



Trinity

**College of Arts and Sciences
WID Working Group Pilot Proposal**

28 February 2013

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
History.....	4
Comparative Program Approaches.....	5
George Mason University.....	6
University of Maryland, Baltimore County.....	7
University of Maryland, College Park.....	8
The Catholic University of America.....	8
University of California at Davis.....	9
CAS Faculty & Instructional Staff Survey Results.....	9
General Concerns.....	10
Support for Action.....	11
WI Implementation.....	12
Going Forward: Pilot Proposal Overviews and Other Issues.....	13
WI Courses: Objectives/Outcomes.....	16
WI Courses: Application and Requirements.....	17
WI Courses: Evaluation and Assessment.....	18
Conclusion.....	19
Appendix: Survey Data.....	20

Introduction

The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) Writing in the Disciplines (WID) Working Group formed in Spring 2012 with a specific goal: craft a proposal outlining the steps CAS faculty could take to address concerns raised by both professors and students about student writing. To achieve that goal the group adopted a number of related purposes, including (1) researching writing programs at institutions similar to Trinity; (2) providing insight into already available as well as potentially available faculty/institutional supports; (3) and developing a mandate to enact changes included in the eventual proposal.

This goal and its related purposes connect directly to Trinity's mission and the University's foundation in the liberal arts. In its initial discussions about the WID proposal, our group members agreed that writing is inextricably linked to both critical reading and critical thinking. The proposal thus needs to encompass approaches that will embrace the different rhetorical strategies of various academic discourses in order to develop not only our students' writing skills but also their critical reading and thinking skills.

In addressing student learning, goals, and outcomes, the proposal also needs to be consonant with a number of institutional goals and projects, including (1) strengthening our enrollment and retention numbers via increased student engagement; (2) reaching students across diverse populations (envisioned in the widest senses, such as language diversity, writing levels or abilities, and post-graduation goals); and (3) lowering the number of Academic Honesty cases reported each academic year. Our proposal therefore seeks to support our students' writing and faculty's pedagogy in order to impact the entire Trinity experience.

History

In a Fall 2011 CAS faculty meeting, serious concerns were raised about student writing. In direct response to these concerns, in early Spring 2012, CAS Dean Elizabeth Child and Provost Virginia Broaddus asked Sarah Wilson to chair a working group that would discuss the issues at hand and develop a proposal (or set of proposals) in response. The WID Working Group was convened at the March 2012 CAS Faculty Meeting, at which Ms. Wilson issued a call for volunteers to work on the project.

The WID Working Group has held regular meetings between March 28, 2012 and the present. To date, the group has been staffed by volunteer faculty members representing the range of disciplines in CAS:

- Bill Beverly (English)
- Steven Gable (Philosophy)
- Sr. Mary Hayes (History)
- Kerry Luse (Mathematics)
- Raúl Tovares (Communication)
- Debbie Van Camp (Psychology)
- Diana Watts (Business)
- Sarah Wilson (Director of Academic Administration & Academic Honesty)

The committee began less with a mandate and more with a topic: what might be done to improve students' writing proficiency beyond the first-year composition courses now in place? The strategies the committee would propose needed to address faculty concerns about the quality, clarity, and correctness of student work; they would also need to respond to students' needs to build skills for academic and professional communication.

That initial question soon broke itself down into others:

- What approaches have been tried and assessed as successful at other institutions?
- Beyond the committee members' perceptions of the exigency around reading and writing problems at Trinity, what consensus exists among Trinity instructors, both full- and part-time, about student reading and writing at Trinity?

To answer the first of these questions, group members researched and had conversations with colleagues at other schools. To answer the second question, our group designed an online survey to gather responses from the CAS faculty. The results from this research and the survey distributed to faculty are described and analyzed below. All quantitative data from the survey are included in the attached appendix.

The work then turned to integrating possibilities for curricular development with the concerns of Trinity faculty about student achievement in writing and reading. That work produced a series of pilot proposals. As part of this step in the process, the committee discussed logistics and avenues of support for revamping Trinity's writing curriculum; the areas of concern included staffing questions, financial and technological resources, staff support, and external funding.

Comparative Program Approaches

As a starting point for our discussions, we began by investigating schools with current or growing Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) and/or Writing in the Disciplines (WID) programs.¹ The schools considered were mostly nearby schools or schools known to members of the committee. Several of the schools we researched subscribe to the idea that more frequent writing will lead to better writing, provided that their writing courses follow careful guidelines. Most of the feedback on whether or not these courses are producing better writers is positive (though anecdotal). We did notice that schools where better writing is considered a major goal for their graduates have several features in common. First, these goals are clearly articulated on their websites. Second, there are clear writing components in either their general education or

¹ WAC and WID programs support each other, but are distinct. WAC programs promote *writing to learn* across the disciplines/programs/etc. WID programs focus instead on *learning to write*. That is, a WAC course would still have the course discipline/content at the center with writing as a support to that content—whereas a WID course would have writing at the center with the discipline/content as a support to the writing.

graduation requirements. Finally, there are several resources available not only for students in the courses, but also for the faculty teaching them. A short summary of what we specifically learned from each of these schools follows.

