid it
   7% One of my mainstays
   36% Use fairly frequently
   36% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   7% Never use

87. Spend time in class discussing how to address a reading audience
   7% One of my mainstays
   43% Use fairly frequently
   7% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   29% Never use

88. Spend time in class discussing how to build an argument in relation to a source
   21% One of my mainstays
   50% Use fairly frequently
   14% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   7% Never use

89. Require multiple drafts of major writing assignments
   43% One of my mainstays
   35% Use fairly frequently
   7% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   0% Never use

90. Inspect student outlines and other materials from early in the writing process
   14% One of my mainstays
   28% Use fairly frequently
   21% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   22% Never use
91. Inspect student research notes, lists and other materials early in the research process
   21% One of my mainstays
   7% Use fairly frequently
   21% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   36% Never use

92. Conferences with Individual Students on papers in progress
   28% One of my mainstays
   7% Use fairly frequently
   29% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   21% Never use

93. In-class Discussion/Workshop of Specimen Paper
   7% One of my mainstays
   14% Use fairly frequently
   21% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   43% Never use

94. Handouts/Checklists/Examples
   14% One of my mainstays
   28% Use fairly frequently
   21% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   21% Never use

95. Peer Critiques of Student Drafts by Other Students
   7% One of my mainstays
   7% Use fairly frequently
   28% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   43% Never use

96. Pre-approval of Student Writing topics
   21% One of my mainstays
   28% Use fairly frequently
   21% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   14% Never use

97. Written or Oral Instructor Comments on Early Drafts
   36% One of my mainstays
   21% Use fairly frequently
   21% Use occasionally
   0% Used in the past, but discontinued
   7% Never use
98. Recommend tutoring
7% One of my mainstays
35% Use fairly frequently
14% Use occasionally
0% Used in the past, but discontinued
29% Never use

99. Direct students to handbooks or websites
14% One of my mainstays
28% Use fairly frequently
21% Use occasionally
0% Used in the past, but discontinued
22% Never use

100. Ongoing student workgroups to share and critique drafts
7% One of my mainstays
7% Use fairly frequently
14% Use occasionally
0% Used in the past, but discontinued
53% Never use

101. Feel free to elaborate on any of your multiple choice answers.
1. Student writing improves when it is targeted directly.

2. All these are stimulating ideas I would like to use more in future!

3. Our students, even in my department, do not get enough practice in writing. I'm not interested in workshops or seminars in pedagogy. I know how to teach writing to students who have basic competence. They should acquire this basic competence in English comp. Those students who have not achieved basic competency must have tutoring services available to them. You don't need to reinvent the wheel by creating your own grammar and style guide; just use Jack Lynch's. I don't think we really need a writing-across-the-curriculum "program" or a newsletter any more than we need a breathing program or newsletter: Writing should be an integral part of every student's college education, but since it isn't, the writing-across-the-curriculum requirement is the least we can do.

4. I don't feel a need to summarize what I've already said. But, I want to say that the tutoring program as it now stands is not much of a help. I have had too many cases where my students have gotten FACULTY INSTRUCTION from STUDENT TUTORS who have not been properly and rigorously trained in grammar, syntax, mechanics and who have weaknesses in these areas themselves. TUTORS NEED TRAINING. There MUST be FACULTY TUTORS who are PAID for their work with either release time or cash. (refer to written version)

5. I taught the writing course last year and this year. Last year the students' writing skills were very poor. This year the students' writing skills are good. The class is much larger in size than last year and my answers to this survey reflect this years class.

6. I primarily have students write summaries and include major issues raised by readings and three graded papers that can be rewritten after feedback by me on writing and content. For students with constant recurring problems, grammar, tenses, logical development of content, I send them to the writing center for tutoring. I have up to 30 students in a section and teach two writing intensive sections a semester with no assistance.
PART VIII. CRITERIA FOR WRITING INTENSIVE COURSES

The following criteria (102-105) for Writing Intensive courses are from the original proposal authorizing the Writing Across the Curriculum requirements for graduation. Please indicate your understanding of each criterion, as it applies to your academic discipline, and give examples of how you address it in the structure of your Writing Intensive course.

102. They call for substantial writing.

1. Six or more writing assignment, from short review essays to a research essay to a final essay.
2. 20-30 pages
3. Too vague
4. I assign 6 papers for the class, besides quizzes and oral presentations. The first version of the paper is not graded but revised, commented and discussed. Only final versions are graded. Because the course in Spanish, especial attention is given to grammar and the use of appropriate college level discourse in the writing.
5. Sometimes I specify a goal of 20 pages. Sometimes I give so many assignments that they don't do less, but more.
6. One of my mainstays.
7. 2 field/lab reports
8. I really do not know how to answer the rest of the questions. I am not particularly a supporter of writing across the curriculum. This course is both a seminar course and a writing course and I try to teach the students both oral and written communication in the field of chemistry.
9. There is a written assignment each week for homework, responding to a study question in the text or assignments I have created based on ideas from the text. For one of those assignments, students grade each others' papers and give feedback, and then the papers are revised. These are short papers, about 1-2 pages each. There is one in-class essay in which students respond to a film, applying what they observed in the film to a question about how a particular philosophical school would critique the situations observed in the film. There is a final exam with an essay portion. Finally, there is a research paper done in collaboration with other students, addressing a particular ethical problem and critiquing it from the perspectives of the various philosophical schools.
10. 3 small assignments, one larger with initial draft -> comment -> longer version
11. Students complain about the amount of writing. Two papers 7 to 8 pages and on of 8-10 pages and summaries of all readings, approximately two or three every two weeks.

