WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM AT CUNY:

A TEN-YEAR REVIEW

Office of Undergraduate Education
Nancy Aries, Interim University Dean for Undergraduate Education

June 2010

Table of Contents

Tables

Introduction

Recognizing the importance of writing to a college education, the CUNY Board of Trustees passed a Resolution on January 25, 1999 indicating that each college was to strengthen its commitment to the teaching of writing throughout its curriculum. By implication, the Board was asserting that the ability to write was important regardless of the discipline a student pursued. The Resolution also stipulated that this goal would be achieved through campus-based faculty development initiatives. It was assumed that faculty informed about writing pedagogy were more likely to change individual practices and college curriculum. The final piece of the Resolution joined the teaching of writing to the Graduate Center through the creation of Writing Fellowships. Doctoral students would staff the campus-based professional development efforts. The explanation appended to the Resolution gave the must succinct statement of purpose, "This resolution serves to ensure that writing instruction is regarded as a common responsibility and that the development of writing proficiency becomes a focus of the entire undergraduate curriculum."[1]

In the last 10 years tremendous activity has taken place on the campuses to advance writing across the curriculum, and this milestone provides an opportunity to highlight the approaches being taken on the CUNY campuses and consider the effectiveness of the programs in achieving their goals. In particular, this report will draw attention to the following issues:
- The structure of the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) programs;
- The use of doctoral students to advance writing instruction on the campuses;
- The integration of writing throughout the undergraduate curriculum; and
- The variety of evaluation and assessment strategies being used by the campuses to determine program effectiveness.

The data for this report are drawn from multiple sources. A survey was developed and administered by the Office for Undergraduate Education in winter 2009. Charles Schuster, Professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee and noted professional in this field, site-visited several of the WAC programs and wrote a report based on these visits. Last, the WAC Coordinators were contacted to provide missing data and update data that had been previously collected.

Campus Implementation Plans

Within six months of the Resolution's passage, campuses were required to submit an implementation plan to the Committee on Academic Policy, Program, and Research. The implementation plans specified goals in four specific areas: curriculum, faculty development, student leaning, and the writing fellowships. Overall, there have not been

---

[1] Board of Trustees Minutes of Proceedings, January 25, 1999, page 15. Retrieved April 20, 2010 http://policy.cuny.edu/text/toc/btm/1999/01-25/

major changes to the program goals since they were written in broad enough terms to encompass the activities that would be undertaken by the campuses to increase the breadth and depth of writing within their undergraduate programs. What have changed over the 10 years are the strategies being used to achieve these goals.

Curriculum Goals

The initial statements of curricular goals articulated two different approaches to how campus practices related to the teaching of writing would be changed. Some colleges sought to increase the commitment of individual faculty, departments and programs to the teaching of writing in their classes. It was assumed that by increasing individuals' knowledge about writing pedagogy and its effects on student learning, these instructors would be more likely to change classroom practices. In contrast, there were campuses that approached the challenge structurally. They planned to change graduation requirements and require students to complete some number of writing intensive (WI) courses in order to receive a degree.[2] The inclusion of such requirements in the curriculum would require departments and programs to offer the writing intensive courses students needed for graduation. Over time, there has been a convergence of these approaches. Campuses are undertaking both strategies in order to realize the goal of enhancing student writing.

Two campuses (Baruch College and Hostos Community College) determined that writing across the curriculum was not an adequately broad formulation to capture the intent of the resolution. Baruch folded its writing initiatives under the larger aegis of communication. Writing is just considered one method of communication with which students must be adept. In addition to writing, communication intensive classes involve speaking and computer-mediated communication. Hostos maintains that writing cannot be disaggregated from reading. Therefore, its program was renamed Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum (WRAC), and its activities consciously incorporate the two.

Faculty Goals

Faculty goals, although expressed in many ways, all stress the need to provide faculty with professional development opportunities related to the teaching of writing so more occasions for students to write will be incorporated in their classes. By changing pedagogic practices, campuses hope to achieve a long-term shift in thinking about the place of writing instruction in a liberal education. Rather than writing being considered the prerogative of English departments, it is a responsibility of all programs. The campuses have taken two different approaches to professional development. Eight colleges require faculty who teach writing intensive courses to be certified as writing intensive instructors. Where no certification is required, the WAC programs work to ensure that faculty have opportunities to learn about good writing pedagogy.

---

[2] A course that carries the WI designation must adhere to defined requirements about the form and frequency of writing to be accomplished over the course of a semester.

Student Goals

The focus on students is secondary in the development and implementation of the WAC programs. The logic model being used asserts that improved faculty practice will result in improved student outcomes. However, nine of the undergraduate campuses and the CUNY Law School use WAC-related resources to either lead workshops open to students or work directly with students. The limits of this strategy was noted by one campus that commented on the survey, "(There is a) need to strengthen our support for students who struggle with the basic protocols of academic work, (by) providing more direct instruction on the reading and writing practices that are particular to a discipline."

Writing Fellow Goals

The WAC program offers a unique opportunity to link CUNY doctoral students with this cross-cutting mandate to improve writing. Each year, six Writing Fellows are assigned to each of the undergraduate colleges; two are assigned to the On-Line Baccalaureate; and three to the CUNY Law School. The concept of the Writing Fellowship has many obvious benefits for the fellows in terms of developing their knowledge of WAC pedagogy, their expertise as classroom teachers, and their professional relations with faculty, often outside their discipline, who will soon be their colleagues. The program benefits the campuses by providing personnel to realize the campus goals to enhance writing in the undergraduate curriculum. However, the Writing Fellows often do not have expertise in WAC pedagogy and require tremendous support on the part of the campus WAC Coordinators in terms of their professional development. Only one campus, however, identified the professional development of the Writing Fellows as a program goal.

WAC Program Structure

Organizational Location

The location and reporting structure of the WAC programs provide some indication of the level of attention being paid to the program. Table 1 indicates that all WAC programs ultimately report through the Provost's office. However, a distinction can be made regarding the centrality and reach of the reporting relations. Four WAC programs report directly to the Provost and an additional 7 program reports to senior administrators in the Provost's Office (4 to an Associate Provost, and 3 to a Dean with college-wide responsibility). In each of these cases, WAC is part of these administrators' portfolio and its coordination with other campus initiatives depends on the collaborative nature of their management. Four WAC programs are embedded within other campus programs that are geared towards teaching and learning and are located within the Provost's Office. Two programs are located within the General Education initiatives. The program at Baruch is located in the Communication Institute, and the Law School's program is located in its Writing Center. Structurally the integration of WAC into other campus activities can help foster the integration of its activities with other initiatives being undertaken on a campus.

