

*Write to the Top: Enhancing Student
Writing through a Writing Intensive
Program*



*The University of North Carolina
at
Pembroke*

Submitted to

The Commission on Colleges (COC)

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

February 2010

The University of North Carolina at Pembroke

www.uncp.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	4
II.	Institutional Context	5
III.	Development and Rationale	9
	Identifying the Topic	9
	Needs Assessment	13
IV.	Literature Review	19
V.	Goals and Objectives	26
	Student Learning Outcomes	27
VI.	QEP Initiatives	31
	Initiative One---The Writing Intensive Program	31
	Tier One—Foundations for Intensive Writing	31
	Tier Two—Writing Enriched/Writing in the Discipline Courses	34
	Initiative Two---Faculty Development	41
	Initiative Three----University Writing Center	48
	Initiative Four--- Technology Enhancement.....	52
VII.	Timeline for Implementation	55
VIII.	Administration of the QEP	66
IX.	Resources	68
X.	Assessment.....	70
XI.	Bibliography	77
XII.	Appendices	80

I. Executive Summary

The goal of the Quality Enhancement Plan is to enhance the ability of students to write effectively and appropriately in the disciplines. The QEP will improve undergraduate student skills in both general writing and professional writing in their disciplines. The choice of writing as the topic of the QEP grew out of a lengthy and deliberative process, in which all faculty, as well as other key stakeholders, were given the opportunity to offer input. Student learning outcomes for improving general writing skills and professional writing skills in academic disciplines encompass skills in four areas: rhetorical knowledge; critical thinking, reading and writing; processes; and knowledge of conventions.

Four initiatives are planned to achieve the goals of the QEP. These include a Writing Intensive Program that continues and expands the Plus-One Program in the Freshman Composition Sequence and will require students to complete nine hours of Writing Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses. A Faculty Development Plan will provide faculty with training in the best practices for assigning and responding to student writing. Strengthening the University Writing Center and providing for the improvement of student writing through the use technology are the third and fourth initiatives.

The University has committed sufficient resources in its financial plan to implement the initiatives outlined in the QEP over the next five academic years. A chart illustrates the timeline for the implementation of the QEP. Supported by QEP Advisory Committee, the QEP Director will administer all aspects of the QEP. An assessment

plan, containing relevant direct and indirect measures of student learning, details the processes for evaluating the student learning outcomes outlined in the QEP.

II. Institutional Context

Begun as a normal (teacher education) school to educate the Lumbee Indians of Robeson County in 1887, the University of North Carolina at Pembroke has been one of the constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina since the system's inception in 1972. Offering forty-one undergraduate programs and seventeen master's degrees, the University serves an eleven county region in South Central and Southeastern North Carolina. Robeson, Bladen, Columbus, Cumberland, Hoke, and Scotland, Richmond and counties account for 58.7% of the undergraduate student enrollment.

Robeson County, which is the county of origin for 35.7 % of the student body, is one of the most ethnically diverse counties in the nation. It is also one of the poorest counties with a per capita income of \$16,277. Classified as a "low employment" county, Robeson County lacks adequate housing and exhibits low educational achievement and persistent poverty. Approximately 69.1% of Robeson County residents have a high school diploma, but only 12.7% have a bachelor's degree. About 20% of the population lives in poverty. Robeson County has been dependent upon tobacco and textiles for many generations, sectors that are now in decline even as the county has been losing its manufacturing base. It has been estimated that the county has lost 41% of its manufacturing jobs over the past decade. The 2009 unemployment rate exceeds the 10% rate for the state as a whole. As the blue-collar workforce declines and the economy moves towards the service industry, the importance of higher education increases.

The total enrollment in fall 2009 was 6,661 students of which 751 were graduate

students. Considered one of the most diverse institutions of higher education in the South, the University's student body had an ethnic composition as follows: 16.5% American Indian, 28.8% African American, 42.1% White, 3.7% Hispanic, and 1.2% Asian. The gender distribution was 62.5% female and 37.5% male. More than 95% of students were in-state residents, and 67.8% were commuter students. Full-time students comprised more than 72% of the student body.

The socio-economic backgrounds and general level of academic preparedness of students at the University vary considerably. Many students are first generation college students, and many receive financial aid. Eighty-three percent of first-time students entering in 2009 received some type of financial aid. Many students work while attending school full time. Consistent with national trends, non-traditional students comprise a significant proportion of the student body. Thirty-six percent of undergraduate students entering in 2009 were 25 years of age or older.

The University has been experiencing rapid growth over the past decade. Enrollment has more than doubled as has the number of full-time instructional faculty. Average SAT scores have risen slightly. However, the one-year retention rate, which was 67% in 2008, remains one of the lowest in the UNC system. The six-year graduation rate was 33%.

The Mission Statement reflects the University's unique heritage as a school for the education of Native Americans and its identity as one of the most diverse institutions of higher education in the South. Excellence in teaching and learning for the purpose of preparing graduates for careers, further education, leadership roles, and lifelong fulfillment is at the heart of the University's endeavors. Faculty and staff affirm their

commitment to personalized teaching, engaged scholarship, creative activity, and public service to a multi-ethnic regional and global society. The full Mission Statement reads as follows:

Founded in 1887 as a school for the education of American Indians, The University of North Carolina at Pembroke now serves a distinctly diverse student body and encourages inclusion and appreciation for the values of all people. UNC Pembroke exists to promote excellence in teaching and learning, at the graduate and undergraduate levels, in an environment of free inquiry, interdisciplinary collaboration, and rigorous intellectual standards.

Our diversity and our commitment to personalized teaching uniquely prepare our students for rewarding careers, postgraduate education, leadership roles, and fulfilling lives. We cultivate an international perspective, rooted in our service to and appreciation of our multi-ethnic regional society, which prepares citizens for engagement in global society. Students are encouraged to participate in activities that develop their intellectual curiosity and mold them into responsible stewards of the world.

UNCP faculty and staff are dedicated to active student learning, engaged scholarship, high academic standards, creative activity, and public service. We celebrate our heritage as we enhance the intellectual, cultural, economic, and social life of the region.

The Vision Statement, Core Values Statement, and Institutional Distinctiveness Statement complement the Mission Statement. The Vision Statement expresses what the University aspires to become. It emphasizes the University's commitment to challenging students to "embrace difference and adapt to change, think critically, communicate effectively, and become responsible citizens." The Core Values Statement expresses institutional beliefs and ethical principles. It guides faculty and staff as they work to promote the value of the liberal arts, appreciation of the University's American Indian history, respect for diversity, and service to the region. The Institutional Distinctiveness Statement articulates the University's identity and expresses that it differs from peer institutions "by offering an affordable, highly personalized, student-centered education to

diverse students” and that the University prepares its students for life and leadership within a diverse society.

Graduation from UNC Pembroke is based upon the successful completion of the General Education Program. The General Education Program is designed to foster the ability to write and speak clearly and think critically and creatively among other goals and objectives. The UNCP graduate will communicate effectively in writing, speaking, and listening and will

- Use written and oral language appropriate to various audiences and purposes;
- Develop logical arguments that are defended by supporting points, in part by locating material from appropriate sources and by correctly using and documenting those sources; and
- Listen to, understand, and evaluate the communication and communicative contexts of diverse speakers and writers.

To better achieve these goals and objectives, the University provided faculty with the opportunity to participate in a Writing and Speaking Across the Curriculum Program in the years between 1993 and 1996 as part of a Title III grant from the U.S. Department of Education. Directed by Dr. Dennis Sigmon from the Department of English and Theatre and Dr. Sharon Sharp from the School of Education, the three-year activity included the following:

- The initial establishment of a University Writing Center (which was continued by the University after the completion of the grant);
- Multi-session writing-centered seminars for faculty across disciplines to assist them in developing confidence and competence in adding writing components to their respective pedagogies;
- Guest presenters with nationally-recognized expertise in writing-across-the-curriculum and oral communication, open to all university faculty;
- Individual workshops about particular writing issues open to all UNCP faculty;
- Publication (each year) of "Works in Progress," where UNCP faculty from various disciplines contributed entries describing writing activities/assignments in their courses and reflected on them in the context of those courses;
- An Advisory Board for the "Communication Across the Curriculum" Activity consisting of UNCP faculty members from various disciplines.

In each of the three years, approximately twelve to twenty faculty members participated in the multi-session seminars, and twenty to forty faculty members attended the individual workshops and presentations by guest speakers. The University Writing Center is the primary remaining tangible result of the work from this grant.

III. Development and Rationale

A. Identifying the Topic

The choice of writing as the topic of the University's QEP grew out of a lengthy and deliberative process, in which all faculty, as well as other key stakeholders, were invited to offer input. A QEP Steering Committee was formed to lead the process of identifying the topic. The Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Director of the Teaching and Learning Center chaired the Committee. The membership consisted of the following faculty representatives from the University's colleges and schools:

Dr. William Gash, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Dr. Elizabeth Normandy, Director, Teaching and Learning Center
Dr. Mark Canada, Department of English and Theatre
Dr. Tim Ritter, Department of Chemistry and Physics
Dr. Lisa Kelly, Department of Biology
Dr. Ottis Murray, Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice
Dr. Cammie Hunt Oxendine, School of Business
Dr. Alfred Bryant, School of Education

Beginning in the fall 2007 semester, members of the Steering Committee made presentations on the QEP to every department or school on campus. During this presentation, which usually took place during a department meeting, the presenter typically described the QEP and distributed an input form to solicit suggestions for the QEP topic (see Faculty Input Form in Appendix A). Next, each department or school

was asked to name a QEP Liaison, who was charged with helping to solicit input on QEP topics from his or her colleagues. Liaisons then met with the Director of the Teaching and Learning Center and heard a detailed presentation on the QEP. Additionally, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs was recruited to present information on the QEP to staff from the Student Affairs Division and solicit input on possible topics. Student input was also solicited through the distribution of input forms in a selection of classes all across campus (see Student Input Form in Appendix B).

During this phase, faculty had the opportunity to contribute ideas to the Steering Committee in five different ways:

- Complete the Faculty Input Form distributed at department meetings;
- Complete an online version of the Form available on the Teaching and Learning Center website;
- Provide information through the University's Blackboard Course Management system;
- Send an e-mail message to a member of the QEP Steering Committee; and
- Contact the departmental liaison.

At the end of the fall 2007 semester, two members of the QEP Steering Committee tabulated the results of this initial solicitation process, taking into account input provided in any one of the five ways described above (see General Summary of QEP Input in Appendix C). Three general topic areas, as well as a few other topics mentioned by just one or two individuals, emerged from these surveys: basic skills, Freshman Seminar, and General Education. More than 70% of the input concerned topics that came under the heading of "basic skills," and approximately half of the input in this area concerned writing or a related skill or area, such as critical thinking, reading, or speech.

In spring 2008, faculty had the opportunity to complete a second input form, which solicited feedback on these three general topic areas and asked respondents to

prioritize them. Faculty could suggest initiatives to improve student learning in these areas and suggest other areas for enhancement of student learning to their Departmental Liaisons or through the Blackboard Course Management system (see Discussion Board Forum in Appendix D). Department Liaisons examined the results and attended another meeting with the Chairs of the QEP Steering Committee. During this meeting, the Liaisons narrowed the topic to writing, and the Chairs of the QEP Steering Committee notified University administrators of the choice of this topic.

At the end of the spring 2008 semester, at the suggestion of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chairs of the QEP Steering Committee invited a large group of faculty from across the University to attend a day-long brainstorming discussion, in which all three of the general topic areas were considered for a final time. The topic of writing emerged as a central concern among those present at this meeting. Having completed the solicitation process, the QEP Steering Committee ultimately determined that writing—a leading concern among faculty—should be the focus of the QEP.

Beginning in June 2008, the QEP Writing Committee, composed of a representative group of faculty from a variety of departments and disciplines, began meeting to develop the QEP. The Chairs of the QEP Steering Committee recruited this group of faculty from among those willing to make a commitment of at least eighteen months duration for the completion of the QEP development process. The membership of the QEP Writing Committee is listed below:

Dr. Anita Guynn, Department of English and Theatre
Dr. Cherry Beasley, Department of Nursing
Dr. Cynthia Miecznikowski, Department of English and Theatre
Dr. David Nikkel, Department of Philosophy and Religion

Ms. Debra Branch, Department of Social Work
Mr. George Guba, Teaching and Learning Center
Ms. Judy Losh, School of Education
Dr. Mark Canada, Department of English and Theatre
Mr. Michael Alewine, Livermore Library
Ms. Rosemarie Pilarczyk, Department of Nursing
Dr. Sherry Edwards, Department of Social Work
Dr. Stewart Thomas, School of Business
Dr. Tim Ritter, Department of Chemistry and Physics
Dr. Tony Curtis, Department of Mass Communications

Meeting every two weeks from summer 2008 through spring 2010, the QEP Writing Committee developed the various components of the QEP. By April 2009, the Committee had produced a draft of the QEP that included a needs assessment, literature review, goals and objectives, and the initiatives to be accomplished by the QEP. The University then secured the services of two external reviewers to read and comment upon the draft. These reviewers were Dr. Suzanne Ozment, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Professor of English, USC Aiken, and Dr. Gerald Lord, Vice President of the Commission on College of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and Staff Liaison for UNC Pembroke. These reviewers visited the campus in April 2009 and met with the QEP Writing Committee. Based on discussions with these reviewers, the Committee revised the draft and worked through the summer and fall of 2009 to complete the remaining sections of the QEP, including the timeline, administrative structure, budget, and assessment.

In fall 2009, members of the Committee also met with student groups and academic departments to brief them on the development of the QEP and made plans to disseminate information about the QEP to all campus constituencies through various means of advertising. The campus was kept informed about the development of the QEP

through the publication of two newsletters. A story about the QEP also appeared in the student newspaper, *The Pine Needle*, and another University-wide publication, the *Brave Bulletin*. In early 2010, a web site was developed to make the QEP draft and a synopsis of the QEP available to the entire campus community.

B. Needs Assessment

As indicated in the section above on “Identifying the Topic,” writing emerged as the basic skill most in need of improvement according to all of the different means used to elicit faculty input. This was reinforced by a survey on writing administered to students. In addition, there is no lack of national studies demonstrating the importance of writing for success in college and/or the need for improvement in student writing. For example, an effort financed by the American Association of Colleges and Universities and the Pew Charitable Trusts, *Understanding University Success: A Report from Standards for Success*, highlighted the crucial role the process of writing plays in reading, critical analysis, and research. Janet Emig drew upon evidence from contemporary psychology and cognitive science in her article, “Writing as a Mode of Learning”:

Writing involves the fullest possible functioning of the brain, which entails the active participation in the process of both the left and right hemispheres (125). . . [it] connects the three major tenses [of time] to make meaning. And the two major modes by which these three aspects are united are the processes of analysis and synthesis: analysis, the breaking of entities into their constituent parts; and synthesis, combining or fusing these, often into fresh arrangements of amalgams. (127).

Though controversial, the 2002 Report Card of the National Assessment of Educational Progress concluded that less than one-quarter of high school seniors scored at the proficient level on the writing assessment component of their test, while only about one percent reached the advanced level. From his research into higher education, Richard

Light concluded, “Of all skills students say they want to strengthen, writing is mentioned three times more than any other” (28).

