

**ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
UNIVERSITY WRITING COMMITTEE
AY 2005-2006**

**Presented at the
657th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate
November 16, 2006**

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

**Genevieve Chandler
John Cunningham
Dina Friedman
Michael Davis
Haivan Hoang
Brian Houle
Elizabeth Jakob
Holly Lawrence
Donna LeCourt
Ernest May
Stephen Olbrys, Chair
Patricia Paugh**

**Faculty Senate University Writing Committee
Summary of 2005-2006 Academic Year**

The Faculty Senate University Writing Committee was extremely productive during the 2005-2006 academic year. Returning members on the Committee were Steve Olbrys (Chair, Communication), Dina Friedman (SOM), Holly Lawrence (SOM), and Mike Davis (Library). New members were Haivan Hoang (English), Elizabeth Jacob (Psychology), and Patricia Paugh (Education). The graduate student representative was Brian Houle (English). The undergraduate student representative was S. J. Port. The Director of the Junior Year Writing Program Coordinator, Ginny Chandler (Nursing), and the Director of the Writing Program, Donna LeCourt (English), serving *ex officio*, were also members that year.

The UWC met monthly, four times in the Fall 2005 semester (beginning September 23 and ending December 2) and four times in the Spring 2006 semester (beginning February 3 and ending May 19, with an early and late April meeting). During December and January, UWC members collected data for the major project of the review of the First-Year Writing Program.

The review was the most significant action taken by the UWC that year; it is included with this summary. Action began on the review with the first meeting of the UWC, during which subcommittees were assigned and previous reviews examined. At each meeting in October, November, December, February, and early April, members spent considerable time at the meetings discussing the data they had gathered through various sources, including interviews, statistical analyses, and reviews of student portfolios and pedagogy materials. In the later April meeting, members provided drafts of various sections; these drafts were compiled into the draft of the report, voted on after a final edit.

In addition to the review of the First-Year Program, the UWC fulfilled its role to monitor the Junior-Year Writing Program by approving (and in several cases, recommending changes to) a number of syllabi from several departments across campus (Nursing, SOM, Judaic Studies, German, Political Science, and Economics). Considerable attention was given to discussion concerning a number of changes proposed by departments to their JYW component, including the increased employment of TAs rather than faculty to teach these courses, and a noticeable shift in some departments to develop a one-credit writing component / writing intensive component as an addition to a pre-existing three-credit course, and the relationship between these classes and the new design of the JYW Program website, particularly as the latter emphasizes and provides examples of JYW as writing within a given field. The UWC decided to recommend monitoring these issues over the course of the 2006-2007 academic year, and thereafter decide whether changes should be made to the procedure by which syllabi and related proposals are cleared through the UWC, such as the creation of a standard submission form.

The other significant JYW issue discussed by the UWC in Spring 2006 was the alterations in funding policies (to \$210 per student, and the new reporting mechanisms for the number of students enrolled in classes), particularly as this may cause concern for the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences. The UWC recommended monitoring this and addressing the issue with the Provost in Fall 2006.

In addition to the review of the First-Year Program, the UWC considered two aspects of freshman writing. The first was the impact of the inordinately high number of enrollments of freshmen in Fall 2005; several recommendations in the review of the Program address this and similar concerns, such as an increase in the base budget and the timing of the placement exams during Orientation. The second was the concern that as more teaching continues at the dormitories (through such programs as

TAP or RAP), new pedagogical strategies and training for TOs will be required. The UWC recommended monitoring this during the 2006-2007 academic year, and thereafter decide whether this warrants further action.

In Fall 2005, the UWC submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies a sample questionnaire for a survey of graduate student writing needs.

In Spring 2006, the UWC discussed the questions concerning online presentation of student work (such as through wikis) and the possible ramifications these may have in First-Year and Junior-Year Writing. The UWC recommended addressing this during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Finally, the Chair of the UWC and the Director of the Writing Program joined the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Plagiarism and reported regularly on its progress to the UWC.

Report on the First-Year Program*

1. Summary Assessment

The Faculty Senate has charged the University Writing Committee “to monitor and oversee the Freshman Component of the Writing Program.” The Freshman Program is a one-semester course (ENGLWRIT 112 or 113, although some students inadequately prepared for 112-113 take the preparatory course, ENGLWRIT 111). It is supplemented by the Junior-Year writing course, which focuses on more discipline-specific writing. From our formal review of the Freshman program during the 2005-2006 academic year, we have found that the program continues to fulfill the requirements mandated by the Faculty Senate.

The Program has earned national recognition on the basis of the research and pedagogical scholarship of Program faculty and graduate Teaching Associates in such areas as writing assessment and evaluation, basic writing, community service learning projects in writing courses, computers and writing, peer response to writing, history of rhetoric, revising and peer response, and writing across the curriculum.

The Writing Committee was impressed with the skill with which the staff of the First-Year Writing Program (FYWP) carried out their roles, the enthusiasm and morale of the staff, the excellent training given to Teaching Associates, and the quality of teaching in the various courses. We commend the Director, the staff, the Course Directors, and the Teaching Associates for the excellent job they are doing in the First-Year Program.

We have four recommendations regarding the First-Year Writing Program; these are set out in section 12, below. In summary, we recommend that:

- the Writing Program receive additional resources to reduce class size and increase full-time staff; that the Bartlett Writing Center be base funded and funding appropriated for a full-time Writing Center director; and that an instructional technology staff be hired
- faculty in other departments integrate writing pedagogy into their courses; and that a Sophomore writing requirement and writing intensive course designation be considered
- minor changes be made in the administration of the diagnostic test during New Students' Orientation ; and that advanced ESL courses be considered
- the Writing Program emphasize more training on the grading system for its graduate instructors; and that specific strategies for teaching RAP/TAP classes be introduced.

2. Background of the First-Year Writing Program

In 1982 the Faculty Senate created the university-wide writing requirement. Specifically, the Senate voted:

The University will require the successful completion of a three-credit course in the English Department, “Expository Writing,” ordinarily taken during the student’s first year

* This report adopts the format and some descriptive material from the previous First-Year review, conducted in 2000-2001. Members of the Writing Committee drafted the sections of the report for which they were responsible; the final report was compiled and edited by Stephen Gencarella Olbrys, Chair, 2005-2006.

The objective of this requirement is to enable students to write with more clarity and logic, with a confidence based on improved knowledge about the elements of prose style—language choices, correct grammar and spelling, strategies for organization, appropriate development, effective tone. Primary emphasis will be on students’ writing rather than lectures, grammar exercises, or the analysis of prose models. (Senate Document 82-057)

Recognizing that a single course is by itself unlikely to give proficiency in writing, the Senate established the Junior-Year Writing Program as well. The Writing Program has overall management of both of these courses, and funding is provided by the Provost's office with funding each year for the FYWP based on the anticipated size of the first-year class.

The Faculty Senate has charged the Writing Committee "to monitor and oversee the Freshman Component of the Writing Program" (Faculty Senate Bylaws, Chapter 6, Section 11, paragraph 1). The Committee has interpreted this mandate as if we were a re-certification team looking into all aspects of the program, including instruction, staffing and resource issues, and support activities.