George Mason University

GMU's curriculum, which incorporates both WAC and WID elements, includes both a Writing Intensive (WI) course requirement and an advanced composition course in each major as well as "writing-infused" courses throughout the curriculum.² Its WAC goals are broad in scope and flexible enough to remain appropriate to each discipline or major. For example, one of the WAC goals for student writers states, "To use credible evidence, to include, as applicable, data from credible primary and/or secondary sources, integrated and documented accurately according to styles preferred in the major."³

The WI requirement at GMU has been in place since 1993. This requirement specifies that all students "must complete at least one writing-intensive course in the major at the 300 level or above."⁴ The GMU website lists the criteria for these WI courses and also has links for the form needed to propose a WI course, a list of the approved WI courses, and WI course assessment materials.

Beginning in 2009, GMU recognized several academic programs that pushed beyond one or two WI courses towards a curriculum in which courses throughout the program had been infused with writing. In order to support these programs and encourage similar expansions in other departments, the WAC program developed a new initiative called the Writing-Infused, or

² See <http://wac.gmu.edu/> for more information. (Accessed 1/28/13.)

³ See <http://wac.gmu.edu/program/index.php> for more information. (Accessed 4/11/12.)

⁴ See http://wac.gmu.edu/program/wi_requirement for more information. (Accessed 4/10/12.)

WIN(ning) initiative. A new task force was formed to outline the new initiative, including listing characteristics of WIN(ning) programs and identifying future plans.⁵

University of Maryland, Baltimore County

UMBC has a writing requirement for all undergraduate students who started in Fall 2007 or later, which consists of both a first-year composition course and a WI-designated course.

These writing requirements were introduced at a time when UMBC was restructuring its general education curriculum—though the writing requirements are not general education courses but rather graduation requirements.

The first course, Freshman Composition, covers audience, research, resource evaluation, and academic writing. The second course is a WI-designated course that may count toward the major. The WI program guidelines are fully described on the UMBC website and are modeled after the guidelines at the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Writing at Duke University.

UMBC has a Writing Board that oversees the WI designations. The goal is to have at least one WI course in every department. In order to support the faculty in the creation of these courses, individuals or departments can apply for Writing Grants (initial grants of up to \$5000 and continuation grants of up to \$2000 coming from the Provost's office). Additional resources include faculty meetings with consultants and "WI Luncheons" (presentations by current WI faculty). UMBC also has a Faculty Writing Resource Center as well as a Resources Center for students.⁶

⁵ See <http://wac.gmu.edu/program/initiatives/winning.php> for more information. (Accessed 1/28/13.)

⁶ This information came from the UMBC website (see, for example, http://www.umbc.edu/undergrad_ed/wi/) as well as phone conversations with Diane M. Lee (Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education) and Jill Randles (Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education).

University of Maryland, College Park

UMD College Park also has a two-course writing requirement. The first course is Academic Writing, which is taken in the first year and has content similar to our ENGL 105/107. This course has been in place in some form since the founding of the school. The second course is Professional Writing, taken after students have earned at least 60 credits. This course has been in place since the 1980s. The content covers writing skills specifically needed in the work force. There are 15 courses in this category covering, for example, the genres central to legal, technical, business, science, and health writing. More recently added courses are Writing in the Arts and Writing for Nonprofits. These courses are taught through the Professional Writing Program (part of the English department) at UMD.

In the past, students have been able to test out of the earlier course or perhaps waive the later course. UMD is currently working to eliminate these waivers and to also develop more courses (with more variety) in the Professional Writing category.⁷

The Catholic University of America

CUA is currently implementing a new First Year Experience program for its students built around foundational courses in philosophy, theology, and writing. In this WAC program, learning community cohorts take two courses concurrently in their first semester: a Philosophy course (The Classical Mind) and an English course (Logic and Rhetoric). The goal of the English class is to develop thinking skills at the same time as writing skills—a recognition of the natural tie between the skill sets for reading, writing, and thinking. This course has no lectures but instead requires students to think through topics via writing, rewriting, discussion, and peer collaboration. There are weekly writing assignments that are structured specifically to get the

⁷ See <http://www.english.umd.edu/administration/writing> for more information.

students to think inductively and communicate through writing. These goals are reinforced in the first semester Philosophy class as well as in the second semester's set of concurrent courses: a second Philosophy course (The Modern Mind) and a Theology course (Faith Seeking Understanding). CUA modeled its overall idea from Notre Dame, while much of the rhetoric course is modeled after a course that used to be offered at Columbia. In addition to these courses, CUA has a strong writing center, which serves the entire campus community.⁸

University of California at Davis

UC Davis offers three types of WID-based writing courses: Writing in the Disciplines, Writing in the Professions, and Specialized Topics in Writing. These courses are all 100-level courses and focus on writing in specific academic disciplines, writing for specific professions, and specialized topics for specific professions, respectively. The UC Davis website contains expanded course descriptions for their writing courses, which provide detailed outlines of each course's goals and writing requirements. These descriptions (as with the GMU goals) outline more general goals such as learning to research, organize, draft, and revise writing as well as content-specific goals.⁹

CAS Faculty & Instructional Staff Survey Results

Here at Trinity, a 47-question survey was electronically distributed to CAS faculty and instructional staff on August 24, 2012 and was collected on September 7, 2012.¹⁰ A total of 66 CAS faculty and instructional staff completed the survey. Of these, 34 were full-time faculty, 11

⁸ See <http://firstyear.cua.edu/> for more information. (Accessed 1/28/13.)

⁹ For Writing in the Disciplines, see <http://writing.ucdavis.edu/course-information/writing-in-the-disciplines>. For Writing in the Professions, see <http://writing.ucdavis.edu/course-information/writing-in-the-professions>. For Specialized Topics in Writing, see <http://writing.ucdavis.edu/course-information/specialized-topics-in-writing>. (All accessed 1/28/13.)