Input from employers buttresses the case for improving student writing. The National Commission on Writing surveyed 120 major U. S. corporations for its *Writing: A Ticket to Work . . . Or a Ticket Out*. It concluded that competence in writing is a make-or-break skill for hiring and promotion in professional occupations, especially for salaried employees (3). Tellingly, over forty percent of responding companies offer or mandate some form of remedial writing instruction, at a cost of up to \$3.1 billion annually (4). Similarly, two-thirds of state government officials, responding to another survey by the National Commission on Writing, reported offering remedial writing training, while indicating that only one-third of their professional employees possessed appropriate government writing skills.

Internal data show that students at UNC Pembroke are no exception to the national need to improve writing. For the past three cohorts of enrolled students, the average SAT writing score has stayed at 434 or 435. This is lower than their average verbal and math scores and manifests that UNCP students have much room for improvement in writing during their college years. A telling statistic from the UNCP Student Perceptions of Writing Survey is that, despite this apparent need to improve writing, fifty-three percent (53%) of UNCP students estimated they never use the University Writing Center during a semester and twenty-four percent (24%) estimated they “rarely” use it (see Appendix E). In addition, the UNCP Faculty Perceptions of Writing Survey found that seventy-eight percent (78%) of faculty rarely or never required students to use the Center as part of an assignment (see Appendix F). This points to a

need to make the University Writing Center more accessible to students and for more faculty efforts to encourage or require its use.

The first-year English Composition sequence (ENG 1050-ENG 1060) provides a good foundation for students who earn a passing grade of “C” or higher. Results from the latest National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) showed that UNCP freshmen do more writing than freshmen at peer institutions as well as at NSSE institutions as a whole. However, an assessment of the English Composition Program at UNC Pembroke, conducted in May 2008, entitled “Final Assessment Report of the Composition Program,” indicated that a significant percentage of composition students do not earn passing grades. In three semesters between fall 2005 and spring 2007 for which data were collected, almost half of ENG 1040 (the remedial course), one-quarter of ENG 1050, and one-third of ENG 1060 students received grades of “C-”, “D”, or “F” or withdrew. A 2007 study, the “Report on Composition Repeaters,” concluded that, of students needing to repeat a Composition course, about one-third were behaviorally or intellectually incapable of college-level writing, about one-third were capable but unable or unwilling to make the effort to succeed at Composition, and about one-third could pass with additional assistance.

While the first-year English Composition sequence gets most students off to a good start, NSSE data revealed problems with the follow-through. In contrast to the above finding that UNCP freshmen write more than other freshmen do, NSSE data indicated that UNCP seniors write *less* than seniors at peer and all NSSE institutions. Furthermore, students estimated that they *complete* an average of only five to ten reading assignments per course. This finding suggests the need for additional writing

assignments on readings—if only by way of quizzes, informal papers, or journal entries—in order to hold students accountable for doing the assigned reading.

The NSSE data were reinforced by some of the responses to the UNCP Student Perceptions of Writing Survey. Forty-two percent (42%) of students reported a total of four or fewer writing assignments per semester in *all* of their classes (Question 7). Moreover, over thirty percent (>30%) of students reported taking only one or two classes per semester requiring *any* writing assignment (Question 6). In addition, the survey showed some tendency among students to avoid courses requiring “a lot of writing” (Question 19). The clear implication of the data that indicated that writing assignments trail off significantly after the first year is that the University needs more writing intensive courses in the General Education Program and in the academic majors and needs to institute some kind of requirement to ensure students enroll in these writing intensive courses.

Relative to this apparent need for writing intensive courses beyond the first year, the UNCP Faculty Perception of Writing Survey provided some mixed results. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of faculty respondents believed “students should know how to write” before enrolling in their courses, while eighty-nine percent (89%) believed that “good writing is independent of the writing style of a particular discipline.” However, the question on expectations of student writing competency before enrolling in upper-level courses suggests that most faculty expect basic knowledge of paragraph organization, paraphrasing, and grammar, but also expect their students’ writing to improve further.

Fifty-seven percent of respondents (57%) disagreed that the freshman writing course should provide students with all they need to know about writing. Eighty-four percent (84%) reported frequently or occasionally giving feedback on student rough drafts. Moreover, more than ninety percent (90%) *did* report making comments on content, organization, and grammar of student papers, whatever their expectations might be. Finally, questions especially relevant to writing intensive courses throughout student careers yield the following encouraging results:

- Sixty-nine percent of faculty respondents (69%) would like to see more writing intensive courses taught in their discipline.
- Fifty-seven percent (57%) would be willing to teach writing intensive courses in their discipline (if there were smaller enrollments in such courses).
- Seventy-seven percent (77%) indicated a willingness to attend workshops on teaching writing in their discipline.

Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) data provide some nuance regarding which aspect of writing may require special attention. Relative to the CLA Analytic Writing Task:

- UNC Pembroke freshmen scored somewhat higher than their expected *mean* score (by twenty-eight points).
- They nevertheless scored somewhat below freshmen at all schools (by twenty-two points).
- UNCP seniors improved by approximately 100 points compared to freshmen (a figure similar to the “added value” from freshman to senior year at most schools).
- UNCP seniors still scored below seniors at all schools (by thirty points).

This CLA Analytic Writing Task actually consists of two components: Make-an-Argument and Critique-an-Argument. For all schools, the mean CLA score among freshmen was exactly the same for the two components, while seniors scored a little higher on the Critique-an-Argument component (by eight points). The data for UNCP, however, displayed a significant discrepancy between scores on the two components, highlighting the need for special efforts to improve critical writing skills. In contrast to

freshmen overall, UNCP freshmen scored twenty-nine points lower on the Critique-an-Argument than on the Make-an-Argument component. By the senior year, though UNCP students improved on both components in comparison with the freshman year, the gap between the two components actually widened to thirty-eight points in favor of Make-an-Argument (in contrast to the eight point higher mean score on Critique-an-Argument for all seniors as mentioned above). Table 1 below provide more detailed figures. Thus, critical writing assignments should be a key constituent of intensive writing and other courses.

**TABLE 1
CLA OUTCOMES**

Part A: Freshmen Tested in Fall 2007

<i>Student Count (1)</i>	<i>Mean SAT Score (2)</i>	<i>Expected CLA Score (3)</i>	<i>Actual CLA Score (4)</i>	<i>Percentile Rank (5)</i>	<i>Deviation Score (6)</i>	<i>Percentile Rank (7)</i>	<i>Performance Level (8)</i>	
<i>Total CLA Score</i>	99	967	1007	1037	43	0.9	81	Above
<i>Performance Task</i>	50	956	983	1018	42	0.9	79	Above
<i>Analytic Writing Task</i>	49	977	1027	1055	47	0.8	78	Above
<i>Make-an-Argument</i>	50	974	1026	1068	53	1.0	87	Above
<i>Critique-an-Argument</i>	49	977	1023	1039	40	0.4	67	At

Part B: Seniors Tested in Spring 2008

<i>Student Count (1)</i>	<i>Mean SAT Score (2)</i>	<i>Expected CLA Score (3)</i>	<i>Actual CLA Score (4)</i>	<i>Percentile Rank (5)</i>	<i>Deviation Score (6)</i>	<i>Percentile Rank (7)</i>	<i>Performance Level (8)</i>	
<i>Total CLA Score</i>	44	985	1110	1150	46	1.1	84	Above
<i>Performance Task</i>	24	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Analytic Writing Task</i>	20	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Make-an-Argument</i>	20	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Critique-an-Argument</i>	20	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Part C: Value-added Estimates

<i>Difference Score (1)</i>	<i>Percentile Rank (7)</i>	<i>Performance Level (8)</i>	
<i>Total CLA Score</i>	0.2	59	At
<i>Performance Task</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Analytic Writing Task</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Make-an-Argument</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Critique-an-Argument</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A

IV. Literature Review

Research in the field of composition has evolved over the past twenty-five years from studies focusing on the composing process itself to studies on how writing enhances learning to, in recent years, studies about genre and the quality of both the learning and the composing college-level writers are expected to demonstrate. Prominent scholars and pioneers in composition studies have published numerous articles and books whose titles illustrate the field's progression from writing-as-process to writing that demonstrates and situates knowledge *within* disciplinary contexts. In recent years, many scholars and teachers of rhetoric and composition have joined forces to help teachers understand the limits of process writing pedagogies for successful academic writing that not only demonstrates students' grasp of disciplinary knowledge but participates in those fields of knowledge.

Current research in the broad field of rhetoric and composition suggests that, as James Moffett argued decades ago in *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*, the kinds of genre conventions that distinguish a literary analysis from a case study or a literature review from an argument must be taught—they are not intuitive. Moreover, they are unique within disciplines, reflective of their distinct research methods and genre conventions. If college teachers want their students to adopt the discourse practices of

successful practitioners in their field, they must teach their students to recognize, evaluate, emulate, and practice the rhetorical strategies of the particular discourse communities they are invited or required to join. This new “post-process” era of composition studies must inform any forward-looking writing program.

Whereas composition studies toward the end of the twentieth-century sought to raise awareness of how writing *happens*—how thinking becomes words on the page—the focus at the start of the twenty-first century assumes “writing as process.” We are urged to acknowledge and articulate the *rhetorical knowledge* that informs and underlies the way the *content of written expression* gets discovered, presented, and disseminated differently within and between academic disciplines as well as to audiences of educated non-specialists and beyond. As prolific scholar and past President of the National Council of Teachers of English, Kathleen Blake Yancey, has noted, the proliferation of composing technologies and digital literacy sites and practices requires our response with new research methods, new composing models, new assessment tools, new curriculum, and new pedagogies “enacting that curriculum” (8). In *Writing in the 21st Century: A Report from the National Council of Teachers of English*, Yancey issues the following “call to action”:

This is ... a call to help our students compose often, compose well, and through these composings, *become* the citizen writers of our country, the citizen writers of our world, and the writers of our future (1).

At the threshold of the twenty-first century, this injunction is intended for all teachers of writing—at all levels and in all fields of knowledge—on behalf of all current and future students, for whom “literacy” as a set of practices, skills, and competences will continue to expand.

In his introduction to *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind*, literary scholar turned composition studies advocate Gerald Graff candidly offers:

For American students to do better—all of them, not just twenty percent—they need to know that summarizing and making arguments is the name of the game in academia. But it’s precisely this game that academia obscures, generally by hiding in plain view amidst a vast disconnected clutter of subjects, disciplines, and courses. The sheer cognitive overload represented by the American curriculum prevents most students from detecting and then learning the moves of the underlying argument game that gives coherence to it all. (3)

In short, if teachers want students to be effective writers, we need to educate them about the *kinds and shapes of writing* we want—and expect—they to produce whenever and wherever we require them to write. As Graff argues, “If we refuse to provide such formulas on the grounds that they are too prescriptive or that everything has to come from the students themselves, we just end up hiding the tools of success” (11). Invoking “basic writing” scholars Mike Rose and Deborah Meier, Graff argues that college education is a process of socialization “comparable to joining a new club” (24) whereby students come to know the conversations and controversies that invigorate and propel study, research, and argumentation in the fields of inquiry that define their chosen disciplines and professions. He writes, “A feel for what insiders agree about or take for granted is as central to becoming socialized into a field as a feeling for their disagreements” (28). It is therefore incumbent upon college teachers to teach our students—new “inductees,” as it were—the distinct modes of thought, “habits” of mind,” vocabularies, and linguistic codes in which ideas that characterize and drive our disciplines are “cast” and presented to “insiders” and “outsiders” at particular times and

places for particular reasons. Leaving students to discover such “insider” knowledge on their own sets even the most competent writers up for failure.

According to the *WPA Position Statement on Assessment* (2007), 21st century college writing classes should “prepare students to become successful ... communicators ... prepared to communicate with a variety of audiences using a variety of media, from traditional pen-and-paper composition to electronic communication”:

21st century literacy educators understand that, to be prepared for this new age, communicators must be able to analyze and address the expectations of these audiences and employ reading, writing, and thinking strategies to meet those expectations. Those strategies are complicated and involve integrating multiple cognitive activities, like processing and production of written texts, with analyses of the contexts and audiences for whom communication is being produced. Good communication in the 21st century is *context-specific: what represents good writing in one context, like writing for an on-line political blog, might not be seen as good writing in another, like creating a pen-and-paper lab analysis in a biology class.* (WPA; emphasis added)

Learning how practitioners within different fields of knowledge and discourse communicate with one another and their various constituencies is a highly specialized endeavor. First-year composition courses that focus on rhetoric and argument provide a foundation for strong, informed, “insider” writing in other specific disciplines. Writing, because it enables abstract thought and social—or communal—memory, plays a crucial role in the development and dissemination of disciplinary knowledge and habits of mind, including inquiry, discovery, *and creation* as well as dissemination of knowledge. Writing as both process and product enhances learning of both knowledge and the practices that shape its discovery, development, and exchange.

Perhaps especially today, college students come to us fully acclimated to an “Information Age” in which answers to questions are easily found. They have been

conditioned to believe that all knowledge is objective, that it is “out there” or in textbooks, and that their teachers and professors know it and disclose it to them. Students come to college believing that everything they need to know and learn already belongs to their instructors or inhabits their textbooks or both. “Learning” is thus a process of “retrieving” someone else’s knowledge via professors, textbooks, or their favorite search engines. Students see themselves “consumers” of knowledge, not “producers” or “critics” or even “users” of it in an engaged way. Small wonder, then, as John Bean writes in *Engaging Ideas: The Professor’s Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom* (2001), so many college-level teachers in every discipline are consistently disappointed by their students’ inept writing, in spite of their training in first-year composition courses.

In his seminal work *Writing Without Teachers* (1973), Peter Elbow claimed, “meaning is not what you start out with but what you end up with” (15; qtd. in Bean 20). More recently, Elbow has described successful writers as readers, first and foremost, who are both “doubters” and “believers” of what other writers, other texts have to tell them. As Bean observes, “The habit of problem posing and thesis making does not come naturally to beginning college students who write more clearly when given assignments that do *not* challenge them as thinkers” (20). First-year composition courses cannot be regarded as “antidotes” to students’ writing “deficiencies” but rather as an “introduction” to academic and professional discourses, their purposes, audiences, genre conventions, and their uses in particular contexts (i.e., at particular times and places). As such, the first-year course in composition can more appropriately be seen as the beginning—not the end—of students’ development as writers.

Students expect their teachers to deliver specialized knowledge they must master. Teachers expect their students to judge the competing claims to truth they encounter and to pursue knowledge in a range of disciplines while “finding their own voice” among them. However, as Graff explains, most college students believe that a “sound essay...consists of uncontroversially true statements” rather than as a contribution to “a conversation or debate” of interest or urgency in a field or profession (53). Students need to be taught what makes a discipline a discipline, how investigators and stakeholders in the discipline talk to—and write for—each other—and why—in a variety of academic contexts. While (Graff admits) the brightest students might intuit the templates through which these disciplinary exchanges and inquiry begin and progress, most students will not have the patience or acuity for that. Transparency about how knowledge is shaped, conveyed, and disseminated is crucial to students’ participation in their own learning (Graff 71):

Since writing is central to all disciplines, all departments have to take responsibility for it.... Then, too, only if writing is taught by instructors from all disciplines are students likely to get a sense of the contrasts and convergences between disciplinary conventions of communication.... However the job is done, it is crucial that students come from basic writing courses with the understanding that entering the public argument culture is the name of the academic game. (78)

Different fields, different disciplines have different writing conventions. What works in a history seminar will not succeed in a biology lab. As Michael Carter (“Ways of Knowing, Doing, and Writing in the Disciplines”) maintains, good writing is writing that reflects and represents the context—audience, purpose, exigence, and so on—which brought it about. A vivid example of how much genre matters is that, as college instructor Mark Richardson notes, while “most humanities-based writing handbooks tell

writers to avoid the passive voice, ...chemistry-lab reports advise students to write *only* in the passive.” Habits of thought, he points out, differ, too.