3. Structure of the First-Year Writing Program (FYWP)

Except for students with transfer credit or those who scored 1460 or more on the SAT Verbal Aptitude and SAT II Writing Subject tests, or a 4 or 5 on the Advanced Placement Language and Composition Test, each student entering the University is required to take a diagnostic writing test. The test exempts about 3% of students from the FYWP. Students who pass the exam, but are not exempted, are placed in ENGLWRIT 112 (College Writing) and/or ENGLWRIT 113 (the computer-based equivalent of 112). Students scoring insufficiently well on the diagnostic exam (approximately 4%) are placed in ENGLWRIT 111 (Basic Writing), which is a combined writing and reading course that prepares students for ENGLWRIT 112 or 113. Students entering the University under the Commonwealth Transfer Compact are assumed to have had an equivalent writing course and are exempted from the University requirement.

The distribution of students who took these courses during AY 2005-2006 is shown here:

Fall 2005

Course	Sections	Enrollment	avg. no. per sec.
111	11	214	19+
112	99	2310	23+
113	4	78	19+

Spring 2006

Course	Sections	Enrollment	avg. no. per sec.
111	4	79	19+
112	74	1768	24
113	6	112	19

Note that enrollment in ENGLWRIT 111 is limited to 20 per section, in ENGLWRIT 112 to 24, and in ENGLWRIT 113 to 20. From the above statistics we see that 6.5% of students served either self-selected ENGLWRIT 111 or scored low enough on the diagnostic exam that they were required to take that preparatory course. For comparison, the overall percentage from previous review years in AY 2000-2001 was 8.2%, and in AY 1997-1998 was 7.2%.

The Director of the Writing Program is Donna LeCourt. The FYWP has eight Course Directors, all either from the Writing Program or the English Department, whose roles are to direct the Teaching Associates as well as to teach their own sections. During 2005-2006 the Course Directors were:

Peggy Woods, Assistant Director, Writing Program
Pat Zukowski, Assistant Director, Writing Program
Deirdre Vinyard, Deputy Director, Writing Program
Joseph Bartolomeo, Professor, English
Haivan Hoang, Asst. Professor, English
Jenny Adams, Asst. Professor, English
Joseph Black, Asst. Professor, English
Donna LeCourt, Assoc. Professor, English

In Fall 2005, there were 92 Teaching Associates (TOs) (90 from the English Department) as well as three part-time lecturers. In Spring 2006, there were 80 Teaching Associations (78 from the English Department). TOs on full year's contract teach two sections per year.

Many of the sections of ENGLWRIT 112 are taught in Residential First-Year Programs or Honors Programs. In Fall 2005 50% (55 of 110) sections were RAP/TAP. This percentage is expected to increase dramatically in Fall 2006. Currently (spring 06), there are 93 sections of ENGLWRIT 112 planned for Fall, 06 of which 66 are RAP/TAP and another 6 honors, a total of 77% of the planned offering. This increase concerns the Writing Committee because TOs in their interviews continually reported that it was more difficult to teach in the dorms due to class management concerns. This move puts a lot of stress on our least experienced teachers at the university.

4. Curriculum for College Writing (ENGLWRIT 112 and 113)

ENGLWRIT 112 and 113 offer the same curriculum, but 113 uses the Writing Program's computer lab for in-class work. A common syllabus is used in all sections of these courses.

The curriculum for ENGLWRIT 112 begins with the belief that good writing can never be defined outside of context and writing emerges from a combination of a writer's motives and external influences (e.g., responses to events and texts) or contextual demands (e.g., professional, academic) that prompt one to write. If writing emerges from context, then the choices one makes about how to best compose a text also emerge in response to that context: the audience's expectations, the writers' goals, what's been previously written on the topic taken up, the style used, etc. Thus, the quality of a given essay can only be assessed according to how well a writer's choices meet the contextual demands for which she is composing. Therefore, ENGLWRIT 112 courses are all based on the same, four premises:

- Writing is a series of choices (about genre, organization, style, etc.) made in response to the context, purpose, and audience of a given text.
- Writing can serve a variety of purposes for writers throughout their lives, including but not limited to personal, academic, civic, and creative purposes. ENGLWRIT 112 emphasizes academic and civic purposes.
- Writing is a recursive process of continual revision, reflection, and response from others.
- Writing exists to be read, and thus writers must also be readers—of other texts, of contexts, of culture—in order to read their own texts and assess their effects on potential readers.

These more abstract premises translate into a series of related goals included in the syllabus that each student receives:

The goal of this course is to help you develop your writing abilities-not only for University writing assignments but also for using writing effectively in life. We will examine writing as a response to varying contexts, analyzing the different kinds of choices they make available to writers. Through producing a variety of essays, we will work together to improve your ability to

- write for various audiences and purposes-for example to explore a topic for yourself, to communicate with others (fellow students, teachers, general readers, etc.), and to create particular effects (persuading, explaining, etc).
- develop and extend your thinking by questioning your own views and considering the views of others-thus becoming better able to write essays that move through an extended train of thinking rather than just defend a static position.
- draw on various sources of thinking and information: your own experience and observations, conversation with others, reading, and research.
- revise your writing in a substantive way by re-thinking and re-seeing each draft, and by experimenting with various forms and organizations.
- be a constructive reader of your own and others' writing, and give constructive and helpful feedback.

- manage your own writing processes by making choices about your texts that are appropriate to your audience and purpose.
- take whatever steps are needed to copy-edit your final drafts successfully.

In order to meet these goals, students in the course read and write extensively. Students read published essays written for a wide variety of academic audiences throughout the course as well as published student writing. There are two required texts for the course, *The Text-Wrestling Book*, edited by the UMass Editorial Collective, and a style manual, *The Everyday Writer*, by Andrea Lunsford. Students must also own a college edition of a standard dictionary.

Students produce multiple drafts of each paper, getting feedback from peers and the teacher on most early drafts before completing a final, copyedited draft. At least two individual conferences with the teacher on an essay draft are also required of each student. Students write four major essays of 1,000-1,250 words in response to four required units that address multiple purposes and audiences. The series of essays moves from an analysis of a familiar topic for an unformed audience (Unit I) to essays responding to complex, academic texts (Unit 2) to essays that seek to use multiple sources and communicate with a public audience (Unit 3). In each essay, students focus on the expectations readers might have given the contexts they are writing for and experiment with multiple ways of communicating with these different groups of readers. Each of the four essays is connected to a specific unit: I: Inquiring into Self, II: Interacting with Texts, III: Adding to a Conversation. The fourth unit is developed by each individual instructor in line with the philosophical goals of the program. What these essay goals share, in addition to attention to audience and contextual awareness, are an emphasis on analyzing source material, composing essays using various lines of development, incorporating and responding to academic writers, and conducting effective research to meet the purpose of the paper.

To meet these essay goals, students engage in substantial generative and exploratory writing about topics, sources, and processes before beginning to draft a formal essay. During the drafting cycle, students are required to revise several times, with the final revisions devoted solely to proofreading issues. To better understand the choices available for composing an effective text for a given context, students also write several short, reflective pieces explaining why they have written an essay in a particular way. Thus, the course culminates with students writing a reflective essay that examines all their writing over the course of the semester; the goal is for students to assess the effectiveness of the rhetorical choices that they've made and the writing processes they've engaged in so that they can make more effective writing choices in the future.

All essays are graded for the quality of the final paper produced and full participation in all required elements of the writing process. Essays are assessed for common goals across sections. (See portfolio assessment section below.)