On four campuses the WAC program reports to administrators within a specific school. In two cases, the programs report to a school dean. While it is recognized that the deans

report to the Provost, this distinction is relevant because the deans do not have functional responsibility for all undergraduate education programs. This could potentially make the coordinators' task more difficult in terms of embedding writing in the curriculum of schools where they have no formal reporting relation. On two campuses (College of Staten Island, John Jay) the WAC program is located in the English department. These programs have the most limiting structural arrangement and run the risk of writing not being perceived as a college-wide responsibility.

Table 1: WAC Administrative Reporting Structure

Administrative Reporting Structure	#	College
College-wide responsibility		
Provost	4	BMCC, City, Hostos, NYCCT
Associate Provost	4	Hunter, KCC, Medgar, Queens
Dean	3	BCC, Brooklyn, LaGuardia
General Education Coordinator	2	Lehman, Online Bacc
Communication Institute	1	Baruch
Writing Center	1	Law School
School-wide responsibility		
Dean	2	QBCC, York
English Department	2	CSI, JJay
Total	*19*	

WAC Coordinators and Compensation

The assignment of responsibility for the coordination of the WAC program provides some indication of the varied level of support being given to the program. On the majority of campuses (14), the WAC program is managed by faculty coordinators. They receive between six and 20 hours of reassigned time. The majority of these campuses provide the equivalent of two or three courses of reassigned time. Coordination of the WAC program is close to a full-time position for the faculty members assigned to the program on three campuses (Hostos, LaGuardia, and Queensborough). At Queensborough the release time is split between three faculty members. The bulk of the release goes to one and the others receive release and additional compensation.

The WAC program on four campuses is coordinated by an administrator. When asked what percent of time could be attributed to WAC, the answer was typically 25%. One administrator, however, responded that it was difficult to make such an assessment as 100% of this person's job was directed towards campus-based writing or communication initiatives. Therefore 100% of effort could be attributed to the WAC program.

Very often coordination of WAC is a shared responsibility. On two campuses (Borough of Manhattan Community College, Queensborough Community College), program coordination and release time is shared by two or more faculty. On three campuses (Baruch, Brooklyn, Queensborough) coordination involves a faculty and an administrative coordinator.

Table 2: Compensation of WAC Coordinators

Compensation Structure	#	College
Faculty Position		
Reassigned Time		
6-8 hours	5	BCC, CSI, Hunter, JJay, Medgar
9-12 hours	6	BMCC, KCC, NYCCT, Online Bacc, Queens, York
20 hours of reassigned time	2	Hostos, LaGuardia
22 hours plus additional compensation	1	QBCC
Combined Faculty and Administrative Position		
3 hours of faculty reassigned time plus administrative support	2	Baruch
14 hours of faculty reassign time plus 10 hours/week of administrative support	1	Brooklyn
Non-Faculty Administrative Position	4	City, Hunter, Law School, Lehman

WAC Staffing Model

The WAC programs are primarily staffed by graduate students through a fellowship program known as the Writing Fellows program. There are 108 slots available for Writing Fellowships. Historically campuses have been assigned the same number of Fellows, six, without regard to student enrollment. The two exceptions are the Law School (3) and the On-line Baccalaureate (2). These graduate students apply and have been hired through a placement process coordinated by the Graduate Center. A long standing concern of the WAC Coordinators at the community colleges is that they are at a disadvantage when recruiting Writing Fellows because the students have not been previously assigned there as Graduate Teaching Fellows.

About half of the campuses have expanded the reach of their WAC programs with staff other than the graduate students who receive the Writing Fellowships described above. Table 3 indicates that there are two staffing models. At three campuses, there are additional graduate students or faculty fellows who extend the programmatic reach of the programs. On seven campuses, the WAC programs have several hours a week of administrative support.

Table 3: WAC Program Staffing

WAC Program Staffing	#	College
Writing Fellows Supported by Other Funds	2	Baruch, Lehman
Faculty Fellow	1	BCC
Other Staffing (Excluding WAC Coordinator)		
Number of Other Staff:		
1	4	BMCC, Brooklyn, Online Bacc, Queens
2	1	QBCC
3	1	KCC
A range: 1-5	1	Hunter
Total hours per week		
≤ 5	1	Online Bacc
6-10	2	Brooklyn, Hunter
11-15	3	BMCC, Queens, QBCC
16-20	1	KCC

Writing Fellowships: As of the writing of this report, the structure of the Writing Fellowship is being altered in three significant ways. Beginning in fall 2010, the appointment of new Writing Fellows and the appointment of all future Fellows will be limited to one year. While the writing fellowship was always a one year appointment, up to this year, Writing Fellows had the opportunity to apply for a second year of fellowship funding. Practically all chose to do so. Second, up to 2010/11 Writing Fellows were selected from Level III doctoral students (students who have advanced to candidacy) or Level II students who would be Level III by the time they began the Writing Fellowship. Commencing in academic year 2011/12, applications for Writing Fellowships will be open only to those students who received Enhanced Chancellor's Fellowships, and the Writing Fellowship will be awarded in their fifth year of study. The last change concerns compensation. Writing Fellows are currently compensated at the highest available rate for a Graduate Assistant A (GAA). As of October, 2009, that annual appointment rate was $30,951. Starting in fall 2011, the compensation for Writing Fellows will be set at the starting salary for a GAA. The starting salary was $20,801 in October 2009. This represents a significant decrease in Fellows' the level of pay.

The WAC coordinators have been generally positive about the staffing model as it was originally conceived with fellows having the option to apply for a second year of funding. First, it is a way to garner manpower through a partnership with the Graduate Center. Second, it provides collaborators for those persons charged with the task of advancing the Board mandate to strengthen writing on the campuses. Last, the coordinators mentioned the inventiveness of the Writing Fellows. Given their relative level of inexperience, they often brought new perspectives to long standing problems.