¹⁰ The results (excluding open-ended responses) are available in the Appendix.

were full-time instructional staff, and 21 were adjuncts—while 23 were from the social sciences, 12 were from the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) disciplines, 23 were from the humanities, 6 were instructional staff members, and 2 were from other disciplines (e.g., PEH).¹¹

General Concerns

The survey asked the faculty how concerned they were about various aspects of their students' writing: lack of central claim/thesis, confused thinking, insufficient evidence/analysis, organizational problems, and mechanical errors. The most frequent response for each of these was “very concerned,” and over 90% of respondents said “very concerned” or “somewhat concerned” for all of them. Comparing the responses of people with different roles at Trinity, we saw almost no difference in these concerns, with the exception of “insufficient evidence/analysis,” which seemed to be less problematic for adjuncts but, nonetheless, still concerned them. There were no other differences, suggesting a strong consensus among instructors that all of these issues are of concern. Perhaps not surprisingly, there were some differences when comparing these responses across disciplines. For “lack of central claim/thesis” and “mechanical errors,” humanities were the most concerned, followed by the social sciences, instructional staff, and then the STEM discipline instructors, who were the least concerned. However, it is important to note that this was a matter of *degree* of concern only and all disciplines' average level of concern was “somewhat concerned” or higher, which again suggests an overwhelming consensus.

¹¹ Currently, the STEM disciplines taught at Trinity are biology, chemistry, biochemistry, physics, and mathematics.

Support for Action

Respondents were asked whether they would welcome support and/or guidance on how to create reading and writing assignments. The majority indicated that they would (78% for writing and 68% for reading), again indicating general support for action. This support was significantly higher for full-time faculty and was lowest among full-time instructional staff, with adjunct support falling in between.

When asked whether there should be a 200- or 300-level Writing Intensive (WI) course, 68% of respondents agreed that there should be a required course or set of courses, with a further 32% saying this should be left up to the individual disciplines, and no-one indicating that there should not be a required course. This pattern of responses was the same for respondents of different roles and different disciplines—so there was a consensus of support for this idea. When asked whether there should be a 300-level Writing in the Disciplines (WID) course, 35% of respondents agree that there should be a required course or set of courses, with a further 49% of saying that this should be left up to the individual disciplines, and 16% saying that there should not be such a course. This pattern of responses was the same for respondents of different roles and different disciplines.

These results suggest that there is currently stronger support for the implementation of a WI course. To further illuminate this, a direct comparison of support for the 200- or 300-level WI option and the 300-level WID option was performed. Overall, support was significantly higher for the WI course than the WID course, and this preference was more pronounced for full-time faculty than for other groups (but was significant for all). Support for WI over WID was also more pronounced for the STEM and the social sciences faculty than for the humanities faculty and instructional staff members, who did not have a preference for either one (though they showed support for both). Finally, the direct questions “if you are teaching / if you are not

teaching, which would you prefer” indicated that the majority (69% / 67%) would prefer a WI course.

Analysis of the open-ended response questions adds important information to the picture and illuminates the concerns of the faculty. Common themes include:

- A concern with how to fit another course into an already full general education and/or discipline-specific curriculum.
- Concerns about staffing, and in particular staffing the courses with skilled writing teachers.
- Additional concerns that these classes require more preparation and are grading intensive.
- The suggestion that it is important to address the deficiencies in writing at the 200-level before students embark on upper-level courses. (Several comments suggested that the course replace the capstone seminar and be taken at the sophomore level.)
- Concerns that students will either avoid WI courses (to take the easiest class that fulfills the requirement) or view them as something to be “gotten out of the way.” Related to this, there were a number of suggestions to standardize the grading practices for these classes.
- Concerns that staff and faculty understand the importance of critical thinking, reading, and writing in *all* classes.

WI Implementation

Respondents were asked about the specifics of who should teach these WI courses, should they be implemented. There was far less consensus for this: 36% said instruction should be by general area, 35% said by discipline, 28% as a single CAS course, and 2% chose “Other.” On the other hand, there was agreement that these course(s) should be taught by either full-time faculty in the disciplines (59%) or by writing professors (34%). Additionally, respondents’ open-ended comments include a suggestion of team teaching and an emphasis on ensuring the instructor has the necessary “talent” and “skills.”

In terms of willingness to teach these classes, 34% said that they would not be willing to teach a WI class. However, 51% said that they would be and another 15% replied “yes, but . . .,” and then went to express that they would require specific training (3 people) and would feel more

comfortable if the course were in their content area of expertise (3 people). This need for support and resources was reflected in the final question specific to implementation (which was “check all that apply” question): to teach a WI course, 64% indicated they would need a professional development stipend, 46% said that they would need an in-service seminar, and 36% said they would need Fourth Monday Workshops.

Overall, then, there is a mandate among the full-time faculty, instructional staff, and adjuncts at Trinity that some form of a WI course should be implemented. Many are willing to teach such a course—though with some hesitation and a strong desire for support. The specifics of how it should be taught (by area, by discipline) and by whom (full-time faculty, writing professors) requires more exploration.