5. Curriculum for Basic Writing (ENGLWRIT 111)

ENGLWRIT 111, "Basic Writing," introduces students to writing processes and academic writing conventions. The Writing Program website lists these curricular goals for the course:

- Using various kinds of thinking and discourse--for example, narrating, explaining, persuading, and analyzing.
- Drawing on various sources of thinking and information: your own experience and observations, conversation with others, and published texts.
- Developing and extending your own thinking by questioning your own views and considering the views of others.
- Revising your writing in a substantive way by means of re-thinking and re-seeing your essays in their various stages of progress.
- Editing your final drafts successfully for style as well as grammatical correctness.
- Reading analytically your own and others' writing.
- Understanding and managing [students'] own writing processes.
(http://writingprogram.hfa.umass.edu/courses_programs/111/goals_objectives.asp)

To support these reading and writing goals, the syllabus relies on the textbook *The Composition of Our"selves."* According to the Writing Program, "The essays, memoirs, and short stories that fill the pages of *The Composition of Our"selves"* are all meant to offer [students] some ways to think about the power of language and writing that perhaps [they] have not thought of before" (http://writingprogram.hfa.umass.edu/courses_programs/111/introduction.asp). Students thus consider the *topic* of language in society in addition to the *practice* of reading and writing.

Students complete five essays that examine language practices in relation to constructions of self, identities, language differences, and gender construction. Each calls on specific rhetorical skills: narrative, interpretation, persuasion, and analysis. Course requirements encompass

- Five essays (each at least 750 words). With each finished essay, [students] must turn in all preliminary drafts, including rough and mid-process drafts, as well as any written peer and teacher response.
- Numerous shorter "exploratory writings."
- A final oeuvre or collection of all [students'] essays, including an analytical introduction to [their] semester's work and prefaces to each of [their] five major essays.
- Other shorter assignments written in class and at home.
(http://writingprogram.hfa.umass.edu/courses_programs/111/course_req.asp)

The essays, which progress from more personal to more academic, culminate in an *oeuvre*, or portfolio. The portfolio includes all five essays (one with an additional revision), introductions to each essay, and a two-page introduction to the entire portfolio that details the student's growth as a writer.

ENGLWRIT 111 therefore adopts approaches that are similar to ENGLWRIT 112, but Basic Writing is characterized by several unique features:

- Five hours a week of instruction, in computer labs.
- An instructional focus on particular writing difficulties, which the staff identify as important, and for which they have developed special techniques and teaching materials.
- A team-based instructional approach in which teachers are regularly sensitized to students' writing problems (each team meets weekly or biweekly).
- Workshop-type writing classes in which students are closely supervised and given considerable feedback on their writing.
- Experienced writing teachers, who are highly experienced in providing focused writing instruction.
- Tutoring workshops, including grammar-focused labs, for all students.
- A variety of grading opportunities that provide a safety net for the students, allowing them several ways to succeed so that they can develop confidence in writing.
- Satisfaction of a University diversity requirement.
- An excellent text written by Marcia Curtis and former TOs, *The Composition of Our"selves,"* which will be updated next year.

6. Staff Development

Peggy Woods, Assistant Director, Writing Program, is primarily responsible for the development program for the Teaching Associates. The hiring of TOs is highly selective. Two Course Directors interview each applicant. The applicant evaluates a student essay and provides a sample of his or her own writing. After acceptance, each new TO receives a thick packet of training materials and attends a four-day orientation before the fall semester begins. The orientation is required for all new TOs.

There are eight Course Directors; three are staff in the Writing Program and five are English faculty, including the Director of the Program. Each Course Director supervises 10-12 TOs. New TOs meet bi-weekly with their Course Director and attend a workshop with all other new TOs on the alternate week. In their first-year, TOs are observed twice each semester, and one of their classes is videotaped during the second semester. Course directors visit classes of all TOs and provide feedback each semester. Beginning TOs are assigned to veteran TO mentors who give them help

on issues ranging from class behavior to ideas for assignments. Veteran TOs are observed annually and required to take at least three practica courses (1 credit) in each semester after their first year. The practica address a variety of teaching issues related to Englwr12 such as diversity, use of technology, and composition theory.

Students evaluate instructors both at mid-semester and at the end of the course; statistics are compiled for each teacher. The Course Directors hold conferences with the TOs to discuss these evaluations. The Writing Program also holds regular workshops and informal discussions on a variety of topics related to the courses; new TOs are required to attend workshops every other week in the first semester in order to address all aspects of the curriculum. Among the informal avenues of exchange of information are a TO resource database available on the website and the Writing Program Newsletter.

The Committee was impressed with the care and attention paid to hiring and to improving the performance of TOs. Opportunities for TO improvement abound, and the permanent staff has become expert in their training methods. A striking feature is the extremely high morale in the whole organization. TOs are quick to praise the permanent staff for their support and respect.

7. The Writing Center

For AY 2005-2006, the Writing Center was open and available for tutoring approximately 52 hours per week. Twenty-four hours were available at the Writing Center in Bartlett 303A (M-Th 10-4), and twenty-eight hours were held at the Writing Center in the Learning Commons (M-Th 5-10; Sun 2-10). Each open hour was staffed by 3-4 tutors, resulting in an average of 182 hours of available tutoring a week. This was a significant increase over previous years when only the Bartlett Center was operational and could only offer approximately 50 tutoring hours per week. Such an increase was made possible by the Learning Commons and the funding provided by the Provost's office for expanded hours.

The Writing Center is directed by a Writing Program staff member who devotes 25% of her time to the position. Two graduate students function as assistant directors for the Bartlett and Learning Commons Centers, respectively, to assist with tutor training and administrative work. Graduate students from the Writing Program teaching staff, as well as undergraduate peer tutors, provide tutoring. Both groups have specific Writing Center training: a short session for graduate students and a required peer tutoring class for undergraduates.

In Fall 2004, 892 tutoring sessions were conducted; in Spring 2005, 805 sessions were conducted. (In the last review, conducted for AY00-01, approximately 430 students were seen over the course of a year. The numbers have quadrupled since then and these figures do *not* include the new Learning Commons' hours.) In Fall 2005, the only semester in which the Learning Commons hours were added for which there is complete data, the Writing Center (both sites combined) saw a total of 1252 students, a 33% increase over the Bartlett center alone. This number is expected to increase in the spring as students become more aware that the Writing Center is available in the Learning Commons.

Students visiting the Writing Center in Fall 2005 represented every major in the university, with the largest percentages coming from Social and Behavioral Sciences (27.5%) and College of Humanities and Fine Arts (15.5%). In 04-05, the highest percentage of use came from the Isenberg School of Management (21%) and Social and Behavioral Sciences (20.6%). The addition of the Learning Commons has affected the level of students visiting the Center. In 04-05, approximately 30% of students were first-years; 22% were juniors, and the other 50% were almost equally distributed among sophomores, seniors, and graduate students. In Fall 2005 more seniors (24%) used the center than any other group, followed by juniors (23.4%), sophomores (21.4%), first-years (18.8%), and finally graduate students (9.4%).

The tutoring system was developed primarily by the Writing Program to help First Year writing students but has always been made available when possible to all students. There is no specific budget allocation for tutoring. Tutors for the Bartlett Center are paid through the First Year Writing Program's general operating budget; tutors for the Learning Commons through the Learning Commons budget.

