I. Proposal Description
We propose a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) to strengthen and deepen the teaching and learning of writing.

In response to recent research that shows students at even the most highly-engaging schools can drift through their academic careers without experiencing their institution’s best practices in writing, this QEP is designed to ensure that all Elon students have a highly-integrated writing experience across and within majors, and in their extracurricular activities as well (Academically Adrift 70-71). Elon’s NSSE data indicates that 65% of Elon first-year students and 71% of Elon seniors wrote five or more 5- to 19-page papers, and 79% of first-year students and 85% of seniors reported engaging in coursework that emphasized synthesizing and organizing ideas in complex ways. While Elon’s students’ reported experience is exemplary compared to other NSSE institutions, our own data illustrates how 35% of Elon’s first-year students and 29% of Elon seniors, a third of each class, still drift through our already highly engaged curriculum without significant practice in writing. Still, these percentages show that Elon’s faculty already support writing, so this QEP presents an opportunity to develop a unique and sustainable campus community that advances our good writing efforts to campus-wide, nationally recognized excellence.

To address and stem this potential to drift, we propose, essentially, that every undergraduate degree awarded by Elon be “writing-enriched.” Consequently, this proposed QEP would benefit every single student (and when done effectively, every faculty member) at Elon University—from first-year students to seniors, and even graduate school students should the university choose to extend its QEP beyond the undergraduate population.

Research in higher education (e.g., Kepler; Kuh; LEAP; Monroe; NSSE;) and varied disciplines (e.g., writing studies, psychology, and education) concludes that (1) writing plays a primary role in providing students with an engaged, deep, high-impact education and (2) the ability to write well is essential for effective practice and action in one’s personal, civic, and professional life. In other words, writing is a primary way to learn, to understand our world, and to make connections between ideas, theories, and people; it is a primary means through which one becomes initiated into and an active member of communities, academic and non-academic; and it is a primary means through which one takes social action in reflective, ethical ways.

Further, the proposed QEP focused on the teaching and learning of writing overlaps with and integrates each of the other five potential QEP topics:

- Writing can be a significant way to create intellectual engagement and also a concrete expression of the quality of one’s intellectual engagement (Bazerman; Emig; Forsman; Herrington).
- Writing can be a key means by which we participate in civic engagement (Clark; Grabill; Rose and Weiser; Simmons; Simmons and Grabill).
- Writing routinely requires one to conduct research of one form or another, determine the validity and value of diverse sources, and negotiate and organize multiple sources in various forms and mediums; in other words, writing effectively typically requires a high level of information literacy (Bowles-Terry, Davis, Hollliday; Selber; Yancey).
- Enhancing writing instruction necessarily involves providing faculty development workshops on teaching writing to diverse learners/student populations (i.e., diverse learning styles; diverse
writing, language, and educational experiences; diverse social and cultural backgrounds; diverse writing strengths and weaknesses). Furthermore, effective writing requires one to study, adapt to, and engage a diversity of audiences, each with different backgrounds, assumptions, needs, and expectations (Anson The WAC Casebook; Porter “Audience and Rhetoric;” Kirsch & Roen).

- Writing—as a way to think through complex issues, make connections between seemingly disparate concepts, extrapolate ideas, and carry those ideas into the future in novel ways—can be one valuable way to engage in futures thinking and innovation (Mueller; Yancey).

Such a plan would further the goals and commitments described in Elon University’s mission, strategic plan, and academic priorities, each of them at heart sharing the same ultimate goal: to provide students with an excellent liberal arts education that will prepare them to be responsible, reflective, and active global citizens.

II. Proposal Goals & Strategies

Transfer – what might be defined as the ability to apply, adapt, or reimagine learned concepts, practices, and skills in new situations – is arguably the key measure of effective learning. Currently, there is intense interest and research into the concept of writing transfer and how this translates into writing expertise. Research shows that curricula supporting the development of writing expertise must provide students with ongoing writing opportunities and direct instruction, in many different classes, in multiple disciplines, and in every year of their academic careers (Wardle). Research also shows that:

- Developing writing expertise requires regular practice across the four years of college. Therefore, one or even two writing classes in the first year alone are insufficient. Similarly, the development of writing expertise is long-term and cannot be measured by a single assignment, test, or class (Carroll).
- Effective writing is context- and situationally-bound, and what is considered “good writing” changes, and must be practiced, in different contexts and in different disciplines (Anson The WAC Casebook & “Assessing Writing”).
- Writing effectively in the 21st century entails writing in new ways, in digital contexts and genres, with new types of digital delivery systems (Porter “Why Technology Matters to Writing” & “Recovering Delivery for Digital Rhetoric;” WPA Outcomes Statement; Yancey)

Goals

To advance Elon’s mission and reputation as a national model of engaged, deep, high-impact learning, we propose transforming the teaching and learning of writing within and across disciplines, and in extracurricular experiences. Specifically we advocate establishing the following goals:

(1) For students to have a highly integrated writing experience across the curriculum, within their majors, and throughout their extracurricular activities, resulting in an undergraduate experience recognized by students, alums, and future graduate/professional schools and employers as writing-enriched and productive of exceptional writers

(2) For faculty within departments to receive the time and support needed to develop writing-enriched majors, integrating writing vertically throughout their majors and leading to the development of exceptional discipline-based writers and writing
(3) For faculty across the university to receive the time and support needed to develop a writing-enriched experience that extends horizontally across the curriculum and leads to the development of writers who can write well across a range of contexts.

(4) For faculty and students to understand writing as both a context-sensitive practice of communication and a means for deep learning, resulting in the awareness that they must implement actively evidenced-based best practices in writing instruction to create what works best within and across their own specific contexts of practice and learning.

(5) To foster the scholarship of teaching and learning specific to writing, locally and nationally.

**Programmatic Strategies for Accomplishing Goals**

**Strategy #1**

Develop a student writing experience that fully integrates the writing students do within majors, minors, and/or programs, across the disciplines, and in extracurricular activities.

Writing in the 21st century is collaborative, multi-platformed, and increasingly “self-sponsored” (i.e., the types of writing students engage in their everyday lives, outside of academia) (Yancey; Brandt; Porter “Why Technology Matters to Writing”). To be full participants in the 21st century, today’s students must be able to integrate all of their writing experiences, from academic to professional to personal, in meaningful ways. We need to design writing experiences at Elon that help students make bridges between their everyday and academic ways of writing (Mueller). This strategy will accomplish primarily Goal #1, but will contribute to accomplishing all other goals as well.

A fully integrated student writing experience must include writing instruction that is integrated, supported, and assessed both horizontally and vertically, across the entire curriculum, from basic to more advanced courses, and within disciplines and/or majors (McLeod and Soven). To ensure this, the following structures need to be put in place: (1) a nationally recognized writing program of excellence (a priority reflected in Academic Affairs priorities over the past several years) conceived under an umbrella of Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) and Writing in the Disciplines (WID); (2) an excellent first-year writing program, one designed for both students and faculty as a shared foundation for the development of writing expertise across contexts; and (3) opportunities for faculty development that supports faculty as they enhance student writing instruction in their classes.

Research-based best practices in first-year writing are reflected in nationally adopted standards such as the Council of Writing Program Administrators’ Outcomes Statement (see Appendix A), the Conference on College Composition and Communication Writing Program Certificate of Excellence, and the first-year experience recommendations from LEAP. One successful practice reflected in these sources is the first-year writing seminar, taught by faculty across disciplines, and designed to provide a foundation in writing instruction as expressed by the WPA Outcomes (“Nationally Recognized Writing-in-the-Disciplines Programs & Their Relationship to First-Year Writing Requirements;” see Appendix B). Two essential components for the development of writing expertise across contexts are: the emphasis on foundational, which implies a starting point that would be built on in later classes, and the shared responsibility of faculty across disciplines for teaching this writing seminar. When faculty are committed to, and are supported in achieving, the development of writing expertise in first-year writing seminars, a “multiplier
effect” can occur (Daigle and Jarmon; Camblin and Steger; Sikka, Beebe and Bedard) and the level of writing instruction, and expertise, across the entire campus is elevated.