Going Forward: Pilot Proposal Overviews and Other Issues

Having performed external scans of other universities’ attempts at WI- and WID-style curricula, we believe the strongest proposal would lay the foundation towards a new WI course requirement for all of our students. Given the restraints of the CAS General Education Curriculum, we have identified a number of options we could pursue for piloting in 2013-2014. In general, the WID Working Group initially recommends the planning and creation of several WI courses. These courses will focus on, reinforce, and build upon the general writing skills introduced by English 105, English 107, and English 150 and will be fashioned from various program offerings already contained within the General Education Curriculum. The group recommends that, eventually, taking at least one of these WI courses becomes a mandatory requirement within the General Education Curriculum. If successful, these WI courses could be the precursors to future WID-style courses as well, but, for now, based on our research and survey work, starting with WAC-oriented WI courses seems to be the path to take.

Based on discussions at WID Working Group meetings—including conversations with the Writing Center Director—we have settled on a number of possibilities for where these WI courses could find space in our curriculum. They are as follows:

- **Developing WI courses taught by faculty volunteers.** Faculty volunteers would be trained in creating and assessing WI courses, which s/he would teach in at least one section in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014. The WI component would not be identical across all of the courses in specific content, though it would have the same measureable goals and objectives. Each instructor could tailor the component to the types of readings, writing assignments, and information already covered in the course.
- **Developing a WI presence program by program.** Volunteer programs would identify specific courses within their major/minor curricula that could incorporate WI elements for Fall 2013 and Spring 2014. These WI elements need not be identical across programs, but they would have similar measureable goals and objectives. Program faculty would receive training after a commitment from each program to continue teaching the selected courses as WI- (or WID-) designated courses for the foreseeable future.
- **Developing a WI dimension for the Capstone Seminars.** The Capstone Seminars, if taken early enough by students, could offer an ideal place to offer WI courses. This pilot would designate a few of the Capstone Seminars as WI courses for Fall 2013 and Spring 2014; the professors teaching those sections would attend the summer workshop. However, given the uncertainty surrounding the Capstone Seminars right now, we are not sure if we can/should move forward with such a pilot.
- **Developing a WI dimension for all Civic Knowledge courses.** A practical research writing “boot camp” would be added to the first 2-3 weeks of the semester in these courses; other WI elements would then continue throughout the semester in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014. The “boot camp” would emphasize the use of sources for a scholarly purpose—all while tied directly to the course’s content—and, though it would not be identical across all of the courses in specific content, it would take the same shape and scope and have the same measureable goals and objectives. Each instructor could tailor the component to the types of readings, writing assignments, and information already covered in the course.
- **Developing a WI dimension for Senior Seminars.** Most of our Senior Seminars already contain a strong writing component, but the added layer of being “WI-approved” would give both professors and students more specific training, content, and outcomes for Fall 2013 and Spring 2014.

Before any of these pilots could begin, the faculty volunteers for any given proposal will attend special funded workshops to cover both the goals and objectives of the WI courses and various pedagogical methods and practices to achieve those goals and objectives. The WID

Working Group recommends a summer workshop of at least three days that is funded by the university.¹² The group will invite in-house faculty and reading/writing specialists as well as outside consultants provide suggestions to and share best practices with the faculty. The content and structure of the summer workshop would be driven by the needs and desires of the WI faculty. Individual WID Working Group/WI Committee members, if not piloting WI courses themselves, will also attend the summer workshop in order to better support WI faculty members during the academic year. Further support will be offered throughout the school year through shorter workshops with content specialists and ongoing WI luncheons during which faculty can discuss their current successes and struggles.

The WID Working Group has considered the possibility that WI faculty will seek guidance when individual mentors are unavailable to assist. The group therefore also recommends the creation of Moodle-based support for faculty teaching WI courses, including writing assignment information, grading rubrics, and writing samples. The initial documents will be generated by the group and the summer workshop participants, and the Moodle documents will be supplemented as future WI courses are taught.

The organization of workshops, the ongoing mentoring of faculty, and the maintenance of on-line support will necessitate the formation of a permanent WI Committee, replacing the initial WID Working Group. The WI Committee will be tasked with maintaining the standards of the WI courses beyond their initial launch. The WI Committee will also be responsible for monitoring future WI course outcomes and assessments. Another future goal for the WI Committee will be to locate and secure outside grant funding to help support further development of our writing curricula.

¹² This funding depends upon administrative approval after the faculty has chosen a specific proposal.

WI Courses: Objectives/Outcomes

Our proposals' objectives and outcomes are grounded in faculty concerns and observations. The specifics of these concerns come from the faculty survey as well as informal discussions among colleagues. These initial broad concerns have been discussed at length in our meetings and have consequently been developed by these discussions, a consideration of the work being done at other institutions, and input from other relevant parties at Trinity (most notably the Writing Center).

Currently, all of our students take a foundational writing course, and a majority actually starts with a pre-foundational course. Each of the pilot proposals aims to solidify and build upon the skills learned in these courses by giving students opportunities to practice these skills and to introduce more detailed instruction for some of the additional reading and writing skills that are required for success in upper-level courses.

The specific objectives we have identified for **students' writing** are:

- Learn how to make (and state with clarity) a claim.
- Learn how to argue a claim with evidence.
- Respond appropriately to different rhetorical situations (varying audiences and purposes) and in particular to replicate the rhetorical style(s) of their discipline.
- Learn how to effectively integrate their ideas with other appropriate sources.
- Master a citation style.
- Use appropriate voice and tone as well as level of formality.
- Demonstrate control of the conventions and surface features of their discipline.

