SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): Undergraduate Major, Undergraduate Writing Program and Graduate Program

Department: English

College/School: College of Arts and Sciences

Date: July 18, 2019

Primary Assessment Contact: Toby Benis (Department Chair); Joya Uraizee (Assessment Coordinator); Paul Lynch (Writing Program Director)

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

A. Undergraduate Major Outcomes Assessed:

1. Culture and Critique (Outcome 5):
   "Students who complete the undergraduate program in English will analyze the ways in which literary works represent the intersections of factors such as race, gender, class, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, environment, and / or belief."
2. We did not assess Outcome 1 (Close Reading) as per our Assessment Plan because we do not yet have enough documents collected. We are assembling portfolios of assignments from selected majors across each course level (2000, 3000 and 4000).

B. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessed:

1. MA Oral Exam (Learning Outcome A):
   Students in the master's program will "demonstrate a foundational knowledge of literary/rhetorical histories, aesthetics, cultures, and emerging areas of inquiry, including an awareness of cultural diversity within literary traditions"
2. PhD Qualifying Exam (Learning Outcome A):
   Students in the doctoral program will "demonstrate a broad knowledge of literary histories, aesthetics, cultures, and emerging areas of inquiry, including an awareness of cultural diversity within literary traditions"

C. Assessment of the Writing Program (WP):

The WP underwent an external evaluation in Spring 2019. In February 2019, Dr. Chris Anson (from North Carolina State University) and Dr. Deborah Holdstein (fom Columbia College, Chicago) evaluated the WP. They subsequently wrote a report, which the WP Director responded to.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

A. Undergraduate Major

Culture and Critique (Outcome 5):

The Assessment Committee evaluated 72 essay assignments that were submitted by English majors in 2017 and 2018 for Culture and Critique courses on the North and Madrid campuses. Of these papers, 16 were from English majors, 2 were from English minors, and 54 were from non-majors.

Additionally, a focus group survey was conducted in Spring 2019 with 2 with students concentrating in Research Intensive English.

A focus group survey was also conducted in Spring 2019 with students concentrating in the Creative Writing Track.

B. Graduate Program

In Spring 2019, the Assessment Committee, with input from the Director of Graduate Studies, assessed 11 reports on student performance in the oral exams, including 7 on the MA oral exam and 4 on the PhD Qualifying exam. The committee also examined 10 reports on student performance in either the doctoral dissertation defense or the doctoral prospectus proposal.

C. Writing Program

The External Evaluator's Report was followed up by a Report from the WP Director, both of which were presented to Departmental faculty at the March 2019 faculty meeting.

How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?
NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

Undergraduate Major and Graduate Program (See Appendices B-D for Rubrics)

For academic year 2018-19, the UG and Graduate Program Assessment committee consisted of the following people: Dr. Joya Uraizee (Assessment Director), Dr. Janice McIntire Strasburg, Dr. Nathan Grant (Fall 2018 only), Dr. Anne Dewey (Fall 2018 only; SLU Madrid), and Dr. Antony Hasler (Spring 2019 only). They were assisted by Ms. Abigail Jarvis, MA student (Fall 2019 only).

The Assessment Committee members discussed and scored assessment artifacts based on the scales below. The committee reported in written form to the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees.

The UG essays received numerical scores: 4 (High Proficiency); 3 (Proficiency); 2 (Competency); 1 (Marginal Competency) and 0 (Does not meet Marginal Competency).

The Graduate Program Portfolios and Reports also received numerical scores: 5 (Excellent); 4

(Above Average); 3 (Average); 2 (Below Average) and 1 (Poor).

Writing Program

The External Evaluator's Report was written by Dr. Chris Anson (North Carolina State University) and Dr. Deborah Holdstein (Columbia College, Chicago). The Departmental Response to the External Report was written by Dr. Paul Lynch, WP Director, in consultation with departmental administrators and faculty.

3. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.
NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

Undergraduate Major

Culture and Critique Outcome, Assignments**:**

The average rating for all 72 assignments was **2.0** (Competency) on a scale of 1–4, with 4 being the highest. This suggests our students may need more training in analyzing culture(s) and recognizing how and why it is being critiqued.