Research on the teaching of writing also makes it clear that excellent faculty development, for permanent as well as contingent faculty, and for faculty who teach beyond the first-year, is an essential component for the excellent teaching and learning of writing. Not only does this lead to excellent first-year writing instruction, but the “multiplier effect” again means that faculty take what they have learned about the effective teaching of writing and apply it in their other higher-level courses as well. More importantly, it leads to the development of and/or maintains shared goals, learning outcomes, and coherent disciplinary writing expectations that reflect national standards. Faculty development opportunities would include, but are not limited to, semester-long seminars in which faculty are provided a stipend to learn about writing theory and pedagogy and to develop, implement, assess, and report on a writing-intensive course; monthly and/or semester workshops that address general writing-in-the-disciplines related topics; brown-bag events that address specific writing topics; and individual consultations (see similar models from University of Minnesota and NCSU).

Components of this strategy

- A first-year core that includes one foundational writing course and at least one writing-intensive class
- Writing-intensive majors that integrate at least one discipline-specific writing course within the major
- Writing incorporated into all classes in all majors, even if the class is not designated writing-intensive
- Senior capstone experiences that integrate and advance students’ discipline-specific writing experiences and knowledge
- An exemplary, ongoing faculty development program

Strategy #2
Commit significant resources to support departments/majors/minors/programs for developing cultures of writing and a university-wide culture of writing excellence.

Research shows that the growth of strong integrated writing experiences within and across disciplines (Strategy #1) should be faculty-driven and emerge out of departments, majors, or programs. Therefore, to enact Strategy #1, we need to dedicate significant resources to departmental writing initiatives. As Jonathan Monroe explains, “To cultivate a sustainable sense of ownership among faculty that will benefit both individual departments and the curriculum as a whole, colleges and universities need to support faculty where they live and work, at the heart of their interests, in the disciplines.” This strategy will accomplish primarily Goal #2, but it will contribute to accomplishing all of the other goals as well.

A new director for the Center for the Advancement of Writing (the Center) and a new Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) director (see Strategy #3) will coordinate faculty development opportunities (see Strategy#1) and distribute grants that would provide financial support as individual departments or institutional units (such as Greek Life, the Kernodle Center, the Isabella Cannon Leadership program, and other student life organizations) engage in a process of analyzing their discipline-specific writing values, practices, and expectations, culminating in the development of implementable plans for change. Using this model, which is informed by the
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Successful Writing-Enriched Curriculum (WEC) program at the University of Minnesota and the Campus Writing & Speaking program at North Carolina State University, change is placed in the hands of the faculty and staff in individual departments or programs, who, assisted by the Center and WAC directors, design, implement, and assess writing in their courses and programs. Grants to departments and programs will include funding for:

- A course release for one term for one point person per participating department
- Learning outcomes development and assessment support
- Funding for each faculty member in participating departments, for two summers in a row
- Travel for faculty to attend disciplinary and WAC conferences or workshops
- Discipline-specific writing workshops & discipline-specific writing resources

Faculty would also be supported by Student Writing Fellows (see Appendix C) who would help faculty provide instruction and feedback to students as they undertake writing projects in individual courses in their major. The Student Writing Fellows Program is a structure that allows faculty teaching large, content-based courses to enhance the instruction of students writing within disciplines by pairing an experienced Writing Center consultant with a faculty member in a discipline and a student, of the faculty member’s choosing, who is experienced in writing in that particular discipline; this team helps the teaching faculty provide writing feedback to students in the faculty’s class. This program benefits the classroom students learning discipline-specific writing conventions, the consultants who gain experience illuminating disciplinary conventions, and the course instructor. This program would begin small, involving five courses per term, eventually expanding to offer this support for additional courses. All participants in the Student Writing Fellows Program will be compensated for their time and effort.

Components of this strategy

- Offer grants to departments and individual faculty to develop, implement, and assess writing plans
- Offer grants for extracurricular student organizations to develop, implement, and assess writing plans
- Provide workshops and consulting services for departments and organizations
- Create a Student Writing Fellows Program

Strategy #3

Create a Center for the Advancement of Writing (the Center) that works closely with CATL and the future Center for Engaged Learning. Hire a CAW director and a WAC director.

A primary strategy for accomplishing all five goals, and becoming a national leader in the teaching and learning of writing, will be the creation of a Center for the Advancement of Writing (the Center) that mirrors the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL). Elon’s core writing units—First-Year Writing, Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), and the Writing Center—would be reorganized and centralized under this new Center. A majority of our peer and aspirant institutions have some kind of “center for writing” and/or large-scale WAC program to coordinate, support and advance the teaching and learning of writing both vertically and horizontally across curricula and, also, to provide faculty development and support that leads to an enhanced student writing experience (“Top WID/WAC Programs”). Elon’s Interdisciplinary Writing Committee also recently recommended transforming and expanding
WAC on our campus (see Appendix D “Interdisciplinary Writing Committee Review of Best Practices in Writing Across the Curriculum Programs”).

Nelms and Dively, among others, conclude that increased coordination between first-year writing, WAC, and Writing in the Disciplines initiatives/programs “could help dismantle roadblocks to the transfer of composition knowledge” (228). They recommend that transfer be a major objective of any coordinated program or initiative. As Wardle argues, the responsibility for ensuring writing transfer “rest(s) on assignments given in classes beyond FYC [first-year composition]” (82), and the Center will play an important role in supporting the university as a whole as it takes into account the research on writing transfer. The Center will provide faculty with this kind of support and act as the driving and organizing force behind the coordination of efforts to transform the teaching and learning of writing across classes, programs, majors/minors and years (Anson “Assessing Writing;” “WEC”). The recent Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing, published jointly by the Council of Writing Program Administrators, the NCTE, and the National Writing Project, also emphasizes the importance of supporting faculty as they develop writing assignments and assessments that fit their disciplinary and teaching styles.

In this proposed structure, the Center’s full-time, nationally recognized director would lead overall efforts to meet the goals of this proposal, would coordinate the efforts of the units under it, and would work with and coordinate activities with CATL (such as the highly successful Faculty Writing Residency) to support shared and overlapping goals. Depending upon the candidates for the position, the Center director might also serve as the WAC director, another important hire that was recommended by Elon’s Interdisciplinary Writing Committee, after a two-year study (“IWC Memo”), and that is an Academic Affairs priority and an institutional priority for 2011-12. The Center director, or perhaps an Associate Center director, would assume primary leadership for fostering the scholarship of teaching and learning specific to writing (Goal #5). The Center would have a standing faculty advisory committee to support the director. It also would host regional and national writing conferences and symposia, similar to the Innovation in Instruction conference hosted annually by CATL, and a speaker series. Additionally, the Center would house a robust resource library for faculty and staff.

**Components of this strategy**

- Create centralized organizational structure for writing-related units at Elon that enables faculty to enhance writing instruction in their courses and programs
  - Create Center for the Advancement of Writing (the Center)
  - Hire Center director
  - Hire Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) director
  - Reorganize First-Year Writing, WAC, and the Writing Center under the Center, with these director positions possibly functioning as associate Center directorships
- Host regional and/or national conferences, symposia, and speaker series about writing
- Create and maintain a disciplinary writing-related resource library for faculty and organizations
Strategy #4
Recreate the Writing Center as a 21st century learning and writing space.