8. Grievance Procedures

Patricia Zukowski is the Writing Program's Ombuds officer. The Writing Program Ombuds officer consults with TOs and accompanies them to hearings, and works as a mediator with students. Various types of grievances occur during the year: those concerning placement, transfer credit, and grades, academic honesty cases, teacher complaints against students, and student complaints against teachers. Most complaints are handled within the Program. Often the settlement involves mediating between the instructor and student. Approximately thirty academic honesty cases arise each semester. Some cases involve simple misunderstanding about appropriate citation; others involve wholesale use of another author's paper or papers. Penalties in these cases range from allowing the student to rewrite the paper to expulsion from the University. The Writing Program policy is fairly consistent. Where it appears that naiveté is the cause of the problem, the student will receive special instruction and be allowed to rewrite the paper. If one incident of wholesale plagiarism is uncovered, the penalty is failure for the course. If more than one incident occurs within the same semester, the penalty is suspension for one semester. Multiple cases will result in a recommendation to expel the student from the University. It is very rare that a grievance goes beyond the Writing Program grievance officer; in the last several years only one or two academic honesty cases, in which suspension or expulsion was recommended, have gone on to a higher University authority.

9. Writing Program Placement Testing

All undergraduate students must satisfy the University Writing Requirement. Transfer students may satisfy the requirement by successful completion of an equivalent course taken elsewhere. Students may also be exempted on the basis of SAT or AP scores. In 2005-2006, students took one placement exam (with two choices of topics) that determined their placement into ENGLWRIT111, ENGLWRIT112/113, or their exemption from the University Writing Requirement. Almost 4300 exams were given, primarily in June and July during Freshman Orientation sessions, although students who do not take the exam during one of these sessions are accommodated during the school year.

In 1998 a change was instituted in the exam procedure, replacing the system that had been in place for fifteen years. From 1998 to 2000, students chose the exam they felt best suited their skills, thus giving students some control and responsibility in their own placement. The first exam was a placement exam, designed to place students either in ENGLWRIT 112/113 or ENGLWRIT 111, if necessary. The exemption exam was significantly more difficult, designed to identify students whose writing skills were strong enough for the student to be excused from the requirement. This procedure was dropped in 2001 (see 2001 review). After three years of experience with separate placement and exemption exams, the Writing Program staff concluded that students did not accurately assess their own writing ability when choosing which exam to take. Many students who would have been exempted had they chosen the exemption exam instead took the shorter, easier placement exam and were placed into College Writing. The most self-assured students—not necessarily the best writers—chose the exemption exam; 64% of those taking the exemption exam were not exempted. Faced with these results, the Writing Program used only one exam in 2001 and has continued that practice through 2005-2006.

The placement exam is 60 minutes long and asks students to use personal experience and knowledge to respond to a short reading passage. The directions specifically ask students to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the author by including “a description of the main issue, a summary of [the author's] views of it, and examples and/or reasons for your opinion. Make sure to quote from [the author's] work in your essay, although you may also rely on your own personal experiences and knowledge.” In this way, students are asked to demonstrate both concrete and abstract thinking as well as demonstrate familiarity with academic norms of argumentation, development, and citation of sources by quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing.

Each exam is read at least twice by graduate student readers (current Teaching Associates) who are selected and trained for this purpose. Each exam receives a score between 1 and 6. The scores from both readers are combined to create a total from 2-12. A score of 4 or below places into 111, 10 or above exempts, and 5-9 into 112.

The results of summer 2005 placement tests were as follows:

4295 students were tested.

136 (3.2%) were placed into Basic Writing (ENGLWRIT 111).

161 (3.7%) were exempted.

3998 (93.1%) were placed into College Writing (ENGLWRIT 112 or 113).

Although the form and scoring of the exam itself has remained the same over the five-year period of this review, the committee would like to note that the administration of the exam did change in Summer 2005. Students took the exam early in the Orientation session, and scores were generated by the students' advising session. As a result, students were immediately registered for the correct course and the percentage of total students tested (almost the entire freshmen class) rose dramatically. New Students' Program (NSP) was not able to keep this schedule for this coming summer (2006) and thus exam scores will have to be reported to students *after* they have already registered for ENGLWRIT 112. Thus, students testing into ENGLWRIT 111 or exempting would then be dropped from their registered course, and those who failed to take the placement exam but registered for 112 will also be dropped after their orientation session.

The committee feels that the change instituted in Summer 2005 served the students' needs much better by ensuring their schedules remained the same as what they registered for at Orientation. Further, this structure resulted in less confusion about a student's placement and/or fewer students attempting to avoid the placement exam. The committee recommends that NSP return to this other version if at all possible in the future.

10. Impact of ESL on ENGLWRIT 111 and 112

Students identified by Admissions are given a language placement test; depending on their scores, these students are encouraged to complete a specified number of hours of ESL instruction. As part of this instruction, students take either both ESL 120 and ESL 130 or just ESL 130 in preparation for Writing Program entrance. During the period of this review, many fewer students are identified as ESL than in past years because of changing criteria. Further, students are no longer required to complete the ESL sequence as in the past. When students finish ESL 130, they are given the Writing Program Placement Test. As one indication that the ESL Program is effective with ESL 130, most students are placed into 112, rather than in 111, although there is some concern that this result might be due to a perception on the part of ESL students and instructors that placing in 111 is "failing the test."

The changing policy of admissions regarding ESL students has resulted in a higher number of ESL writers beginning their writing course work in either ENGLWRIT 111 or ENGLWRIT 112. The curriculum of 111, in particular, is well set up for such a group, however, and there has been little impact on the quality of the student writing produced. The only noticeable change has been that teacher training for 111 is dealing more directly with assessment of ESL students' writing issues, and effective practices for helping ESL writers become more adept with U.S. academic writing norms. In fact, Deputy Director, Deirdre Vinyard, new to the program this year and course director for ENGLWRIT 111, comes to the program specifically with over 20 years experience with ESL and composition and is well positioned to deal with this change.

11. Evaluations

In assessing the FYWP, the Committee reviewed samples of student portfolios and review essays in depth; conducted in-depth interviews with a group of Course Directors and administrative staff; conducted in-depth interviews with several groups of TOs from ENGLWRIT 112 and ENGLWRIT 111; reviewed the role of the Learning Commons in the FYWP; reviewed the FYWP curriculum documents; and reviewed student evaluation averages for the Program.

11.1. Analysis of Student Portfolios

The portfolio review sought evidence that course goals were being met in the writing students produced in the course. The review had two components: one focused on rhetorical knowledge and writing skills, and a second on writing processes. In the first component, five to eight student portfolios were collected from twelve Writing Program Teaching Associates distinguished by experience teaching in the program: 0-1 years; 1-2 years; 2+ years. The Committee requested student portfolios that represented a range of student abilities—high, medium, low—and included the final drafts of all four major units in the curriculum. These portfolios served as the basis for assessment of how well students were meeting the goals specified by the program and how consistently TOs were emphasizing those same goals. In the second component, the reviewers collected all process work (generative writing, 2-3 drafts, peer and teacher responses, and final drafts) for the third, research unit from a different, randomly selected, group of TOs. Representing the work of 18 students and seven teachers, this data set was analyzed to assess how student work improved through the writing process and how the process aided in reaching the unit goals.

