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Rationale

This document provides a rationale for large-scale enhancements and a dedicated budget line for the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC)\(^1\) program at IUP.

University-wide assessments indicate that IUP students struggle with writing and communication overall. Students who take the NSSE report that they are not receiving enough feedback on draft of writing assignments, they are not assigned enough drafting before having to submit writing assignments, and overall, it appears that students are not assigned a lot of writing. Three years of CLA+ results show that first-year and seniors are writing at a “basic” level, indicating that after four years of college, our students are writing at the same low level at which they entered IUP (see Appendix A for all referenced assessment data). IUP’s strategic plan indicates that a tactic implemented to prepare students for success in work and life, in addition to academic success, is the expansion of “IUP’s use of recognized ‘high impact practices’ to increase undergraduate student engagement and retention” (Goal 2, Strategy 1, Tactic 3).\(^2\) The Association of American Colleges and Universities\(^3\) lists writing across the curriculum as one of ten widely tested teaching and learning strategies they consider to be a High Impact Practices (HIP); the association recommends these practices for student engagement and active learning be implemented in \textit{systematic and cumulative ways} so as to see the most benefit. \textit{The implementation of a robust WAC program is aligned with the university’s strategic plan, the Middle States Commission standards for assessment of student learning}\(^4\), and \textit{recommendations by the AAC&U, and it is clearly essential to improving education at IUP.}

WAC is already in motion at IUP; many departments are currently developing writing plans that map out how writing is taught and assessed in their courses. With approval from Liberal Studies, students who major in these departments soon will not need to meet the writing-intensive requirement. Instead of one or two courses including writing “intensively,” all of their courses will include writing in some way. The director of Liberal Studies, the Provost’s Associate, and the Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences are in the process of bringing the WAC program plan to the Council of Chairs, Council of Deans, UWUCC, and University Senate. However, even with vocal support from faculty and administration, the program will need financial backing to serve its constituents and be sustainable.

\(^1\) Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) pedagogy is based on the principle that teaching writing is the responsibility of all members of a university faculty in all parts of a student’s curriculum. Students cannot be taught foundational skills in a first-year composition course and then be expected to develop those skills without further vertical writing practice; skills must be fostered throughout their college career. The staple of WAC is \textit{writing-to-learn pedagogy}, which encourages faculty to use ungraded/low-stakes exploratory writing as a mode of teaching rather than only a tool for assessing. Students write to think through ideas, process course content, and discover what they know and need to learn. Writing instruction focuses on process in addition to product.

\(^2\) \url{http://www.iup.edu/strategic-planning/faq/goal-2/#1}

\(^3\) \url{https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips}

\(^4\) \url{http://www.msche.org/publications/CHX-2011-WEB.pdf}
The Future of WAC at IUP

The mission of the WAC program at IUP is to provide support for faculty university-wide in implementing writing into their courses and sustain a community of writers and writing teachers; our motto is “Teach. Write. Teach Writing.” To achieve this mission, we envision a multi-faceted program that provides faculty development, maintains a robust research and assessment agenda, and builds and maintains relationships across the IUP community.

WAC programs at universities across the country are ranked nationally in publications like *US News and World Report*. Programs like those at George Mason University, University of Minnesota, and Elon University are ranked highly because they are multi-faceted: they engage faculty and students in multiple ways, provide ample resources to support faculty in teaching writing in their disciplines, and implement programming that makes writing a central part of the university culture. With adequate support, IUP can develop a comparable program.

The Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Director, Bryna Siegel Finer, was hired in fall 2012 to develop a program that would help faculty address growing concern about students’ writing skills and to encourage a writing culture among faculty and students at the university. Siegel Finer spent that academic year collecting data from students and faculty across the university about their perceptions of writing education at IUP. She spent the next two years piloting various initiatives, gaining credibility among colleagues, and meeting with administrators (Provost Moerland, then Provost’s Associate Laura Delbrugge, then Director of Liberal Studies David Pistole, and various Deans and department Chairs) and other university stakeholders (e.g., Director of the Writing Center, Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, University Libraries faculty), to make determinations about the mission and outcomes of the program, which culminated in a White Paper presented to the Provost in June 2015 (located online at www.iup.edu/wac under “Reports.”).