Research into the value of discipline-specific and cross-disciplinary writing programs has been ongoing since the mid-1980s. Such scholars as Charles Bazerman, Carolyn Miller, Michael Carter, John Bean, and many others have written about multi-disciplinary writing programs which, more recently, address and incorporate the new genres emerging from late twentieth- and early twentieth-century technologies. The underlying assumption informing all such programs is that academic writing is “social action,” that its ultimate purpose is community-building through shared knowledge and inquiry practices that identify its members as “insiders.” In *Writing and Revising the Disciplines*, Jonathan Monroe writes,

If writing and the teaching of writing are to be given the priority they deserve, writing must be understood in the most capacious sense, not merely as a matter of mechanical skill, grammar, or style narrowly conceived, but as a matter of profound intellectual importance and resonance, a concern that reaches to the heart of, and indeed informs at all stages, the shapes fields take. (5)

Skillful use of the conventions of writing can take novice writers only so far. They need to learn the conventions and rhetoric of inquiry and communication that mark a particular discipline’s discourse if they are to write successfully about and within it.

A recent article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (November 2008) announces, “Writing Is Not Just a Basic Skill”—something teachers of writing—and any teacher whose pedagogy incorporates writing as a technology for learning—knows. Academic literacy is not something students should have when they arrive; it’s what they need to learn and what we need to teach them. As Mark Richardson explains,

[F]irst-year composition is only *indirectly* preparatory to writing in other disciplines.... Academics who would like their students to become more effective writers must work with professors of rhetoric and composition not only to design effective writing assignments and writing instruction within their own courses, but also to create discipline- specific versions of advanced composition course and require, and at least urge, their majors to take those courses.

What matters most to successful writing in college is not basic skills—students can get those through tutoring and practice. What matters most is knowledge of and practice with the genre conventions operant within a discipline whose discourse students must master in order to demonstrate their learning and knowledge.

V. Goals and Objectives

The goal of the Quality Enhancement Plan is to enhance the ability of students to write effectively and appropriately in the discipline. The QEP will improve undergraduate student skills in both general writing and professional writing in their disciplines.

- **General writing** demonstrates critical thinking, style, and fluency appropriate to the audience and task; consistency in focus and reasoning; structural integrity; and mastery of standard edited English.
- **Professional writing** should also exhibit style and vocabulary appropriate to the discipline and task; synthesize research in writing appropriate to the discipline; and exhibit the ability to access, evaluate, and utilize information from a variety of sources and media.

The focus of the QEP on competent and professional writing skills reflects the need both for student competence in core courses and for knowledge of and proficiency in writing skills pertinent to individual disciplines. The faculty will facilitate student

acquisition of writing skills appropriate for success at the general education level and for success in the disciplines. Students will be provided learning opportunities through which they will develop the ability to write organized, clear, correct, and purposeful prose.

The QEP assumes that writing proficiency is a result of developing—over time--the ability of students to complete increasingly difficult literacy tasks. Working against the time-honored myth that first-year composition courses will produce students who can write anywhere, anytime, on any topic, the faculty will see their challenge as encouraging the development of writing skills as students progress. Students will demonstrate overall proficiency in written communication. Students who complete the Writing Intensive Program will improve their ability to employ program-specific writing as a mode of critical thinking and communication and will demonstrate better writing as compared to both internal control groups and students at similar institutions.

Student learning outcomes for improving general writing skills and professional writing skills in academic disciplines encompass skills in four areas:

- Rhetorical knowledge;
- Critical thinking, reading, and writing;
- Processes; and
- Knowledge of conventions.

These four areas are derived from the Outcomes Statement of the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA).

Student Learning Outcomes

A1. Rhetorical Knowledge—General Competency

Students who complete courses in the Writing Intensive Program will be able to:

- Articulate the purpose of a piece of writing and effectively organize the writing in light of that purpose.
- Exhibit consistency in focus and reasoning. Details will be of sufficient quality and quantity to support thesis.
- Students will demonstrate the ability to develop content in which the central idea/purpose is clearly stated, the content is accurate and relevant, and credible support is provided.
- Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality with attention to appropriate audience. Exhibit skills in style and fluency, including voice and vocabulary appropriate to audience, discipline and task.
- Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation. Exhibit structural integrity in organization and development. This will include a clear thesis and purpose; logical arrangement of ideas; and appropriate opening, conclusion, and transitions.

A2. Rhetorical Knowledge---Disciplinary/Professional Competency

Students who complete courses in the Writing Intensive Program will be able to:

- Understand and employ the main features and purposes of writing in the relevant discipline.

Different areas of study require different forms for the composition of a particular text.

To recognize and use the rhetorical characteristics of writing in particular fields, students need guidance from faculty and independent practice. Faculty must describe the methods used in a particular discipline and explain the dominant conventions of the field.

Students will recognize and analyze these rhetorical conventions, understand the purposes and contexts in which they are appropriate, and use this knowledge to create their own texts. They will also recognize readings as examples of the kind of writing produced by professionals in their major field.

B1. Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing—General Competency

Students who complete courses in the Writing Intensive Program will be able to:

- Understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, involving finding, analyzing, evaluating, and synthesizing appropriate primary and/or secondary sources.
- Assess the nature and scope of writing assignments to determine appropriate writing and/or research strategies.

- Exhibit ability to access, evaluate, and utilize information from a variety of sources and media.
- Constructively develop their own ideas in relation to those of others.
- Exhibit critical thinking by applying principles and strategies of analysis and argumentation.

B2. Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing---Disciplinary/Professional Competency

Students who complete courses in the Writing Intensive Program will be able to:

- Learn the interrelationships among critical thinking, critical reading, and writing in the relevant discipline.
- Exhibit ability to synthesize research in writing appropriate to the discipline.

In upper level courses, students are asked to complete writing assignments taking into account multiple theories, contexts, and perspectives as they make their own independent, evidence based arguments. Students must engage in reflection, problem solving, and active, critical reading to complete assignments. Faculty will provide guidance to students in what to look for as they read discipline specific and interdisciplinary texts and on how to make use of those texts in their own writing in a particular discipline.

C1. Processes---General Competency

Students who complete courses in the Writing Intensive Program will be able to:

- Write multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text.
- Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, critiquing, editing, and proof-reading/copy-editing.
- Learn to critique their own and others' work

C2. Processes--- Disciplinary/Professional Competency

Students who complete courses in the Writing Intensive Program will be able to:

- Write multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text in the relevant discipline.
- Write in stages, review work-in-progress in collaborative peer groups, save editing for the latter stage of the writing process, and apply technologies commonly used to research and communicate in their fields.
- Reformulate and revise first drafts, attending first to concerns about argument and accuracy and later to more local, paragraph, and sentence issues.

- Learn to critique their own and others' works according to the standards of the relevant discipline.

College level writing assignments are complex and multi-faceted and require lengthy periods of time to be completed. Students benefit from collaborating with teachers and other students engaged in writing processes. Instructors help students focus and reflect by asking questions and making suggestions. Active and student-centered learning occurs when students critically read works in progress and ask each other questions about their revisions. Peer review activities offer students' authentic audiences and experiences to help them become better critics of their own work.

D1. Knowledge of Conventions—General Competency

Students who complete courses in the Writing Intensive Program will be able to:

- Use appropriate syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Exhibit competency in usage and writing mechanics so that words accurately convey the writer's meaning
- Appropriately document their work. Students will demonstrate the ability to incorporate research appropriately and to cite sources accurately.
- Develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics. Students will demonstrate the ability to organize papers with an identifiable structure.

Writing conventions include the following: a unified sense of purpose; coherent, orderly paragraphs; clear, correct, and concise sentences; and a strong vocabulary. Students should be able to compose focused, organized and error-free prose for their courses and their professions. Faculty must develop strategies to enhance students' ability to adhere to conventions of usage, vocabulary, format, and documentation.

D2. Knowledge of Conventions--- Disciplinary/Professional Competency

Students who complete courses in the Writing Intensive Program will be able to:

- Appropriately use specialized vocabulary, format, and documentation in the relevant discipline. Use syntax, terminology, and technical language appropriate to the selected discipline's overall style.
- Write in the forms and genres of writing required by each discipline (i.e., conference papers and research articles).

Differences of interpretation as to the writing conventions that apply in disciplinary writing must be clarified in the context of particular courses so students will not become confused. To enhance writing in the discipline, faculty need to provide students with explicit instruction concerning the kinds of analysis, uses of evidence, documentation styles, and sentence constructions expected or preferred in a particular discipline.

E. Other—Disciplinary/Professional Competency

Students who complete courses in the Writing Intensive Program will be able to:

- Exhibit confidence in the emerging writing skills and cognitive abilities needed to communicate in the disciplines.
- Exhibit less apprehension about scholarly writing
- Demonstrate writing skills sufficient to fulfill the writing requirements of each academic program (i.e., a graduate level thesis).

VI. QEP Initiatives

Initiative One—The Writing Intensive Program

A. Tier I – Foundations for Intensive Writing--The Freshman English Composition

Sequence--English 1050 and 1060

The General Education Program requires students to complete the English Composition sequence that consists of ENG 1050 Composition I and ENG 1060 Composition II. Students must earn a grade of “C” or better in both ENG 1050 and ENG 1060. Composition I emphasizes analytical and informative or "expository" writing. Composition II builds on Composition I and emphasizes strategies of argumentation and research. The student learning objectives of the Composition Program are based upon the

Writing Program Administrators (WPA) Outcomes Statements for First-Year Composition. Upon completion of English 1050, students should demonstrate agency and facility in various aspects of Rhetorical Knowledge; Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing; and Processes. In addition to these outcomes, students completing ENG 1060 should demonstrate agency and facility in additional aspects of Rhetorical Knowledge and Processes as well as various aspects of Knowledge of Conventions. These student learning objectives of the English Composition Program are consistent with the student learning objectives contained in the Quality Enhancement Plan as both sets of objectives are informed by the WPA outcome statements (<http://www.wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html>).

The Plus-One Program

In order to raise the rate of successful completion in English Composition courses, the University began the Plus-One Program in 2008 with funding from a grant from the Native American-Serving Non-Tribal Institutions program of the U.S. Department of Education. The program had been previously developed and piloted with support from a Teaching Enhancement Award from the UNC Pembroke Teaching and Learning Center. The Plus-One Program provides at-risk and other students in ENG 1050 and 1060 an additional hour of contact time with a Composition instructor. Students take courses in the required composition sequence (ENG 1050 and 1060) in tandem with a one-credit “lab” component. Plus-One students in effect have a four-credit hour composition class rather than a three-credit one. While the Plus-One is “marketed” to students who have attempted the course and not completed it successfully, any student may enroll in these courses.

Linked composition courses are limited to twenty-one students. The lab sessions are capped at seven and are taught by the same instructor as the regular classroom component. Weekly laboratory sessions build on the classroom instruction to meet each student's needs. In the weekly small-group meetings, students are able to ask more detailed questions, work one-on-one with the instructor or other students, dissect difficult readings, or share drafts. The smaller class size encourages even the least vocal students to speak up. Grading for the course is based on active participation and commitment to one's own and others' success.

Instructors synchronize teaching and learning between the composition and laboratory courses to maximize student success in these important gateway courses. During writing laboratories, instructors provide instruction in the following areas: assignment comprehension, reading comprehension, prewriting and planning, drafting, organization, research, grammar and punctuation, summary and paraphrase, and citation and documentation. Instructors use the following methods of instruction: writing workshops, guided practice, peer review, collaborative learning, and roundtable discussions.

Assessment of the Plus One Program by the English Composition faculty found that the success rates of Plus One students were higher than for those students enrolled in conventional Composition classes. Students enrolled in the Plus One Composition classes were more likely to pass their composition classes and earn a higher grade than those not enrolled in the Plus One Program. In general, the percentages of students in the Plus-One Program passing with a grade of "C" or better was in the 70% and 80% range as compared to the 60% range for students who did not participate in the Plus One

Program. The grade point average of Plus One students ranged from 2.45 to 2.65 as compared to 2.09 and 2.23 for students in the traditional sections of ENG 1050 and 1060.

To enhance the success of this program in achieving the student learning objectives embedded in the Quality Enhancement Plan, Part A, Tier I of Initiative One of the Plan is to continue and expand the Plus-One Program. This will consist of providing additional funding to enable the Department of English and Theatre to hire the additional non-tenure track faculty that will make it possible for the Department to provide additional sections of Plus-One English Composition classes.

B. Tier II – Writing Enriched Courses and Writing in Discipline Courses

In addition to successfully completing ENG 1050 (three hours) and ENG 1060 (three hours), students will complete nine hours of Writing Enriched Courses and Writing in the Discipline courses. Writing Enriched courses are courses within departments at the 200 to 400-level. These could include courses that satisfy General Education requirements. To create Writing Enriched courses, the content and form of existing courses will be modified in order to integrate strategies critical to the QEP objectives. Writing in the Discipline course will be newly created inter-departmental courses (for example, “Writing in the Social Sciences” or “Writing in the Physical Sciences”). These courses will contain significant writing and discipline-specific research components. It is expected that students will take Writing Enriched courses in the sophomore or junior year and the Writing in the Discipline courses in the junior or senior year. Academic advising will focus on ensuring that students adhere to this sequencing.

The QEP Advisory Committee will approve all existing courses to be designated as Writing Enriched courses and all courses be developed as Writing in the Discipline

courses. The QEP Advisory Committee will develop a generic template for Writing Enriched courses and for Writing in Discipline courses that faculty will use in the development of courses and will use for the evaluation and selection of courses in the Writing Intensive Program. The templates will be based on the Committee's research into current best practices in Writing Intensive and Writing in the Discipline courses. This information might be gleaned from guidelines produced by institutions such as the University of Missouri, Western Illinois University, and George Washington University. The elements to be included in Writing Enhanced and Writing in the Discipline courses are discussed below.

Writing Enriched Courses

Writing Enriched courses will provide a variety of in-class and out-of-class writing opportunities. They will require students to write throughout the semester rather than only at the end of the course and will include assignments requiring more than one draft. The instructor and, when possible, other students will respond to preliminary drafts. The multistage revision process will allow students to gain practice in the writing process. Writing opportunities in these courses may include formal and informal papers, journals, learning logs, on-line discussion forums, in-class assignments, and research projects.

Participating faculty will embed writing assignments in course requirements and syllabi and clearly define expectations for performance in writing assignments. Faculty will make their writing expectations clear *before* students submit their first major assignment. Faculty will use rubric-based grading. Not only do rubrics often externalize a set of unstated assumptions on which faculty base grades, but they also make the

subjective process of writing and evaluation more objective. In addition, developing these rubrics as a group can provide valuable faculty development opportunities. Faculty will provide students with adequate feedback on their written work by using rubrics in evaluating papers and providing extended commentary on drafts.