The specific objectives we have identified for **students' reading** are:

- Maintain and develop the habit of reading critically and with comprehension.
- Improving note-taking, annotation, and memorization practices as well as other means of processing and retaining key concepts from a text.
- Identify structures in a text (e.g., introduction, thesis, argument(s), conclusion, genre).
- Understand how to integrate another author's ideas with their own ideas.
- Prepare for and participate in verbal and written discussions of a reading's substance, including articulating critical responses to a reading informed by careful consideration of the text.

Other objectives related to the **students' processes of writing and reading** are:

- Identify and confront problems and stumbling blocks in their reading and writing.
- Approach reading as a task with multiple and varied outcomes.
- Approach writing as a series of tasks that begins with finding and evaluating appropriate sources.
- Understand the importance of multiple drafts and rewriting and develop strategies for revising, editing, and proofreading.

Faculty and staff can help students develop these skills in a number of ways that translate into a set of specific outcomes:

- Provide opportunities for students (1) to interact with models of discipline-specific writing to teach them how to read these texts, (2) to understand the expectations of readers in their fields, and (3) to analyze examples of how they can approach their own writing.
- Instruct students in the specific conventions (features and uses) of writing in their academic and professional field(s), including genre(s), audience(s), and citation style(s).
- Develop structured opportunities for students to read and write as a means of learning the content as well as developing related reading and writing skills.
- Provide specific instruction for how to locate and evaluate research material in their academic and professional field(s).
- Develop structured writing assignments that help students to appreciate the multi-stage processes of writing—including locating and evaluating materials, drafting, responding to feedback, editing, etc.

To support all of these objectives, there are a number of objectives for the process of implementing a WI(D) program:

- Provide opportunities for faculty and staff to receive both initial and ongoing training in developing effective reading/writing assignments in all courses.
- Increase communication among all staff and faculty about student reading and writing, making sure to include adjunct faculty.
- Provide opportunities for all staff and faculty to share strategies for reading and writing instruction.

WI Courses: Application and Requirements

After a specific proposal is chosen, the newly formed Committee will need to put in place application procedures as well as standardizations/requirements for all approved WI courses. As

these specifics depend upon the proposal chosen, we will leave the precise details to the Committee to decide (in consultation, of course, with CAS-CAP). The following websites represent examples of the kinds of procedures and requirements put in place at other schools.

- Some Application Examples:
 - UMBC: http://www.umbc.edu/undergrad_ed/wi/docs/individualWIDProposalForm12-13.pdf
 - Duke: http://trinity.duke.edu/uploads/assets/The%20W%20code_Guidelines.pdf
 - University of Missouri: <http://cwp.missouri.edu/wi/propose.php>
- Some Requirements Examples:
 - UMBC: http://www.umbc.edu/undergrad_ed/wi/guidelines.html
 - Duke: <http://twp.duke.edu/faculty/wid/guidelines>
 - GMU: http://wac.gmu.edu/program/wi_requirement/index.php
 - University of Missouri: <http://cwp.missouri.edu/wi/guidelines.php>

In general, the group feels that the following list identifies some general potential common elements that could be integrated in WI Courses:

- Course cap size of 15-20 students (pending administrative approval)
- Classroom instruction on academic and/or professional writing with attention paid to critical inquiry and/or scholarly research
- Frequent, smaller writing assignments throughout the semester that emphasize the writing process
- Minimum number of words and/or pages of “finished” writing
- Detailed feedback on student writing
 - Substantive revision and resubmission of at least one assignment
 - Incorporation of instructor feedback in future assignments via scaffolding and other methodologies
- Emphasis on student writers as both metacritical, self-reflexive authors and constructive peer critics
- Written assignments as major component of final grade

WI Courses: Evaluation and Assessment

As with the application procedures and course requirements, the specifics of how to evaluate and assess future WI courses should be decided by the future Committee. Likely components of WI course evaluation and assessment would include self-assessment by both

professors and students, portfolios, and section-to-section comparisons of the same courses in which a traditional section is compared to a WI section. These analyses will allow the Committee and WI faculty to refine the WI components of courses in the following semester(s).

Conclusion




While many of the details for this pilot remain undetermined, the overall trajectory is defined: to provide instructors with an increased understanding of reading and composition theory, methods, and pedagogy so that Trinity's students can become better thinkers, readers, and writers. This WI project will help support a number of other initiatives and activities on campus, including our upcoming Middle States Review, first-year student initiatives, and various projects focused on increasing our retention and completion rates. The core of our group's work, after all, is inextricable from the liberal arts mission of Trinity: the cross-curricular nature of thinking, reading, and writing is central to both. While much work still lies ahead, it is work that is necessary for Trinity to move forward. It is work that will bring all of us into dynamic conversations and that will move us onto more productive paths. It is work that will position our students for success both here at Trinity and in their chosen academic and professional fields, whatever those may be.