Current Program Initiatives

Seventeen departments are currently working on Department Writing Plans (see below), which will move them from writing-intensive to a writing enriched curriculum. As WAC Director, Siegel Finer meets with one or two liaisons from each department once every 3-4 weeks to review plan progress; when plans are complete, she works with departments to maintain an assessment and curriculum revision cycle. Siegel Finer also provides scheduled and on-demand workshops for all university faculty. WAC supports a faculty teaching of writing award, the Punxsutawney journaling across the co-curriculum project in conjunction with the Punxsy Writing Center, publishes an annual newsletter, maintains a website of resources, a Facebook page, and a Twitter feed. The WAC Director also speaks on behalf of the program at New Faculty Orientation, in various other administrative venues and meetings, and has an important role in the Liberal Studies assessment mandate.

---

5 Siegel Finer has a PhD in Composition and Rhetoric; she teaches courses in the English department and directs Liberal Studies English in addition to WAC.
6 http://wec.umn.edu/
Campus Partnerships
One of the strengths of the WAC program is the collaborative relationship with the Jones White Writing Center. While the writing center directly supports students, the WAC program focuses on faculty professional development. Together, the program directors and the writing center tutoring staff collaborate annually on the National Day on Writing event on campus. The Jones White Writing Center supports a student writing award for writing across the curriculum. The Writing Center shares a portion of its secretarial support with the WAC director. The two programs also hope to collaborate on a new writing fellows program, as described below. WAC benefits greatly from the support of the writing center, not only financially, but by the expertise and experience of the Writing Center Director.

WAC has also offered a Teaching of Writing award through the Center for Teaching Excellence and a Teaching Circle through Reflective Practice. The WAC Director envisions other ways to partner with CTE as well.

Funding
In 2015-16, the program survived on a $1500 budget provided by the Chair of the English Department and the Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. In 2016-17, the budget was $1000. The Jones White Writing Center and the Punxsutawney campus have supported some initiatives.

Sustainability
Indicators of program sustainability include (1) embedded assessment as part of every Department Writing Plan, which aligns with Middle States standards for assessment and integration of results into teaching and learning, (2) the WAC director’s relationships with well-established and respected faculty at the university, and (3) discipline-specific ENGL202 sections as collaboration between expert writing faculty and content specialists.

Challenges to program sustainability include (1) the current Liberal Studies Writing-Intensive requirement, (2) the perceived connection between WAC as directed by the English department, (3) the lack of a WAC advisory board or council, and (4) lack of dedicated and consistent funding.

Sustainability factors are discussed in more depth in the 2016 WAC Annual report located online at www.iup.edu/wac under “Reports.”
Cost Estimate

To create a culture at IUP where writing is valued not only in individual departments but is understood as a way to connect students and faculty in the joint venture of improving students’ education, the WAC program needs dedicated funding to support the following new and continued initiatives detailed in this document. As the following table demonstrates, at very minimal cost, we can expand the program’s foundation so that WAC becomes an integral part of the IUP undergraduate curriculum infrastructure. This means that best practices in the teaching of writing will be far reaching to all faculty, as well as best practices in assessing that writing. Our students will be the beneficiaries of those practices, as will the university in achieving its strategic goals and accreditation requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Category 1: No Extra Dollar Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Department WAC Fellow</td>
<td>One semester course release for one or two faculty depending on size of department and sophistication of curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University-Wide Writing Committee</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WAC Teaching Circle</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Writing Fellows Consultancy Course</td>
<td>One semester course release for permanent faculty member in English to teach the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faculty Development Workshops</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Category One:</strong> $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Category 2: Operating Budget (CHSS and English Dept)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Annual Spring Newsletter</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>National Day on Writing celebration</td>
<td>$0-$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marketing (copying, novelty items like pens and notepads with WAC logo, office supplies, brochure printing)</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Category Two:</strong> Up to $1650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Category 3: Cost to Colleges (Deans)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Faculty Teaching of Writing Award</td>
<td>$500 per college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 All initiatives in this table are fully described below by item number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grants for WAC research initiatives</th>
<th>up to $5,000 per college</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Department writing plan assessment</td>
<td>up to $2,000 per college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Writing Fellows, 2-4 per year (cost for one fellow in one section of a course for one semester is $510)</td>
<td>$2,040-$4,080 per college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Category Three:** Up to $12,000