To emphasize critical thinking, these courses will include at least one writing assignment for which there is more than one acceptable interpretation, explanation, analysis, and/or evaluation. They will include a number of non-graded and graded writing assignments in which students rehearse writing that exhibits high levels of thought. These assignments may include reaction papers, reflections, summaries, essays, term papers, and research papers. In Writing Enriched courses, twenty-five percent of the course will be devoted to improving student writing skills. Writing assignments will constitute at least twenty percent of the grade.

Writing samples will be assessed using rubrics, and students will be taught how to assess their own and their peers' writing using rubrics. Students will be encouraged to use the resources provided by the University Writing Center in order to achieve writing that demonstrates critical thinking, style, and fluency appropriate to the audience and task; consistency in focus and reasoning; structural integrity; and master of standard edited English.

Writing in the Discipline Courses

In Writing in the Discipline courses, the writing of students should exhibit style and vocabulary appropriate to the discipline and task; synthesize research in writing appropriate to the discipline; and exhibit the ability to access, evaluate, and utilize information from a variety of sources and media. Faculty teaching Writing in the

Discipline courses will provide multiple opportunities for writing in and out of class, adapt rubrics to incorporate discipline-specific writing elements, and embed them in course requirements. Faculty will communicate these rubrics to students and teach them to assess their own and peers' writing using the adapted rubric. In order to teach students about the roles and uses of writing in the field of study, Writing in the Discipline courses will include a writing assignment that requires the use of discipline-specific conventions, specialized vocabulary, format, and documentation style for purpose appropriate to the discipline (e.g., a research report, literature review, lesson plan, business case study, or policy proposal). Students will utilize online resources and University Writing Center resources to develop the writing style appropriate to their discipline. Faculty will encourage students to conduct independent and collaborative research in the discipline, submit articles to scholarly journals, and attend conferences to present research

Students will demonstrate higher-level writing skills using logic (induction and deduction) in analysis and argumentation, demonstrate proper technical skills, and advanced, organized thought processes. They will demonstrate proper research skills and documentation specific to their discipline. Upon completion of Writing in the Discipline courses, students will be able to use discipline-specific technical terminology and will be prepared to read and write the basic forms and genres of writing demanded by their profession.

The creation of a number of Writing in the Discipline courses builds upon a similar effort already underway in the Department of Social Work. Writing for the Social Sciences is a core course in the Social Work major that is infused with writing assignments. It is a foundation course designed to introduce Social Work students to

writing for the Social Sciences with an emphasis on using the American Psychological Association (APA) style and improving grammar and the general mechanics of writing.

It is designed to help students master competencies in the area of manuscript development and literature review. By the completion of this course, students are expected to:

- Understand basic generalist Social Work values and practice principles in application to professional writing and use of resources.
- Develop professional writing skills for the purpose of presentation of ideas and current research.
- Understand the difference between documentation and professional writing unique to the Social Work profession.
- Understand the ethical issues surrounding plagiarism and the impact of plagiarism on the transition from student to practice professional.
- Demonstrate how to successfully complete a review of current literature, including how to determine quality of information.
- Become familiar with writing guidelines unique to the APA style.

Assignments require students to use APA style citations in the manuscript and on the reference page. Students learn the importance of ethical writing and how to avoid plagiarism. Class assignments accentuate and require the use of person-first, non-discriminatory and nonsexist language that is required of literature written using the APA style. Assignments help students gain additional knowledge in completing a resume and cover letter, writing general letters, memoranda, emails, documentation, agency forms, court reports, and HIPPA requirements. Learning outcomes are evaluated by comparing a pre- and post-observational writing assignment, exams scores, successful completion of a review of current literature, and mastery of additional writing assignments. See Appendix H for the complete syllabus for the Writing for the Social Sciences course.

Instructors in Writing Intensive Program will evaluate student writing assignments in terms of the four QEP Student Learning Outcomes, namely, Rhetorical

Knowledge; Critical Thinking, Research and Writing; Process; and Knowledge of Conventions. Depending upon the course, instructors will use the General Competency and/or the Professional Competency Outcomes. The QEP Student Learning Outcomes will be publicized in the University Catalogue, the Faculty Handbook, the Student Handbook, and the campus newspaper, *The Pine Needle*. The Writing Intensive Program will be guided through the appropriate approval process, involving the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Affairs Committee, and the Faculty Senate. Particular courses in the Writing Intensive program that also will serve as General Education courses will be submitted to the General Education Subcommittee and then to the three bodies just mentioned above. Within five years, the Writing Intensive Program will offer at least twenty-five courses to students.

Information Literacy and the Writing Intensive Program

Information literacy is the set of skills needed to find, retrieve, analyze, and use information. Information literacy is a crucial component of academic writing and research. The core skills of information type recognition, selection, as well as the critical analysis of information, are all essential aspects of synthesizing multiple concepts and ideas as a part of the academic writing process. Information literacy skills support the development of both general writing and professional writing, specifically in the areas of critical thinking and synthesizing research. As a writing course that emphasizes argumentation and research, ENG 1060 Composition II has been associated traditionally with information literacy instruction offered by the Mary Livermore Library. Because this course is a required foundation course, it is a useful way to reach a large number of freshman students. An additional component of the Writing Intensive Program is to

provide information literacy instruction to at least seventy-five percent, or approximately forty-three sections per year, of ENG 1060 by December 2014. The instruction can be provided in one of two ways depending on the instructor: 1) through formal on-site instruction in information literacy instruction in the library or 2) through the use of online instructional resources (e.g., online information literacy guides or tutorials).

Library instructional services and outreach personnel will meet both formally and informally with English faculty and the Chair of the Department of English and Theatre on a regular basis to provide an overview of information literacy instructional services and resources that are available for their students. The number of ENG 1060 sections being provided with instructional sessions in the library or access to online instructional resources will be increased by three each academic year over the next five years. The Instructional Services/Reference Librarian will keep statistics concerning the number of ENG 1060 sections being provided with in-library instructional sessions or access to online instructional resources.

All students graduating from UNC Pembroke should not only possess the requisite baseline information literacy skills, but should also be proficient in the research methodologies and resources that are specific to their own disciplines. Another component of the Writing Intensive Program is to provide information literacy instruction to all upper division courses (3000 or 4000 level) designated as Writing in the Discipline courses by December 2014. As with English Composition courses, the instruction can be provided in one of two ways at the instructor's discretion: 1) through formal in-library information literacy instruction or 2) through the use of online instructional resources (e.g., online information literacy guides or tutorials).

Library instructional services and outreach personnel will meet with instructors in Writing in the Discipline courses to provide an overview of information literacy instructional services and resources that are available for their students. The number of Writing in the Discipline sections being provided with in-library instructional sessions or access to online instructional resources will be increased by two each academic year over the next five years. The Instructional Services/Reference Librarian will keep statistics concerning the number of all upper division writing intensive sections being provided with in-library instructional sessions or access to online instructional resources.

Initiative Two—The Faculty Development Plan

Faculty have a primary role in facilitating student acquisition of writing skills appropriate for success at the general education level and in the disciplines. They bear a large share of the responsibility for seeing that student learning occurs. Yet many faculty feel inadequate or ill equipped when they are required to develop relevant writing assignments and assess good writing. They are often wary of assigning writing because they do not feel confident of their abilities to assess it. Teaching writing and identifying writing strengths and weaknesses are often challenges.

To improve student successes in the writing process, faculty need to become engaged in practices that positively influence student writing. Successful writing programs require engaged faculty who believe in the significance of writing in their disciplines and who are open to exploring more efficient and effective ways to use writing to achieve student learning goals. Engaged faculty are those instructors who understand the learning process and use classroom techniques that promote learning. Enhancing faculty practices is at the core of preparing engaged faculty.

The UNC Pembroke Faculty Development Plan will provide faculty with training in the best practices for assigning and responding to student writing. It will enable faculty to become familiar with current trends in writing pedagogy and the skills that define good writing across disciplines. It will educate faculty about issues germane to writing. It will encourage faculty to incorporate best practices regarding writing into their courses and enable them to develop meaningful writing assignments for students, evaluate the effectiveness of the assignments, and assess student writing in the context of the course.

Faculty teaching courses in the Writing Intensive Program will participate in faculty development activities, such as workshops, seminars, and presentations. The first phase of the Faculty Development Plan will coincide with the initiation of the overall QEP initiative. A multi-day workshop will be held at the beginning of the semester, and four to six additional, half-day workshops will be held throughout the academic year. The Faculty Development Plan encompasses participation from current faculty at a variety of levels and may include new faculty. The Faculty Development Plan has a tiered approach which mirrors the same tiers identified in the QEP initiatives. Faculty teaching the Freshman Composition sequence, English 1050 and 1060, will be given opportunities to participate in workshops as well as faculty who teach upper division students in their specific disciplines. All faculty will be encouraged to participate in these faculty development sessions, but the primary focus will be those faculty who teach in the Writing Intensive Program.

Workshops will feature peer-to- peer training and mentoring. They will use outside consultants as well as those on campus who have special expertise or who exhibit

best practices in the teaching of writing. Subject matter experts from within the current faculty as well as external consultants will be compensated for presenting instruction for faculty development sessions. The QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will be responsible for overseeing the design and implementation of the workshops. They will solicit input from individual faculty and academic departments concerning the design of workshops and other faculty development activities. The QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will form a multi-departmental QEP subcommittee to assist with the administration of faculty development activities. The content of the workshops will include an evaluation component. Possible topics to be covered in the workshops include:

- Theoretical frameworks describing how students learn and develop cognitively during the college years
- How to teach the “ways of knowing” and the writing conventions of a discipline
- The learning-writing connection and how to construct writing-to-learn activities
- The writing process and how to stage high stakes activities
- Current trends in teaching mechanics and structure of writing
- Assigning and teaching research papers and research skills
- Developing in-class writing assignments (including essay tests)
- How to incorporate writing in large-enrollment classes
- Creating effective writing assignments
- How to incorporate new technologies into the writing process
- Creating and using effective grading rubrics
- How to construct syllabi that feature writing
- Time-saving tips for providing feedback on students work
- How to conference effectively with students
- Recognizing, handling, and preventing student plagiarism
- Strategies to assess and evaluate student writing

The impact of these faculty development sessions will be assessed in three major categories: knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of the participating faculty. Objectives for each of the three areas are as follows:

Knowledge

- To recognize the rhetorical nature of writing, specifically that proficient writers have a rhetorical purpose (e.g., to argue, to inform, to entertain), have an awareness of the particular context and situation, and have an awareness of audience.
- To believe that writing is a process and requires revision of thought, as well as of prose.
- To comprehend the relationship between writing and the production of knowledge in a field (i.e. the academic dialogue).
- To grasp the disciplinary nature of academic writing and to understand the main writing conventions of the faculty member's field, including the conventions of evidence, format, specialized vocabulary, and documentation.
- To know the best practices for assigning and responding to student writing.

Behaviors

- To create writing assignments that use writing as a mode of learning ("low stakes" writing,) as well as assignments that encourage students to engage the writing process: to revise thought and prose through multiple revisions.
- To teach the writing conventions of the faculty member's field, allowing students to understand the disciplinary nature of writing tasks and audiences.
- To provide meaningful, strategic, and productive feedback to student writing that is appropriate to the kind of writing ("low stakes" or "high stakes"), that is appropriate to the stage of writing (rough draft or finished product), and that provides motivation and strategies for revision.

Attitudes

- To value the importance of writing within and beyond a student's academic career.
- To acknowledge that attending to student writing is a responsibility of all faculty—across the campus and in all disciplines—not just of English Department faculty.
- To value writing's generative capacity as a mode of learning and a tool of critical thinking.
- To value the process of revision and to value the process of providing productive feedback as students engage in the academic dialogue whereby knowledge is produced and examined.

Baseline assessments will be conducted by means of surveys to determine the levels of participants' knowledge, skills, and attitudes toward student writing. At the conclusion of the academic year, the first group of faculty participants will be surveyed

again, using the same instrument, to gather data on any changes in these areas. During the summer, the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will compare the baseline survey to end-of-first-year results. Conclusions drawn from this comparison will be used as a formative assessment to refine the development activities delivered to the second group of faculty participants.

Development in the faculty population will also be assessed via portfolios. Faculty portfolios will be used primarily to measure improvement in writing-related behaviors. These portfolios will contain samples of faculty writing assignments and evaluations. At the completion of the year's cycle of faculty development activities, the participating faculty members will submit to the QEP Director a teaching report/portfolio containing course materials and a reflective cover memo. Toward the end of the academic year, the QEP Director will facilitate a workshop to help faculty complete the portfolio. As a group, workshop participants will review drafts of their reports, collect and organize documentation, and reflect on their experiences with students.

Follow-up professional development will be provided to faculty who have completed the first year of faculty development activities. This might include interdisciplinary learning communities, teaching circles, and round table discussions. On-line chat rooms will be available through the Blackboard Course Management System to allow faculty to connect with each other and discuss issues of common concern. A second group of faculty will begin participating in development activities in the second year of implementation. Subsequently, the process will repeat annually with a formative evaluation to be completed after each cycle. Faculty who complete faculty development activities and develop expertise in areas of best practice will be invited to

assist and facilitate workshop sessions for new participants entering the plan in ensuing years.

Faculty teaching courses in the Writing Intensive Program will receive a stipend for developing writing intensive courses. Faculty receiving stipends will be required to participate in faculty development activities as a condition for receiving the award. Academic departments and colleges will be expected to take faculty development activities and participation in the Writing Intensive Program into consideration for annual merit evaluations in the area of teaching as defined in the Faculty Evaluation Model. Annual awards will be given for outstanding teaching and demonstration of student learning related to writing. The QEP Advisory Committee and the QEP Director will establish criteria for selection, review nominations, and grant awards each year. Course syllabi and descriptions of exemplary courses will be showcased on a website maintained by the Teaching and Learning Center.

To recruit faculty for the faculty development program, the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will formulate an application process which will be used to identify faculty who are already offering Writing-Enriched or Writing in the Discipline courses or who are willing to offer such courses. The process will be designed to measure current practice and willingness to meet expected outcomes. Based on the review of the applications, a target group of approximately twenty faculty will be identified to receive stipends to participate in the faculty development activities.

Integrating writing into a course will increase faculty workload. Therefore it will be important for the University to find ways to offset the time commitment made by faculty. In consultation with academic departments, the QEP Director and the QEP

Advisory Committee will award course release time to faculty who are engaged in faculty development activities and new course development to improve student learning through writing.

Funds will be available for travel to regional or national conferences on the teaching of writing to faculty teaching in the Writing Intensive Program and others interested in participating in the Program. In addition to on-campus writing workshops, the QEP includes support for faculty to attend discipline or program specific regional or national conferences that focus on pedagogy and student learning. Faculty will be encouraged to attend conferences on using various kinds of instruction and assignments to improve student learning. Resources related to promoting student success in writing, including books, articles, and videos describing best practices for writing instruction and assessment, will be kept in the library of the Teaching and Learning Center. The TLC will also provide links to a collection of online resources on its website.