Despite positive feelings about the existing staffing model, the majority of WAC coordinators indicated that the model was problematic. Their concerns are highlighted in Table 4. Practically all of the WAC coordinators mentioned one of two inter-connected issues concerning the Writing Fellows' lack of expertise and the time limited nature of

the fellowship. If Writing Fellows are to be effective working with faculty, they must be well versed in the pedagogy of writing. Unfortunately there has been no coordination of professional development activities between the Graduate Center and the WAC programs. With no consistent professional development on WAC principles taking place earlier in the students' graduate education, this role has been assumed by the WAC coordinators. They not only sponsor 2.5 days of professional development for the Writing Fellows, but each campus Coordinator engages in professional development activities for the fellows on their campuses. The absence of coordinated professional development relates to the Coordinators' concern about the time limited nature of the fellowship. This situation will be exacerbated by the changes to the fellowship. Although the WAC programs have been built on a model of constant turnover, that turnover occurs on a two year cycle. As a result, there is a group of established fellows on each campus and a group of new fellows. Come fall 2011, all fellows will be new. As a result, coordinators will be challenged to rapidly orient the fellows to the principles and practice of WAC pedagogy and assign them to projects in which they will be immediately useful and successful.

There is a beginning dialogue between the WAC Coordinators and the Associate Provost and Fellowship Director at the Graduate Center about how to build more WAC related professional development into the years preceding the Writing Fellowship. In this way, the fellows could benefit the campuses from the start of their one-year fellowship. In preparation for the dialogue, the Coordinators developed a curriculum plan that could be offered during each year of the Enhanced Chancellor's Fellowship. (See Appendix A: Professional Development of WAC Writing Fellows and Graduate Students in the Teaching and Learning of Writing) Reorganizing the professional development for Writing Fellows is proving more difficult than had been anticipated given union rules regarding graduate fellowship working hours, funding for such a professional development program, and the non-centralized nature of professional development of graduate students.

Table 4: Challenges to Integrating Graduate Writing Fellows into College WAC/WID Programs

Challenges to Integrating Fellows into College WAC/WID Programs	#	College
Lack of expertise	10	BMCC, BCC, CSI, Hostos, KCC, Law School, Lehman, NYCCT, QBCC, York
Time limited nature of the Writing Fellowship	13	Baruch, BMCC, Brooklyn, Hostos, Hunter, JJay, KCC, Law School, Lehman, NYCCT, Medgar, Queens, York
Faculty resistance to utilizing WAC pedagogy	8	Baruch, BMCC, BCC, City, Hunter, Medgar, Queens, QBCC
Other (please specify)		
Faculty and Fellow initial awkwardness	1	QBCC
Limit on Fellow services (no teaching, no grading)	1	Hunter

WAC Programs

The campuses proudly claim that there is no single model that describes the organization of WAC programs. Each campus has developed its own approach to the goals of advancing writing across the curriculum. However, the campuses can be characterized by the primary ways that they have chosen to make these goals operational and the multiple activities that they undertake. Table 5 indicates that there are five common types of activities around which the WAC programs are organized. Most significant are strategies designed to engage faculty in utilizing WAC pedagogy. WAC programs work with individual faculty who self identify as having an interest in participating in the WAC program or teaching a writing intensive course. Such faculty partner with a Writing Fellow. Together they consider where writing fits into the course curriculum and how the learning of writing can be advanced through a variety of in-class and take-home assignments. WAC programs also operate at the departmental level in order to broaden their impact. At some campuses the Writing Fellows work with a small group of interested faculty within the department. Through meetings and one-on-one conferences, they discuss with faculty ways WAC principles can be integrated into their curriculum. Alternatively, Fellows work with faculty who teach in multi-section, high enrollment courses. In this case, the Fellows are helping faculty develop a singular approach to the teaching of writing in these courses.

In addition to working directly with faculty, the WAC programs are engaged in a variety of other program activities to advance writing at the colleges. On 14 campuses, Writing Fellows are involved with the delivery of either faculty development workshops or student writing workshops. These are typically one time events that are widely publicized on campus. On 15 campuses, Fellows are involved in campus efforts to assess the WAC programs. On 11 campuses Writing Fellows produce a newsletter or related promotional material. It is interesting to note that there is increasing interest in the web presence of WAC and the development of web-based teaching and learning tools for the WAC program. Some campuses noted that Writing Fellows began blogs about the experience, but the efforts have not been sustained. Unexpected was the fact that over half the campuses have Writing Fellows working on a one-to-one basis with students to support their writing. Often this is in the context of working with a particular faculty member on the redesign of a course.

Table 5: Activities carried out by Writing Fellows

WAC Activities	#	Campus
Faculty Driven Activities		
Work with faculty who self-identify as interested in WAC	15	Brooklyn, BCC, City, CSI, Hostos, Hunter, JJay, KCC, Law School, Lehman, Medgar, NYCCT, Queens, QBCC, York
Work with departments and faculty identified in these department interested in WAC	15	BMCC, BCC, Brooklyn, City, CSI, Hostos, Hunter, KCC, LaGuardia, Lehman, Medgar, NYCCT, Queens, QBCC, York
Work with departments and faculty teaching courses identified by the departments to integrate WAC principles	14	Baruch, BCC, Brooklyn, City, Hostos, Hunter, LaGuardia, Lehman, Medgar, NYCCT, Online Bacc, Queens, QBCC, York
Workshops		
Lead workshops open to all faculty on the teaching of writing	10	Brooklyn, City, CSI, Hostos, Lehman, NYCCT, Online Bacc, Queens, QBCC, York
Lead workshops open to students	8	Baruch, BCC, Hostos, Hunter, Law School, NYCCT, Queens, York
Participate in WAC assessment activities and other related research projects	15	Baruch, BMCC, Brooklyn, BCC, CSI, Hostos, Hunter, JJay, KCC, LaGuardia, Lehman, Medgar, Queens, QBCC, York
Produce newsletters and other promotional material (pamphlets, handbooks and print resources for instructors)	11	BMCC, BCC, Brooklyn, City, CSI, Hostos, JJay, LaGuardia, Online Bacc., Queens, York
Work one-on-one with students to improve their writing	10	BCC, Hostos, Hunter, JJay, KCC, LaGuardia, Law School, Medgar, NYCCT, Queens,
Participate in professional development organized by WAC coordinators on their behalf	13	Baruch, BCC, City, CSI, Hostos, Hunter, KCC, LaGuardia, Lehman, Medgar, Queens, QBCC, York
Other (please identify)		
Develop Web presence (On-line Learning Applications, WID website and archive)	4	City, Hostos, Hunter, Medgar
Produce student writing anthology	1	Brooklyn
Help coordinate programs (Composition and Introduction to Literature)	1	Hunter

Integration of WAC into other campus programs

The WAC programs coordinate with a number of campus centers and initiatives that are concerned with the teaching of writing. On practically every undergraduate campus, the WAC program is coordinated with the General Education and the CUE initiative. In both cases these activities involve broad inquiry into the place of writing in the curriculum. There is also a strong tendency for WAC to coordinate with the Writing Centers and the Centers for Teaching and Learning. Both are logical linkages. Writing Centers typically serve students who are responding to the assignments that result from the professional development work being carried out by the WAC program. As noted earlier, working

with students is the sole thrust of the WAC program at the Law School, which is located in the Writing Center. WAC also coordinates with Centers for Teaching and Learning on half of the campuses. In one case (City Tech), the WAC program is located within the Center, and therefore the activities are potentially well coordinated. It is interesting to note that on only three campuses WAC coordinates with the offices that are responsible for the administration and the provision of additional support to students taking the CUNY Proficiency Examination (CPE).