Whereas WAC’s primary mission is to serve faculty, the Writing Center’s primary mission is to serve students, and its current resources fit a consulting model that assumes students will bring in printed papers. This is an antiquated model that fails to address the wide range of multi-platformed, computer-mediated, highly visual genres that students are writing across the disciplines and for extracurricular purposes (Sheridan and Inman; Porter “Why Technology Matters to Writing”). This limited model further hinders the Writing Center’s ability to support students as they engage in the kinds of information practices and electronic literacies that are always a part of writing and research (Selber; VanHorne), but are increasingly important in the 21st century. Recreating the Writing Center as a 21st century learning and writing space requires significant additional resources and space, and creating satellite Writing Centers across campus will invite more students to take advantage of this excellent writing resource. This strategy will accomplish primarily Goal #1, but it will contribute to accomplishing all of the other goals as well.

While the Writing Center already does good work supporting writing horizontally, across the curriculum (typically, in an academic year, students working with about 140 different professors visit the Writing Center, and students bring in writing from over 90 different classes), this work can be enhanced. The Writing Center can also drill deeper, vertically, to serve more students within disciplines. Further, the Writing Center can expand to provide additional consulting support to students for their extracurricular writing. Even though the Writing Center serves close to 1,900 students in an academic year, there are many extracurricular and disciplinary contexts that could be further supported through specially designed workshops for students groups and the creation of satellite Writing Centers across campus.

The Writing Center would also develop initiatives to support student writing in extracurricular contexts (such as, but not limited to, the Multicultural Center, the Spanish Center, the Kernodle Center, Student Life, the Leadership program, Greek Life, and Residence Life) and in their daily lives. These initiatives will support the writing students are doing, in the places and organizations they are already writing. As our student body diversifies, the Writing Center also needs to expand its capacity to work with students who have particular needs, such as non-native speakers.

Another support would be a Faculty Writing Fellows Program, which will give three faculty members each term a course release to work in the Writing Center for 5 hours per week and to work on a disciplinary writing-related project for 5 hours per week. Faculty Writing Fellows would participate in select English 319 classes (the Writing Center course) and have access to travel and research funding. This program supports students by fostering a faculty focus on writing, and it creates an important connection between the Center for the Advancement of Writing and the Writing Center. By working as consultants in the Writing Center, these Faculty Fellows will learn first-hand about the variety of writing strengths, weaknesses, and questions that students have when writing within and across the disciplines. Further, faculty will be given the time, space, and support to design additional ways to contribute to the culture of writing on campus, in ways that appeal to their own interests and disciplinary expertise. For example, Faculty Fellows may choose to develop a student workshop on a disciplinary-writing issue of their choice; to visit and research writing in their disciplines at peer-institutions; or to attend a
writing conference. Students will also benefit from the disciplinary expertise the Faculty Writing Fellows bring to the Writing Center.

**Components of this strategy**
- Redesign 21st century Writing Center as learning and writing space
- Enhance support for student acquisition of information literacy
- Increase consultant training
- Create a Faculty Writing Fellows Program
- Develop initiatives and workshops that support writing happening in extracurricular contexts
- Create satellite Writing Centers across campus

**Strategy #5**
Continue to support and promote faculty scholarship in the teaching and learning of writing across and within disciplines.

While there is already valuable faculty development support occurring on Elon’s campus, it could be broadened and deepened to include opportunities for faculty scholarship in the teaching and learning of writing across and within disciplines on a national and international level. While this strategy will primarily accomplish Goal #5, it will contribute to the accomplishment of all of the other goals as well, because faculty who are engaged in studying the teaching and learning of writing within and across disciplines will likely become more effective teachers of writing (the “multiplier effect”), which will in turn contribute to students achieving higher levels of writing expertise.

This strategy builds on the excellent local and international work already occurring, such as in the Faculty Writing Residency and Elon Research Seminar: Writing and the Questions of Transfer. The existing annual Faculty Writing Residency supports faculty writing about scholarship of teaching and learning; we propose additional writing residencies that foster faculty and staff writing about the scholarship of teaching and learning of writing. In addition to opening these focused writing residencies to staff to draw attention to writing initiatives in Student Life, Residence Life, and other areas of campus, we propose consulting with the current Writing Residency organizers about modifications that might better serve this expanded group of potential participants.

The Elon Research Seminar on Writing Transfer brings together leading scholars in writing studies from around the world to study the question of the transfer of writing knowledge, skill, and expertise across years of school and contexts for writing. This seminar has brought national attention to Elon. Establishing an ongoing, interdisciplinary and inter-institutional Writing Research Seminar gives us the opportunity to sustain the record of excellence we are establishing in this area by supporting additional curricular and research projects at Elon, as well as national initiatives.

The Center also would organize and support a Writing Scholar Program, similar to the CATL Scholar Program, through which faculty would receive course releases and travel funds for conducting disciplinary writing-related research projects. This initiative would offer an
additional avenue of support for writing-related research, which in turn would facilitate faculty’s integration of research-informed writing instruction in their classes.

**Components of this strategy**
- Enhance opportunities for faculty scholarship in the teaching and learning of writing across and within disciplines on a national and international level
- Facilitate faculty and staff Writing Residencies specific to the teaching and learning of writing
- Create a Writing Scholar Program to encourage long-term faculty research on disciplinary writing
- Establish a permanent interdisciplinary and inter-institutional Writing Research Seminar
- Provide grants and other support for research on writing

**III. Proposal Outcomes**

**Student Outcomes**
Students will achieve, within the first year, the learning outcomes identified in the “WPA Outcomes Statement,” and these will be expanded on significantly throughout their 4 year curriculum. Highlighted student learning outcomes include:

1. Students will become more effective at using writing as a means of deep-learning.
2. Students will become more effective writers across contexts (e.g., across disciplines) and become attuned to, and make wise decisions about, variations in genre, audience, purpose, and medium as they develop the ability to analyze writing situations and respond appropriately.
3. Students will develop meta-cognitive skills that make them more aware of their own writing strengths and weaknesses.
4. Students will recognize, and be able to make wise writing decisions about, the visual nature of writing, broadly defined.
5. Students will understand the important connection between effective writing and effective information literacy and research methods.
6. Students will understand the role writing plays in civic engagement and recognize the ethical responsibilities of writers.

In order to achieve these student learning outcomes, the university will transform the teaching and learning of writing within and across disciplines. Students must not only write in all classes, but learn to write by receiving direct instruction and formative feedback. Therefore, faculty and leaders of extracurricular organizations must be supported as they develop and integrate writing into departmental courses, majors, and/or programs and extracurricular organizational activities. This will create a *culture of writing* in which the academic community, at large, is invested. Faculty immersed in a culture of writing understand how the transfer of writing expertise occurs and that the development of writing expertise is long-term; they understand that students will write often in their classes, in different ways, for different audiences and purposes, in ways that are appropriate for the given discipline and as decided by departments, majors, programs, and contexts.
IV. Measures of Success

Needs Assessment

Need at Elon, in the context of this proposal, is not driven by strong negative data or position. The need is driven by strong opportunity:

- To create a campus-wide culture of writing excellence, thereby leading to excellent teaching and learning of writing for every single undergraduate student, and
- To move further from “the edge” of national excellence into solid recognition as being among the very best writing programs in the nation.