Appendix: Survey Data



WID Working Group Survey (CAS)



1. I am:

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
A fulltime faculty member in CAS 	52.2%	35
A fulltime instructional staff member in CAS 	16.4%	11
An adjunct faculty member in CAS 	31.3%	21
	AnsweredQuestion	67
	SkippedQuestion	0

2. I have taught at Trinity before this semester:

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Yes 	82.1%	55
No 	17.9%	12
	AnsweredQuestion	67
	SkippedQuestion	0





3. My CAS discipline is

	ResponseCount	
	67	
	AnsweredQuestion	67
	SkippedQuestion	0




4. In general, you are concerned about these aspects of your students' writing to the following degree:

	not at all concerned	somewhat concerned	very concerned	RatingCount	
Lack of a central claim/thesis	6.3% (4)	41.3% (26)	52.4% (33)	63	
Confused thinking	7.9% (5)	42.9% (27)	49.2% (31)	63	
Insufficient evidence/analysis	4.8% (3)	30.2% (19)	65.1% (41)	63	
Organizational problems	7.9% (5)	41.3% (26)	50.8% (32)	63	
Mechanical errors	3.2% (2)	47.6% (30)	49.2% (31)	63	
Other? Please specify				10	
				AnsweredQuestion	63
				SkippedQuestion	4






5. How often do you find that your students have acquired the required texts for your courses?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
never	0.0%	0
rarely 	1.6%	1
sometimes 	28.6%	18
often 	60.3%	38
always 	9.5%	6
	AnsweredQuestion	63
	SkippedQuestion	4







6. As best you can infer, what portion of your students have read the assigned reading on a given day?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
none	0.0%	0
few 	19.0%	12
some 	60.3%	38
most 	20.6%	13
all	0.0%	0
AnsweredQuestion		63
SkippedQuestion		4







7. To what extent do you feel that Trinity students understand the importance of completing assigned reading?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
not at all	0.0%	0
very little 	16.1%	10
somewhat 	45.2%	28
mostly 	22.6%	14
very much 	8.1%	5
I am unsure 	8.1%	5
AnsweredQuestion		62
SkippedQuestion		5

8. To what extent do you feel that Trinity students understand the importance of comprehending key terms, concepts, or issues in assigned reading?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
not at all 	1.6%	1
very little 	7.9%	5
somewhat 	39.7%	25
mostly 	39.7%	25
very much 	6.3%	4
I am unsure 	4.8%	3
AnsweredQuestion		63
SkippedQuestion		4

9. When students do not complete reading assignments, what reasons do they express? (Check all that apply.)

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Didn't know about assignment 	17.5%	11
Didn't have book or text 	54.0%	34
Didn't understand reading 	38.1%	24
Didn't have time 	73.0%	46
Didn't value the reading or see the point 	20.8%	13
Other 	12.7%	8
Other? Please specify:		12
AnsweredQuestion		63
SkippedQuestion		4

10. Which best describes how often you require students to write FORMALLY in these courses?

	Daily	Weekly	Every other week	Monthly	Once a semester	Never	N/A	RatingCount
100-level	5.4% (3)	28.6% (16)	14.3% (8)	16.1% (9)	17.9% (10)	8.9% (5)	8.9% (5)	56
200-level	3.6% (2)	10.7% (6)	12.5% (7)	26.8% (15)	8.9% (5)	3.6% (2)	33.9% (19)	56
300-level	0.0% (0)	16.1% (9)	14.3% (8)	17.9% (10)	8.9% (5)	1.8% (1)	41.1% (23)	56
400-level	1.8% (1)	8.9% (5)	8.9% (5)	21.4% (12)	5.4% (3)	0.0% (0)	53.6% (30)	56
AnsweredQuestion								56
SkippedQuestion								11

11. Which best describes how often you require students to write INFORMALLY in these courses?

	Daily	Weekly	Every other week	Monthly	Once a semester	Never	N/A	RatingCount
100-level	19.6% (11)	32.1% (18)	10.7% (6)	5.4% (3)	7.1% (4)	10.7% (6)	14.3% (8)	56
200-level	8.9% (5)	25.0% (14)	8.9% (5)	1.8% (1)	3.6% (2)	12.5% (7)	39.3% (22)	56
300-level	5.4% (3)	26.8% (15)	8.9% (5)	3.6% (2)	1.8% (1)	8.9% (5)	44.6% (25)	56
400-level	5.4% (3)	16.1% (9)	5.4% (3)	3.6% (2)	3.6% (2)	8.9% (5)	57.1% (32)	56
AnsweredQuestion								56
SkippedQuestion								11






12. In these courses, I generally require assignments with the following primary concern (check all that apply)

	100-level	200-level	300-level	400-level	RatingCount
Summary	88.9% (40)	57.8% (26)	46.7% (21)	31.1% (14)	45
Reflection/Reaction	81.8% (36)	52.3% (23)	50.0% (22)	29.5% (13)	44
Analysis	70.6% (36)	52.9% (27)	52.9% (27)	43.1% (22)	51
Argument	60.0% (24)	55.0% (22)	65.0% (26)	52.5% (21)	40
Research paper	25.7% (9)	31.4% (11)	68.6% (24)	60.0% (21)	35
Lab report	54.5% (6)	27.3% (3)	45.5% (5)	36.4% (4)	11
Exposition/Description	72.0% (18)	48.0% (12)	28.0% (7)	28.0% (7)	25
Narration or other personal writing	76.0% (19)	44.0% (11)	32.0% (8)	16.0% (4)	25
Literature Review	17.4% (4)	21.7% (5)	65.2% (15)	69.6% (16)	23
Creative writing	50.0% (4)	75.0% (6)	62.5% (5)	25.0% (2)	8
Review (film, book, art, etc.)	61.5% (16)	61.5% (16)	65.4% (17)	42.3% (11)	26
Case study	38.9% (7)	38.9% (7)	72.2% (13)	55.6% (10)	18
Primary source paper	56.3% (9)	43.8% (7)	56.3% (9)	68.8% (11)	16
Journal	58.8% (10)	52.9% (9)	41.2% (7)	41.2% (7)	17
In-class writing	77.8% (21)	44.4% (12)	40.7% (11)	29.6% (8)	27
Other (please specify)					4
AnsweredQuestion					56
SkippedQuestion					11