Table 6: WAC Involvement with Related Campus Programs and Initiatives

Related Campus Programs and Initiatives	#	Campus
General Education	16	Baruch, BMCC, BCC, Brooklyn, City, CSI, Hostos, Hunter, KCC, LaGuardia, Lehman, Medgar, Online Bacc., Queens, QBCC, York
CUE	13	Baruch, Brooklyn, City, NYCCT, Hostos, JJay, KCC, Lehman, Medgar, Online Bacc, Queens, QBCC, York
Writing Centers	13	Baruch, BCC, Brooklyn, City, Hostos, Hunter, KCC, Law School, Lehman, Medgar, Queens, QBCC, York
Centers for Teaching and Learning	9	BCC, Brooklyn, City, Hostos, JJay, KCC, NYCCT, Queens, York
ACT and/or CPE Preparation	3	BCC, Hostos, City*
Academic programs (Composition, Learning Communities, Common Reading Project, Academies, Freshman Initiative	4	Brooklyn, City, Hostos, Queens,
Other (specify)		
Disability Services	1	CSI
Assessment	1	York
Support College (Mellon-funded, Middle States, ESL) Committees	1	Hunter

* Beginning Fall '10

Formalization of WAC

Recognition of the importance of WAC can be marked by the level of formal integration of WAC principles into undergraduate programs. There are three indicators in this area: Writing Intensive course designation; graduation requirements; and faculty certification.

Writing Intensive Course Designation

One way that campuses can be credited with the incorporation of writing into their curriculum is through the designation of classes as writing intensive (WI). While there is room for debate as to whether such designation is necessary given the expectation that faculty value writing as a method for students to clarify and express their thinking on a particular issue, almost every campus has some method for designating a class as writing

intensive. (Baruch uses the designation of communication intensive and Hostos uses the designation of writing and reading intensive.) The exceptions are the College of Staten Island, which has no such designation; Medgar Evers, which has a proposal for writing intensive course designation under review; and the Online Baccalaureate, which considers every course in its curriculum to be writing intensive regardless of designation. The designation is important because courses with this label are typically capped in terms of their enrollments. The cap recognizes the labor intensive nature of teaching students to write so that faculty can be duly responsive to students' assignments.

Table 7 describes how each campus identifies a class as writing intensive, the enrollment caps for these classes, and the post-approval review to determine whether the courses continue to fulfill the writing intensive criteria. There are two ways in which WI designation is achieved. In most cases the courses are first reviewed by a WI committee and then presented to the governing body such as the college-wide curriculum committee or faculty senate. In a small number of cases a department chair or committee has authority to approve a course for WI designation. On five campuses, faculty members are certified to teach WI courses. This means that faculty can decide which classes they teach will carry the WI designation in any particular semester. While there is standardization of requirements for course designation, Table 7 points out that there is little review of classes once they are mounted to ensure that the guidelines for writing intensive are being met.

Practically, all writing intensive courses have course limits. The median primary limit is 22 students. This includes the Law School with a lower limit of 16 students. Baruch and City have WI recitation sections of large lectures set at 20 students, and Medgar Evers has proposed a limit of 20 students. The median for the secondary limit is 25 students. Baruch and City have the highest cap—40 students.

Five campuses currently engage in a review of syllabi following WI course designation to determine whether classes continue to fill the campuses' WI requirements.

Table 7: Writing Intensive (WI) Course Designations and Enrollment Caps

Campus	Writing Intensive Designation (Yes/No)	Faculty Approval Process for WI Course Designation	Primary and Secondary Enrollment Caps for WI Courses (#/#)	Post-Approval Review of WI Courses to determine whether they continue to fulfill WI requirements (Yes/No)
Baruch	Yes	Courses are designated "communication intensive." The approval process is managed by the Director of the Schwartz Communication Institute in consultation with Associate Provost and/or School Deans.	Varies from 20-40	No
BMCC	Yes	WI courses do not go through the curriculum committee. WI course designation is based on whether a WAC/WID-certified faculty is teaching the course. Instructors submit two specific learning outcomes and a WI statement as part of their syllabus. WI is seen as a value-added proposition.	25/25	No
BCC	Yes	BCC does not certify courses. The College certifies faculty who are eligible to teach WI classes.	22/24	Yes
Brooklyn	Yes	There is both WI Course and WI Major designations. Proposals to designate either one are first approved by the department and then submitted for approval to the WAC committee, who upon approval return the proposal to the department for submission to the Faculty Council's curriculum committee.	25/25	No
CCNY	Yes	The Gen Ed Reform of 2008 determined that nearly all course requirements for Core (Perspectives courses) qualify as WI courses. The exceptions are Math 150 and Natural Science courses. The Core is a suite of pick-and-choose Perspectives classes. Individual departments submit proposals for courses they would like to qualify as Perspective courses. The Gen Ed Committee votes on these proposals. Approved courses are then sent to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Faculty Council. The Faculty Council Reports to the University Faculty Senate.	26/26 Art: 40/40 Large lecture recitations capped at 20	Not yet
CSI	No			
Hostos	Yes	WI Task Force reviews syllabi and recommends syllabi to College Wide Curriculum Committee for WI designation. The Task Force is composed of volunteer faculty who have already created WIs and the WAC Coordinators. The WI Task Force votes to recommend the course for WI designation to the College Wide Curriculum Committee (CWCC). Syllabi recommended for designation are presented by the faculty member with the WAC Coordinator to the CWCC which votes to officially designate a section as WI. If this is not a new course, but a WI section of an existing course, the CWCC passes the information to the Senate for informational purposes (no vote.)	27/27	Pending
Hunter	Yes	Senate committee approval (upon departmental request).	Departmental	No
JJay	Yes	WI designation follows the certified faculty member.	21/21	Not yet
KCC	Yes as of 9/10	Once certified, a faculty member may offer any course on a writing intensive basis with approval of the department Chair.	25/25	Not yet