**Category 4: Proposed Sustainability Initiatives (Provost)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual faculty writing and research retreat for department liaisons</th>
<th>$5,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Annual speaker series</td>
<td>$2,500-$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Program Assistant/Clerical Support</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Student Writing Award</td>
<td>$250 - $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Faculty Grants to travel to Writing-Enriched Curriculum (WEC) Conference and International Writing Across the Curriculum (IWAC) Conference</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>WAC Program Assessment</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Director’s Professional Development: guaranteed funding for IWAC conference attendance, WEC conference attendance, or Writing Program Administrators (WPA) conference attendance, separate from department travel</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Category 4:** Up to $28,000
WAC Program Features

Category 1: No Extra Dollar Cost

1. Department WAC Fellow (for writing plan development)
The cornerstone of the WAC program at IUP is the Department Writing Plan\(^8\). The table below lists the departments currently engaged in developing writing plans and their status. The WAC Director meets regularly (typically once a month) with one or two liaisons from each department that is actively involved in creating a writing plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Status as of Spring 2017</th>
<th>Roll-out expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Near complete (waiting to perform baseline assessment)</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>On hold while curriculum is under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Will begin Fall 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Will begin in Fall 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Nutrition</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>Will begin in Fall 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/Regional Planning</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoscience</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Management</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism and Public Relations</td>
<td>Will begin Spring 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^8\) The DWP is the cornerstone of the WAC program at IUP. It is a curriculum development template used to identify where writing is and isn’t in the curriculum as well as where and how to purposefully integrate writing into existing coursework. It asks faculty to consider how writing is valued in the department as an academic discipline and as a career field, how writing is defined both in academia and professionally, what students should be expected to know and accomplish as writers throughout their time in the major, and how writing can help students as learners in their coursework. The DWP asks faculty to examine all department syllabi and major milestone assignments for places where writing can be integrated and to develop a protocol to assess the writing of graduating seniors. The most important aspects of this proposal are: departments define what writing is in their discipline, departments define how writing will be taught in their majors, departments have ownership over the DWP creation process and maintenance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Studies</th>
<th>Will begin in Fall 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pace of completion of DWPs is decidedly slower than described in the original White Paper, which indicates we expected eleven departments to roll-out their writing plans in fall 2016. In a meeting on March 27, 2014, Siegel Finer expressed concern about the speed of this timeline. Universities that move to the model we are using at IUP typically take up to or more than ten years (depending on how many departments they have) to get every department plan in place, and those programs have funding to give release time to every department liaison and provide other types of support; the WAC director in those programs works with no more than 2-5 new programs per year because of the time-intensive nature of the work: creating a writing plan with embedded assessment, training faculty, piloting the plan, and then continually revising it based on what is learned from assessment.

In spring 2017, Dean Asamoah agreed to support a course release for one faculty liaison in each CHSS department to begin drafting a CWP; by reassigning permanent faculty time, this is not costing the college money. The WAC director anticipates this will speed up completion of writing plans in each of these departments. For the university to move to a full-scale WAC model in every department in a reasonable amount of time, every department needs to have at least one department liaison who has at least one course release at the beginning of the CWP process to get it off the ground.