Curriculum Analysis

The reviewers analyzed 84 total portfolios via a rubric based on the goals for each assignment. The reviewers looked for evidence of the criteria in each paper and also listed comments specific to each paper. Criteria included a clear focus, development of ideas, critical analysis, analysis of a published author's ideas, awareness and use of academic expectations about textual evidence and response, use of cohesive devices, and proper documentation of sources (e.g., quoting, paraphrasing).

After reviewing all 84 portfolios, the reviewers concluded that almost all students showed evidence of learning what the course purports to teach them and that the course goals seemed appropriate to what students needed to work on most at this stage in their writing and intellectual development. Specifically, the reviewers made the following observations:

- The majority of the papers, even those rated “low,” showed evidence of attention to the goals. Even if the writing itself was not fully effective, the writer was moving toward the goals. The reviewers felt this indicated instructors’ orientation toward the goals.
- The papers contained evidence that students were pushed beyond their initial writing abilities. For example, many papers in the “middle” rated group had evidence of more complex thinking although the writer did not yet sustain this throughout the total composition. Also, in many papers, there was evidence of “writing as thinking” or students using the writing process to gain new insights on the topic.
- Many papers showed evidence that students were challenged beyond simple technical growth as writers; there was clear evidence that their sense of audience, purpose, and context was becoming more developed. For example, in the assignments asking the student writer to interact with a published text, many students attended to rhetorical strategies used by an author rather than only the essay’s content.
- Reviewing the choice of readings that provided critical material for the assignments, we found evidence that class readings fit the nature of the program. For example, there is evidence that student writers addressed multiple perspectives within their writing based on class discussions of readings that were provocative and invited critical thought.
- Not surprisingly, the more advanced writers tended to demonstrate sophisticated thinking and more attention to cohesion.

Based on this review, the reviewers recommend retaining these goals and reinforcing them in TO training and workshops. Linking writing to complex thinking, rather than simply technical proficiency, is an essential and appropriate focal issue. Reviews of the Unit I papers reveal that critical analysis and awareness of audience are the skills most often missing, especially in portfolios rated middle and low. Students arriving from high schools where test performance encourages a focus on formulaic writing may need increased support in shifting their thinking about the relationship between form and function for university-level academic writing. Further, such rhetorical flexibility lays the groundwork for understanding disciplinary differences in writing emphasized in the junior-year course. The

reviewers also noted, not surprisingly, that the teachers with more experience had greater success in emphasizing the relationship between successful texts (form, genre, style) and differing audiences; thus, the focus of training on these aspects of writing should continue.

Process Analysis

The purpose of reviewing Unit III: Adding to a Conversation was to determine if students developed or grew as writers between drafts. Most portfolios contained three drafts. Criteria for drafting the unit included analyzing the audience, responding to a particular rhetorical context, and demonstrating a clear sense of purpose. More specifically, we also looked for evidence of certain writing skills: organization appropriate to purpose, integration of sources, and proper citations. Most drafts showed improvement in each.

Most significantly, there was evidence that all students were revising, but the level of revision seemed connected to the strength of the first draft. Students who began with strong first drafts tended to make changes and improve, but those improvements were generally minimal. Students who needed to make the most significant changes generally made improvements but did not make significant enough improvements to make the final draft a 'strong' draft. Additionally, most students, especially those whose drafts could be labeled mid-range, responded to teacher comments, often making very small, easy changes, such as word choice suggestions. Larger, more significant changes, such as problems with organization or purpose, were less frequent. How to address a specific audience through their texts seemed to be the goals students at all levels struggled with the most.

Based on this analysis, the reviewers recommend that the focus on revision as a global rethinking of the content and structure of an essay be continued, if not further reinforced by the curriculum. Similarly, attention to audience and context so central to this unit is clearly where students need the most help; thus, these goals seem appropriate to the curriculum.

11.2. College Writing (ENGLWRIT 112) Course Director and Administrative Staff Interviews

The interviews with the Course Directors and Administrative staff sought evidence of a strong relationship between administrative expectations and actual practices, and suggestions for improvement of the FYWP. Four people were interviewed: Donna LeCourt (Director of the Writing Program), Deirdre Vinyard (Deputy Director), Pat Zukowski (Assistant Director), and Peggy Woods (Assistant Director).

Donna LeCourt is Director of the writing program and a faculty member in the English department; Professor LeCourt receives a course release as Director. She participates in all aspects of the writing program through collaboration and supervision of the other staff members. Her main duties include setting the curriculum for ENGLWRIT 112, leading the teacher training, administrative coordination with other university entities (such as the New Students' Program and the Provost's office), leading new initiatives, doing outreach with other departments on teaching writing, and serving as the "face" of the program on various university committees. As someone recently hired to UMass (in 2002) who directed a similar program at another comparable university, Professor LeCourt is impressed with the overall program here, particularly its organizational structure and staff. While most writing programs are located in an English department, UMass' structure allows the program to more directly focus on general education and the writing needs of first-year students. She also notes that the teacher training done at UMass, and its national reputation for excellence, was one reason she was attracted to the position here. Professor LeCourt made three recommendations: (1) that class size in both ENGLWRIT 112 and 111 be reduced to 15, to be in line with nationally recommended standards (e.g., WPA Outcomes Statement), and (2) that the placement procedures be reorganized with NSP to better meet the needs of the students, and (3) more resources be dedicated toward developing instructional technologies for use in 112 through the creation of a permanently funded technology position in the program who could support a teaching staff that changes very quickly.

Deirdre Vinyard is Deputy Director of the Writing Program. She recently joined the UMass Amherst campus, and has a background in ESL instruction. Her responsibilities include oversight of ENGLWRIT 111, budget management, administration of the main office, and evaluation of the two members of the clerical staff. In addition, she is placement

coordinator, and determines which writing courses, if any, incoming students must take. She is very positive about her experiences to date: she is impressed with Professor LeCourt's leadership, the collaborative attitude of the group, the curriculum, and the week-long TO training program. She offers three comments regarding the program. First, she recommends a reduction in the number of students in the classroom (currently ENGLWRIT 111 permits 20 students per section, and ENGLWRIT 112 permits 24 students). In her estimation, all sections would ideally be capped at 12-15 students. Second, she notes that students are placed into either ENGLWRIT 111 or ENGLWRIT 112, or exempted altogether, based on a placement test in essay format. She feels that this test is much more relevant and effective for assessing student writing than the SAT, and that it is worth the effort and cost to continue to administrate in this fashion. Third, she comments that the nationally-recognized TO training works well in the one intensive week in the summer with on-going meeting and workshop sessions during the semester.

Pat Zukowski is an Assistant Director with multiple roles. She is an ombudsperson for the Program. She also serves as a Course Director. She has occasionally taught "Learning through Teaching," the first course of a two-semester sequence for peer writing tutors. The content of the first semester is more theoretical, and the second semester is primarily a practicum. Students must also carry out a project to benefit the Writing Center. In the last nine months, papers about this class have been accepted at two major conferences, with tutors as co-presenters. She also directs the Writing Center, which is now staffed both in two locations, Bartlett Hall and the Learning Commons. She commented that the establishment of the Learning Commons significantly helps alleviate the constraints of too few tutors, too little space, and too little time that had previously plagued the Writing Center; indeed, the staff has increased from 13 to 34. In general, she suggests that increased secretarial help and clerical support would be welcome and allow administrators such as herself to outreach to other campus faculty. For example, the Writing Center now functions only on a drop-in basis, and additional help would allow students to make appointments. In addition, the webmaster is currently a graduate student, and it would be better to have this than the responsibility of the permanent staff.