While the average rating for all 18 assignments from majors was 2.2 (Competency), the average rating for all 54 assignments from non-majors was 2 (Competency). This suggests that some review of assignments and courses might be necessary.

Focus Groups:

The results of the 2 focus groups that were conducted are as follows:

Creative Writing Focus Group, Spring 2019:
Students agreed that creative-writing courses increased their appreciation of textual complexity and that the "workshop" format enhanced this understanding. They appreciated the ways in which these courses help them craft a distinctive style in their writing or understand the relationship between "freedom and constraint" in the process of writing. This suggests that the small class size and intensive workshop format is yielding good results.

Research Intensive Courses Focus Group, Spring 2019:
Students indicated that the honors track encouraged the pursuit of original research questions and had a developmental attitude toward research. There was a mixed response to the preparation offered by the department in terms of advanced awareness of theoretical, historical and interpretive contexts. The students felt that some of the dual-level seminar courses were particularly strong in that the level of discussion was elevated and the exposure to theory was advanced. This suggests that our honors program although small, is working well, and that the dual-level format should be continued.

Graduate Program

M.A. Outcome A, Oral Exam:

The average rating for all 7 of the MA exams was **3.84** (between average and above average), on a scale of 1–5, with 5 being the highest.

The committee was unable to find any patterns over time since the number of exams was fairly limited. The exam format also made it difficult for the committee to gauge the ability of MA students to be independent thinkers. However, the results suggest that the students' foundational knowledge of literary aesthetics and cultures is stronger than their foundational knowledge of literary histories or emerging areas of inquiry. The results also suggest that the exam format could be changed to include, for example, a written component.

Ph.D. Outcome A, Qualifying Exam:

The average rating for all 4 of the PhD exams was **4.25** (between above average and excellent), on a scale of 1–5, with 5 being the highest.

The committee was unable to find any patterns over time since the number of exams was fairly limited. However, the results suggest that the students possess broad knowledge of literary histories, aesthetics, cultures, and emerging areas of inquiry, as well as proficiency in formulating written and spoken arguments situated within a historical or methodological field of study. The results also suggest that the exam format could be changed to synchronize the written and oral components of the exam more closely.

Indirect Measures:

Reports on dissertation prospectuses/defenses:
In Spring 2019, the committee analyzed 10 reports on doctoral students' dissertation defenses or prospectus approvals. The average rating for all 10 reports was **4.42** (between above average and excellent), on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest. The committee did not discuss these at length since both the format and the results were nearly excellent.

Reports on incoming graduate students:
In Fall 2018, the Director of Graduate Studies conducted interviews with 29 graduate students, of whom 21 were doctoral students and 8 were master's students. 86% of the doctoral students are considering alt-ac employment. 55% of the master's students would have opted for a direct PhD option if it were offered at SLU. In general, the students liked the graduate student community, the range of faculty, and the opportunity to work across disciplines. Students requested more transparency about how funding decisions are made, better communication between mentors and mentees, and more professionalization opportunities. The results suggest that professionalization within both academic and non-academic fields should be a more obvious part of the curriculum.

Writing Program

Summary of the Recommendations in the External Evaluator's Report:

While the WP has excellent leadership and strong participation by full time tenured faculty, it needs to attend to the following:

1. SLU students need more writing instruction. A second writing course should be added to the existing writing requirements, and a university-wide Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program should be created.
2. The WP should be less reliant on NTT faculty.
3. The location and staffing of University Writing Services are problematic.
4. The WP should seek development opportunities, such as a generous donor.

4. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

Recommendations for the Undergraduate Program:

In Fall 2018, the Assessment committee wrote 2 reports on its assessment of the Culture and Critique assignments and sent them to the Director of Undergraduate Studies. In the reports, the committee recommended reviewing the courses that currently count toward Culture and Critique and requested that the department have some oversight on whether assignments in Culture and Critique courses address the Culture and Critique outcomes/objectives.

In Spring 2019, the Director of Undergraduate Studies discussed the Assessment Committee reports (including their recommendations) at the February meeting of the Undergraduate Committee. The members of the Undergraduate Committee considered the results mentioned in the reports as well as the relative workload involved in the report's recommendations. The committee eventually created 5 options for revising the Culture and Critique requirement. These were: to review syllabi for Culture and Critique courses and remove courses that don't meet the Culture and Critique outcomes; to ask instructors of Culture and Critique courses to identify one assignment that addresses the outcomes; to require all Culture and Critique courses to include a reflective essay about the outcomes; to revise the outcomes; and to ask the Assessment Committee to do a further review of other Culture and Critique assignments. The Director of Undergraduate Studies presented these options to the Department at its March meeting.