2. University WAC committee
Currently, WAC leadership consists solely of the WAC director. WAC would be more sustainable and have more clout (possibly engaging more departments) if there were a small committee of university stakeholders representing the program. These stakeholders would be recommended or nominated by the WAC director and approved by the Provost; they would include faculty who have been serving as WAC liaisons and other university stakeholders such as the CTE director, Liberal Studies director, Writing Center director, and a member of the Council of Chairs, Council of Deans, University Senate, and APSCUF. The WAC director would serve as chair, but this type of membership would ensure that WAC is integrated into the university infrastructure. The roles of this group would be to:

- help the WAC director articulate the goals of WAC to stakeholders in the university,
- collaborate with the Provost’s Associate’s office on programmatic writing assessment
- collaborate with the Liberal Studies director on LS writing assessment
- serve as co-facilitators of professional development workshops, retreats, and other sessions when appropriate,
- provide feedback on new ideas and initiatives, and serve as a sounding board for trouble-shooting any programmatic issues.

---

9 [http://wec.umn.edu/faq.html](http://wec.umn.edu/faq.html)
10 e.g., professional development workshops, conference attendance, faculty retreats where the majority of the CWP could be drafted
The way the program exists now, if the WAC director were to move to another position at the university or leave the university, the program could not be sustained. A group like this could ensure that others are knowledgeable of the initiatives, practices, and mission should the WAC director be assigned to other university responsibilities or for whatever reason be unable to continue in the position. This group would also be in a strong position to hire a new WAC director.

3. WAC Teaching Circle
The WAC Director hosts the “Issues and Ideas in Teaching Writing Across the Curriculum” Teaching Circle through the CTE each year. Funding we have needed for a book or other item we have secured through reflective practice mini-grants, and we can continue to do so.

4. Writing Fellows Consultancy Course
This one-credit course to train and support Writing Fellows (see below #11) will be taught by a permanent member of the English department as reassigned time or on a summer contract for an online course.

5. Faculty Development Workshops
The WAC Director gives one-hour long workshops twice per month or at an on-demand schedule for groups or departments as part of her course release for directing the program. There are occasional incidental costs (see #8 below). As WAC assessment develops (see item #18), faculty development workshops would be driven by results from the assessments.

Category 2: Operating Budget

6. Annual Spring Newsletter
*The IUP WAC Newsletter* is published each spring online through issu.com, as a PDF on our website, and hard copies are sent to the mailboxes of upper administration, college deans, department chairs, and department WAC liaisons. CHSS and the Department of English have previously paid for printing.

7. National Day on Writing celebration
Each year, WAC and the Jones White Writing Center collaborate to celebrate the National Day on Writing. October 20th is designated by Congress as the NDoW and is officially sponsored by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). We have celebrated with an Instagram contest, a Tweetathon, a Writing Carnival, and an open-mic reading. We award prizes and other incentives to get students and faculty involved in the event. The Writing Center, English Department, and CHSS have previously paid any costs. The collaboration with the Writing Center is successful and should be continued, but WAC should have its own funding to contribute to supporting the event.
8. Marketing
Other annual costs include copying, pens and notepads with WAC logo, miscellaneous supplies, and brochure printing.

9. Faculty Teaching of Writing Award
The Center for Teaching Excellence offers $500 teaching awards each year. For the last two years, the Dean of CHSS has provided $500 for a Teaching of Writing Award, which “is intended to recognize the thoughtful use and balance of writing-to-learn activities, writing-to-communicate assignments, and a commitment to improving students’ communication skills.” To allow CTE to continue offering this award, it should be paid for by the respective dean of the faculty winner.

10. Grants for WAC research initiatives and course development
The WAC Director already assists faculty with research projects related to the teaching of writing in their classes. Faculty could be motivated to develop research projects in the scholarship of teaching and learning with a focus on the teaching of writing if provided with the chance to compete for research grants in their own colleges. Faculty could also be motivated to develop new courses with an emphasis on writing, in which they could design research projects for eventual publication. Having funding for research and course development grants allows the WAC Director to partner with college deans in creating criteria for awards and evaluating submissions. Published research projects, of course, circulate IUP’s name in a variety of disciplinary communities and raise the university’s level of scholarly prestige.