LaGuardia	Yes	Departments propose capstone and urban studies courses to be WI. The courses need to go through curriculum committee and then the Senate for approval. In order to be considered urban studies, the course guidelines need to demonstrate writing intensive requirements (writing every week, opportunities for revision, research, etc.) and urban studies criteria (focus on NYC issues, field trips within city, etc.).	25/25	Yes
Law School	N/A	N/A	16/22	N/A
Lehman	Yes	WI courses are approved by Department Chairs only.	22/22	No
Medgar	Proposed	The WID Review Committee was formed this spring and developed a set of criteria for sections to be designated WI. These criteria have not been presented to the College for approval. The proposal recommends a class size cap of 20. To be certified faculty should have some prior engagement with the WID program, ideally having completed the College's semester-long WID Study Group.	20/20 (proposed)	No
NYCCY	Yes	Designation of WI classes is done by the departments.		No
On-Line Bacc	No	All Online courses are considered writing intensive	22/22	
Queens	Yes	The WI SubCommittee (of Academic Senate), comprised of faculty from multiple disciplines and including students, reviews proposals for new WI courses. If the proposal demonstrates that the college's WI criteria are met, it is recommended to Academic Senate and ultimately to Board of Trustees.	25/25	Yes
QBCC	Yes	Individual faculty are certified not courses. The Senate approved the concept of a portfolio as a method of certification. If the faculty member teaches a course other than the one for which he/she constructed the portfolio, a second portfolio must be constructed for this second class.	25/25	Yes
York	Yes	There are four kinds of WI designation; a per course section, per faculty, per semester, and permanent WI designation option. An Interdisciplinary faculty committee reviews proposals, makes recommendations to a WAC Course Coordinating Committee with membership that includes the Provost (ex officio), Registrar, WAC Coordinator, Chair of College Curriculum for approval. In practice the recommendation has gone to a Dean. The Dean meets with the WAC Coordinator to discuss the recommended courses, to look at the budgetary impact of reduced class size for X sections, and to explore the possible need for added courses to meet student demand.	25/27	Yes (for per semester WI offerings); No (for permanent WI designation)

Writing Intensive Graduation Requirements

Learning to writing is a process that requires engagement over time. One way to enforce this concept is through the development of writing intensive graduation requirements. Excluding the Law School, 13 out of 18 undergraduate colleges require at least one writing intensive course for graduation in addition to Composition I and II. Four campuses have no such a requirement. The Online Baccalaureate considers all of its courses to be writing intensive.

Of the 13 campuses with graduation requirements that include writing intensive classes, the number of required courses ranges from one course at BMCC, Brooklyn and Kingsborough to four courses at Baruch (for BBA students) and Lehman. The majority of campuses require between two and three writing intensive courses. City College has taken a different approach. Practically all courses in its core are designated writing intensive. In addition, students must complete one writing intensive course outside the major. Where these classes are required in the curriculum is indicated in Table 9.

Table 8: Number of Writing Intensive Courses Required for Graduation

Number of Writing Intensive Courses Required for Graduation	#	Campuses
0 courses	5	CSI, JJay, Medgar, NYCCT, Online Bacc (not formally required)
1 course	3	BMCC, Brooklyn, KCC
2 courses	4	BCC , Hostos, LaGuardia, QBCC
3 courses	4	Hunter, Law School, Queens, York
4 courses	2	Baruch, Lehman
6 or 7 courses	1	City

Table 9: Writing Intensive Graduation Requirements by College

Campus	# of WI Courses	Writing Intensive Graduation Requirement
Baruch	4	4-courses are required for the BBA; 2 courses required in general education; 1 course required in major and 1 course required in minor
BMCC	1	Any course with a WI designation
BCC	2	Any courses with a WI designation
Brooklyn	1	Students are required to take at least one WI course before graduation. Most majors require a WI course, so most students fulfill the requirement in their major. English 1 and 2 are not designated WI courses but are prerequisites for any WI course.
City	6 or 7	5-Perspective classes are WI. One Gen Ed course is designated WI or Quantitative Reasoning. Students are also required to take one upper division WI elective outside of the major.
CSI	0	
Hostos	2	Students can take two WI courses from any of the 3 divisions. It is recommended that they take one early on in their curriculum and one later on, but this is not required.
Hunter	3	The current WI requirement is disconnected from curricular progress.
JJay	0	
KCC	1	The WI course should be taken prior to 60 credits, but is not part of General Education requirement.
LaGuardia	2	1-WI course is a required urban studies class in the general education curriculum and 1 is a capstone class.
Law School	3	N/A
Lehman	4	Students must complete 4-courses designated as WI; 3 prior to earning the 60th credit and 1 following. Individual sections of courses will be designated as WI, and students may take writing intensive sections of courses in General Education, major, minor, or elective.
Medgar	0	
NYCCT	0	
Online Bacc	0	All classes are considered WI
Queens	3	3-course WI requirement is part of a Gen Ed Writing requirement, but WI courses can be taken within or outside of major, at any level. Note that some majors include a required WI course.
QBCC	2	The 2-WI courses for graduation can be taken at any point from within the first 15 credits to the last 15.
York	3	Writing intensive courses are subject-area courses that build on the foundational writing courses (English 125 and, as appropriate, Writing 301, 302, or 303). The list of WI courses varies from semester to semester.

One potential problem is the ability of campuses to mount an adequate number of WI courses so students can meet their graduation requirements in a timely way. When such classes are not available students have the option to apply for a waiver of the graduation requirement. Several campuses mentioned that they have begun to track the waivers to better understand which programs have problems mounting an adequate number of WI courses so that the situation can be rectified.

Faculty Certification for WAC

Eight colleges require faculty to be certified in WAC before they can teach a writing intensive course. The rationale for the certification programs is that WAC pedagogy is grounded in theory and practice with which faculty teaching WI courses should be knowledgeable.

On all but one campus the certification process is a year long process. During the first semester, faculty typically participate in a seminar covering such issues as WAC principles, assignment design, responding to student writing, writing to learn strategies, ELL dialect issues, and writing in the discipline. Following the seminar, faculty teach a WI course, usually with the assistance of a Writing Fellow. At the end of the course, the faculty portfolio will be reviewed and certification granted. Table 11 explains the certification process on the eight campuses mentioned above.