According to NSSE results, Elon already stands among top 10% of institutions in the nation in terms of level of academic challenge, particularly for first-year students. Elon has been collecting this data for a long time, and the institution remains stable in this area. Elon has also established strategic goals to be among the very best of institutions in engaged learning, including writing instruction. The “need” addressed by this proposal focuses on what we need to do in order to reach the goals we have set for ourselves as an institution.

Recent conversations about a new general studies curriculum at Elon provide insight into the Elon community’s beliefs about student writing. These conversations make clear that the community values writing and wants to strengthen writing instruction and achievement: 69% of faculty surveyed in the GST Review Survey noted the importance of writing, suggested more writing instruction, integrated throughout the four years and, perhaps, in the disciplines (GST Review Committee, “Rationale” 2; 5). And while programmatic assessment results for Elon’s College Writing program and NSSE results indicate that Elon is performing better than average at teaching students to write, the writing instruction in our current General Studies model still is described by some faculty as “insufficient” (GST Review Committee, “FAQs” 2; see Appendix E “Resources on Teaching Writing in the First-Year and Beyond”). A culture of writing would support the goals of the domains of inquiry, knowledge, and communication (“writing skills as a means to global engagement, a central feature of the new program” [GST Review, “Rationale” 2]). Support for the proposed Writing in the Disciplines (WID) requirement as well as for the renewed emphasis on writing instruction in GST 110 and GST 410 (faculty and course development, student writing support) would be part of the Center for the Advancement of Writing.

Student Measures of Success

Part of this QEP is to support the development of specific learning and writing objectives and appropriate assessment tools within departments and programs (Anson “Assessing Writing”). Therefore, it would be premature to identify specific methods of student assessment. Assessment of the QEP will be based largely on department-specific measures that are developed by departments, majors, minors and/or programs in consultation with the Center, reflecting researched-based best practices in the teaching of writing, in general, and in writing in the specific disciplines, majors, minors, and/or programs (Huot; Huot, O’Neill & Schendel). In particular we can also use as models, and adjust accordingly, the assessment plans of other writing-intensive programs, such as the Writing-Enriched Curriculum (“WEC”) program at the University of Minnesota and the Campus Writing & Speaking program at North Carolina State University.
While any solid assessment plan includes both formative and summative assessment, we want to emphasize the importance of formative assessment for providing meaningful feedback to disciplines/majors/minors and programs as a way to improve further writing instruction and learning in those units. In general, summative student measures of success will reflect positive results aligned to the outcomes outlined earlier in this report.

Nonetheless, we would expect all graduating seniors to demonstrate that they can:
1. Identify and use effectively the writing strategies and research methods/information literacy practices of their chosen disciplines.
2. Identify and compose effectively the genres of their chosen disciplines.
3. Understand and choose wisely among the wide range of 21st century multi-platformed, computer-mediated, highly visual genres and different delivery systems.
4. Adapt their academic writing practices for civic and public purposes and audiences.

Faculty Measures of Success
1. Faculty will have studied/discussed the teaching and learning of writing within and across their disciplines.
2. Faculty will have integrated writing, as a context-sensitive practice as well as a vehicle for deep-learning, into their courses, majors/minors, and/or programs.
3. If interested in such support for their own scholarly writing, faculty will have participated in workshops, retreats, and writing groups.

Department Measures of Success
1. Departments will have their own departmental, major, minor, and/or program writing goals and outcomes.
2. Departments will conduct assessment of their writing goals and outcomes following an alignment model (Anson “Assessing Writing”) that is determined by departments.
3. Departments will include writing goals in departmental EOY reports and 5-year plans.

Combined, these measures of success reflect a campus-wide commitment to advancing Elon’s culture of writing to a nationally-recognized, and locally celebrated, level of excellence.

V. Budget and Resources Requirement
(see Appendix F for Detailed Budget)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Student Writing Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Department Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>CAW &amp; WAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Recreate the Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Scholarship of Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Literature Support

Statements from Nationally Recognized Writing Organizations

**High-Impact and Engaged Learning**


**Writing Transfer**


**21st Century Writing**


**Writing Across the Disciplines & Writing in the Disciplines**


**Writing-to-Learn**


**Civic Engagement**


Information Literacy
Bowles-Terry, Melissa; Davis, Erin; and Wendy Holliday. “‘Writing Information Literacy’ Revisited: Application of Theory to Practice in the Classroom.” Information Literacy and Instruction. Ed. Lisa O’Connor. 49.3 225-230.

Audience

Assessment

Elon University Documents
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- A: Writing Program Administrators’ Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition
- B: Nationally Recognized Writing-in-the-Disciplines Programs & Their Relationship to First-Year Writing Requirements
- C: Student Writing Fellows Program
- D: Interdisciplinary Writing Committee (IWC) Review of Best Practices in Writing Across the Curriculum Programs
- E: Resources on Teaching Writing in the First-Year and Beyond
- F: Detailed Budget for QEP on the Teaching and Learning of Writing
Appendix A

WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition

This document can also be downloaded as a PDF.

Adopted by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA), April 2000; amended July 2008.

For further information about the development of the Outcomes Statement, please see http://comppile.org/archives/WPAoutcomes/continue.html

For further information about the Council of Writing Program Administrators, please see http://www.wpacouncil.org

A version of this statement was published in WPA: Writing Program Administration 23.1/2 (fall/winter 1999): 59-66

Introduction
This statement describes the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes sought by first-year composition programs in American postsecondary education. To some extent, we seek to regularize what can be expected to be taught in first-year composition; to this end the document is not merely a compilation or summary of what currently takes place. Rather, the following statement articulates what composition teachers nationwide have learned from practice, research, and theory. This document intentionally defines only "outcomes," or types of results, and not "standards," or precise levels of achievement. The setting of standards should be left to specific institutions or specific groups of institutions.

Learning to write is a complex process, both individual and social, that takes place over time with continued practice and informed guidance. Therefore, it is important that teachers, administrators, and a concerned public do not imagine that these outcomes can be taught in reduced or simple ways. Helping students demonstrate these outcomes requires expert understanding of how students actually learn to write. For this reason we expect the primary audience for this document to be well-prepared college writing teachers and college writing program administrators. In some places, we have chosen to write in their professional language. Among such readers, terms such as "rhetorical" and "genre" convey a rich meaning that is not easily simplified. While we have also aimed at writing a document that the general public can understand, in limited cases we have aimed first at communicating effectively with expert writing teachers and writing program administrators.

These statements describe only what we expect to find at the end of first-year composition, at most schools a required general education course or sequence of courses. As writers move beyond first-year composition, their writing abilities do not merely improve. Rather, students' abilities not only diversify along disciplinary and professional lines but also move into whole new levels where expected outcomes expand, multiply, and diverge. For this reason, each statement of outcomes for first-year composition is followed by suggestions for further work that builds on these outcomes.
Rhetorical Knowledge

By the end of first year composition, students should

- Focus on a purpose
- Respond to the needs of different audiences
- Respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations
- Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation
- Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality
- Understand how genres shape reading and writing
- Write in several genres

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn

- The main features of writing in their fields
- The main uses of writing in their fields
- The expectations of readers in their fields

Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing

By the end of first year composition, students should

- Use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating
- Understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources
- Integrate their own ideas with those of others
- Understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn

- The uses of writing as a critical thinking method
- The interactions among critical thinking, critical reading, and writing
- The relationships among language, knowledge, and power in their fields

Processes

By the end of first year composition, students should

- Be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text
- Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading
- Understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and re-thinking to revise their work
- Understand the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes
- Learn to critique their own and others’ works
- Learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part
- Use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn

- To build final results in stages
- To review work-in-progress in collaborative peer groups for purposes other than editing
- To save extensive editing for later parts of the writing process
To apply the technologies commonly used to research and communicate within their fields

Knowledge of Conventions

By the end of first year composition, students should
- Learn common formats for different kinds of texts
- Develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics
- Practice appropriate means of documenting their work
- Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn
- The conventions of usage, specialized vocabulary, format, and documentation in their fields
- Strategies through which better control of conventions can be achieved

Composing in Electronic Environments

As has become clear over the last twenty years, writing in the 21st-century involves the use of digital technologies for several purposes, from drafting to peer reviewing to editing. Therefore, although the kinds of composing processes and texts expected from students vary across programs and institutions, there are nonetheless common expectations.