11. Department Writing Plan (DWP) assessment
Departments creating DWP’s develop embedded assessment plans in their own programs, typically through capstone or 400-level courses. What makes the WAC program as currently conceived most sustainable is the assessment piece incorporated into every Department Writing Plan. IUP’s self-study, approved by all major stakeholders at the university, indicates a commitment to Middle States standard 5 regarding assessment. Because an assessment cycle is written into each Department Writing Plan and that assessment is to be reported in five-year program reviews, programs will more automatically close the loop between what is learned from assessment and how that knowledge is turned into instruction and curriculum revision.

To maintain the cycle of assessment, raters need to be trained and then read writing samples, usually over the summer, every two years. Any department with a CWP should have dedicated funding to perform these assessments supported by the Provost. Costs vary depending on how many writing samples a department needs to rate in order to have confidence they are assessing a representative sample of their graduating student population. Some departments may be able to do this for little or no cost if they have a very small class of seniors, their sampling size is small, and faculty are willing to do the rating
themselves. In all cases, the WAC director would train faculty or graduate student assessment raters as part of her WAC release time.

12. Writing Fellows
Undergraduate students currently have the opportunity to serve as peer tutors in the Writing Center. A Writing Fellows program extends that concept to give students the chance to work directly with an instructor in a class in the student’s major. Exemplary students, typically juniors or seniors and nominated by faculty in departments with writing plans, will take a one-credit seminar in peer tutoring methods in the semester before they serve as a fellow. They will then assist those faculty by coming to classes on days when students are working on major writing assignments; they will conference with individual students, work with students in small groups, and offer tutoring hours out of class. This alleviates some of the burden of grading writing for the faculty member whose time is already stretched; the fellow will discuss early drafts with students and provide feedback toward revision before students’ writing is graded by the faculty member. This provides a mutually beneficial situation for the faculty member, the students in the class, and the Writing Fellow\textsuperscript{12}. To ensure that the peer tutor is not exploited and that the faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement is followed, the student fellow will be paid at the student employee rate of $7.25 an hour. A typical fellow would work about five hours a week for the semester, which includes attending the class, meeting with the instructor, and holding tutoring hours for the students ($507.50 for one fellow).

Category 4: Proposed Sustainability Initiatives

13. Annual faculty writing and research retreat
As departments move to CWPs and away from Writing Intensive courses, the 2-day Liberal Studied workshop intended to certify instructors to teach W courses would be converted to a 3-day retreat for faculty interested in WAC as a way to improve student learning and communication skills. This retreat would serve three purposes: (1) provide professional development in the pedagogy of writing across disciplines, (2) help faculty develop plans for research projects that study how they teach writing to their students, and (3) provide time and strategies for faculty to enhance their own writing and research skills.

The three-day retreat, led by the WAC Director and co-led by a member(s) of the university WAC Committee (see #2 above) will take place at the IUP college ski hut each August. Each day will consist of a mix of individual and group reading, writing, and presenting, along with a seminar provided by a mindfulness expert and a writing assessment expert. Activities will be designed toward the goals of developing faculty members’ knowledge of WAC pedagogies and teaching writing-to-learn, enhancing faculty members’ own writing

\textsuperscript{12} For more information on in-class peer tutoring, see Spigelman, Candace and Laurie Grobman. \textit{On Location: Theory and Practice in Classroom-Based Writing Tutoring} or the March 2008 special issue of \textit{Across the Disciplines} on Writing Fellows as Agents of Change.
skills, and helping faculty develop research projects where they will study their own students’ writing and communication skills.

As WAC assessment develops (see item #18), faculty development workshops would be driven by results from the assessments.

14. Annual speaker series
In fall 2016, Mike Palmquist, founder and editor of the WAC Clearinghouse, came to IUP to talk about WAC and how writing across the curriculum pedagogy helps students improve critical thinking skills. Hosting an annual speaker on a topic related to teaching writing – whether discipline-specific or of general interest to the whole university – can help bring the university faculty and administrators together around a mutual interest. While on campus, a speaker could also do a small workshop with interested faculty, meet with graduate students in an educative session, or meet with administrators as a consultant. Costs include an honorarium and travel expenses.