Table 10: WAC Faculty Certification

Faculty Certification Model	#	Campus
None	11	Baruch, Brooklyn, City, CSI, Hunter, Law School, Lehman, NYCCT, Online Bacc, Queens, York
Required Certification	8	BMCC, BCC, Hostos, JJay, KCC, LaGuardia, Medgar, QBCC

Table 11: WAC Faculty Certification Process

Campuses Requiring WAC Faculty Certification	Length of Certification Process	Description of WAC Faculty Certification Process
BMCC	Year	Faculty members become certified by participating in a semester-long series of workshops, at the end of which they produce a portfolio with a draft syllabus and assignments for the WI course they intend to teach. They then teach this WI course during the following semester working along side a Writing Fellow. At the end of the semester, they produce another portfolio, including reflections. After this 2-semester process, the instructors are WI-certified and eligible to teach any 2 of their courses as WI (with the understanding that through their training, they teach using WI criteria and WAC pedagogy.) Students in WI courses at BMCC must be assigned 10-12 pages of formal writing (1 longer or several short papers), have informal writing assignments and opportunities for revision. A "significant" proportion of their grade must come from written work.
BCC	Semester	For WI certification, faculty participate in a semester-long series of seminars (5 total). We use John Bean's book among other readings. Each faculty member is partnered with a writing fellow for the semester where they meet for a minimum of 30 minutes each week to go over the readings, do the homework assignments, and work on the development of a WI syllabus. At the end of the semester, faculty submit a WI syllabus for the course they are planning to teach as WI in the subsequent semester and ancillary materials for approval.
Hostos	Year	In order to teach a WI section, faculty must attend three to four on campus WAC workshops and work closely with a Writing Fellow over the course of an academic year on the development of a WI course. Faculty who have already received approval for a previous WI course might not work as closely with a Writing Fellow in creating a new one, but they still attend workshops. Only adjuncts who are "perennial," may develop a WI course. Only certified faculty can take over someone else's WI course, and then they must agree to follow the approved syllabus. In all these ways, we attempt to maintain the integrity of the WI courses and insure that those teaching them have the necessary WAC background and experience.
JJay	Year	In order for faculty members to be WI certified, they need to attend 8 hours of WI workshops that are typically run by the WAC Coordinator and other interested faculty members. The workshops can be completed in one semester or across a number of them. A number of issues are covered in the workshops including an introduction to WAC/WI requirements at John Jay, minimal marking, using high and low-stakes writing, scaffolding assignments, working with ELL students, integrating writing into discipline-specific courses, and teaching grammar.
KCC	Year	A faculty member who wants to be certified has three options at KCC (A, B, and C). There are three steps to A & B certification (training, piloting, submitting a course portfolio). C consists of only the last step.

A and B: On-campus or On-line: The first two options (A and B) involve participating in "WAC training" during KCC's 6 week Winter term, using John Bean's *Engaging Ideas* to "retool" a course that faculty teach regularly. The "training" consists of either an on-campus workshop series of 9, 2 1/2 hour sessions (with readings, reflective writing, and assignment/syllabus design revision homework), or a 9 module, on-line tutorial that covers the same ground (and may be done autonomously, from home).

After completing the "training" in the winter (January/February), both on-line and on-campus groups "pilot" their newly designed writing intensive course with the help of a Writing Fellow during the 12 week spring term. On the basis of that experience, the course is revised and a "course portfolio" with |

KCC, continued		a detailed syllabus, assignments, sample student work, and a reflective statement is submitted to the Committee on WAC Certification in June. This representation of writing-intensive practice in a discipline is then approved or sent back for revision, and the faculty member becomes "certified." C: Open to former Writing Fellows and faculty with extensive WAC experience. They are only required to submit a course portfolio to the Committee on Certification. If it fulfills KCC's guidelines for a WI course, the faculty member is then certified.
LaGuardia	Year	Faculty teaching WI courses (i.e., capstone, urban studies) must complete the WID seminar (year-long for full-time, one semester for part-time faculty). At the end of the seminar to be "WID certified," faculty must submit a portfolio, which will include the WI course pre-WID syllabus, post-WID syllabus, all writing assignments, sample student writing, and excerpts from a reflective teaching journal.
Medgar	Semester	To be certified faculty should have some prior engagement with the WID program, ideally having completed our semester long WID Study Group.
QBCC	Year	For certification, participating faculty, with the assistance of a Writing Fellow complete a portfolio which includes: Cover letter (2-3 pages) which is developed over the year in which the faculty member participates in the WID/WAC workshops and works with a writing fellow, a signed reproduction release form from the faculty member, signed reproduction release forms from all students whose work is included in the portfolio and samples of all formal (high stakes) assignments. If an assignment is given in stages, samples of each stage with instructor's commentary should be included. Copies of all in -class (informal) writing assignments. A planning portfolio is assembled in the fall semester, and the final portfolio is handed in or sent to me on-line at the end of the spring semester.

Table 12 indicates the total number of WAC Certified Faculty on the eight campuses where certification is required and the number of faculty who received certification in the past two years. The number of certified faculty ranges from 55 at Hostos and John Jay to 202 at Queensborough. Increasing the number of certified faculty is critical if the ability to mount a WI section is limited to a select group of faculty. In addition, six of these Colleges also have WI graduation requirements, which put even greater pressure in terms of matching faculty with the courses needed by students to meet their graduation requirements.

Table 12: Number of WI Certified Faculty; 2008-09, 2009-10

Campus	Number of faculty who received certification in 2008-09	Number of faculty who received or are expected to receive certification in 2009-10	Total number of WAC Certified Faculty as of 2009-10
BMCC	111	21	132
Bronx	10	9	122
Hostos	45	55	55
JJay	33	28 Fall '09	55 (estimated)
KCC	11	28	94
LaGuardia	24	21	150 (estimated)
Medgar	10	10	
QBCC	18	36	202

The Reach of the WAC Program

Given that the effort of most WAC programs is directed towards faculty development, a simple indicator of program effectiveness is the number of faculty on a given campus who participated in WAC programs. As described earlier, WAC works with faculty in three discrete ways. First are the ongoing relations faculty members forge with Writing Fellows over a semester or a year as they reconsider how to modify their teaching practices in line with good writing pedagogical theory. Second, faculty have the opportunity to learn more about WAC principles through workshops or brown bag lunches where they are exposed to particular topics. Third, on eight campuses there are WAC faculty certification programs. While the accounting of faculty participation may not be as accurate as one would like, Table 13 indicates the number of faculty who worked directly with a Writing Fellow and the number of faculty who attended WAC related workshops in the 2007-08 to 2009-10 academic years. These are not necessarily unduplicated counts. Overall, most campuses reach a relatively small number of faculty each year given the mandate to incorporate writing throughout the curriculum.