13. When you assign formal writing assignments, how often do you explicitly provide/state the following:

	never	rarely	sometimes	often	always	RatingCount
Prompt/Assignment Sheet	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.8% (1)	14.3% (8)	83.9% (47)	56
Audience	17.9% (10)	25.0% (14)	14.3% (8)	8.9% (5)	33.9% (19)	56
Purpose	1.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.8% (1)	17.9% (10)	78.6% (44)	56
Genre/Format	5.4% (3)	3.6% (2)	3.6% (2)	16.1% (9)	71.4% (40)	56
Model(s) of a successful assignment	14.3% (8)	7.1% (4)	33.9% (19)	14.3% (8)	30.4% (17)	56
Grading rubric/criteria	0.0% (0)	1.8% (1)	3.6% (2)	21.4% (12)	73.2% (41)	56
	AnsweredQuestion					56
	SkippedQuestion					11






14. When you assign formal writing assignments, how often do you require students to self-reflect about the writing process?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
never 	19.6%	11
rarely 	17.9%	10
sometimes 	28.6%	16
often 	21.4%	12
always 	12.5%	7
	AnsweredQuestion	56
	SkippedQuestion	11





15. How often do your formal writing assignments cover a text (or texts) that you have already discussed in class?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
never 	3.6%	2
rarely 	12.5%	7
sometimes 	26.8%	15
often 	37.5%	21
always 	19.6%	11
	AnsweredQuestion	56
	SkippedQuestion	11




16. In general, do you cover the topic of plagiarism in your classes?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
never 	3.6%	2
rarely 	1.8%	1
sometimes 	7.1%	4
often 	17.9%	10
always 	69.6%	39
	AnsweredQuestion	56
	SkippedQuestion	11






17. When you do cover plagiarism in your classes, to what extent do you review it?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Quick review 	8.9%	5
General Overview 	46.4%	26
Thorough coverage 	41.1%	23
N/A 	3.6%	2
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11





18. To what extent do you cover the citation style(s) required in your classes?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Not at all 	7.1%	4
General Overview 	62.5%	35
Thorough coverage 	30.4%	17
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11






19. How often do you cover in your classes the topic of what constitutes credible sources in your discipline(s)?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
never 	5.4%	3
rarely 	7.1%	4
sometimes 	25.0%	14
often 	30.4%	17
always 	32.1%	18
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11






20. Do you give student feedback on writing assignments during the semester so that they may apply your recommendations to subsequent writing assignments that semester?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
no, never	0.0%	0
yes, but rarely 	3.6%	2
yes, sometimes 	5.4%	3
yes, often 	23.2%	13
yes, always 	67.9%	38
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11






21. How frequently do you allow students to do revisions on writing assignments?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
never 	12.5%	7
rarely 	21.4%	12
sometimes 	30.4%	17
often 	25.0%	14
always 	10.7%	6
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11






22. How frequently do you require students to do revisions on writing assignments?






	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
never 	30.4%	17
rarely 	25.0%	14
sometimes 	23.2%	13
often 	14.3%	8
always 	7.1%	4
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11






23. How often do you require your students to read original source materials from your specific discipline (beyond the textbook) for your class?






	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
never 	10.7%	6
rarely 	8.9%	5
sometimes 	37.5%	21
often 	23.2%	13
always 	19.6%	11
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11






24. How often are your reading assignments designed to illustrate the characteristics/conventions of writing in your field(s)?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
never 	10.7%	6
rarely 	10.7%	6
sometimes 	28.6%	16
often 	19.6%	11
always 	30.4%	17
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11






25. How often are your writing assignments designed to have students practice the characteristics/conventions of writing in your field(s)?			
		ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
never		8.9%	5
rarely		8.9%	5
sometimes		28.6%	16
often		28.6%	16
always		25.0%	14
AnsweredQuestion			56
SkippedQuestion			11

26. When you mark FORMAL written assignments for grammar/mechanics, do you generally:			
		ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Mark every mechanical error		50.0%	28
Mark the most egregious mechanical errors		28.6%	16
Mark the most frequent mechanical errors		12.5%	7
I do not mark any mechanical errors		3.6%	2
Something else		5.4%	3
Something else? Please specify or comment:			13
AnsweredQuestion			56
SkippedQuestion			11



27. When you mark INFORMAL written assignments for grammar/mechanics, do you generally:			
		ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Mark every mechanical error		8.9%	5
Mark the most egregious mechanical errors		44.6%	25
Mark the most frequent mechanical errors		17.9%	10
I do not mark any mechanical errors		23.2%	13
Something else		5.4%	3
Something else? Please specify or comment:			8
AnsweredQuestion			56
SkippedQuestion			11

28. To what extent do you grade your students' writing solely for content or include correctness/clarity as part of the grade?			
		ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
content only		1.8%	1
mostly content, some correctness/clarity		35.7%	20
even mixture of content and correctness/clarity		55.4%	31
some content, mostly correctness/clarity		1.8%	1
correctness/clarity only		5.4%	3
AnsweredQuestion			56
SkippedQuestion			11

29. What tools or strategies do you use to assess whether your students have read and understood the assigned reading? (Check all that apply.)