15. Program Assistant/Clerical Support
The Jones White Writing Center Clerk Typist 2 job description includes 25% of the hours to be dedicated to the WAC program (the total cost for all hours is approximately $28,000). Responsibilities include promoting WAC through the newsletter, website, Facebook page, Twitter feed, and IUP news feed; maintaining a database of faculty who attend workshops; sending thank you notes to faculty after workshops; booking and preparing space for workshops and other events including catering and maintenance requests; handling the event calendar; creating reports of collected data and creating surveys using Qualtrics. This position is jointly supported by the Provost and CHSS. Dedicated funding for a part-time assistant should be available as part of the WAC budget to ensure that if the current position becomes vacant, or if the position changes in any way, the WAC program has the funds to secure its own clerical support.

16. Student Writing Award
An award of $500 has been given to a student in a department with a writing plan to motivate students writing in various disciplines and to reward departments that are taking the initiative to write these plans with a chance to boast about their students’ achievements. This award has been funded by the Jones White Writing Center. As a student award, the collaboration between the Writing Center and WAC should be continued, but at least half of this cost should be part of a dedicated WAC budget to make the program sustainable and encourage faculty to work with their students as teachers of writing toward entering to win the award.

17. Travel Grants
Attending conferences fuels faculty energy, provides networking opportunities, and helps our program grow stronger by having the chance to get feedback on our work and hear about the work of others. Faculty in departments that have writing plans would have the opportunity to compete for travel funding to attend the Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC) conference held sporadically at the University of Minnesota or the International
Writing Across the Curriculum conference, which is held in a different US location every two years. When our faculty who attend conferences like these, especially in a group, they can bring back to IUP what they've learned and share it with their colleagues in order to enhance our WAC work here. Having a dedicated budget to provide these travel grants would allow the WAC director to create a network of WAC supporters at IUP; funding could be used to match department funds, USRC grants, and other funding available to faculty elsewhere on campus.

18. University-Wide Writing Assessment
Departments will use embedded assessments to determine how their writing plans are working; however, programmatic assessment is necessary as well. To understand the effects of various program initiatives, standardized university assessments, and in order to know when and how to make changes to the program, WAC program assessment must be implemented. This would involve a range of studies including surveys, interviews, focus groups, as well as rated assessment of student writing. Data from rated assessment of student writing could potentially be used for Liberal Studies assessment and other university assessment mandates. Costs would include training and paying raters, transcription, other data analysis, and incentives for students to participate.

19. Continuous Program Innovation / Enhancement
To keep the program pedagogically and theoretically current, the university should ensure the program is always in a state of continuous improvement so that it reflects changes in the field. The Director must participate in discipline-specific professional development. The director should have guaranteed funding to attend the International Writing Across the Curriculum conference (held every two years in a different location), the Writing-Enriched Curriculum conference (held at the University of Minnesota on a sporadic basis), or the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) conference held annually in a different US location. This guarantees networking with other program directors and spreading the word about the program at IUP. This funding should be separate from department travel funding the director uses to present research projects at other conferences.
Appendix A: University-Wide Assessments

University-wide assessments facilitated through the Provost’s Associate’s office and the Office of Institutional Research that include questions about writing provide the following data:

National Survey of Student Engagement

The Partnership for the Study of College Writing (between the Council of Writing Program Administrators and the National Survey of Student Engagement) was created in 2007 and has since been providing a 27-question set available to NSSE participants that are intended to illuminate the connection between writing and student engagement. IUP students respond to the writing-related questions asked in the standard question set; they do not respond to the writing consortium set (NSSE allows participants to add two topic modules, consortium, or system sets; IUP students respond to the “diverse perspectives” topical module and the PASSHE system set).

What follows are charts for each writing-related question across years for which we have data. Below each chart is a summary of notable trends. **The most troubling trend across the data is that seniors appear to receive less feedback, do less drafting, receive less feedback, and write fewer pages than first-year students do.**

During the current school year, to what extent have your instructors provided feedback on a draft or work in progress?