Peggy Woods is the Assistant Director for Teacher Training. She is in charge of the 92 TOs. She is also in charge of the innovative Spring Writing Festival. She has an active role in developing outreach programs and supervises outreach of weekly writing groups, weekly reading groups, opportunities to meet other writers and creative non-fiction groups. She co-designs the intensive Fall TA training program with Professor Le Court. (The schedule for that program is attached as Appendix I.) She suggests that a full-time writing center in the Campus Center would be valuable to students. She would also like to see a mix of weekly writing groups offered, such as creative writing, perhaps with both undergraduates and graduates.

11.3. College Writing (ENGLWRIT 112) TO Interviews

The interviews with ENGLWRIT 112 TOs sought evidence that training, mentorship, and support assisted TOs in reaching curriculum and pedagogical goals, and that student experiences in the classroom met these goals. There were two TO groups interviewed: a group of twelve experienced TOs (defined by more than one year of teaching in the FYWP) and a group of ten inexperienced TOs (defined by the first year of service in the FYWP). The list of questions is included as Appendix II.

In the first set of interviews, the TOs recognized the strengths of ENGLWRIT 112 as: (1) necessary practice in writing; (2) an introduction to critical thinking; and (3) the employment of writing to assist critical thinking. The TOs agreed that students who successfully completed ENGLWRIT 112 would have a clearer sense of managing the writing process. They observed that students themselves often noted improvements in their writing during the semester. TOs did raise a concern, however, that such knowledge often fades without frequent reminders and writing assignments in other courses in the undergraduates' majors, and that students often must reacquire the skills they gained in ENGLWRIT 112 when they take Junior Year Writing. The TOs strongly supported the notion of a Sophomore year writing requirement. The TOs were supportive of the Course Director system and the pre-packaged curriculum as a training device. They concluded that teaching one section of ENGLWRIT 112—including planning, meeting with course directors, meeting with students, and reading student writing—exceeds more than 20 hours per week. They all recommended a reduction of the class size from 24 to 20. In attempting to meet educational goals for their students, several TOs created their own assignments. In general, the TOs request still greater training in ways to teach organization, how to facilitate classroom discussions, and how to manage classroom dynamics.

In the second set of interviews, the TOs largely echoed the sentiments and concerns of the first group. They recognized the strengths of ENGLWRIT 112 as: (1) necessary practice in writing; (2) an introduction to critical thinking; and (3) the employment of writing to assist critical thinking. They also emphasized the engaging nature of the *Text Wrestling* book and saw ENGLWRIT 112, as one TO explained, as a corrective to “some of the ridiculous things students learn in high school” writing classes. The TOs praised the general flexibility of the course to accommodate their own needs as graduate students and supported the Course Director system and the pre-packaged curriculum as a training device. They praised the Summer Orientation as helpful and necessary. The TOs were unanimous in asserting that they felt tremendous support from all administrative personnel, from their Course Directors to the Director of the Writing Program, in addressing day-to-day classroom concerns and responses to students. These TOs also recognized the need for reinforcement of writing in other courses and strongly support the idea of a Sophomore writing requirement. They concluded that teaching one section of ENGLWRIT 112—including planning, meeting with course directors, meeting with students, and reading student writing—exceeds more than 20 hours per week. They all recommended a reduction of the class size from 24 to 16. The other recommendation these TOs offered was a possible reevaluation of the curriculum to better accommodate Tuesday-Thursday classes; many noted that the current design better accommodates a Monday-Wednesday-Friday course schedule.

11.4. Basic Writing (ENGLWRIT 111) TO Interviews

The committee likewise interviewed ENGLWRIT 111 TOs with a similar goal of assessing teachers’ perceptions of how effectively the Writing Program assisted teachers in carrying out the pedagogical goals of Basic Writing and how the course helped students grow as academic writers. Two University Writing Committee members interviewed five TOs at one of their practicum meetings. The list of questions is included as Appendix II.

The TOs were committed to the Writing Program’s goals for ENGLISH 111: to provide students with writing workshops to get started, to learn about writing processes and academic conventions, and to grow confident in their writing. In particular, they commended the curricular emphasis on exploratory writing—significant given the demographic of Basic Writing students. According to these teachers, many students who test into basic writing require more instruction in academic writing conventions. A common theme among the students is the way past writing experiences have failed them, resulting in “bad writing histories” and a need to “overcome anxieties.” At the same time, the ENGLWRIT 111 student body is diverse in terms of academic writing ability, language proficiency, (dis)ability, nationality, and race. Responding to such student diversity presents rich opportunity and challenges for the curriculum. The focus on writing exploration, revision, and reflection helps students see writing more productively and enables teachers to regularly assess students’ writing progress throughout the term.

Teachers, based on their intensive interaction with students and their writing, noted that successful students have gained confidence with their writing and familiarized themselves with academic writing processes and essay conventions. Specifically, they saw students progress in the following areas: confidence with writing, improved class discussion skills, understanding of writing processes (e.g., getting started, interpreting texts, revising), extended reading skills (e.g., taking notes in margins, asking questions), critical thinking, and development of ideas through an essay.

The TOs also attributed students’ writing development to the nature of the course. They appreciated the 20-student class size (smaller than the ENGLISH 112 24-student limit) and the two-hour class meeting twice per week (as opposed to three 50-minute class sessions each week) because this allows for more individualized instruction and in-class writing. Given the diverse and widely varying needs of ENGLWRIT 111 students, Deirdre Vinyard (Writing Program Deputy Director and course director for ENGLWRIT 111 TOs) recommended that, in fact, students might benefit more from the curriculum if class size were limited to 15 students.

ENGLWRIT 111 TOs, all experienced college writing teachers, responded positively to continued training and mentorship they received from the Writing Program. These TOs met with one another and their course director every other week to discuss pedagogical issues specific to this course. Without exception, the teachers appreciated this

“useful” opportunity to discuss their teaching in this small group. They described their course director as “accessible” and “passionate”; she “welcomes suggestions.” The basic writing teachers also appreciated having a detailed syllabus and the textbook’s “good basic roadmap” to provide structure to their course. Because few sections of ENGLISH 111 are offered in spring semesters and there would therefore be fewer basic writing teachers, these teachers were concerned about not having the same support as they had in the fall semester with their course director group.

Teachers offered two suggestions to strengthen the existing Basic Writing curriculum and teacher training. First, the Writing Program should provide an orientation or workshop to introduce new teachers to ENGLWRIT 111. Such an orientation is already being discussed by Writing Program administrators. The TOs suggested the following as orientation topics: the course curriculum, the use of space in a computer classroom, an introduction to technology and teaching, and pedagogical approaches to teaching different learners (e.g., ESL students, students with learning disabilities, etc.).