The Faculty Development Plan outlined above is intended to create a scholarly environment where faculty will work together to improve student learning. Workshops provide a collegial setting for stimulating thought, discussion, and innovation in pedagogy. Uniting faculty from a variety of disciplines to improve the writing abilities of students improves faculty communication and camaraderie. Historically, university faculty tend to work in isolation within their discipline, and the Quality Enhancement Plan provides an excellent vehicle for faculty to join forces for a unified goal. Enhancing faculty practice is at the core of creating such an environment.

Initiative Three—The University Writing Center

The University Writing Center is an academic support program that provides individual peer tutoring in writing to all UNC Pembroke students. Funded originally by a Title III grant in 1994, the University Writing Center was granted permanent institutional support in 1998. The Office of Academic Affairs and the Department of English and Theatre support the Center jointly. The Director is a full-time faculty member in the Department of English and Theatre with a two-course release for University Writing Center administration.

The University Writing Center employs student tutors from all disciplines, paying them an hourly wage for their tutoring services. The primary mission of the Center is to provide one-to-one tutoring in writing to students who are working on writing related to coursework. The University Writing Center staff works with students at any stage in the writing process, from brainstorming topics to drafting, revising, and editing. The staff works with students on any writing task, helping students focus, select, organize, and develop ideas in early drafts of writing and helping them review, improve, and strengthen later drafts before submission. Students from any course or department are welcome. Tutors work with students on all types of writing assignments. Students are welcome to use the University Writing Center computers to draft and revise their writing. The University Writing Center staff also will assist students with word processing, Internet searching, research formatting, and other writing and research skills. Writing reference texts are also available.

The University Writing Center is open more than forty hours per week during fall and spring semesters. Students can take advantage of walk-in sessions or make

appointments by telephone or online. Faculty can request flyers through campus mail which include important information for students about the University Writing Center. University Writing Center staff members will conduct informational visits to classes, give a five minute informational talk about services, and pass out a set of flyers. Faculty can also bring their students on a field trip to the University Writing Center where staff will give a short informational talk accompanied by a PowerPoint and hand out flyers. Faculty are encouraged to include information about the University Writing Center in their syllabi and to encourage students to come to the University Writing Center during the planning or drafting stages of their writing. Faculty can allow students to earn extra credit for visiting the University Writing Center and may require a University Writing Center visit at a strategic time, such as a few days before the due date.

The University Writing Center employs six or seven student tutors every semester who have completed a three credit hour course, Writing Center Theory and Practice, in which they receive instruction in the tutoring of writing. For the course, students read theoretical and practical articles in the writing center field. They also write several papers, one of which requires research on a writing center related topic, observe University Writing Center sessions, and role-play tutoring situations. Students are encouraged to submit their work for publication in journals or for conference presentation. The class creates a knowledgeable and skilled cohort of tutors in the University Writing Center. Student tutors are recruited by e-mails directed to all students and faculty announcements in classes. Students are selected based upon a writing sample and recommendations from faculty members and are typically recruited from English courses. They are paid for fifteen hours of work per week.

The University Writing Center website provides links to online writing resources including the Mary Livermore Library Guide to Library Research, Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL), UNC Chapel Hill Writing Center Handouts, and APA Style Guide (<http://www.uncp.edu/writing>).

Initiative Three of the Quality Enhancement Plan is to strengthen the University Writing Center. This will entail three components. The first component is to increase the number of student tutors and to recruit student tutors from a variety of disciplines in order to improve the ability of the University Writing Center to respond to the increased needs of students taking Writing Enriched courses and faculty offering Writing in the Discipline courses. The second component is to develop a cadre of professional tutors who will train and mentor the disciplinary student tutors. These may be current faculty with expertise in writing in the discipline, retired faculty subject experts, and practitioners in the field or subject matter area with knowledge of writing in the discipline and the ability to work with students. These tutors will serve as liaisons to academic departments and assist faculty to teach writing more effectively in their Writing Enriched courses and to develop goals, assignments, and assessments for Writing in the Discipline courses. Professional tutors will participate in the Faculty Development Program.

The third component is the development of an on-line tutoring service. This may include the development of an online presence for academic support in writing using Blackboard Enterprise Academic Suite and other applications including open source software. The Online Writing Center will be available to meet the needs of students as the number of writing assignments grows in most curriculum areas as well as the needs of an increasing number of students in online classes. Distance-learning students need

access to online academic support services such as a writing center. The Online Writing Center will move student support into the realm of interactive web-based consultations. Students learn best when they can interact with the material in meaningful contexts in collaborative environments, requiring the development of interactive web-based tutorials that provide students with computer-mediated communication whenever possible. Some possibilities that would be supported by Blackboard Enterprise Academic Suite include:

- Documentation guides (interactive bibliography generator)
- Organization and outlining guides (interactive outline generator)
- Interactive workshops (Blackboard's virtual classroom, Flash, Shockwave, PowerPoint, Camtasia)
- Email writing consultations
- Real-time consulting (Elluminate online chat, video conferencing, webcam/webconferencing)
- Interactive grammar/editing/plagiarism exercises

Interaction with the text in a supportive environment with an active consultant will provide the feedback students need to develop as writers. The most successful Online Writing Labs (OWLs) offer students interactive tools they need to enhance writing skills. As more and more faculty move through the QEP professional development program and begin to teach Writing Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses, student usage of online resources should increase. With the implementation of the QEP, the Online Writing Center would become a natural outgrowth of an on-campus writing center.

The Online Writing Center web site will be available to students 24/7. It will contain tutorials, writing guides, style guides, and writing tips and will make use of Web 2.0 tools such as wiki's and blogs. There will also be sections where students can work directly with the writing specialists via online tools both asynchronously and

synchronously. For synchronous communication, the University will be using the Online Tutoring Module of WOnline. WOnline is a scheduling, record-keeping, and reporting software for writing centers. The Online Tutoring Module allows for consultant and students to meet in a synchronous space with shared whiteboard; online text editor; and text, video, and audio chat. Students will also be able to schedule appointments through the website utilizing the scheduling features of WOnline. In addition to student and tutor scheduling, WOnline also allows for session reporting for the tutors, logging of student and tutor interaction, and comprehensive reporting for the analysis of center usage.

Initiative Four---Technology Enhancement

The University will seek to find and implement technology tools for the improvement of student writing. The University will hire an instructional designer/technologist with a writing specialty or a background in writing instruction who will develop online resources using the enhanced features of Blackboard Enterprise Academic Suite and other applications including open source software. This specialist will also provide faculty with technology training and help determine the technology needed to support the classroom, writing, and online elements of the QEP.

Several technology tools for the improvement of student writing have already been identified in the QEP planning process. As mentioned previously in Initiative Three, WOnline, a scheduling, record-keeping, and reporting software with an Online Tutoring Module, will be purchased for use by the University Writing Center. Further, in order to assist with faculty evaluation of student writing, as well as tracking student writing performance, the University will purchase the Waypoint Outcomes Software.

This software allows faculty to give students detailed feedback on their writing based upon rubrics that faculty create or ones in an extensive library provided by the company. A detailed critique is then e-mailed to the student or posted in the grade book in the Blackboard Course Management System. The program also collects and aggregates data on large numbers of evaluations of student writing that can be used for assessing student learning outcomes in writing such as those developed for the QEP. Other possible technology solutions will also be evaluated.

For faculty development, in addition to face-to-face workshops, seminars, and conferences, an online portal will be developed to allow for asynchronous training opportunities, recorded sessions, and additional materials for implementing and managing Writing Enhanced and Writing in the Discipline courses. The online faculty development portal will be developed using the Blackboard Course Management System. The portal will contain moderated, asynchronous training courses to be developed for the QEP, a section for archived online presentations and or seminars, and sections for print-based and other training materials. In addition to training, the online faculty development portal will contain an area in which faculty can share and view examples of writing assignments as well as selected student submissions and an open discussion forum for faculty conversations.

Finally, the QEP will provide support to an existing project to infuse technology into English Composition courses. The Writing and Technology Project is based on the proposition that the learning outcomes are better for English Composition students who are competent and comfortable with technology than for those who are not. Students who hand-write their first drafts struggle to develop ideas and arguments fully and to

revise their writing effectively and efficiently. Such students submit final papers that reflect much less critical thinking about the degree to which their writing reflects the strategies and standards they are learning about and practicing in their classes.

Twenty-first literacy practices demand that students become skillful users of writing technologies if they are to compete successfully for the jobs they want when they graduate. The Writing and Technology Project is designed to create additional computer labs so as to make it possible for all English Composition instructors to teach their classes in fully equipped computer labs at least once a week. This will enable instructors to incorporate instructional practices into their teaching that enable students to make visible progress in their writing and learning at virtually every class meeting. It should help bridge the socio-economic gap between students who can afford available technologies and those who cannot as well as the academic achievement gap between students who attend colleges and universities where computer and information literacy is every student's expectation and those who don't.

Begun in the spring 2010 semester and involving all students enrolled in ENG 0104, 1050, and 1060, the project's expected outcome is the increase in students' ability to develop, compose, revise, and edit assignments as they become more skillful users of computer word processing software for composition. Based on the course in which they are enrolled, students are assigned to one of five different class formats utilizing either student owned or vendor provided laptop or netbook computers or a designated computer laboratory one class session per week.

The QEP will provide funding to support the continued development of the computer labs and the purchase of computer-based technology training for students,

faculty, and staff. The project is being assessed by means of tracking student pass rates and average student grades as compared to student performance in previous semesters and the administration of faculty and student surveys. The achievement of student learning outcomes for the courses will be evaluated through the use of a common rubric to assess student portfolios.

VII. Timeline for Implementation

The chart below illustrates the timeline for the implementation of the QEP. The process begins in the Fall 2010 semester and extends through Spring 2015. The four primary initiatives of the plan as well as the assessment of the plan are represented in the timeline. From fall 2010 through spring 2015, the University will continue and expand the Plus-One Program by providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.

For the creation of Writing Enriched courses and Writing in the Discipline courses and implementing new course requirements, the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will begin the process of curriculum change in fall 2010. The Director and the Committee will meet with department chairs to identify courses to become Writing Enriched courses and existing Writing in the Discipline courses and identify faculty to participate in faculty development activities. In the University Writing Center, student tutors will be employed and receive instruction in the tutoring of writing. Professional tutors will be recruited, the online tutoring service will be developed, and the WOnline software will be purchased. For technology enhancement, the instructional technologist/designer will be recruited and hired, the WayPoint software

will be purchased, and the online portal for faculty development created. The Writing and Technology Project begun in spring 2010 will continue.

In spring 2011, the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will complete the curriculum change process and work with faculty to develop the Writing Enriched courses. Faculty development activities will begin for faculty, especially those offering Writing Enriched courses and Writing in the Discipline courses. Student tutors will provide tutoring to students in the University Writing Center, professional tutors will participate in faculty development activities, the online tutoring service will begin, and the University Writing Center will employ the WOnline software.

The first Writing Enriched courses will be offered in fall 2011, and the first student cohort will begin to complete the new writing intensive requirements. The QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will begin to identify new Writing in the Discipline courses. Faculty development activities will continue. Professional tutors will begin mentoring student tutors and serving as departmental liaisons. The online tutoring service will be reviewed and modified as necessary, and the license for the WOnline software will be renewed. The instructional technologist will offer training for faculty, the WayPoint software license will be renewed, and more resources will be added to the online portal for faculty development.

In spring 2012, the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will work with faculty to develop new Writing in the Discipline courses. Additional faculty will be ready to offer Writing Enriched courses, and the second phase of faculty development activities will begin. The instructional designer/technologist will determine what technology infrastructure is needed to support writing in the classroom and online

elements of the QEP. Tutoring activities, the use of WOnline, WayPoint, and the online portal for faculty development will continue as in previous semesters.

The first new Writing in the Discipline courses and the second phase of Writing Enriched courses will be offered in fall 2012. The third and fourth phases of the Writing Enriched courses will follow in fall 2013 and fall 2014. The second phase of Writing in the Discipline courses will be offered in fall 2013, with the fourth phase to follow in fall 2014. The first cohort of students to complete the new Writing Intensive course requirements will graduate in spring 2015. Faculty development activities will continue throughout the period from fall 2012 through spring 2015, with a review of the Faculty Development Plan occurring in fall 2013. Adjustments will be made to the Plan as necessary. Tutoring activities in the University Writing Center and for the technology enhancement initiative will continue as in previous semesters.

The Plus-One Program and the Writing and Technology Project will be assessed every semester. A national writing assessment instrument such as the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) or Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) will be administered to assess the Writing Intensive Program at the beginning, middle and end of the program. Data from the Waypoint Outcomes Software will be collected on a course-by-course basis every semester and will be aggregated for all courses at the end of every academic year. The Faculty Survey of Student Writing and Student Survey of Student Writing will be administered every semester and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) will be administered every academic year.

To assess the Faculty Development Plan, surveys to measure changes in faculty knowledge, attitudes, and behavior will be administered to participants in faculty development activities at the beginning and end of a semester's worth of activities and at the end of the academic year to faculty offering Writing Enriched or Writing in the Discipline courses. Faculty portfolios will be submitted and reviewed at the end of the academic year. University Writing Center usage and referrals will be tracked on an annual basis and data from the WCOline software will be collected annually.

QEP Timeline 2010-2015

Initiative	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
Initiative One—The Writing Intensive Program A. Tier I – Foundations for Intensive Writing--The Freshman English Composition Sequence--English 1050 and 1060	1. Continue and expand the Plus-One Program by Providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.	1. Continue and expand the Plus-One Program by Providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.	1. Continue and expand the Plus-One Program by Providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.	1. Continue and expand the Plus-One Program by Providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.	1. Continue and expand the Plus-One Program by Providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.
Initiative One—The Writing Intensive Program B. Tier II – Writing Enriched Courses	1. QEP Advisory Committee meets with Department Chairs to identify possible courses. 2. The Committee and the QEP Director begins the curriculum change process.	1. The Committee and the Director complete the curriculum change process. 2. The Committee and the Director work with faculty to develop Writing Enriched courses.	1. The first Writing Enriched courses will be offered. 2. The first student cohort will begin to complete the new writing intensive requirements.	1. Writing Enriched courses continue to be offered.	1. The Second Phase of Writing Enriched courses are offered.