![Chart](chart.png)

Trends: Seniors report receiving less feedback than first-years (first-year students most likely receive feedback because they are enrolled in ENGL101). Ideally, the majority of
students would indicate that they receive quite a bit or very much feedback on drafts of writing assignments.

During the current school year, about how often have you prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in?

Trends: Figures between first-year and senior year are erratic; it is difficult to tell if preparing drafts is a standard practice for our students in either their first or senior year. A particularly troubling result is that twenty-five percent of seniors in 2014 report they never prepared a draft before submitting an assignment (almost across the board, seniors report "never" at a higher rate than first year students).

How much as your experience at IUP contributed to your knowledge, skills and development in writing clearly and effectively?
Trends: Many seniors report that IUP has contributed to their ability to write clearly and effectively, but the figure is lower than it was seven years ago. As WAC spreads, hopefully this number will begin to go up.

The NSSE also asks several questions to determine the number of pages students are typically writing in their first year and in their senior year. While research in Writing Studies shows that students who write more will typically become more effective writers, evidence shows that this is more often because of the type of writing students are asked to do than because of the actual number of pages. Nonetheless, data is reported here because it can possibly demonstrate trends worth tracking.

Trends for individual questions are illustrated in their respective charts, but overall the data indicates that both first-years and seniors report that they are writing very few papers at every page-length, in most cases no more than 5 papers in one year at any length.
Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages:

Most first-year students report writing 1-5 papers that are fewer than 5 pages in length.

Most seniors report writing 1-5 papers that are fewer than 5 pages in length.
Number of written papers or reports between 5-10 pages in length:

Trends: Most first-year students and seniors report writing 1-5 papers that are between 5-10 pages in length. It should be noted that the second largest percentage of first-year and seniors report writing no papers of this length.
The largest page length reported for the last two years is 11 pages or more. In previous years, the NSSE collected data about papers of 20 pages or more.

Trends: First-year students report writing no papers at this length at significantly higher proportions than seniors; first-year students typically should not be writing 11+ page papers. Overall, these numbers seem realistic if not slightly low. The largest percentage of seniors report writing at least 1 or 2 11+ page papers; we might hope to see this number rise into the 3-5 range, but only if Department Writing Plans indicate that disciplines require more sustained inquiry.
**Collegiate Learning Assessment +13**

The CLA+ has two primary uses, one of which is to help “institutions estimate their contribution to students’ higher-order thinking skills”; one way this is measured is through “evidence of students’ competency in written communication” (CLA+, 2016, p. 2). Students have an hour to write an essay; the mean score of students taking the test is then assigned a level: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Accomplished, or Advanced. Percentiles demonstrate the percent of other schools taking the CLA+ to which IUP students score equal or better than.

**Mean Scores on Performance Task (written essay)**
The Performance Task (PT) measures “written communication,” defined by CAE as “Constructing organized and logically cohesive arguments. Strengthening the writer’s position by providing elaboration on facts or ideas (e.g., explaining how evidence bears on the problem, providing examples, and emphasizing especially convincing evidence.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First-Year</th>
<th>FY Percentile</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>SEN Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1041 = Basic</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1053 = Basic</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56% report they put in a lot or best effort)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(52% report they put in a lot or best effort)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1032 = Basic</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1035 = Basic</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(71% report they put in a lot or best effort)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(52% report they put in a lot or best effort)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1074 = Basic</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1137 = Proficient</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(61% report they put in a lot or best effort)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(68% report they put in a lot or best effort)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trends: Reasonably, many students entering IUP would be at the Basic level; however, when they are near graduation, we should see more growth. That seniors are still at Basic or only moving one level into Proficient is a clear indication that students are not writing enough beyond their first and possibly second year at IUP. A Writing Across the Curriculum program, where writing is taught at all levels in every program, is necessary if we want to see these scores go up. Notably as well, student effort in performing this task has gone down over the past three years.

---

13 IUP has been participating in the CLA for many years, but because the Council for Aid to Education changed the format of the CLA, previous scores are not comparable.