Second, while the textbook provides a strong apparatus and teachers enjoyed the organization of topics and writing assignments, the TOs expressed a need to update and revise the ENGLWRIT 111 curriculum. Deirdre Vinyard, in fact, has already launched discussions about how to revise the textbook in order to respond to the changing student body and to offer teachers more time to adequately address different writing tasks. Course readings, the TOs said, should be updated and should reflect current students’ backgrounds—e.g., address ESL and learning disability topics. The readings, moreover, should reflect contemporary scholarly treatment of language in relation to race, gender, and society. One teacher added that the students could also benefit from “sociohistorical context” to help students, especially those unfamiliar with American culture and politics, understand the readings.

11.5. Review of the Writing Center in Bartlett Hall and Learning Commons

The committee reviewed the role of the addition of the Writing Center location at the Learning Commons through an interview with the director, Pat Zukowski, and review of statistical information (see section 7). As the statistics attest, the number of students visiting the Writing Center *before* the addition of the Learning Commons had risen over 100% from the previous review in AY00-01. This number further increased by 33% in Fall, 2005 with the addition of the Learning Commons; in fact, the two Centers saw over 1200 students combined. While the number of students seen highlights the importance of the Writing Center to student learning and increased accessibility through the Learning Commons is clearly a benefit, Pat Zukowski contends that the split between the Learning Commons and Bartlett has its costs as well as benefits: Bartlett tutors have easy access to her, but the Learning Commons is very accessible to students. Administering both sites as a limited portion of her position has significantly increased her workload. It is apparent to the Committee that there may be a need for a full-time director who can focus their attention primarily on the Center.

The Writing Committee commends the addition of the Learning Commons Center as a way of better meeting the writing needs of our students. However, the Bartlett Center, which still offers a large percentage of the tutoring has no permanent funding source and is maintained at the loss of other expenditures for the Writing Program. The Committee does not believe it is the Writing Program’s responsibility to fund a service that clearly benefits all students.

11.6. Curriculum Documents Review

The Committee reviewed a number of documents used for the training of TOs, including the “Teaching Mission and Guidelines” booklet for 2005-2006, the detailed calendar provided to new instructors, an assessment and planning grid of the curriculum, and the *Text-Wrestling Book* (custom-published by the Program). The guidebook describes all aspects of the Program: an overview, TA responsibilities and resources, planning for courses, rules and regulations, services for students, and a writing teacher’s bibliography. In particular, the Committee was impressed with the emphasis and clarity with which the course goals and philosophy of the Program are explained to the TOs. The variety of documents provide information on both the rhetorical goals of the course as well as the specific writing skills the course is meant to cover (e.g., writing skills including matters as source documentation and paragraph structure). Similarly, the TOs are provided with very concrete suggestions on ways to teach these goals and skills on a day-to-day

basis. Finally, the *Text-Wrestling Book* offers a clear explanation to both students and teachers of both the philosophy of the course and the important role of reading in learning to write.

The Committee is very impressed with the curriculum design with respect to undergraduate students for a number of reasons. First, it provides the academic skills necessary for success in college writing, often filling in the gaps from high school education. Second, the emphasis on audience and context provides students preparation for learning to write in their major through Junior Year Writing and a means to engage public contexts in the formation of an educated citizenry prepared to participate in democracy. Third, the emphasis on the writing process and reflective writing (as opposed to writing to preconceived forms) helps students learn their own strengths and weakness, participate in their own learning, and devise strategies to address those weaknesses in their future writing.

11.7. Review of Student Evaluations

The Committee reviewed the summary of student evaluations for the Fall 2004-Fall 2005. Every indicator revealed that the students found their instructors' quality of teaching to be above average to superior. Further, in questions specifically about the course and course goals, students overwhelmingly agreed that they had learned what the course intended to teach them. The summary is included in Appendix III.

12. Recommendations

The first two recommendations based on this report are remarkably similar to the recommendations made five years ago—and, in the case of recommendation 1A, eight years ago as well.

1. The Administration should provide the Writing Program with funds to do the following:

A. Reduce the maximum section enrollment in ENGLWRIT 112 to 20 students, and in ENGLWRIT 111 to 15 students. These recommendations were made in the last two triennial reviews and we are repeating them here. This relatively small reduction in class size (at most four students in ENGLWRIT 112) would produce a great improvement in quality of instruction while allowing TOs more time to complete their own programs of study.

B. Fully fund the Writing Center in Bartlett Hall and in the Learning Commons. With the greatly expanded roles of this Center in the education of students, the need for hiring a full-time administrative staff is apparent. Likewise, the Committee recommends that the Center be funded through the base budget rather than the general operating budget.

C. Provide funding to hire and sustain an instructional technology staff member to address the ever-increasing needs of the Program, particularly for the development and maintenance of website design.

2. Faculty in other departments should be encouraged to incorporate writing pedagogy, including multiple drafts and peer review, in other University courses, especially General Education courses. In some programs, students write few or no papers between College Writing and the Junior Year Writing Program course. It is not surprising that these students are poor writers. A one-semester writing requirement is already minimal; at the very least its achievements should be sustained by requiring students to write and revise frequently in other courses. In order to advance this goal, two recommendations are offered:

A. The possibility of a Sophomore writing requirement should be considered seriously. Minimally, the Committee recommends the creation of a Sophomore elective for writing.

B. The General Education Council should consider the feasibility of creating a designation for writing-intensive courses and requiring a certain number of such courses as part of the undergraduate curriculum.

3. Instructional diagnoses and curriculum prescriptions for students should address the following:

A. As advised by administrators interviewed above, the Committee recommends that the New Students' Program work with the FYWP to ensure that students take the diagnostic exam early during Orientation (as occurred in summer 2005) rather than after they have been assigned to a writing course (as will occur in summer 2006). The Committee also very strongly recommends that the SAT Verbal and Writing scores not be used to exempt students from the diagnostic exam.

B. While ENGLWRIT 111 is accommodating additional numbers of ESL writers well and will continue to do so, the Committee wishes to point out that the ESL need on campus is not limited to entering students and recommends more advanced level ESL courses (and graduate courses) to meet the continuing needs of this population.

4. The Writing Program should do the following:

A. Provide more explicit information about the grading system used in ENGLWRIT 112 and review grading standards to TOs during their training sessions, in order to offset TO insecurities about their grading standards in comparison with other sections.

B. Provide specific class management strategies for teaching in the dormitories if the university continues to expand the number of RAP/TAP sections. If this is not successful, the Committee recommends that the next review look carefully at any differences between the quality of instruction in the dormitories versus campus classrooms.