Table 13: Faculty Participation in WAC Programs; 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10

Campus	Number of faculty working one-on-one with a Writing Fellow 2007-08	Number of faculty attending WAC/WID related workshops 2007-08	Number of faculty working one-on-one with a Writing Fellow 2008-09	Number of faculty attending WAC/WID related workshops 2008-09	Number of faculty working one-on-one with a Writing Fellow 2009-10	Number of faculty attending WAC/WID related workshops 2009-10 (estimated)
Baruch	60	22				
BMCC	30	20	20	50	46	40
BCC	46	11		20		20
Brooklyn	22	84	18	69	20	60
CCNY	5	20	10	30	7	30
CSI	8				0	0
Hostos	10	56	15	50	17	50
Hunter	29		33	26	18 (so far)	5 (so far)
JJay	15	0	12	45	15	50
KCC	20	9	32	11	41	17
LaG	24					
Law School	10	15	10	15	10	15
Lehman		30				
Medgar	19	8			20	40
NYCCY	15	50	18	60	24	80
OnLine Baccalaureate				40+	6	
Queens	22	53	24	43	30	37
QBCC	15	15	18	18	36	36
York	13	134	14	142	18	125

Evaluating WAC

Evaluating the impact of WAC on writing outcomes of CUNY students is difficult because the relation is an indirect one. WAC was built on a faculty development model. By exposing faculty to theories of WAC pedagogy and working with faculty on integration of such pedagogy into their classrooms it was assumed that two things would occur. First faculty practice in their classrooms related to the teaching of writing would be changed, and second, faculty would assess program curriculum to see whether there were adequate opportunities for students to be exposed to the learning of writing. If one or both happened, it was further assumed that student writing would improve. How best to measure these impacts is the challenge facing WAC coordinators and Central Office. Varied approaches are being undertaken by the colleges. These are described in Table 13.

Table 14: Evaluation and Assessment Strategies utilized by WAC Programs

Evaluation and/or Assessment Strategies	Conducted Annually	Conducted Occasionally	Planned
Writing Intensive Courses Outcomes			
Reporting of number of WI Courses	BMCC, BCC, CCNY, Hostos, Hunter, KCC, LaGuardia, Lehman, Medgar, Queens, QBCC, York		JJay
Reporting of number of WI Courses by department	BMCC, BCC, CCNY, Hostos, Hunter, KCC, LaGuardia, Queens, QBCC, York		JJay
Correlation of WI courses to:			
CPE Pass Rates	BCC, Hostos, York		CCNY
CPE testing when first eligible	BCC		CCNY
Retention and graduation	BCC		CCNY
Assessment of Student Writing			
Assessment of student writing distinct from class	BCC, LaGuardia (WID Seminar), Queens, QBCC	BMCC, BCC	
In class assessment based on common learning outcomes or objectives	Brooklyn		BCC
Review of student e-Portfolios	CCNY, LaGuardia		
Assessment of Faculty Practice			
Syllabi review of WI courses	Brooklyn, CCNY, Hostos, KCC, LaGuardia, Law School (some, not all), Queens, QBCC, York	BCC, Medgar	
Review of faculty teaching portfolios	Hostos, KCC, LaGuardia (WID Seminar), Lehman, QBCC	Medgar	
Five year follow up WID seminar faculty about continued use of WID principles in WI courses;	LaGuardia		Queens
Program Monitoring Activities			
Evaluation of structure and operation of WAC program and its organizational impact	Hostos, Hunter, KCC, LaGuardia, Lehman, NYCCT, Online Bacc, QBCC	BMCC, Medgar, Queens, York	CCNY
Faculty evaluation of WAC workshops and training	BCC, Brooklyn, Hostos, JJay, KCC, LaGuardia, Lehman, NYCCT, Online Bacc, QBCC	BMCC, Medgar, Hunter, Queens	JJay
Survey of faculty about learning and utilization of WAC pedagogy	Hostos, LaGuardia, Online Bacc, QBCC	KCC, Hunter (Focus Group), Medgar (faculty reflective activities), Queens, York	CCNY
Faculty Evaluation of Writing Fellow Collaboration	Queens	NYCCT	
Survey of students about learning and improvement in writing	Hostos, Law School, Online Bacc, Queens, QBCC	BMCC, BCC, Hunter (Focus Group), KCC, York	CCNY
Evaluation of Fellows			
Writing Fellow reflection and assessment of fellowship	Hostos		
Longitudinal Studies			
Tracks student performance before, during, and after the faculty seminar participation	LaGuardia		
Longitudinal study tracking students at QBCC and beyond. Data set includes WI classes.	QBCC		

WAC, Writing Intensive Courses, and the CPE

One place to look for impact is whether a relation exists between the WAC program, Writing Intensive courses, and the CPE. Over half of the campuses monitor the number of Writing Intensive courses and the number of Writing Intensive courses by department. This monitoring occurs on campuses where there are writing intensive graduation requirements. It is an effective way to determine whether an adequate number of classes are being offered to enable students to move in a timely way towards graduation.

A more evaluative measure would be the examination of the relation between the CPE and WAC. The CPE was mandated in 1997, two years before the WAC program. Among the purposes of the CPE is the demonstration of student readiness for upper level courses. Given the timing and the intent of the two, the CPE and WAC are effectively linked in many peoples' minds, although they are not closely aligned on the campuses. As noted earlier, only three programs indicated that they collaborate with those responsible for administering the CPE. However, a credible argument can be made that enrollment in a WI course should be positively correlated to various CPE measures such as student score or campus pass rate. Only three campuses have undertaken such studies. According to York's Director of Institutional Research, "Data suggest that WI courses help prepare students to pass the CPE." They are in the process of identifying other variables that can explain these positive results and build a model that can include at least those variables for which data are available.

WAC and the Assessment of Student Writing

Several campuses have assessed the quality of student writing. There are three models for how this has been achieved. The first model is characterized by before and after studies of writing samples from a WI course. A one-time assessment was carried out in 2003-2004 by the Writing Coordinator at BMCC, Ruth Misheloff. This study enabled the college to consider how much progress students made in their writing skills over a semester. A more continuous approach is being taken by LaGuardia. For the past five years, LaGuardia has been carrying out a simple before/after writing sample, based on a general prompt and a six-point rubric. These writing samples are read by normed readers. Last spring, LaGuardia changed its prompts to reflect the disciplines of the classes from which student writing is being assessed.