Initiative	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
Initiative One—The Writing Intensive Program B. Tier II –Writing in Discipline Courses	<p>1. QEP Advisory Committee and QEP Director identify existing Writing in the Discipline courses.</p> <p>2. The Committee and the Director begin curriculum change process.</p>	<p>1. The QEP Advisory Committee and the QEP Director complete the curriculum change process.</p> <p>2. Faculty development activities provided for faculty with existing Writing in the Discipline courses.</p>	<p>1. QEP Advisory Committee and QEP Director meet with Department Chairs to identify new Writing in the Discipline courses.</p>	<p>1. QEP Advisory Committee and QEP Director work with faculty to develop Writing in the Discipline courses.</p>	<p>1. First Writing in the Discipline courses offered.</p>
Initiative Two—The Faculty Development Plan	<p>1. QEP Advisory Committee and QEP Director will identify faculty to participate in faculty development activities.</p> <p>2. The Committee and Director will oversee the design and implementation of faculty development activities, including workshops, seminars, and presentations.</p>	<p>1. Faculty development activities begin for faculty offering Writing Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses, including workshops, seminars and presentations.</p>	<p>1. Faculty are ready to offer first Writing Enriched courses.</p> <p>2. Faculty development activities continue.</p>	<p>1. Additional faculty are ready to offer Writing Enriched courses.</p> <p>2. Second Phase of faculty development activities begin, including learning communities, teaching circles and round table discussions.</p>	<p>1. Faculty begin offering Writing in the Discipline courses.</p> <p>2. Faculty development activities continue.</p>

Initiative	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
Initiative Three—The University Writing Center	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student tutors will be employed and will complete instruction in the tutoring of writing. 2. Professional tutors will be recruited. 3. Online tutoring service is developed 4. WOnline software will be purchased. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student tutors provide one-to-one tutoring in writing to students in the University Writing Center. 2. Professional tutors will participate in faculty development activities. 3. Online tutoring service is deployed. 4. WOnline software is employed by the University Writing Center. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student tutors will be employed and will complete instruction in the tutoring of writing. 2. Professional tutors will mentor student tutors and serve as departmental liaisons. Additional professional tutors will be recruited if necessary. 3. Online tutoring service is reviewed and modified as necessary. 4. WOnline software license is renewed. Use of the software continues. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student tutors provide one-to-one tutoring in writing to students in the University Writing Center. 2. Professional tutors will serve as departmental liaisons and participate in development activities. 3. Online tutoring service continues. 4. WOnline software continues to be used by the University Writing Center. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student tutors will be employed and will complete instruction in the tutoring of writing. 2. Professional tutors will mentor student tutors and serve as departmental liaisons. Additional professional tutors will be recruited if necessary. 3. Online tutoring service is reviewed and modified as necessary. 4. WOnline software license is renewed. Use of the software continues.
Initiative Four—Technology Enhancement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional technologist is recruited and hired. 2. WayPoint software is purchased. Faculty are trained in the use of the software. 3. Online Portal for Faculty Development is created. 4. Writing and Technology Project continues. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional technologist develops online resources for Blackboard and open source software. 2. Faculty begin to use Waypoint software. 3. Resources for the Online Portal for Faculty Development are developed. Faculty begin to use the Online Portal. 4. Writing and Technology Project continues. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional technologist offers technology training for faculty. 2. WayPoint license is renewed. Faculty continue to use Waypoint software. 3. More resources are added to the Online Portal for Faculty Development. 4. Writing and Technology Project continues. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional technologist determines what technology infrastructure is needed to support classroom writing and online elements of the QEP. 2. Faculty continue to use WayPoint software. 3. Faculty continue to use the Online Portal for Faculty Development. 4. Writing and Technology Project continues. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional technologist develops technology infrastructure. 2. Waypoint license is renewed. Faculty continue to use Waypoint software. 3. Online Portal is reviewed and modified as necessary.

Initiative	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
Program Assessment	<p>1. Plus-One Program— student pass rates, grades calculated and portfolios reviewed at the end of every semester.</p> <p>2. Writing and Technology Project— student pass rates, grades calculated and portfolios reviewed at the end of every semester.</p>	<p>1. Pre- and post-workshop surveys of faculty knowledge, skills and behaviors administered to faculty participating in development activities.</p>	<p>1. CAAP/CLA administered to students taking first Writing Enriched courses</p> <p>2. Waypoint Outcomes software used every semester to measure achievement of student learning outcomes in Writing Enriched courses.</p> <p>3. Faculty and student perception surveys administered at end of each semester.</p>	<p>1. Data from Waypoint Outcomes software on student learning outcomes aggregated for all Writing Enriched courses.</p> <p>2. NSSE and FSSE administered at end of academic year.</p> <p>3. End of year survey of knowledge, skills and behavior administered to faculty teaching Writing Enriched courses.</p> <p>4. Portfolios of faculty teaching Writing Enriched courses reviewed.</p> <p>5. University Writing Center usage and referrals statistics calculated at year-end.</p> <p>6. WOnline tracking data collected for the academic year.</p>	<p>1. CAAP/CLA administered to students taking first Writing in the Discipline courses</p> <p>2. Waypoint Outcomes software used every semester to measure achievement of student learning outcomes in Writing in the Discipline courses.</p>

QEP Timeline 2010-2015

Initiative	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Initiative One—The Writing Intensive Program A. Tier I – Foundations for Intensive Writing--The Freshman English Composition Sequence--English 1050 and 1060	1. Continue and expand the Plus-One Program by Providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.	1. Continue and expand the Plus-One Program by Providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.	1. Continue and expand the Plus-One Program by Providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.	1. Continue and expand the Plus-One Program by Providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.	1. Continue and expand the Plus-One Program by Providing funding for the Department of English and Theatre to hire additional non-tenure track faculty in order to provide additional sections of Plus-One Composition classes.
Initiative One—The Writing Intensive Program B. Tier II – Writing Enriched Courses	1. Writing Enriched courses continue to be offered.	1. Third phase of Writing Enriched courses offered.	1. Third phase of Writing Enriched courses continues.	1. Fourth phase of Writing Enriched courses offered.	1. Fourth phase of Writing Enriched courses continues. 2. First student cohort graduates.
Initiative One—The Writing Intensive Program B. Tier II –Writing in Discipline Courses	1. Writing in the Discipline courses continue to be offered.	1. Second phase of Writing in the Discipline courses offered	1. Second Phase of Writing in the Discipline courses continue to be offered.	1. Third phase of Writing in the Discipline courses offered.	1. Third phase of Writing in the Discipline courses continue. 2. First student cohort graduates.
Initiative Two—The Faculty Development Plan	1. Second stage of faculty development activities continue.	1. Review of Faculty Development Plan and any necessary adjustments to the Plan are made.	1. Final stage of the five-year plan begins. 2. Faculty development activities continue.	1. Faculty development activities continue.	1. Faculty development activities continue.
Initiative Three—The University Writing Center	1. Student tutors provide one-to-one tutoring in writing to students in the University Writing	1. Student tutors will be employed and will complete instruction in the tutoring of writing.	1. Student tutors provide one-to-one tutoring in writing to students in the University Writing	1. Student tutors will be employed and will complete instruction in the tutoring of writing.	1. Student tutors provide one-to-one tutoring in writing to students in the University Writing

	Center. 2. Professional tutors will be recruited. 3. Online tutoring system is developed 4. WOnline software continues to be used by the University Writing Center.	2. Professional tutors will participate in faculty development activities. 3. Online tutoring system is deployed. 4. WOnline software license is renewed. Use of the software continues.	Center. 2. Professional tutors will mentor student tutors and serve as departmental liaisons. Additional professional tutors will be recruited if necessary. 3. Online tutoring service is reviewed and modified as necessary. 4. WOnline software continues to be used by the University Writing Center.	2. Professional tutors will serve as departmental liaisons and participate in development activities. 3. Online tutoring service continues. 4. WOnline software license is renewed. Use of the software continues.	Center. 2. Professional tutors will mentor student tutors and serve as departmental liaisons. Additional professional tutors will be recruited if necessary. 3. Online tutoring service is reviewed and modified as necessary. 4. WOnline software continues to be used by the University Writing Center.
Initiative Four--- Technology Enhancement	1. Instructional technologist continues to develop online resources. 2. Faculty continue to use WayPoint software. 3. Faculty continue to use the Online Portal for Faculty Development.	1. Instructional technologist continues to develop technology infrastructure. 2. Waypoint license is renewed. Faculty continue to use Waypoint software. 3. Online Portal is reviewed and modified as necessary.	1. Instructional technologist continues to develop online resources. 2. Faculty continue to use WayPoint software. 3. Faculty continue to use the Online Portal for Faculty Development.	1. Instructional technologist continues to develop technology infrastructure. 2. Waypoint license is renewed. Faculty continue to use Waypoint software. 3. Online Portal is reviewed and modified as necessary.	1. Instructional technologist continues to develop online resources and technology infrastructure. 2. Faculty continue to use WayPoint software. 3. Faculty continue to use the Online Portal for Faculty Development.
Program Assessment	1. Data from Waypoint Outcomes software on student learning outcomes aggregated for all Writing in the Discipline courses. 2. NSSE and FSSE administered at end of academic year. 3. End of year survey of knowledge, skills and	1. Data from Waypoint Outcomes software on student learning outcomes aggregated for all Writing Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses.	1. CAAP/CLA administered to students finishing required Writing Enriched courses. 2. Data from Waypoint Outcomes software on student learning outcomes aggregated for all Writing Enriched and Writing in the	1. Data from Waypoint Outcomes software on student learning outcomes aggregated for all Writing Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses.	1. CAAP/CLA administered to first cohort of graduating students. 2. Data from Waypoint Outcomes software on student learning outcomes aggregated for all Writing Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses.

	<p>behavior administered to faculty teaching Writing Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses.</p> <p>4. Portfolios of faculty teaching Writing Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses reviewed.</p> <p>5. University Writing Center usage and referrals statistics calculated at year-end.</p> <p>6. WOnline tracking data collected for the academic year.</p>		<p>Discipline courses.</p> <p>3. NSSE and FSSE administered at end of academic year.</p> <p>4. End of year survey of knowledge, skills and behavior administered to faculty teaching Writing Enriched courses.</p> <p>5. Portfolios of faculty teaching Writing Enriched courses reviewed.</p> <p>6. University Writing Center usage and referrals statistics calculated at year-end.</p> <p>7. WOnline tracking data collected for the academic year.</p>		<p>3. NSSE and FSSE administered at end of academic year.</p> <p>4. End of year survey of knowledge, skills and behavior administered to faculty teaching Writing Enriched courses.</p> <p>5. Portfolios of faculty teaching Writing Enriched courses reviewed.</p> <p>6. University Writing Center usage and referrals statistics calculated at year-end.</p> <p>7. WOnline tracking data collected for the academic year.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

VIII. Administration of the QEP

The QEP Director is the individual who has the ultimate responsibility for overseeing the implementation and assessment of the QEP. Supported by QEP Advisory Committee, the QEP Director administers all aspects of the QEP. The QEP Director is a full-time faculty position with responsibilities that include:

- Provide leadership for the development, planning, and implementation of the Quality Enhancement Plan;
- Supervise the work of the QEP and monitor progress toward the achievement of QEP goals and program outcomes on an annual basis;
- Direct assessment processes for all aspects of the QEP;
- Oversee QEP professional development program—organize, facilitate, and evaluate faculty development activities;
- Work with faculty and department to identify and develop Writing Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses;
- Collaborate with the QEP Advisory Committee to complete the curriculum change process;
- Promoting faculty participation—secure and maintain sufficient faculty involvement in the QEP to meet plan objectives;
- Monitor and analyze the results of surveys and evaluations to assure program quality;
- Manage the QEP budget, including the submission of requests to fund equipment, material, supply and staffing needs;
- Oversee the use and maintenance of equipment and facilities assigned to the program;
- Perform all supervisory duties required to maintain and operate the program;
- Establish and maintain effective working and cooperative relationships with faculty, staff, and the QEP Advisory Committee;
- Assist in coordinating the development, review and revision of QEP publications, publicity, and other community relations activities;
- Assure compliance with SACS standards; and
- Prepare annual reports and the Fifth Year Interim Report for the SACS Commission on Colleges.

The QEP Director will be selected through a national search. The successful candidate will hold an earned doctorate and be qualified for an appointment to a faculty position in an academic department. The individual should possess leadership, administrative, and interpersonal skills and, if possible, have experience in the assessment

of student learning outcomes. The QEP Director will be expected to teach one course per semester. The QEP Advisory Committee will conduct the search for the QEP Director. The QEP Director position will be located in the Office of Academic Affairs and report to the Senior Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. The Director will be expected to establish a close working relationship with the Teaching and Learning Center to promote collaboration in the areas of faculty development and the assessment of student learning outcomes.

The QEP Advisory Committee will provide support to the QEP Director. The QEP Advisory Committee will be composed of representation from diverse academic departments. Under the direction of the QEP Director, the QEP Advisory Committee will be charged with assisting in the implementation, administration, assessment, and revision of the QEP. Members of the Committee will serve as liaisons between the Committee and their own academic department. They will act as information clearinghouses for the QEP, disseminating information regarding the QEP to academic departments and providing feedback to the Committee regarding the implementation of the QEP in their respective areas. The Committee will meet at least monthly to review progress and resolve issues of concern regarding the implementation and assessment of the QEP.

The QEP Advisory Committee will work with the QEP Director to identify and develop Writing Enriched courses and Writing in the Discipline courses and assist the Director in the design and implementation of faculty development activities. The QEP Advisory Committee will assist the QEP Director with the process of curriculum change for the creation of Writing Enriched courses and Writing in the Discipline courses and

implementing new course requirements. It will form subcommittees as necessary for the implementation of the QEP initiatives and the assessment of student learning outcomes.

IX. Resources

The University has committed sufficient resources in its financial plan to implement the initiatives outlined in the QEP over the next five academic years. The costs outlined represent an accurate assessment of the University's financial capacity to meet the institutional goals and needs identified for the QEP. Based upon the resources available and projected expenditures, the University administration, the QEP Leadership Team, and the QEP Steering Committee has created a QEP fiscal budget for the five years ending 2015. The budget presents by fiscal year the available resources the University will appropriate to the QEP and the anticipated expenditures for the QEP. The costs related to the QEP are as follows:

- Personnel Costs—Salaries and Fringe Benefits
- Consultants and Trainers
- Travel
- Office Equipment and Supplies
- Software and Instructional Supplies
- Promotional Expenses

Funding for personnel costs includes salaries and fringe benefits for the QEP Director and the Instructional Designer/Technologist. The budget provides for an initial salary of \$70,000 (\$87,066 with fringe benefits) for the Director and \$50,000 (\$63,486 with fringe benefits) for the Instructional Designer/Technologist. An Administrative Assistant will also be hired at a salary of \$25,000 (\$34,011 with fringe benefits). These salaries are scheduled to increase modestly over the length of the QEP. Other staff positions to be funded include professional and student tutors in the amount of \$75,000.

Stipends of \$500 apiece are provided for faculty to develop courses for the QEP for a total of \$20,000 per year.

Funding is also designated for training and other learning opportunities for faculty. Fifteen thousand dollars per year will fund faculty development activities. Travel for faculty and the QEP Director is funded at an initial level of \$12,000. To provide software and instructional supplies for the Writing Intensive Program, \$13,600 will be set aside in the first year for the Waypoint Outcomes software, WOnline software, and the CAAP or CLA writing assessment instruments. In summary, achieving QEP goals with respect to student learning will require a five-year budget commitment of approximately \$1.5m, with yearly costs ranging from \$379,000 to \$390,000.