Recommendations for the Graduate Program:

In Spring 2019, the Assessment Committee wrote a report about its assessment of the reports on the MA and PhD Exams, and sent it to the Director of Graduate Studies. In the report, the committee recommended adding a writing sample or a written exercise to the MA oral exam and synchronizing the oral and written portions of the doctoral qualifying exam, by providing the students with, for example, written essay choices.

In Spring 2019, the Director of Graduate Studies discussed the report with the members of the Graduate Committee, who also did some of their own research on the topic. The Graduate Committee eventually created a proposal to modify the MA exam. The proposal included revising the reading list to include 15 student-generated texts clustered around a theme, and adding a writing portfolio that would not be graded.

Recommendations for the Writing Program:

The Department's response to the External Evaluator's Recommendations are as follows:

1. While the Department does not have the resources for a second mandatory writing course, it endorses the development of a Writing Across the Curriculum program led by a faculty member housed in English. The implementation of the new university-wide core (which places writing at the center of student learning outcome #4) will provide the appropriate opportunity for this effort.
2. The Department endorses the idea that the WP should be less reliant on NTT faculty.
3. The Department seconds the recommendation that the location and staffing of University Writing Services are problematic.
4. The Department would like to set up a "writer's house," named for a donor, in Des Peres Hall, that would include first-year writing classrooms, WAC classrooms, the Compass technology lab, and University Writing Services.

5. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

Undergraduate Program:

The Director of Undergraduate Studies modified the 5 options created by the Undergraduate Committee for Culture and Critique courses and drafted a formal proposal which she presented to the department at its April faculty meeting. The proposal recommended 3 options: that either the undergraduate committee or an ad hoc committee review all syllabi for Culture and Critique courses and remove courses that don't appear to fit the outcomes; that the instructors of instructors of Culture and Critique courses identify one assignment that addresses the outcomes; and that the Culture and Critique outcomes be revised. The 3 options were discussed and faculty agreed that some course don't fit the Culture and Critique label very well. It was agreed that this discussion would continue at the annual faculty retreat in August 2019.

Graduate Program:

The Director of Graduate Studies drafted a formal proposal indicating that the MA exam be modified to include a final portfolio of written work, which would be a capstone type experience, and would include a one page reflection paper, a curriculum vita, a professionalization document and a polished piece of writing. This portfolio would be required but not graded. The proposal also indicated that in the oral portion of the exam the student would be tested over a list of 15 texts drawn from the students coursework and approved by the 3 committee members. This exam would be pass/fail only. The proposal was put to a vote and passed unanimously.

Writing Program:

The WP has been involved in the discussions around a new university wide core, and has sent in proposals for a Writing Across the Curriculum program. The WP and the Department believe that the new core provides a crucial opportunity to re-instantiate writing instruction at the center of SLU's undergraduate education.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

Please see the following.

Appendix A: Revised MA Assessment Plan

Saint Louis University
Program Assessment Plan

Program (Major, Minor, Core): Master of Arts
Department: English
College/School: Arts & Sciences
Person(s) Responsible for Implementing the Plan: Graduate Committee (Ruth Evans, Georgia Johnston, Anessa Kemna [student], Paul Lynch, Nathaniel Rivers, Rachel Greenwald Smith, Joe Weixlmann, Heather Witcher [student])
Date Submitted: November 11, 2015
Date Revised: September 13, 2018 (Joya Uraizee, Janice McIntire-Strasburg, Nathan Grant, Anne Dewey)

Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	Use of Assessment Data
What do you expect all students who complete th program to know, or be able to do?	*Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?*	*How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.*	*How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and "close the loop" to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?*