A second model considers a sample of student work independent of a class. At Queens College, the assessment of student writing has turned into a multi-year project. First was the collection of samples of student writing produced in about 25 sections of three sophomore level courses (psychology, English, and sociology). The quality of writing was evaluated and then correlated against the number of WI courses taken by the students. Queens is now collecting writing samples from another 25 sections of the same three courses (taught largely by different instructors). These are being evaluated by the Writing Fellows. The relationship between the quality of the writing and the number of WI courses taken will be reexamined with this sample. Working with Institutional Research Queens will determine what other variables should be considered in the analysis.

Third are e-Portfolios. LaGuardia has the most developed e-Portfolio program at CUNY. The student portfolios provide extensive data that is just beginning to be analyzed.

WAC and the Assessment of Faculty Practice

The most common form of assessment of faculty practice is a review of Writing Intensive course syllabi to monitor how writing is being taught and whether the courses meet the criteria established by campus policy-making bodies, such as academic senates or school faculty. As indicated earlier, most campuses have a process for reviewing syllabi before courses are designated as writing intensive. Only a few campuses review syllabi at a later date. The most systematic follow up is being undertaken by LaGuardia. Faculty are evaluated five years after completing their WID seminar to determine whether they continue to use WID principles in their WI courses.

WAC and Program Monitoring Activities

Almost all of the programs are interested in understanding their effectiveness. Frequently, campuses have developed surveys for faculty who teach WI courses about their utilization of WAC pedagogy. The faculty surveys are seen as a way to ascertain the effectiveness of their collaboration with the Writing Fellows and WAC's impact on their teaching. Many campuses also utilize student surveys to understand the impact of the WI course on their writing ability. One of the difficulties with this type of research is that it depends on the respondents' perceptions of the events and is not necessarily an accurate statement of what has occurred or what has changed as a result of their involvement in the program.

Two campuses are engaged in longitudinal studies that address the impact of WAC on student writing. LaGuardia is tracking student performance in relation to faculty participation in the WID seminar. At Queensborough, data is being collected while the students are at Queensborough and for a period of time after they leave. Among the questions they can address is the impact of WI courses on student writing.

Moving Forward: Recommendations to Enhance the WAC Program

Campus Based Recommendations

- The integration of writing throughout the undergraduate curriculum is critical outcome of the WAC program.

  Structurally, several policies have been put in place to ensure the teaching of writing throughout the undergraduate curriculum. These include the creation of WI courses which specifies what is involved in the teaching of writing as opposed to the assignment of writing. WI designation also protects small classes throughout the curriculum. Graduation requirements also have the positive effect of increasing the number of opportunities to write. Where there are no WI designations or graduation requirements colleges want to ensure the availability of

small classes where students have the opportunity to be exposed to good pedagogic practices such as having the opportunity to rewrite an assignment.

- WAC programs are strongest when integrated into other campus writing initiatives.

  Where WAC is embedded within larger efforts to strengthen student writing, the programs appear to have the greatest reach. For example, the WAC programs at CCNY and Baruch both have administrative coordinators for writing programs who could not necessarily distinguish what aspects of their jobs were uniquely related to WAC. The organizational isolation of WAC on some campuses runs the risk of isolating the program and allowing to college to relegate the teaching of writing back to the English Department or limit the program's reach to the good will between schools and faculties.

Fellowship Based Recommendation

- With the changed organization of the Writing Fellowship, there is a greater need for professional development of Enhanced CUNY Fellows prior to their fifth year of the fellowship.

  The use of doctoral students to advance writing instruction on the campuses has been positive for graduate students. They receive high quality professional development on teaching as seen through the lens of the teaching of writing. In addition, they have the opportunity to work collegially with faculty. If they accept academic jobs upon completion of their degree they will be advantaged by these experiences.

  The loss of the second year of the Writing Fellowship, however, puts tremendous strain on the campuses to meet program goals while providing professional development to graduate students whose preparation in WAC pedagogy is uneven; meaning they are not necessarily prepared substantively to begin work with faculty. While the decision to move the application process to the fall of the Enhanced Chancellor's Fellows fourth year is appreciated, there needs to be more discussion between the Graduate Center and the campuses about how the model can retain a balance in terms of preparing the Fellows for the fellowship.

Evaluation of CUNY's Mandate to Strengthen its Commitment to the Teaching of Writing

- The work with faculty around teaching practice needs to be linked more explicitly to student learning outcomes.

  There are a variety of evaluation and assessment strategies being used by the campuses to determine program effectiveness. Given the difficulty of linking faculty development to the goal of student outcomes more attention needs to be paid to improving the evaluation of the products, processes, and assessments of

student writing. In terms of product, this might include document review including the syllabi to determine if there is use of good pedagogic practices such as sequenced assignments, low stakes writing and the like. A process-related question concerns demonstrating that faculty participation in WAC can be linked to changed pedagogic practices and student outcomes. Last, there is a greater need to document changes in the writing habits of students.

- The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment in Central Office should be involved with the development of an assessment of student writing that would provide cross campus comparisons.

  The CPE provides a tremendous untapped source of data for assessing student writing at multiple levels starting with the student and ending with cross department or college comparisons. Student test scores when correlated to a number of indicators could provide greater insight into identifying where there are effective practices that could potentially be brought to scale.

DRAFT – February 5, 2010
Professional Development of WAC Writing Fellows and Graduate Students in the Teaching and Learning of Writing

Professional Development Principles:
- Approach to WAC professional development needs to be recursive as learning is recursive and not linear
- Scheduling of professional development workshops should be spread across the year based on the same rationale as above
- Self reflection is integral to the learning experience
- Fourth year professional development will be accomplished through an integrative experience focused on the development of a writing intensive syllabus in the Fellow's field of expertise

Multi-Year Curriculum for the Teaching and Learning of Writing

What Fellows need to know:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5*
Theories of pedagogy	√				
WAC history, theory				√	√
Assignment design: formal/ informal, high-/low- stakes	√	√	√	√	√
Incorporating writing in course development, e.g. identifying course goals and developing assignments to achieve them	√		√	√	
Staging assignments	√			√	
Responding/ evaluating student writing		√	√		
Peer review		√			
Writing to learn strategies		√		√	
ELL dialect issues			√		
Reading/accessing difficult texts		√			√
WID	√		√		√
What it means to be a Fellow: Working with Faculty				√	√
Campus specific issues				√	√
Developing a teaching portfolio				√	
	10 hours**	10 hours	10 hours	10 hours	

* Integrated into the Writing Fellowship
** It is assumed that each check equates to 2 hours of workshop time in Years 1-3. Year 4 will touch on multiple issues but not necessarily for an extended period of time.