103. They offer multiple writing assignments.
1. Students are required to write in different ways, from short reactions to reviews to research papers to works of journalism.

2. 12 1-page study question responses; 2 major papers; in-class essay final; occasional in-class ungraded writing

3. Yup!

4. The course is a literature one, thus, must writings are based on the readings done, for example, in the construction of the Romantic mulatto hero in the first Spanish-American novel on slavery, Sab (1837) or race relations in Cuba during the 19th century as evidenced in the novel Cecilia Valdes. I assigned topics that I know it would be hard to find through the Internet. They must show that first, they have read the texts; secondly, that they understood it and have a clear idea of what is requested of them; third, that they can develop the topic in a coherence form, etc.

5. I always offer between four and six writing assignments with the promise to drop the lowest grade. Sometimes a single assignment may contain several subjects; the student may choose to write on one or two or more.

6. One of my mainstays.

7. 2 field/lab reports

8. see answer to A) above.

9. (above)

10. See above.

104. They expect revision of work.

1. Varies with the course. In some courses, students revise many essays. In others, they revise only those that they want to improve substantially for a higher grade. In other courses, typically smaller ones, write at length and then revise.

2. Instructor approves topics ahead of time; students work in peer groups to share drafts.

3. Yup!

4. Yes, every paper is returned with comments about style, grammar and content.

5. Students always have an opportunity to revise (once) a paper, based on the comments and questions I have indicated.

6. One of my mainstays.

7. sections are handed in and returned for revision

8. Two short papers include revision requirements.

9. (above)

10. I always have students revise work with my feedback when appropriate before grading.

105. They provide students with learning opportunities through critical feedback.

1. Always, in both comments on papers and discussions with the entire class.

2. Extensive comments on papers, and 2 "mini-conferences" for topic approval.

3. critical feedback is crucial! conferences

4. Must students come back to discuss with me the comments, to request help and also, students are beginning to talk about themselves about their writing problems.
5. My comments and questions are the feedback.

6. One of my mainstays.

7. Students learn how to organize a report, present and analyze data collected during field exercises.

8. After grading the papers for any particular assignment, I prepare a rough description of how most people answered and how the answers fit into the readings. I sometimes quote from exemplary papers. I write extensive notes and suggestions on the homework papers.

9. (above)

10. See above, always give critical feedback for good and mistakes.

106. To what extent are you satisfied that these criteria provide appropriate guidance for instructors of Writing Intensive courses (not too restrictive or too vague, etc.)? What changes, if any, would you like to see?

1. Criteria are good. Occasional opportunities to meet with colleagues and writing professionals on how to teach our students to be better writers would be valuable.

2. They include substantial writing instruction.

3. I wish I could have attended a meeting prior to the teaching of the course to make sure that my syllabus adhered 100% to the objectives of the course or I would have benefited from other peers' experiences in handling the writings assignments.

4. I think they are fine, but those in disciplines which do not use writing as a customary means of evaluation - e.g. science and math - probably find them vague.

5. Pretty much satisfied.

6. ok

7. I find them sufficient and follow them constantly. I find the summaries of readings to be very helpful.

8. I think they gave me a general idea of what to do. Thanks.

107. The following are goals often associated with Writing Across the Curriculum Programs. In your Writing Intensive classroom, which of the following do you consider the three most important reasons for assigning writing. (rank from 1-3 with 1 as most important)

To improve basic student writing skills. 7% =1
To improve student writing process. 7% =1
To help students master course content. 7% =2
To initiate students into the ways of thinking and writing in a specific discipline. 7% =2
To help students communicate with instructor and peers. 7% =1, 7% =2
To develop skills in reasoning and argument. 57% =1, 14% =2
To prepare students for writing on the job after graduation. 7% =1, 57% = 2, 7% = 3
To develop critical skills in reading complex texts. 7% =1, 7% =2, 50% =3

108. Please add any additional comments on how you conceive the goals of Writing Across the Curriculum in general and your course in particular.

1. WAC can improve undergraduate teaching in general.

2. 7 out of 8 above are all important (refer to written test)

3. This course was one semester of a year senior seminar course. When the department was told to identify a course to meet the WAC requirement, this course was chosen. I still view this course as one to help students feel comfortable giving a talk in front of an audience and to search the scientific literature, email me a summary of at least eight journal articles (some can be a web page), and ultimately prepare a poster for a poster presentation at the end of the semester.
4. The goals of the WAC should be to teach a common ability of analytical writing about texts with emphasis in particular vocabularies at commenting for specific disciplines. (Refer to written version)

5. I think that has been covered above.

PART IX. GOALS FOR WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

109. Overall, how would you describe your experience as instructor of a Writing Intensive course? What did you find most rewarding? What did you find most frustrating? What can the WAC Program do to help?