By the end of first-year composition, students should:
- Use electronic environments for drafting, reviewing, revising, editing, and sharing texts
- Locate, evaluate, organize, and use research material collected from electronic sources, including scholarly library databases; other official databases (e.g., federal government databases); and informal electronic networks and internet sources
- Understand and exploit the differences in the rhetorical strategies and in the affordances available for both print and electronic composing processes and texts

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn
- How to engage in the electronic research and composing processes common in their fields
- How to disseminate texts in both print and electronic forms in their fields
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Nationally Recognized Writing-in-the-Disciplines Programs (from *US News*) & Their Relationships to First-Year Writing Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endowed Centers/Programs</th>
<th>First-Year Seminar</th>
<th>First-Year Composition</th>
<th>No Explicit FY Requirement</th>
<th>See additional notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami of Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Denver</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Writing Depts. or Programs</th>
<th>First-Year Seminar</th>
<th>First-Year Composition</th>
<th>No Explicit FY Requirement</th>
<th>See additional notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td>X *</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td></td>
<td>X *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Umbrella Units</th>
<th>First-Year Seminar</th>
<th>First-Year Composition</th>
<th>No Explicit FY Requirement</th>
<th>See additional notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC State</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“First-Year Seminars” in this table refer to writing seminars staffed by faculty from across the disciplines and administered by units independent from and outside of English departments.

“First-Year Composition” courses in this table, unless otherwise noted, are housed within English departments. All within English departments are part of semi-autonomous composition programs that are mostly and often exclusively staffed independently from the English faculty, often including a large cadre of temporary staff (including TAs/GAs)

Additional Notes

Carleton College: Students submit writing portfolios for evaluation, including work from three of four separate divisions, including one writing-rich course.
George Mason: Students are required to take a first-year composition course offered by the Composition Program within the English department; they then must take another advanced composition course within their major, as well as a writing-intensive course within their major.

Hamilton: Students have an elective curriculum that is imbued with writing throughout. The college’s tag-line is “A NATIONAL LEADER in teaching students to write effectively, learn from each other and think for themselves.”

Santa Barbara: Students meet university writing requirements differently depending on major area, but all must complete two writing courses beyond the introductory writing course. These courses are offered through an independent writing program.

Stanford: All students must complete three writing courses, one in the first year, one in the second year, and one in the third year. The first two courses are offered through an independent writing program; the third course is taught within the major.

UC-Davis: Students are required to take two writing courses, with options for satisfying this requirement designed by separate divisions within the university.

University of Denver: Students start with a first-year seminar taught by faculty from across the disciplines, and then they take a series of required writing courses offered through the independent writing program unit.
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Student Writing Fellows Program

Mission
- To improve students' disciplinary and/or pre-professional writing competence.
- To facilitate an increase in the amount of students' upper-level disciplinary writing without increasing the workload of faculty.
- To facilitate increased upper-level disciplinary writing instruction through faculty workshops and course support.
- To offer an intensive, experiential opportunity for select students to learn about writing in their specialized area of study.
- To raise awareness of the importance of discipline-specific writing instruction.

What are the criteria for WF support?
- Course must be a 200-level or above, with strong preference given to majors courses.
- Course must include at least two extended writing projects.
- Professor agrees to participate in a development workshop series before the first semester of participation and voluntarily participate in some of the program's ongoing workshops and events.
- Professor must be willing to carefully design and sequence writing projects so students and Fellows can interact effectively from invention through "publication."
- Professor agrees to work with Fellows and WAC Director throughout the semester.

Who will be Fellows?
- Students who have completed English 319 (the tutor training workshop course) and have been recommended by both the WAC Director (or Writing Center Director) and their major or minor department.
- Students who have taken the course in which they will serve as a Fellow are highly preferred.

What will Fellows do?
- Meet regularly with participating professor to discuss assignments.
- Meet regularly with WAC Director for continued training and in-service support.
- Work one-on-one with students, tutoring no more than 15 students in a course.

Proposed calendar

Summer 99
- Identify and contact 2 faculty participants for Spring 00 pilot.
• Develop materials for pre-term workshops to be delivered Fall 99.
• Schedule pre-term workshops.
• Identify 4 tutors as Fellows.

**Fall 99**
• Work with participating faculty and Fellows to prepare for spring pilot – developing course syllabi, creating assignments, scheduling writing sequences and processes, practicing response, scheduling regular meetings, etc.
• Prepare an assessment tool for pilot.
• Educate whole-faculty about initiative (e.g., advertise online report within Writing Program web site).

**Spring 00**
• Support pilot initiative – meet regularly with faculty and Fellows; observe classes, group, and one-on-one sessions; offer feedback and support materials; collect assessment data, etc.
• Request proposals for Fall 00 Writing Fellow supported courses.

**Summer 00**
• Assess pilot
• Determine with VP and participating faculty what to do next
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IWC Review of Best Practices in Writing Across the Curriculum Programs
Completed 1 June 2011

Introduction

One of the 2009-10 goals for the Interdisciplinary Writing Committee [IWC] was to review exceptional Writing Across the Curriculum programs [WAC] and establish a recommended list of “best practices” that could shape the future structure and staffing of Elon’s Interdisciplinary Writing Program.

In the spring of 2010, our WAC program, along with CATL, invited Chris Anson, University Distinguished Professor, Professor of English, and Director of the Campus Writing and Speaking Program at North Carolina State University, to the campus to lead some writing across the curriculum workshops and to discuss the future of the WAC program at Elon with interested stakeholders. One of the many suggestions Chris made was to examine excellent WAC programs across the country in order to see what top programs were doing so that we might develop a long term plan appropriate for Elon’s WAC program.

In the spring of 2010, Tim Peeples, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, shared a potential list of WAC programs we might investigate, using the U.S News & World Report’s list of top Writing in the Discipline Programs [WID], as well as his own knowledge of exceptional programs. The committee members each chose one school off the list to investigate and we discussed these programs at our November 2010 meeting. The programs we investigated were located at

- Carleton College
- Clemson University
- Cornell University
- Denver University
- Duke University
- George Mason University
- Oberlin College
- Stanford University

While the committee did not use specific criteria when selecting which schools to investigate, we did try to select some that reflect Elon’s size and mission.

After the committee’s discussion of our research, we drafted a tentative set of “best practices.” After a review of these “best practices” at our December 2010 meeting, we developed the following report on the future of the WAC program at Elon and the best practices that should shape its mission and goals.
The committee did not limit itself to “what the university can afford” or any other outside criteria. We offer here ideas for developing the strongest Writing Across the Curriculum program at Elon we can, consistent with the university’s mission and goals.

A. Program focus

Writing programs are not all the same. We explored writing across the curriculum [WAC], writing in the disciplines [WID], and communications across the curriculum programs [CAC], among others. While each of these programs offer important support for writing and communication, the distinctions between them are important to understand. A WAC program takes on a significantly larger mission than a WID program, and CAC programs, adding speaking and all kinds of communication besides writing, become even larger. While we see value in each of these programs for Elon University, we agree that a WAC program would be best suited to the current needs of students and faculty. While we certainly value speaking and all forms of communication beyond “writing,” however we might define that term, we found that most CAC programs took on more than they could do well. We believe that Elon’s first step should be to establish a strong WAC program, as we continue to support the further growth of our vibrant Writing Center. This would not rule out the possible transformation to a CAC program at a later time.

