Progress Report on the Action Recommendations of the Writing Program (Modern Languages) Program Review July 1, 2010

The Writing Program was reviewed in 2008, and action recommendations were updated Fall 2009. Based on feedback from an external review, action recommendations were updated June 2010. The following summarizes progress made towards the program review recommendations.

- Hire two additional full-time members with specific expertise in rhetoric and/or composition (and possible experience in writing center administration).
 Completed, with modifications. The current program director is a full-time faculty member with PhD in English, concentration in Rhetoric and Composition. A proposal for a second tenure-track line was denied. In lieu of this, the program director participated in the search for a new LEC Director, a full-time (non-TT) administrative position. The search committee hired a new director (start date: July 1, 2010) with writing center administration experience and a PhD in Rhetoric/Composition (ABD). Although the LEC Director is not a member of Modern Languages, we anticipate working closely with her concerning the Writing Program.
- 2. Develop and insure consistent use of standardized rubrics for written assessment that is directly linked to the GE Written Communications learning outcomes. The external reviewer recommends that more norming activities amongst full-time faculty and adjuncts is needed in the form of assessment, specifically to measure actual learning outcomes. To achieve consistency and application of normed learning outcomes, the external reviewer strongly recommends compensating adjunct faculty to participate in assessment processes.
 In progress. During the Fall and Spring (2009 2010) mandatory faculty meetings, full-time and adjunct faculty worked collaboratively to develop Rubric A: Assessment of Student Writing which serves all instructors in the Writing Program. Adjuncts were not compensated for participating in these meetings.

However, four adjuncts volunteered for the Fall 2009 assessment of WRT 110 Challenge Exams, and collaborated with full-time faculty to create *Rubric B: Assessment of WRT 110 Competency*, which guided their scoring of exams. Faculty used this rubric to score the Spring 2010 assessment of WRT 110 Challenge Exams. For this, instructors were compensated with a consulting fee of \$45/hour. Total faculty compensation: \$1,620. Full-time faculty also created *Rubric C: Assessment of the Writing Placement Exam* (for new admits) to assess and place new Fall semester admits. This assessment process was initiated May 2010 and is in progress during the summer session, meriting compensation for full-time faculty: \$1,050.

In progress: create measurements of actual learning outcomes amongst students. The program director would like to initiate a portfolio review process for WRT

- 111 students, to assess learning outcomes at the fulfillment of the final Written Communication GE requirement. This would serve to further ensure that program standards are consistent, and that students show evidence of learning outcomes for both CSWA and CSWB. Adjuncts must participate in this process, and should be compensated. Estimated costs: \$2,000.
- 3. The external reviewer also recommends that the Program revise GE Learning Outcome #3 for consistency in program objectives of critical thinking/analysis and writing process theory. Rather than focusing on a "modes" approach to writing, the program should institute a Learning Outcome that emphasizes writing across the disciplines, including greater awareness of strategies, conventions, genres, and purposes for writing to various audiences. In progress. Full-time faculty members will discuss this recommendation.
- 4. Develop a creative writing major to present to CAS curriculum committee and Faculty Senate.
 Half-done. The Writing Program presented the Creative Writing Major to the Curriculum Committee where the proposal for the major was approved. The Writing Program presented the Creative Writing Major proposal to UGAP where the committee requested changes. The Writing Program will return to the Curriculum Committee and UGAP to present the revised proposal next year (Fall
- 5. Require new adjunct faculty to utilize program-developed syllabi, course agendas, and assignments for the first two semesters of each course they teach in the writing program.

Semester 2010) before presenting it to Faculty Senate.

- Done. Syllabi are reviewed each semester to ensure consistency with the program's goals and course outlines. The program also adopted a required style and grammar reference for all composition courses, and a grammar workbook for WRT 109. During the Fall 2010 semester, the program will begin its inaugural common text program, "One Book, One University"; students in all composition courses will read *The Soloist*. Full-time faculty and adjunct faculty will participate in a mandatory curriculum development workshop to discuss the common text and other program goals on August 19, 2010. The CAS Dean has agreed to fund compensation for adjunct participation. Furthermore, model syllabi and assignments are available in the faculty handbook as additional resources for new and continuing adjuncts.
- 6. Adopt a standardized review process for all part-time faculty members. In progress. The program implemented collegial review process for new instructors: classroom observation is required during their first semester. In the upcoming year, this process will also include a brief written review of new instructors' course syllabi, a model assignment, and two samples of pass/fail graded student papers. A fourth year review process should also be instituted prior to recommendations for promotion (to be discussed). Clear explanation of all

review expectations and procedures should be available to all instructors, perhaps in the faculty manual.

7. Explore adding a 300-level writing intensive course to the General Education curriculum.

To be discussed: this recommendation necessitates further exploration and discussion amongst full-time faculty in the department. The program director does not have enough information about the history and context of this recommendation, and its feasibility.

- 8. Secure standardized funding for Prism Review production.
 In progress. As of 2009-2010, Prism Review still does not have a line on Modern Languages/Writing Program budget. The printing cost is \$2000. The costs for the May launch party totaled \$115.
- 9. Build a stronger pedagogical connection with the Learning Enhancement Center. As discussed in the Fall 2009 Update, the Writing Program piloted a collaborative program in which three adjunct writing instructors tutored at the LEC. The program director is currently evaluating pilot data, but early analysis shows that adjuncts mainly tutored students enrolled in upper-division undergraduate courses throughout the disciplines, most notably: Psychology, Education, and Business. Although the adjunct tutors originally were intended to work with students in the Writing courses, this was not a stipulation of the LEC-Writing Program collaboration. Analysis of other data collected from the LEC shows that students in Writing courses, who tend to be freshmen and sophomores, preferred to work with peer writing tutors. This information builds toward the conclusion that:
 - a) Adjunct writing tutors at the LEC provide a much-needed service of tutoring upper-division undergraduates across the disciplines, seeking help on advanced assignments such as literature reviews and senior projects. These students tend to prefer the assistance of Writing faculty as tutors.
 - b) Peer writing tutors at the LEC serve students enrolled in the Writing courses, who tend to prefer the assistance of more advanced peers.

In light of the above, adjunct tutoring at the LEC should continue, with funding for 2-3 adjuncts with increased hours (currently they tutor 5 hours/week). Also, to increase the number and quality of peer tutors, the Writing Program will offer a tutor training course during Fall 2010 for advanced undergraduates who will work at the LEC as peer writing tutors.