Personnel (Salaries)	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
QEP Director (12 months)	70,000	72100	74263	76491	78786
Instructional Designer/Technologist	50,000	51500	53045	54636	56275
Administrative Assistant	25,000	25750	26523	27318	28138
Part-Time Professional Tutors and Student Tutors	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Salaries for English Faculty to Continue Plus One Program**	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Stipends for faculty to develop courses (40 @ \$500.00)	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Personnel Fringe Benefits					
QEP Director (12 months) 17.9% + 378.00 per months for Insurance	17066	17442	17829	18228	18639
Instructional Designer/Technology	13486	13755	14031	14316	14609
Administrative Assistant	9011	9145	9284	9426	9573
Consultants and Trainers (including travel)	15,000	13,000	10,000	7,000	6,000
Travel					
Director	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Faculty	10,000	9,000	8,000	7,000	6,000
Office Equipment and Supplies	10,000	8,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Software and Instructional Supplies					
Waypoint Outcomes Software	9,300	9,300	9,300	9,300	9,300

WOnline Software	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
Writing and Technology Project	10,000	9,000	8,000	7,000	6,000
CAAP/CLA Assessment Instrument	2,500		2,500		2,500
Promotional Expenses	4,000	4,000	3,000	2,000	1,000
	379,163	390,792	389,575	386,515	390,620

** Funding will be provided by the Division of Enrollment Management

X. Assessment

The purpose of the assessment process is to measure the degree to which the QEP is achieving its goals, especially its impact on the improvement of student writing. The assessment plan details the processes for evaluating the student learning outcomes outlined in the QEP. The plan contains relevant direct and indirect measures of student learning and measures outcomes at the initial and ending stages of the program. It uses both internal and external comparisons to assess the contribution of the QEP to student writing. The results of the assessment will be reviewed by the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee and used to make modifications to the QEP as necessary. The results will be compiled in a report that will be submitted to the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and disseminated to all relevant campus constituencies.

The Plus--One Program

The Plus-One Program will continue to be evaluated by the means that have been used over the last two years. This includes the tracking of student pass rates and grades in the Plus One sections of ENG 1050 and ENG 1060 as compared to other sections of these two courses in the English Composition sequence. It is expected that the percentage of students in the Plus-One Program passing with a grade of “C” or better will continue to exceed those of students not participating in the program and that the average grade of Plus-One students will exceed those of students in traditional sections of ENG

1050 and ENG 1060. In addition, the surveys that have been used to measure faculty and student perceptions of the Plus-One Program will be continued.

As mentioned above, the student learning outcomes for the courses in the English Composition sequence are consistent with those outlined in the Quality Enhancement Plan, and all objectives are based on the Writing Program Administrators (WPA) Outcomes Statements for First-Year Composition. Instructors in the Department of English and Theatre will continue to evaluate student learning outcomes for these courses by using a common rubric to assess student portfolios. The Director of the English Composition Program and the Coordinators of the Plus-One Program will provide the results of the assessment to the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee. All these entities will work collaboratively to analyze the results of the assessment and make any necessary changes to the program.

The Writing Intensive Program

A baseline level of performance for the student learning outcomes outlined for Writing-Enriched and Writing in the Discipline Courses will be established for students at the conclusion of the Freshman Composition sequence. Baseline data will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the QEP and to provide empirical evidence of the extent to which student writing improves. A national writing instrument such as the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) or the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) will be used to measure proficiency in the areas of rhetorical knowledge; critical inquiry, reading and writing; and knowledge of conventions.

The CAAP is designed to measure the academic progress and abilities of college students. It is a reliable and valid instrument for measuring differential performance and

making comparisons of student performance in writing. The CAAP is normed and standardized for a large sample of college students and has demonstrated internal reliability. The CLA measures student performance in written communication, critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and problem solving. Both the CLA and the CAAP may be used for pre- and post-testing of students in participating and non-participating programs in order to compare student achievement levels with national norms and to document changes in achievement levels over time.

These national assessment tests will also be administered to a sample of senior students who have completed the Writing Intensive Program. Students will show significant improvement in all student learning outcomes as demonstrated by improved post-test scores when compared with pre-test scores on the writing skills assessment test. The QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will compare end-of-program data with the baseline data obtained at the beginning of the program.

Performance in student writing in Writing-Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses will be tracked using the Waypoint Outcomes Software. This software allows faculty to give students detailed feedback on their writing based upon rubrics that faculty create or ones in an extensive library provided by the company. It also collects and aggregates data on large numbers of evaluations of student writing that will be used for assessing the student learning outcomes in writing that have been developed for the QEP.

The QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will determine which rubric(s) will be used in the courses in the Writing Intensive Program and will analyze and interpret the data collected from rubric-based assessments. It is expected that students in the Writing-Enriched and Writing in the Discipline courses will demonstrate

an improvement in their writing skills by the conclusion of the course and that their proficiency in writing will exceed that of students in courses that are not writing enriched.

Locally generated/internal and national student and faculty surveys will also be used as indirect assessment measures. A local Faculty Perception of Writing Survey and the national Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) will be used to document changes in faculty perceptions about writing. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) as well as a local Student Perception of Writing Survey will be administered to students to document changes in students' perceptions regarding writing.

The QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will conduct an analysis of faculty and student responses to these surveys and compare the results with data for similar institutions from the national surveys. They will use the results of the rubric-based assessment and the faculty and student surveys to determine what changes need to be made to the program and provide an annual report on their activities to faculty and administrators. Through this process, the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will continuously monitor the impact of the QEP on student learning.

The Faculty Development Plan

The Faculty Development Plan will be assessed via surveys and portfolios. Surveys to determine faculty development participants' levels of knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors will be conducted at the beginning of faculty development activities to establish a baseline. At the conclusion of the faculty development activities, faculty participants will complete a post-seminar survey concerning their plans for implementing particular writing strategies. The pre/post survey data provide an initial measure of the

success of the seminar. At the end of the academic year, surveys will also be used to measure changes in the same areas of knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors with emphasis on assessing the use of particular writing strategies in courses. The QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Council will compare the baseline survey to the end-of program results to determine the effectiveness of the Faculty Development Plan. Conclusions drawn from this analysis will be used as a formative assessment to refine the faculty development activities delivered to faculty participants in the future. The QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will also complete a summative assessment of the impact of the QEP on faculty knowledge, attitudes and behaviors relative to writing. This assessment will be communicated in reports distributed to faculty and the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Faculty portfolios will also be used to measure improvement in writing-related behavior. At the end of the academic year, faculty participating in development activities will submit a teaching portfolio to the QEP Director. The portfolios will be used to track the implementation of writing assignments in courses taught by participants in the professional development program and the development of writing intensive courses. They will contain course syllabi, writing assignments, rubric scoring data, samples of student writing, and a reflective piece that includes the instructor's overall assessment of student learning outcomes, the impact of development workshops on pedagogical strategies, discussion of student evaluations, and changes to be made in the future. It is expected that these portfolios will show increases in the number of process-based writing assignments and a change in faculty attitudes toward writing similar to that documented in the faculty surveys. At the end of the academic year, the QEP Director will meet with

faculty to assist them with the completion of the portfolio. Faculty participants will review drafts of their portfolio materials, collect and organize documentation, and reflect on their experiences with students.

The University Writing Center

To assess the strengthening of the University Writing Center, the usage of the University Writing Center will be tracked, especially the use of professional and student tutors. It is expected that statistics on student usage of the University Writing Center will show an increase in usage as a result of the provision of increased tutoring resources. The number of faculty referrals to the University Writing Center will also be calculated. It is expected that the number of University Writing Center referrals and the number of faculty requests for classroom presentations by University Writing Center staff will also increase as a result of professional tutors serving as liaisons to academic departments.

The effectiveness of the on-line tutoring service will also be assessed through the use of the WOnline software that allows for session reporting for tutors, logging of student and tutor interaction, and comprehensive reporting for the analysis of online center usage. Faculty and student users will also complete a survey to measure efficacy and user satisfaction with writing-related services offered by the University Writing Center. The QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will oversee the collection of all assessment data related to the University Writing Center and will work collaboratively with the University Writing Center staff to make any necessary changes to services and programs following a comprehensive review and analysis of all data collected.

Technology Enhancement

The performance of the instructional designer/technologist who will be hired to develop online resources to support the QEP and provide faculty with technology training will be assessed through regular University procedures for the evaluation of EPA Non-Faculty employees. As discussed above, the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee will review the data on student learning outcomes and student usage, collected through the use of the Waypoint Outcomes and WOnline software, and determine what modifications in the assessment instruments are needed. The effectiveness of the online portal for faculty development will be determined by tracking statistics on faculty usage and faculty satisfaction surveys.

As mentioned previously, the Writing and Technology Project will be assessed by means of tracking student pass rates and average student grades as compared to student performance in previous semesters and the administration of faculty and student surveys. The achievement of student learning outcomes for English Composition courses will be evaluated through the use of a common rubric to assess student portfolios. The Coordinators of the Writing and Technology Project will provide the results of the assessment to the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Committee. All these individuals will work collaboratively to analyze the results of the assessment and make any necessary changes to the program.

XI. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartholomae, David. "The Study of Error." *College Composition and Communication* 31.3 (1983) 253-69.
- Bateman, W.L. *Open to Question: The Art of Teaching and Learning by Inquiry*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
- Bazerman, Charles, and Joseph Little, Lisa Bethel, Teri Chavkin, Danielle Fouquette, and Janet Garufis. *Reference Guide to Writing Across the Curriculum*. Parlor Press and the WAC Clearinghouse, 2005.
- , and Harvey Weiner. *Reading Skills Handbook*. Houghton-Mifflin, 1998.
- , *Writing Skills Handbook*. Houghton-Mifflin, 1998.
- Bean, John C. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*. Jossey-Bass, 2001.
- , "Summary Writing, Rogerian Listening, and Dialectic Thinking." *College Composition and Communication* 27.2 (1986) 343-46.
- Breuch, Lee-Ann M. Kastman. *Post-Process 'Pedagogy': A Philosophical Exercise.* "Cross-Talk in Comp Theory." Ed. Victor Villaneuva. National Council of Teachers of English: 2003. 97-125.
- Brodkey, Linda. *Academic Writing as Social Practice*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.
- Brookfield, S. D. *Developing Critical Thinkers: Challenging Adults to Explore Alternative Ways of Thinking and Acting*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- Bruffee, Kenneth. "Writing and Reading as Social or Collaborative Acts." In *The Writer's Mind: Writing as a Mode of Thinking*. National Council of Teachers of English: 1983.
- , *Collaborative Learning: Higher Education, Interdependence, and the Authority of Knowledge*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Center for Educational Policy Research, *Understanding University Success: A Report from Standards for Success*. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 2003.
- Carter, Michael. "Ways of Knowing, Doing, and Writing in the Disciplines." *College Composition and Communication* 58.3 (2007) 385-418.
- , "A Process for Establishing Outcomes-Based Assessment Plans for Writing and Speaking in the Disciplines." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*. 6 (2002) 4-29.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. "WPA Position Statement on Assessment—DRAFT." November 2007. <<http://www.wpacouncil.org/AssessmentPosition>>.
- Elbow, Peter. *Embracing Contraries: Explorations in Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Emig, Janet. "Writing as a Mode of Learning," *College Composition and Communication* 28.2 (May 1977) 125-27.
- Final Assessment Report of the Composition Program. University of North Carolina at Pembroke, May 2008.
- Graff, Gerald. *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Henry, James. *Writing Workplace Cultures: An Archaeology of Professional Writing*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2000.

- Herrington, Ann, and Charles Moran. *Writing, Teaching, Learning in the Disciplines*. Modern Language Association, 1992.
- , and Marcia Curtis. *Person in Process: Four Stories of Writing and Personal Development in College*. National Council of Teachers of English, 2000.
- Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Language, Learning, and Academic Writing 1* (2004). <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/samuels1004.cfm>.
- Jolliffe, David A. "Learning to Read as Continuing Education." *College Composition and Communication* 58 (2007): 470-94.
- Kenyon, R. W. "Writing Is Problem Solving." In *Writing to Learn Mathematics and Science*. Teachers College Press, 1989.
- McLeod, Susan, et al, eds. *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing Across the Curriculum Programs*. National Council of Teachers of English: 2001.
- Meyers, C. *Teaching Students to Think Critically: A Guide for Faculty in All Disciplines*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.
- , and T. B. Jones. *Promoting Active Learning: Strategies for the College Classroom*. San Francisco: 1993.
- Moffett, James. *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Houghton Mifflin 1983.
- Monore, Jonathan. *Writing and Revising in the Disciplines*. Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Mullin, W. J. "Qualitative Thinking and Writing in the Hard Sciences." *Writing to Learn Mathematics and Science*. Teachers College Press, 1989.
- Persky, Hilary R., Mary C. Daane, and Ying Jin. *The Nation's Report: Writing 2002*. National Assessment of Educational Progress (July 2003). <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pubs/main2002/2003529.asp#section2>.
- Richardson, Mark. "Writing Is Not Just a Basic Skill." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 7 Nov. 2008 <<http://chronicle.com/article/Writing-Is-Not-Just-a-Basic/22146/>>.
- Samuels, Robert. "RE-inventing the Modern University with WAC: Postmodern Composition as Cultural and Intellectual History." In *Across the Disciplines*:
- Simmons, W. Michele, and Jeffrey T. Grabill. "Toward a Civic Rhetoric for Technologically and Scientifically Complex Places: Invention, Performance, and Participation." *College Composition and Communication* 58.3 (2007) 419-48..
- Thaiss, Chris, and Terry Myers Zawacki. *Engaged Writers and Dynamic Disciplines: Research on the Academic Writing Life*. Boynton/Cook, 2006.
- The National Commission on Writing, "Writing: A Powerful Message from State Government" (2005), <http://www.writingcommission.org/pr/message-from-state.html>.
- The National Commission on Writing, *Writing: A Ticket to Work . . . Or a Ticket Out: A Survey of Business Leaders*. New York: College Board, 2003, 3.
- Valenti, Patricia D. "Report on Composition Repeaters" University of North Carolina at Pembroke, June 21, 2007.
- Villaneuva, Victor, ed. *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader* National Council of Teachers of English: 2003.

- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. *Writing in the Twenty-First Century: A Report from the National Council of Teachers of English*. National Council of Teachers of English: 2009.
- , and Brian Huot. *Assessing Writing Across the Curriculum: Diverse Approaches and Practices*. Ablex Publishing, 1998.
- Yoshida, J. "Writing to Learn Philosophy." In Ann Ruggles Gere, et al, eds., *Roots in the Sawdust: Writing to Learn Across the Disciplines*. National Council of Teachers of English: 1985.

APPENDIX A

FACULTY INPUT FORM SACS QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN

Name (Optional) _____

Status (Faculty, Staff or Student) _____

Core Requirement 2.12 of the SACS *Principles of Accreditation* requires an institution to have a *plan* for increasing the effectiveness of some aspect of its educational program relating to student learning. The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is a document developed by the institution that describes a course of action for institutional improvement. The QEP addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) related to enhancing student learning.

Student learning is defined broadly in the context of the QEP and may address a wide range of topics or issues. It may include changes in students' knowledge, skills, behaviors, and/or values that may be attributable to the collegiate experience. Examples of topics or issues include, but are not limited to, enhancing the academic climate for student learning, strengthening the general studies curriculum, developing creative approaches to experiential learning, enhancing critical thinking skills, introducing innovative teaching and learning strategies, and exploring imaginative ways to use technology in the curriculum.

The QEP Committee solicits your input in determining the topic or issue(s) for the QEP. Please provide specific answers to the questions on the following page. Return the completed form to your departmental representative or the QEP Committee c/o the Teaching and Learning Center, Old Main, Room 241. You can also submit information electronically to tlc@uncp.edu or via the discussion board at the QEP Blackboard site (UNCP Quality Enhancement Plan for SACS) to which all faculty are subscribed. Thank you for your help.