B. Administrative Structure

The majority of programs we examined have directors dedicated to the program, support staff, and a budget for fostering the program’s goals. Most reminded of us of the organizational and administrative structure of our own CATL. Clearly, the more components for which the program is responsible [portfolios, writing outcomes, research agendas, etc.], the more significant the commitment of staff and monies to the program. A number of the best programs were supported by endowments that gave their programs a great deal of flexibility. We recommend hiring a dedicated director of our WAC program, who would promote the initiatives outlined below. This director would need a strong budget to achieve the new and enhanced WAC mission.

We also agree that the Writing Center should continue to be maintained as a separate entity from WAC, with its own director, who would continue to report to the Assistant Provost, same as the WAC Director. While both the Writing Center and WAC may collaborate as they work towards achieving their missions and goals, they serve entirely different populations. The Writing Center serves students; WAC serves faculty. The best Writing Across the Curriculum programs nearly always support this two-pronged approach.

C. Writing Outcomes and Expectations across four years

The best programs fostered writing in every discipline, program, and college year. Some had upper level requirements; some had writing requirements in the majors or disciplines
[WIM; WID]; some had writing requirements embedded in courses across the curriculum. All of them strived to foster writing instruction beyond first year requirements. None of them had a magic formula for Elon to adopt. Instead, each developed requirements and programs that best matched their university mission and student body. These programs continually evolve, based upon the development of new practices and the changing needs of departments, disciplines, programs, and students. WAC programs we investigated used outcomes and expectations from across campus areas to determine how to best support faculty development in those areas, and as tools for periodic self-assessment, of both the programs and WAC. We recommend that our WAC program promote the creation of developmental writing outcomes and expectations, working with all disciplines and programs as they create outcomes in support of their learning goals and objectives.

D. Writing Program grant monies

Much like our own CATL grants, the best writing programs offered grants to assist disciplines, departments, and programs in developing writing outcomes and expectations, new writing projects, and faculty research in writing. WAC programs offered grants ranging from $360 for faculty workshops to $5000 for multi-year projects. All monies supported projects that would further the writing program and the university mission. Overall, each of these WAC programs promoted developmental workshops, projects, and research that were considered an important part of faculty careers at these universities.

The best WAC programs also had a clear research agenda, best exemplified by George Mason University. This agenda promotes faculty-initiated on-campus research projects that inform the teaching of writing on and off the campus. We believe that a research agenda should be an important component of Elon’s WAC program. Such an agenda is consistent with CATL and SOTL research, and will help provide valuable assessment data for use across the university.

We recommend that a significant WAC budget be created so that when a new director is named, the program can offer a wide-range of grants and stipends to support the development of writing at Elon. These grants will assist faculty in their quest to continually improve teaching and student learning through writing.

E. Relationship of writing and “new media”

A good number of the programs we investigated offered grants and faculty development monies for exploring the relationship of “new media” and the teaching of writing, broadly defined (not only alphabetic text, but also videos, images, hypertext, etc). There is a long relationship between new technologies and how writing is produced and delivered, so it is important that our WAC program continually support faculty as they explore the evolving digital world and its impact on writing. Funds should be available to support such exploration, especially to address on-going pedagogical issues that arise from this evolution. We also believe that the best research will be done within the disciplines and
programs where the writing and new media will be used. So our WAC program should be able to support disciplinary projects where new media intersects with writing, and where that new media can be applied.

The best programs did not include technology experts within the WAC program, though there were clearly intentional ties to technology experts. While our WAC program can draw upon the strong technology support programs for faculty, already in place, it is important to recognize that newer composing technologies affect writing, research, pedagogy, and meaning-making in different disciplines in different ways. This means, then, that it is essential that our WAC program support faculty as they explore these issues, within the context of their own disciplines. Therefore, we also recommend that grants, resources, and space be made available for faculty as they study how newer composing technologies are changing the nature of writing, research, pedagogy, and meaning-making in their particular disciplinary fields.

**Conclusion**

None of these programs would be as successful as they are without strong university support. The best programs offered support for writing at all undergraduate levels in mission statements, academic priorities, and the faculty reward structure. We already have in place certain statements in our mission to support our WAC program. We recommend that we develop academic priorities to support the WAC program for at least its first five years and that the university investigate ways to promote faculty involvement with writing and thinking across the university.
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Resources on Teaching Writing in the First-Year (and Beyond)
Prepared by Jessie Moore (jmoore28@elon.edu) and Paula Rosinski (prosinski@elon.edu)

This document summarizes resources on curriculum and program designs for supporting the vertical integration of writing, beginning in the first-year. This information is divided into the following sections:

- An Introduction to the Council of Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition,
- A Brief Overview of Elon University’s Current First-Year Writing Program,
- A Discussion of the Impact of Program Models on Vertical Integration of Writing,
- A Brief Annotated Bibliography, and
- The Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Statement in its entirety.

Council of Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition
Adopted in 2000 and amended in 2008 to integrate writing with technologies, this document reflects shared outcomes for first-year writing in U.S. postsecondary institutions. Although first-year writing programs vary significantly across the country, Council members identified these shared learning goals for first-year writing (excerpted from the full statement):

Rhetorical Knowledge
By the end of first year composition, students should
  o Focus on a purpose
  o Respond to the needs of different audiences
  o Respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations
  o Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation
  o Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality
  o Understand how genres shape reading and writing
  o Write in several genres

Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing
By the end of first year composition, students should
  o Use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating
  o Understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources
  o Integrate their own ideas with those of others
  o Understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power

Processes
By the end of first year composition, students should
  o Be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text
  o Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading
  o Understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and re-thinking to revise their work
  o Understand the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes
  o Learn to critique their own and others' works
  o Learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part
Knowledge of Conventions
By the end of first year composition, students should
- Learn common formats for different kinds of texts
- Develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics
- Practice appropriate means of documenting their work
- Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Composing in Electronic Environments
As has become clear over the last twenty years, writing in the 21st-century involves the use of digital technologies for several purposes, from drafting to peer reviewing to editing. Therefore, although the kinds of composing processes and texts expected from students vary across programs and institutions, there are nonetheless common expectations.

By the end of first-year composition, students should:
- Use electronic environments for drafting, reviewing, revising, editing, and sharing texts
- Locate, evaluate, organize, and use research material collected from electronic sources, including scholarly library databases; other official databases (e.g., federal government databases); and informal electronic networks and internet sources
- Understand and exploit the differences in the rhetorical strategies and in the affordances available for both print and electronic composing processes and texts

Given the Outcomes Statement significance in the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition and the field of Writing Program Administration, we have included the statement in its entirety at the end of this resource. The history of the statement has been described in:


A Brief Overview of Elon University’s Current First-Year Writing Program
Elon’s first-year writing program currently exists as an English Department course, although the program coordinator is responsible both to English and to General Studies and the funding for faculty development comes from both the College of Arts and Sciences and General Studies. Approximately 63-66 sections of ENG 110: College Writing are offered each academic year, with a growing percentage of sections staffed by limited-term and part-time faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections of College Writing Taught by...</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Lecture-Track Faculty</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited-Term, PT/FT, and Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The 2010-2011 numbers reflect the latest staffing information for the year; these numbers might change after pre-registration for spring 2011.
Jessie Moore submitted an application for the Conference on College Composition and Communication Certificate of Excellence in 2007. The review committee encouraged us to reapply when we had more years of assessment data; the reviewers complimented our assessment approach, but wanted it to be in place longer. At that time, we also were praised for our use of the lecture track as a way to reduce our dependence on non-continuing faculty. Since the English Department has taken a hiatus from that hiring approach, and since our staffing by non-continuing faculty has increased steadily, Jessie has not wanted to reapply. Further, our additional years of assessment data have shown mixed results in terms of meeting our learning outcomes for the course, further limiting our chance of a successful application.