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Quizzes 	69.6%	39
Tests and exams 	76.8%	43
Journals/Reading responses 	46.4%	26
Discussions 	91.1%	51
Summary writing 	39.3%	22
Not applicable	0.0%	0
Other <input type="checkbox"/>	1.8%	1
Other? Please specify:		9
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11



30. Would you find it helpful and/or welcome to receive support/guidance on how to create and assess reading assignments in your courses?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Yes 	67.9%	38
No 	32.1%	18
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11





31. Would you find it helpful and/or welcome to receive support/guidance on how to create and assess writing assignments in your courses?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Yes 	78.6%	44
No 	21.4%	12
AnsweredQuestion		56
SkippedQuestion		11




32. Should there be at least one required 200- or 300-level Writing Intensive course?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
There should be a required course or set of courses 	66.7%	36
This should be left up to the individual disciplines 	33.3%	18
There should not be a required course	0.0%	0
AnsweredQuestion		54
SkippedQuestion		13




33. If Trinity were to require 200- or 300-level Writing Intensive classes, these should be taught:

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
by area (humanities, social sciences, natural sciences) 	35.2%	19
by discipline (economics, political science, sociology, biology, etc...) 	35.2%	19
as a single course across CAS 	27.8%	15
as something else 	1.9%	1
Something else? Please specify or comment:		4
AnsweredQuestion		54
SkippedQuestion		13





34. If Trinity were to require 200- or 300-level Writing Intensive classes, these should generally be taught:




	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
by fulltime faculty across the disciplines 	59.3%	32
by writing professors 	33.3%	18
by adjuncts 	1.9%	1
by some other group 	5.6%	3
Other group? Please specify:		5
AnsweredQuestion		54
SkippedQuestion		13





35. Would you be willing to teach a 200- or 300-level Writing Intensive course?





	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Yes 	51.9%	28
No 	33.3%	18
Yes, but... 	14.8%	8
...please specify:		12
AnsweredQuestion		54
SkippedQuestion		13




36. What resources/support would you need to teach one of these 200- or 300-level Writing Intensive courses? (Check all that apply.)

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
In-service/Summer seminar 	46.3%	25
4th Monday sessions/workshops 	37.0%	20
Professional development stipend 	64.8%	35
Other 	11.1%	6
Other? Please specify:		6
AnsweredQuestion		54
SkippedQuestion		13





37. Should there be a required 300-level Writing in the Disciplines course?			
		ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
There should be a required course or set of courses		34.6%	18
This should be left up to the individual disciplines		50.0%	26
There should not be a required course		15.4%	8
		AnsweredQuestion	52
		SkippedQuestion	15

38. If Trinity were to require 300-level Writing in the Disciplines classes, these should be taught:			
		ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
by area (humanities, social sciences, natural sciences)		34.6%	18
by discipline (economics, political science, sociology, biology, etc...)		51.9%	27
as a single course across CAS		9.6%	5
as something else		3.8%	2
Something else? Please specify or comment:			2
		AnsweredQuestion	52
		SkippedQuestion	15



39. If Trinity were to require 300-level Writing in the Disciplines classes, these should generally be taught:			
		ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
by fulltime faculty across the disciplines		73.1%	38
by writing professors		15.4%	8
by adjuncts		5.8%	3
by some other group		5.8%	3
Other group? Please specify:			5
		AnsweredQuestion	52
		SkippedQuestion	15

40. Would you be willing to teach a 300-level Writing in the Disciplines course?			
		ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Yes		55.8%	29
No		32.7%	17
Yes, but...		11.5%	6
... please specify:			7
		AnsweredQuestion	52
		SkippedQuestion	15



41. What resources/support would you need to teach one of these 300-level Writing in the Disciplines courses? (Check all that apply.)

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
In-service/Summer seminar 	48.1%	25
4th Monday sessions/workshops 	40.4%	21
Professional development stipend 	63.5%	33
Other 	13.5%	7
Other? Please specify:		7
AnsweredQuestion		52
SkippedQuestion		15



42. Are you clear on the distinctions between these two proposals? (That a WID course is writing focused while a WI course is discipline focused with a strong writing component?)

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
Yes 	84.6%	44
No 	15.4%	8
Yes, but...	0.0%	0
...please specify:		4
AnsweredQuestion		52
SkippedQuestion		15

43. In the world in which Trinity adopts one of these types of courses and you are asked to teach it, which would you prefer Trinity adopts?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
300-level Writing in the Disciplines courses 	32.7%	17
200- or 300-level Writing Intensive courses 	67.3%	35
AnsweredQuestion		52
SkippedQuestion		15

44. In the world in which Trinity adopts one of these types of courses but you are not teaching it, which would you prefer Trinity adopts?

	ResponsePercent	ResponseCount
300-level Writing in the Disciplines courses 	34.6%	18
200- or 300-level Writing Intensive courses 	65.4%	34
AnsweredQuestion		52
SkippedQuestion		15

45. Do you have specific concerns about either of these two options that you would like to share? (Either the 300-level Writing in the Disciplines courses or the 200- or 300-level Writing Intensive courses?)

	ResponseCount
	21
AnsweredQuestion	21
SkippedQuestion	46

46. Do you have any other proposals or options that you think the WID Working Group should consider?

	ResponseCount
	15
AnsweredQuestion	15
SkippedQuestion	52

47. Is there anything else that you think the WID Working Group should consider, think about, or know as it continues developing some curricular proposals?

	ResponseCount
	16
AnsweredQuestion	16
SkippedQuestion	51