1. What do you see as the major obstacles to student learning at UNCP?

2. What solutions to these obstacles would you propose that could become the basis of the Quality Enhancement Plan? Proposals can involve the initiation of new programs or modifications to existing ones.

APPENDIX B
STUDENT INPUT FORM
QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN

Name (Optional) _____

Status (Faculty, Staff or Student) _____

The University's accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), requires UNC Pembroke to have a *plan* for increasing the effectiveness of some aspect of its educational program relating to student learning. The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is a document developed by the institution that describes a course of action for institutional improvement. The QEP addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) related to enhancing student learning.

The QEP Committee solicits your input in determining the topic or issue(s) for the QEP. Please answer the questions below. Return the completed form to your instructor. Thank you for your help.

1. What problems do we have in the area of student learning at UNCP?

2. What solutions to these problems would you propose?

APPENDIX C
GENERAL SUMMARY OF QEP INPUT

<u>Learning Obstacles</u>	
Basic Skills	39
Writing	5
Attitude	5
Preparation	2
Studying	3
Math	9
English	8
Critical Thinking	2
Reading	3
Speech	1
Motivation	1
Freshman Seminar	4
Consistent Experience	1
Inconsistent quality	1
Lack of emphasis on internship	1
Lack of resources	1
General Education	4
Core skills	4
Others	7
Faculty Responsibility	1
Community Service	1
Access to technology	1
Integrating learning	2
Anti-intellectual policies	1

<u>Proposed Solutions</u>	
1	Better student assessment to identify skill level
2	Build into curriculum interdisciplinary learning
3	Class Attendance Policy modeled on English Comp.
4	Develop stronger sense of community
5	Embed writing and math in courses
6	Enhance remedial opportunities
7	Freshman seminar should be taught by qualified faculty
8	Freshman seminar with emphasis on critical thinking
9	Improve basic English and Math skills Writing skills improvement
10	Improve communication skills
11	Incentives for study skills workshops
12	Increase Freshman Seminar to a full semester course
13	Increased monitoring of student progress
14	Interdisciplinary course with perhaps team teaching
15	Learning Communities and Research Projects
16	Liberal Arts education
17	Modify freshman 1st year experience
18	More emphasis on developmental skills
19	More resources and attention placed on helping students
20	Multicultural and global awareness
21	Placement of under prepared students in enhanced remedial courses
22	Program to engage students outside of the classroom
23	Provide more experiential learning experiences
24	Reduce faculty teach load; increase focus on students
25	Scholar Skills Resource Center (mentoring and tutoring technologies)
26	Service requirement for all students
27	Strengthen Early Alert Program

Parking (access)	1
Total	54

28	Strengthen General Education curriculum
29	Team working skills
30	Uphold standards
31	Work with local schools in preparing students for college

APPENDIX D DISCUSSION BOARD FORUM

SACS QEP Update and Request for Further Input

The SACS QEP Committee thanks you for your input on the QEP topic. The Committee has reviewed all the feedback received so far and has met with the departmental representatives. From this review, we have distilled the discussion on student learning to the three areas for improvement or enhancement listed below. In your view, are these the appropriate directions for us to take in developing the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)? Please comment on each of these three directions. How would you rank or prioritize these in order of importance? What initiatives to improve student learning would you propose in these areas? Feel free to suggest other areas for enhancement and propose initiatives in those areas. Thank you for your help.

- 1) Basic skills/writing and math
- 2) First year experience/advising
- 3) Experiential learning/civic involvement
- 4) Other areas for enhancement/initiatives

APPENDIX E
STUDENT PERCEPTION OF WRITING SURVEY

Perceptions of Your Writing

This is a short survey about who you are and your perceptions of writing. Please complete the following questions as openly and as honestly as possible. It is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. Your survey will remain confidential and anonymous.

1. In what school is your major program of study? (Choose one.)

Arts and Sciences Education Business Undeclared

2. What is your class rank?

Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

3. What is your current University GPA?

4. What was your score on your last SAT?

5. What year did you start attending UNCP?

6. On average, how many classes do you have per semester that require some type of writing assignments?

1 2 3 4 5 or more

7. On average, how many writing assignments do you write per semester in all of your classes?

1 2 3 4 5 or more

8. On average, how often do you utilize the University Writing Center per semester?

Not at all
Rarely
Once or twice per semester
Once a month
Once a week
More than once a week

9. If you used the University Writing Center for feedback, was it useful?

Yes

No
Did Not Use the University Writing Center

10. I have turned in someone else's writing as my own.

Frequently
Sometimes
Never

11. I have used exact words from a source without enclosing them in quotation marks.

Frequently
Sometimes
Never

APPENDIX F
FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF WRITING SURVEY

Faculty Perceptions of Writing

The purpose of this survey is to assess the current writing culture at UNCP. Please take a few minutes to fill out the survey. This information will be helpful in the design of the Quality Enhancement Plan at UNCP.

1. In which school/college is your teaching appointment?

Arts & Sciences Business Education Honors College

2. What is the rank of your current appointment?

Lecturer/Instructor Assistant Professor Associate Professor Full
Professor Other

3. How many years have you been teaching at UNCP?

0-3 years
4-8 years
9-15 years
16 or more years

4. Students should know how to write before they enroll in my courses

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

5. Good writing is independent of the writing style of a particular discipline.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

6. If I take time in my courses to attend to student writing, I will compromise the quality of content instruction.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

7. I check students' sources, use Turnitin, or otherwise screen student writing for plagiarism.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

8. What kinds of comments do you include on students' essays?

Comments on content

Comments on clarity and organization
Grammatical corrections

9. Which of the following areas do you feel students should have mastered before coming to one of your upper-level classes?

Paragraph organization
Paraphrasing
Grammar
Documentation

10. How often do you assign short (1-3 pages) formal writing assignments in a course?

Never
1-2 times a semester
3-4 times a semester
5-6 times a Semester
6-7 times a semester
7-8 times a semester
9-10 times a semester
More than 10 times a semester

11. How often do you assign medium length (4-9 pages) formal writing assignments?

Never
1-2 times a semester
3-4 times a semester
5-6 times a Semester
6-7 times a semester
7-8 times a semester
9-10 times a semester
More than 10 times a semester

12. How often do you assign lengthy (10+ pages) formal writing assignments?

Never
1-2 times a semester
3-4 times a semester
5-6 times a semester
6-7 times a semester
7-8 times a semester
9-10 times a semester
More than 10 times a semester

13. When you assign writing, how often do you provide feedback to students' rough drafts?

Frequently
Occasionally
Rarely
Never
Not applicable; I do not assign writing.

14. How often do you make assignments that require the use of the University Writing Center?

Not at all
Rarely
Occasionally
Always

15. The freshman writing courses should teach students all they need to know to write successfully throughout their college careers.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

16. I would be willing to attend workshops on "Teaching Writing in my Discipline."

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

17. I would like to see more writing-intensive courses taught in my discipline.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

18. I am willing to teach more writing-intensive courses.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

19. I would need the following to make it possible for me to teach more writing-intensive courses. (Choose all that apply.)

Workshops on teaching writing
Smaller classes
Other (please explain)

APPENDIX G
SWK 3710
WRITING FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
SPRING 2009

Professor: Debbie H. Branch, MSW, LCSW-P

Contact information:

Office: #308 DF Lowry

Office Hours: By Appointment

Phone: 910.521-6510

Email: debra.branch@uncp.edu

Inclement Weather Information: 910.521.6888

Course prerequisites: SWK 2000 co requisite

Course Description and Rationale

This course is an introduction to writing for the social sciences, with an emphasis on using the APA style (American Psychological Association). It is designed to help student master competencies in the area of manuscript development and literature review.

Social Work Program Objectives

Graduates of the program are expected to:

1. Apply critical thinking skills within the context of professional social work practice. (EP3.0.1)
2. Understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards and principles, and practice accordingly. (EP3.0.2)
3. Practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge, and skills related to clients' age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex and sexual orientation. (EP3.0.3)
4. Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination and apply strategies of advocacy and social change that advance social and economic justice. (EP3.0.4)
5. Understand and interpret the history of the social work profession and its contemporary structures and issues. (EP3.0.5)
6. Apply the knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice with systems of all sizes. (EP3.0.B6).
7. Use theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence to understand individual development and behavior across the life span and the interactions among individuals and between individuals and families, groups, organizations, and communities. (EP3.0.7)
8. Analyze, formulate, and influence social policies. (EP3.0.8)
9. Evaluate research studies, apply research findings to practice, and evaluate their own practice. (EP3.0.9)

10. Use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities. (EP3.0.10)
11. Use supervision and consultation appropriate to social work practice. (EP3.0.11)
12. Function within the structure of organizations and service delivery systems and seek necessary organizational change. (EP3.0.12)
13. Use social work skills within the context of our rural environment. (EP3.2)

Course Objectives

By completion of this course students are expected to:

1. Understand basic generalist social work values and practice principles in application to professional writing and use of resources. (program objective 2)
2. Develop professional writing skills for the purpose of presentation of ideas and current research.(program objectives 6, 9, 10)
3. Understand the difference between documentation and professional writing unique to the social work profession. (program objectives 5, 6, 9, 10)
4. Understand the ethical issues surrounding plagiarism and the impact of plagiarism on the transition from student to practice professional. (program objective 2)
5. Demonstrate how to successfully complete a review of current literature, including how to determine quality of information. (program objectives 9, 10)
6. Become familiar with writing guidelines unique to the APA style. (program objectives 1, 9, 10)

Required Texts

Szuchman, L. T, & Thomlinson, B. (2008). *Writing with style: APA style for social work* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole. [Referred to as **Text** in the assignments]

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5th ed). (2001). Washington DC: American Psychological Association. [Referred to as **APA Manual** in the assignments]

About Computer Usage

Social work majors are required to have an email account to submit and receive assignments. Students may apply for an account. Merely complete the "New User Account" form found at <http://www.uncp.edu/ucis/accounts/index.htm>

Social work majors and students in this class are required to have an email account to submit and receive assignments. Student may apply for an account. By completing the "New User Account" form found at <http://www.uncp.edu/ucis/accounts/index.htm>

Assignments

See Blackboard (Information) for detailed description of assignments, supplemental readings and due dates.

Assignment	% of grade
Attendance/Participation (Particularly Blackboard Discussions and other	25

assignments)	
Exam # 1	10
Observation # 2	10
Midterm exam	10
Literature Review and PowerPoint	25
Resume	10
Final exam	10
Total	100

1. **Observation Exercise with Title Page.** This is a simple observation exercise. You will go to a place where you can watch people for about 20 minutes. In this exercise you will write about what you see and hear. Field notes like this are a staple of research. Be specific. Use critical thinking. For the first part of the exercise make no assumptions—be purely objective and observational. For the last five minutes, choose one or two persons that you are observation and make an attempt to interpret their behaviors and underlying thoughts or feelings. The assignment will consist of three pages
 - a. A title page in APA format (see Text - chapter 12 & APA, page 306).
 - b. Write your observations, and limit to two pages. Use the same title you used on the title page. Have it look like page 306 of the APA manual. Here you can describe what you saw and heard in your visit to this place. Note what you see in the parking lot, for example. What does the place look like? What is the time of day? Describe the people you see. How old are they? What are they doing? Then in a separate paragraph, write your hypotheses for the behaviors of your target person(s).

2. **Literature Review:** You will choose an issue or topic and study the literature in an effort to determine what is known, interpret varying viewpoints when there is a controversy, and assess for gaps in the literature. This paper should be a minimum of 6 -8 pages in length (not including the title page and reference page). APA style should be use for all assignments.

3. **Resume:** You will complete a one page Resume. Be sure to include all volunteer experience.

Attendance and Participation Policy

Attendance and class participation are critical to the learning and integration of materials. Therefore, the Social Work Department has implemented the following policy. **There are no excused absences. A student will fail the class upon the seventh absence for day classes and the fourth absence for evening class (for three hour courses).** Students are therefore encouraged to be mindful of absences and make every effort to be in attendance. Students are expected to have read assigned material prior to the class. Students are also expected to participate in class discussion, exercises, and any

Blackboard discussions. See University Academics Policies at <http://www.uncp.edu/sa/handbook/11academic.htm>

Online Course Attendance

The Class Discussion Board is designed for ongoing class discussion. Students will have the opportunity to earn their attendance and participation grade here. Students must share thoughts regarding course content, relate content to course objectives, respond to the thoughts, questions, and experiences of others, ask general and course content questions, and read & reflect on all contributions to this discussion board. Students are expected to complete all assignments. If you do not post discussions in a timely manner, you will be considered late and if you fail to post, you will be considered absent for the week. As a result, both the attendance and participation grade will be negatively impacted. Assignments will be posted on Discussion Board on Monday. Students must post in a timely manner for discussion with classmates to occur. Post **will not** be accepted for grading after date due.

Grading

The grading scale is outlined below and is in the [University Student Handbook](#):

A 92-100	B 82-86	C 72-76	D 62-66
A- 90-91	B- 80-81	C- 70-71	D- 60-61
B+ 87-89	C+ 77-79	D+ 67-69	F 0-59

Giving and Taking Help

The practice of social work includes two important concepts: "process" and "outcome." Outcome is the degree of success in achieving a goal. Process includes the hard work and self-discipline a social worker employs in achieving a goal. The social work faculty feels that the "process" is as significant as the "outcome." When one student assists another by sharing projects, term papers, book reports, reactions papers and other assignments, the benefits of the "process" are usurped. The student who recycles the assignment is denied the opportunity to enhance his/her self-discipline and work habits. Simply stated, Don't share your work with other students. The social work faculty considers such behavior as cheating, a violation of the NASW Code of Ethics and a violation of the Student Honor Code. You are also not to use the same assignment in two different classes without permission of both instructors.

Plagiarism

The Social Work Program does not permit plagiarism. All students enrolled in SWK courses are required to use the APA citation style, anyone caught plagiarizing automatically receive an F. You will lose points on assignments if you do not use APA citation style. APA manuals can be purchased in the bookstore. There is a copy on closed reserve in the library. Also refer to the [Library resource for APA](#). You may also get help from University Writing Center hours during the semester are from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Thursday and 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. on Friday. For an appointment, stop by the University Writing Center, Dial 131, call 910.521.6168, or email writing@uncp.edu.

Child Welfare Waiver Students

Child Welfare Waiver Students must complete the same assignments as scholarship students.

Students with Disabilities

ADA Academic Access Statement:

Any student with a documented disability needing academic adjustments is requested to speak directly to Disability Support Services and the instructor, as early in the semester (preferably within the first week) as possible. All discussions will remain confidential. Please contact Disability Support Services, DF Lowry Building, Room 107, or call 910-521-6695 for an appointment. This publication is available in alternative formats upon request. Please contact Disability Support Services, DF Lowry Building, Room 197, or call (910) 521-6695.

Portfolio Assignment

The portfolio is an effective tool for measuring a student's growth and celebrating accomplishments on the continuum of beginning the social work major to the point of entry-level social work employment.

For this course the portfolio assignment is the Literature Review. You must keep this assignment and include it in your portfolio which will be graded during SWK 4900/4910. Graded assignments should be revised prior to inclusion in the portfolio. The list of all portfolio assignments can be found in the student handbook. Students are encouraged to save portfolio assignments on their Snappy accounts.

Bibliography (See Blackboard)