The program uses three assessment methods (indirect student assessment, direct student assessment, and indirect faculty assessment) to triangulate our results. While our assessment results reflect short-term gains in areas related to faculty development, we have only seen sustained improvement in one area – the inclusion of argumentative/persuasive writing in ENG 110 sections. The graphs below illustrate a few examples of our short-term gains in other areas.

**Invention Strategies**

How often did you engage in invention strategies (i.e. - clustering, freewriting, listing, brainstorming, etc.) both in and outside your ENG110 class this semester?

Secondary assessment measures on individual invention activities (i.e., outlining, listing, brainstorming, clustering, freewriting, etc.) show a similar trend, with one exception – tagmemics – which showed an increase in use.

**Revising Strategies**

How often did you engage in revising strategies (i.e. - identifying features that require revision, writing a revision plan, developing a way to deal with responses from peers or writing center consultants, highlighting different sections/topics with different colors, etc.) both in and outside your ENG110 class this semester?
Although peer response activities remain high, overall, developing strategies for incorporating responses from peers or Writing Center consultants remains low (and dropped from previous semesters). Engagement in other individual self-assessment activities for revision declined, with one exception – “Visiting the Writing Center on Your Own,” which showed a slight increase but remains low in comparison to other revising strategies.

**Research Strategies**

In 2009-2010, both indirect and direct assessments showed an increase in students’ successful use of research strategies. The increase corresponds with Scholarship of Teaching and Learning project that emphasized teaching source use in 18 sections of ENG 110 during the academic year. The direct assessment scores remained the lowest scores among the measured items, though, and it remains to be seen if our program can sustain this positive increase.

As program coordinators, the short-term improvements corresponding with our faculty development offerings are initially satisfying, but we worry about the lack of long-term growth. We speculate that our inability to sustain this program development is reflective of frequent staffing turnover, particularly as our reliance on part-time, part-time/full-time, and limited term faculty has increased. Additionally, we worry that the lack of sustained improvement reflects a lack of shared commitment to the course objectives.

Please contact Jessie Moore (jmoore28@elon.edu) if you would like to see additional assessment results.

**Program Models**

Program designs have the potential to influence the vertical integration of writing across campus. The following examples are intended to be illustrative of this potential correlation. Other models of course exist that would fall along this continuum.
Non-outcomes-based first-year writing courses in English Departments do not tend to emphasize as many strategies that transfer to students’ future writing, unless the writing occurs in the English Department. Few of these types of courses still exist across the nation, as the majority of writing programs have adopted curriculum informed by the Council of Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Statement.

Outcomes-based first-year writing courses in English Departments offer more potential transfer to students’ writing in other courses, since students are learning writing processes and rhetorical strategies that they can apply to future writing. Local research and the limited national publications on transfer highlight the limitations of this model, though; students only transfer these strategies if they have opportunities to write in other classes – and if they identify the new writing tasks as activities that enable them to use existing knowledge (i.e., their writing processes and rhetorical strategies).

Unfortunately, unless their future teachers make explicit reference to students’ previous writing courses, students often don’t recognize these new situations as opportunities to transfer and apply what they know; instead they silo their first-year writing experience and view it as having relevance to writing in other English classes only. Some students do not even identify that within-department transfer, in part because they recognize that their section is taught by a part-time or limited-term staff member – not by a continuing faculty member. Our current staffing practices, then, suggest a devaluation of first-year writing to our students; if continuing faculty are not interested in the course and its content, why should students identify it as valuable?

Outcomes-based first-year writing seminars outside of the English department have the possibility to support transfer and enhance vertical integration of writing in two ways:

- First, students would see continuing faculty from across the curriculum teaching the course, suggesting to them that the university as a whole values the course.
- Second, as faculty learn strategies to teach writing in the first-year writing seminars, they can apply those same strategies in their other courses. As a result, students would see more opportunities to apply what they learned about writing processes and rhetorical strategies as
assignments in other classes and disciplines call on them to participate in planning activities, to submit and peer review drafts, and to use previously practiced revising and editing strategies.

- Finally, writing and the teaching of writing would no longer be siloed, but instead would be a shared, university-wide responsibility.

A Brief Annotated Bibliography

In this section we highlight a few disciplinary calls for changes in first-year writing, some ideas about Advanced Placement and first-year writing (since questions about AP credit were raised at the October Numen-Lumen breakout session on writing), and some calls that echo our own hope for more digital/multimedia writing in the first-year. We would be happy to add to this section in response to any other specific questions the review committee has about first-year writing, but we did not want to overwhelm you with sources at this stage in your work.

Curricular Structures, Staffing, and Requirements


Beaufort conducted an ethnographic study about the kinds of knowledge that students transfer from writing courses and other college learning to writing in the workplace. She examined five knowledge-domains that work-related writing draws on and that writing pedagogy should address: discourse community, subject matter, genre uses, rhetorical situation, and writing process knowledge. Arguing that college writing courses help prepare students for the kind of writing they will be asked to do outside of school only if they help student think rhetorically, she then also notes that college writing classes often failed in this task. Her two major conclusions about transfer are that the mindfulness of writers is important (self-monitoring what they are doing versus what they could be doing) and that very limited transfer occurred in writing courses that did not focus on metacognition.


Hansen and six co-investigators examined writing samples from three groups of sophomores: a group who took first-year composition, a group who took only a high school AP English course, and a group took both a high school AP English course and first-year composition. Students who had taken both an AP class and first-year composition outperformed their peers in the other two groups on sophomore writing tasks. Writing scores for the sophomore writing were statistically indistinguishable for the students who had taken either an AP class or first-year composition. Further, these students tended to overestimate their writing ability. The study also found that the majority of students from all three groups reported writing only one research paper a year in high school, so taking an AP class did not provide students more experience writing with sources.
In this 1998 study of 233 writing programs, 27% of the schools had options outside their English departments for satisfying a first-year writing requirement. That percentage increased to 29% in private schools. 45% of private schools surveyed allowed students to place out of the first-year writing requirement using AP credit. 11% of private schools staffed first-year writing courses only with full-time, continuing faculty.

Murphy advocates a staffing model similar to the English Department's short-term attempt to build a cohort of lecture-track faculty who could specialize in teaching first-year writing. He suggests using a teaching-focused track that embraces and rewards good teaching to address perpetual staffing problems in traditional first-year writing courses.

At Elon, the English Department only attempted this model with four hires, and because those hires did not have the full support of the department, they came at substantial cost to their supporters – and even to some of the hires. We lost one of our hires, in part because the battles for this type of professionalization of first-year writing within the department got so ugly. We share this information to point out that we attempted to implement other solutions to our staffing problems in ENG 110, but this department-based solution was not successful.

Russell uses activity theory to argue that first-year writing curricula that aim to teach a “universal educated discourse” are utterly ineffective. Activity theory views writing as a tool that people use in activities in order to achieve the objectives of those activities. Courses based “general writing skills” are therefore severely limited in regard to transfer, because the writing instruction these courses provide do not reference any specific activity. He calls instead for writing curricula that focuses on studying why a “universal educated discourse” does not exist.