Appendix I: Schedule for TA Training Program

Orientation Schedule (Fall 2005)

	Monday, August 29, 2005—Tobin 622
9:00-10:15	Welcome Introduction to Orientation— <i>Peggy Woods</i> Introduction Exercise—“Interview Exercise”— <i>Natalie Lyalin</i>
10:15-10:30	Coffee Break
10:30-11:45	What Do We Think About When We Think About Writing— <i>Donna LeCourt</i> Philosophy of Writing— <i>Donna LeCourt & Peggy Woods</i> Overview of Rhetorical Terms
11:45-1:00	Lunch with Resource Center Staff (lunch provided)
1:00-1:15	Introduction to Unit 1— <i>Donna LeCourt</i>
1:15-2:15	Beginning Unit 1: Inquiring into Self The Contexts That Make Me— <i>Peggy Woods & Ryan Haybermeyer</i>
2:15-2:30	Coffee Break
2:30-3:30	A Look at Other Assignments for Unit 1— <i>Haivan Hoang</i> (in small groups look at other assignments—determine goals and develop possible generate writing assignments)
	Assignment —Read selected essay from <i>The Text-Wrestling Book</i>

	Tuesday, August 30, 2005—Tobin 622
9:00-9:30	Introduction to the Process of Teaching Writing— <i>Peggy Woods</i> (revision, response, reflection, and publication)
9:30-10:30	The Role of Revision— <i>Pat Zukowski & Natalie Lyalin</i>
10:30-10:45	Coffee Break
10:45-12:00	The Role of Response Groups — <i>Donna LeCourt & Collie Fulford</i>
12:00-1:00	Lunch Break (on your own)
1:00-3:00	Responding to Writing in Process— <i>Haivan Hoang & Pat Zukowski</i>
	<i>Assignment</i> —Read all Introductions to <i>The Text-Wrestling Book</i> (Introduction to book and Introductions to Sections 1, 2, & 3) Review <i>The Writing Program Teaching Mission & Guidelines</i> .
	Wednesday, August 31, 2005—Tobin 622
9:00-10:15	The Role of Grammar & Style— <i>Deirdre Vinyard & Collie Fulford</i>
10:15-10:30	Coffee Break
10:30-11:30	A Look at How Unit 1 leads into Units 2, 3, 4, and the Writer’s Reflection— <i>Donna LeCourt & Casey Burton</i> (a review of the process, Writer’s Notebook, etc.)
11:30-12:30	Lunch Break (on your own)

	<i>Assignment</i> —Draft of Grading Policy (bring 5 copies)
	Thursday, September 1, 2005—Tobin 622
9:00-10:30	Grading Policy Workshop (small group workshops facilitated by Course Directors & RCID staff)
10:30-10:45	Coffee Break
10:45-12:00	A Look at the Classroom— <i>Peggy Woods</i> 1 st Day –how to present self to class Race & Gender issues Authority issues How to plan and use class time
12:00-1:15	Working Lunch—provided GEO SPIRE demo Writing Program Website demo Resource Center Database demo First Day Logistics
1:15-1:30	Our Role & Your Role in the Writing Program— <i>Donna LeCourt</i>
1:30-2:30	What is it really like to teach 112?— <i>Resource Center Staff</i>

Please be sure to bring *The Text-Wrestling Book* and *The Writing Program Teaching Mission & Guidelines* everyday.

Friday, September 2, 2005—Teaching Assistant Orientation

You are invited to attend the one-day Teaching Assistant Orientation (TAO) organized by the University Center for Teaching under the auspices of the Provost's Office and the Graduate School. Registration begins at 8:00am at the Campus Center Auditorium. The opening welcome begins at 9:00am and is followed by workshops until 4:00pm. The orientation gives a general overview of teaching at UMass as well as workshops on such things as managing the first day of class, leading effective discussions, and strategies for teaching in the diverse classroom. The day provides the opportunity to meet and talk to graduate student teachers from other departments of the university. The University will provide morning refreshments and lunch. We have included in your packet information about the orientation. You can register by returning the enclosed reservation form or online at <http://www.umass.edu/cft> by August 26, 2005.

Tuesday, September 6, 2005—Registration Day

1:00-2:00pm **General Meeting for all Writing Program Teaching Staff**—Herter 227

***Course Director Groups & Practica will meet immediately following the General Meeting**

3:00-5:00 **Writing Program Reception in Bartlett 303**

Tuesday Workshops

The following workshops are part of the required teacher-training program for new teachers, others are welcome. They will be scheduled from 11:15-12:30 on the following Tuesdays in **TBA**. Bring your lunch if you like.

September 13— Interacting with Texts

September 27—Student Conferences & Response Groups

October 11— Adding to the Conversation

October 25— More on Grammar in English 112 & ESL Issues

November 8—Topic to Be Announced Essay

November 22—Writer's Reflection

Appendix II: ENGLWRIT 111 and 112 TO Questionnaire

Pre-Interview Questions

1. How long have you been teaching composition?
2. What is your area of graduate study?

Interview Questions

1. Curriculum Issues
 - What do you see as the goals of ENGLWRIT 111/112?
 - What do you see as the strengths of ENGLWRIT 111/112?
 - What additional aspects of writing would you like to see the curriculum address, if any?
2. Teaching Perspective
 - What experiences (teaching or otherwise) do you bring to the students of 111/112?
 - To what extent do you feel this curriculum reflects not only the Writing Program goals, but your goals as a teacher?
3. Student Perceptions
 - What differences do you see in students' writing and their perceptions of their writing by the end of 111/112?
 - How would you describe a student who completed 111/112 successfully? Unsuccessfully?
4. Training and Mentorship
 - Did the one-week orientation and fall semester TO workshop support your teaching, and if so, in what ways? What suggestions do you have for next year's?
 - What is the purpose of your CD (Course Director) group meetings and observations? In what ways do they or do they not support your needs?
 - In what additional ways could / should the Writing Program support teacher training and mentorship?
5. Other Issues
 - Would you describe anything about your educational, linguistic, and/or cultural background that may help us better understand your teaching experience in the Writing Program?
 - Is there anything else you would like us to know about your experiences with the Writing Program?

Appendix III: Summary of Students’ Course Evaluations from ENGLWRIT 111/112/113

The first 12 questions are the “standard” questions asked by the Student Response to Instruction Form and focus on instructor performance. Questions 13-23 are specific to the Writing Program and are designed to focus on the curriculum and learning outcomes. The averages below represent student evaluations from all sections of ENGLWRIT 111 Basic Writing, ENGLWRIT 112, College Writing, and ENGLWRIT 113 College Writing with computers.

	FA04	SP05	FA05
Instructor Questions			
(5 = almost always; 1 = almost never)			
1. The instructor was well prepared for class.	4.64	4.64	4.68
2. The instructor explained course material clearly.	4.25	4.29	4.37
3. The instructor cleared up points of confusion.	4.27	4.31	4.39
4. The instructor used class time well.	4.32	4.37	4.40
5. The instructor inspired interest in the subject matter.	4.08	4.09	4.16
6. The instructor showed a personal interest in helping.	4.51	4.49	4.60
7. I received useful feedback.	4.44	4.48	4.55
8. The methods of evaluating my work were fair.	4.40	4.44	4.49
9. The instructor stimulated student participation.	4.26	4.34	4.34
Overall ratings			
10. Overall, how much do you feel you learned? (5 = much more; 1 = much less)	3.55	3.60	3.64
11. Overall rating of instructor’s teaching. (5=almost always effective; 1=never effective)	4.22	4.27	4.35
12. Overall rating of this course. (5=one of the best; 1=one of the worst)	3.74	3.75	3.86
Curriculum/Student Learning			
(5=strongly agree; 1 = strongly disagree)			
This course helped me....			
13. adapt my writing for particular audiences.		3.88	4.01
14. use writing to discover new ideas		3.70	3.81
15. see revision as a useful process.		4.12	4.21
16. use readers’ comments to improve my writing.		3.98	4.08
17. feel more confident about my writing.		3.86	3.99
In this course, I found helpful/...			
18. peer review/workshop sessions.		3.70	3.81
19. in-class activities.		3.67	3.74
20. reading other students’ writing.		3.69	3.76
21. reading essays in the assigned text.		3.40	3.53
22. conferences with my teacher.		4.05	4.21
23. revising my papers.		4.18	4.31