1. I do see improvement in student writing over the course of a semester. But because the level of preparation varies widely in a large class, it can be difficult to teach at a level that helps everyone, and it can be hard to work effectively with every student. Occasional meetings for constructive sharing of ideas among colleagues would help. Stronger preparation in the English Composition 101 and 102 sequence would help, also. Too often, we are trying to teach skills and habits of mind that students should have gained years ago.


3. (refer to written test)

4. I loved it, but wish I could have done more for some students.

5. I like the Writing Intensive courses because I feel basically that all courses should be writing intensive. Watching the students improve - watching the students watch themselves improve - incredibly satisfying. And they do visibly improve.

6. We knew to keep our classes small or better yet even smaller; we simply can't teach writing with big classes. Do we have a writing center staffed with tutors who are available to work with WAC students who need remedial or elementary writing instruction? I had thought we did, but a colleague informed me that our writing center is open only to students currently enrolled in composition classes. If so, that's nuts. In every class I've taught I've taught writing, and in every class I taught there are at least a few students who are in need of remedial tutoring. I can teach students who already know the basics how to write better, in some cases much better. But I am not trained to teach writing from scratch, and I honestly do not know how. I suspect that I am not alone.

7. My head hurts after reading assignments, Students in my course are seniors, why aren't they learning how to write when they are freshman and sophomores?

8. I like teaching writing. The most rewarding part of it is to connect with individual students, which is more likely when you are constantly reading their ideas. The least rewarding is the grind of reading every essay on several levels, i.e. for content as well as grammar. I have 35 students. It's a bit much, but I am very lucky to have a comparatively light course load, so I gladly do it.

9. It really killed the enrollment in that class. Students who do not need the W will not take it.

10. I enjoy it and think it is very useful both for learning and for future functions as educated people for the students. I also find that students writing has improved over the past several years. It is a lot of work, however.
According to the 1988 Inter-Campus Articulation agreement, each campus will annually submit to the System-wide Standing Committee on Written Communication a description of how its Writing-Intensive (WI) program addresses the concerns listed below. Campus WI Program Directors may provide supporting or qualifying details in the blank spaces provided or may append additional materials as needed.

Upon receipt of each description, the Committee will review, advise, and recommend action on inter-campus articulation of the campus's WI courses.

Campus: Date:

Writing-Intensive Program Director:

Report submitted by: Title:

Description of Writing-Intensive Program

I. PROGRAM SUPPORT

Personnel

Yes No

1. Is the program directed by a person who has been appropriately appointed and given appropriate released time to supervise the program? (Note: For the last few years, the Committee has interpreted "appropriate released time" as "support that is appropriate for the program's current size and state of development" TH)
2. Who assists the director in supervising the program?

Faculty Board
Secretary/Student Assistant
Other ___________________________
Other ___________________________


3. Do the director and board members have adequate professional/secretarial/clerical assistance to support their work and maintain records necessary for articulation of WI courses? ___

4. Does a network of support exist for instructors of WI courses? _ _ _
Overall Teaching Load and Class Size

Yes  No

5. Are classes designated as WI limited to 20 students so that effective interaction between instructor and student can occur? ___

6. Are teaching loads of instructors such that courses can be planned for and carried out in a way that is true to the spirit of the WI guidelines and that does not add unreasonably to the overall workload of the instructor? ___

7. Is the teaching of WI courses appropriately rewarded in review processes, including tenure and promotion? ___

Student Needs

8. Are enough WI courses offered so students can meet graduation or degree requirements? ___
9. Are WI courses clearly designated in class schedules? ___

10. Are students advised about the availability of and purpose for WI courses through regular campus publications? ___

11. Can students who need help on writing problems get help, either from instructors or from staff in a writing workshop or laboratory? ___

12. Are WI designations recorded and explained on student transcripts? ___
Budget

13. Have adequate funds been provided to support the program? __ __ __

II. COURSE DESIGNATION PROCESS

1. Is the WI designation process reasonable, explained to faculty, and followed regularly by program administrators? __ __ __

2. Does the designation process include the following:

   a) Publicizing the hallmarks of writing-intensive courses

   __  __

   b) Soliciting proposals from individual faculty members

   __  __

   c) Reviewing proposals

   __  __
d) Approving the designation of courses as writing-intensive


e) Notifying appropriate personnel of such designations


3. Does the program offer an option for WI designations that extend beyond a single semester? If yes, please add a brief description of the option. [added spring 1998]
III. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

1. Is there a program of evaluation that assesses WI courses to see if they are doing what they are supposed to do help students improve their writing?

2. Do program supervisors monitor the progress of students as they move through WI courses?

IV. FACULTY TRAINING PROGRAM

1. Are training programs in WI course instruction required or provided for faculty who want to participate in them?
2. Are orientation sessions provided at the beginning of each ___ semester for instructors new to WI course instruction? ___

3. Are resources provided for instructors who want or need help in ___ planning and teaching WI courses? ___

If you have additional information for the committee, please submit it with this form.
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