Smit recommends a three-tiered writing curriculum with a introductory writing course, a second course with practice in a particular discourse community, and a third course with practice writing for communities outside the academy (184-193). Smit also acknowledges that little is known about students’ abilities to transfer writing skills from current configurations of first-year composition to other courses in the curriculum. [Editorial Note: The 2011-2013 Elon Research Seminar will focus on this questions as it supports exploration of “Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer.”]
Wardle, Elizabeth. “Mutt Genres” and the Goal of FYC: How Can We Help Students Write the Genres of the University?” *College Composition and Communication* 60.4 (2009): 765-789.

Wardle’s two-year study, which included 23 teachers and 462 students in 25 sections of first year composition using “rhetorically based” or “academic writing skills” curricula, identified nine genres that were commonly assigned in these classes. She describes these genres as “mutt” genres because, when taught outside of disciplinary contexts, they are isolated from the real activity they were meant to be a part of and instead become a kind of artificial, watered-down performance in its own right. In other words, the “mutt” genres required in first year composition courses can, at best, only mimic “real” genres doing real work in other activity systems (i.e., in other disciplines). At the very least Wardle argues for these “mutt” genres to be identified as such and to be viewed as “boundary objects” that can bridge, in some future course, to the actual activities that actually require it. Wardle concludes that first year composition should stop attempting to teach how to write genres outside of the activities (i.e., disciplines) that require them, and instead shift to writing about writing as a way to prepare students for writing those genres once they are really participating in those activities that require them (i.e., disciplinary writing).

*Writing in the 21st Century: The Role of Digital/Multimedia Writing in First-Year Writing Seminars*


Leverenz calls on Writing Program Administrators to update writing curricula to reflect 21st century writing. She specifically advocates more integration of new media writing. While noting that such curricular updates will require extensive faculty development as well as technological resources for writing courses, an updated curriculum would better serve today’s students while opening up new research opportunities for faculty.

Takayoshi, Pamela, and Brian Huot. “Composing in a Digital World: The Transition of a Writing Program and Its Faculty.” *Writing Program Administration* 32.3 (Spring 2009): 89-119.

In an article describing Kent State University’s efforts to integrate multimedia composing and digital texts into a first-year writing program, the authors highlight similar efforts at Clemson University, Purdue University, and Michigan Tech University to teach computer-based composition. The article forefronts the classroom spaces and faculty development opportunities Kent State implemented to support their curricular efforts to catch up with the types of writing students are completing in the 21st century.
WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition

Adopted by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA), April 2000; amended July 2008.

For further information about the development of the Outcomes Statement, please see http://comppile.org/archives/WPAoutcomes/continue.html

For further information about the Council of Writing Program Administrators, please see http://www.wpacouncil.org

Introduction
This statement describes the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes sought by first-year composition programs in American postsecondary education. To some extent, we seek to regularize what can be expected to be taught in first-year composition; to this end the document is not merely a compilation or summary of what currently takes place. Rather, the following statement articulates what composition teachers nationwide have learned from practice, research, and theory. This document intentionally defines only "outcomes," or types of results, and not "standards," or precise levels of achievement. The setting of standards should be left to specific institutions or specific groups of institutions.

Learning to write is a complex process, both individual and social, that takes place over time with continued practice and informed guidance. Therefore, it is important that teachers, administrators, and a concerned public do not imagine that these outcomes can be taught in reduced or simple ways. Helping students demonstrate these outcomes requires expert understanding of how students actually learn to write. For this reason we expect the primary audience for this document to be well-prepared college writing teachers and college writing program administrators. In some places, we have chosen to write in their professional language. Among such readers, terms such as "rhetorical" and "genre" convey a rich meaning that is not easily simplified. While we have also aimed at writing a document that the general public can understand, in limited cases we have aimed first at communicating effectively with expert writing teachers and writing program administrators.

These statements describe only what we expect to find at the end of first-year composition, at most schools a required general education course or sequence of courses. As writers move beyond first-year composition, their writing abilities do not merely improve. Rather, students' abilities not only diversify along disciplinary and professional lines but also move into whole new levels where expected outcomes expand, multiply, and diverge. For this reason, each statement of outcomes for first-year composition is followed by suggestions for further work that builds on these outcomes.

Rhetorical Knowledge
By the end of first year composition, students should
- Focus on a purpose
- Respond to the needs of different audiences
- Respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations
- Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation
- Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality
- Understand how genres shape reading and writing
- Write in several genres

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn
Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing
By the end of first year composition, students should
  o Use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating
  o Understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources
  o Integrate their own ideas with those of others
  o Understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn
  o The uses of writing as a critical thinking method
  o The interactions among critical thinking, critical reading, and writing
  o The relationships among language, knowledge, and power in their fields

Processes
By the end of first year composition, students should
  o Be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text
  o Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading
  o Understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and re-thinking to revise their work
  o Understand the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes
  o Learn to critique their own and others' works
  o Learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part
  o Use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn
  o To build final results in stages
  o To review work-in-progress in collaborative peer groups for purposes other than editing
  o To save extensive editing for later parts of the writing process
  o To apply the technologies commonly used to research and communicate within their fields

Knowledge of Conventions
By the end of first year composition, students should
  o Learn common formats for different kinds of texts
  o Develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics
  o Practice appropriate means of documenting their work
  o Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn
  o The conventions of usage, specialized vocabulary, format, and documentation in their fields
  o Strategies through which better control of conventions can be achieved

Composing in Electronic Environments
As has become clear over the last twenty years, writing in the 21st-century involves the use of digital technologies for several purposes, from drafting to peer reviewing to editing. Therefore, although
the *kinds* of composing processes and texts expected from students vary across programs and institutions, there are nonetheless common expectations.

By the end of first-year composition, students should:

- Use electronic environments for drafting, reviewing, revising, editing, and sharing texts
- Locate, evaluate, organize, and use research material collected from electronic sources, including scholarly library databases; other official databases (e.g., federal government databases); and informal electronic networks and internet sources
- Understand and exploit the differences in the rhetorical strategies and in the affordances available for both print and electronic composing processes and texts

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn

- How to engage in the electronic research and composing processes common in their fields
- How to disseminate texts in both print and electronic forms in their fields
Appendix F

V. Budget and Resources Requirement

Detailed Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy #1 – Student Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires none of its own specific budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy #2 – Department Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants for departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a course release for one term for one point person per participating department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• learning outcomes development, implementation, and assessment support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• funding for each faculty member in participating departments, for two summers in a row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• travel for faculty to attend disciplinary conferences or workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• discipline-specific writing workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• discipline-specific writing resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grants for extracurricular student organizations (ie., The Multicultural Center, Student Life, etc.) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Writing Fellows Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Start with five courses per term, and increase to offer this support over time)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy #3 – CAW &amp; WAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CAW Director, 12 months position (could also be WAC director, but this depends on the person hired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WAC Director, 11 month position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associate CAW Director, new faculty line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program support for CAW, ½ time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program support for WAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facility costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource Center/Library that is built and sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speaker series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conference/Symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seminar operational costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workshops for faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Strategy #4 - Recreate The Writing Center as a 21st century learning & writing space**

- Resources to redesign 21st century Writing Center as learning and writing space (cost to create and run a computer space, one-time cost)
- Ongoing operations
- Administrative support, ½ time position
- Faculty Writing Fellows Program
- Information Literacy
- Extracurricular (workshops, lunches, resources)

**Strategy #5 - Scholarship of teaching and learning**

- Half of Writing Residency (CATL currently pays entire cost)
- Symposium
- CAW Teaching and Learning Writing Scholars (2 or 3 per year)