A. demonstrate a foundational knowledge of literary/rhetorical histories, aesthetics, cultures, and emerging areas of inquiry, including an awareness of cultural diversity within literary traditions	Direct Assessment: This knowledge is learned throughout the student's program of study and will be directly assessed through a review of the M.A. oral examination that each candidate takes at the conclusion of his/her degree program. Indirect Assessment: Each student's knowledge base will be indirectly assessed through annual faculty reporting on the wide historical array of course work the student takes during master's study, especially that in 6000-level seminars, as well as through relevant data from graduate course evaluations.	Direct Assessment: During the M.A. oral examination which culminates the degree, each student will demonstrate his/her relative competence by discussing a wide range of faculty-approved core texts (historical, national, critical, and theoretical, with a grounding in diversity issues). Students will examine assigned primary texts within their critical and theoretical contexts in response to questions from an examining committee of three faculty, who will complete a departmental rating form expressly prepared for the purpose of assessing each student's level of demonstrated knowledge. Indirect Assessment: Faculty reports on each student's overall academic performance, especially in seminar courses, will be shared with the student's faculty mentor, who in turn will include information about the student's acquisition of knowledge in the annual student report filed with the department's director of graduate studies. Aggregated data from course evaluations bearing on Learning Objective A will also be considered.	Feedback on Direct Assessment: The director of graduate studies will collect and aggregate the ratings of student performance on the M.A. oral examinations with respect to Learning Objective A, looking for patterns of overall success as well as specific areas of relative strength or weakness. In turn, the director will report the aggregated results of student performance to the faculty at the department's annual August retreat so that recommendations for changes to our program may be considered. This report will include recommendations about changing the core list of texts, which will be revised every three years. Feedback on Indirect Assessment: Annual reports from faculty mentors will form the basis both for reviewing each student's progress toward successful degree completion and for meeting Learning Objective A. The director and faculty mentor will meet individually with any student who is lagging and larger patterns of poor performance, if identified, will be shared with a departmental faculty committee for possible recommendations that could produce revisions to our program. Such recommendations would be considered at one of the department's monthly faculty meetings.

B. demonstrate knowledge of research expectations, and of theoretical approaches, requisite for advanced study in English, including appropriate research resources and tools	Direct Assessments: This knowledge is learned throughout the student's program of study and will be directly assessed (1) through review of a portfolio which each M.A. candidate will present at the conclusion of course work but prior to taking the M.A. oral examination that includes what the candidate regards as the strongest research paper s/he has produced during course work and (2) through a review of the student's performance with respect to Learning Objective B on the M.A. oral examination which each student takes at the conclusion of his/her degree program. Indirect Assessment: Each student's knowledge base with respect to Learning Objective B will be indirectly assessed through annual faculty reporting on the wide historical array of course work the student takes during master's study, especially that in ENGL 5000 (Methods of Research), ENGL 5110 (Literary Theory), and 6000-level seminars, as well as through relevant data from graduate course evaluations.	Direct Assessments: (1) A departmental faculty committee will review each student's portfolio for evidence of research and theoretical competence and assess individuals using a departmental rating form expressly prepared for this purpose; in addition, (2) information regarding each student's research and theoretical competence will be gleaned from the M.A. oral evaluation form referenced under Objective A above. Indirect Assessment: Faculty reports on each student's overall academic performance, especially in ENGL 5000, ENGL 5110, and seminar courses, will be shared with the student's faculty mentor, who in turn will include information about the student's acquisition of research and theoretical knowledge in the annual student report filed with the department's director of graduate studies. Aggregated data from course evaluations bearing on Learning Objective B will also be considered.	Feedback on Direct Assessment: The director of graduate studies will collect and aggregate the faculty ratings of students' portfolios as well as the research and theory sections of their M.A. oral examinations, looking for patterns of overall success as well as specific areas of relative strength or weakness. In turn, the director will report the aggregated results of student performance to the faculty at the department's annual August retreat so that recommendations for changes to our program may be considered. Feedback on Indirect Assessment: Annual reports from faculty mentors will form the basis both for reviewing each student's progress toward successful degree completion and for meeting Learning Objective B. The director and faculty mentor will meet individually with any student who is lagging. Larger patterns of poor performance, if identified, will be shared with a departmental faculty committee for possible recommendations that could lead to revisions to our program. Such recommendations would be considered at one of the department's monthly faculty meetings.

C. demonstrate an ability to engage productively with relevant critical debates through written and spoken arguments	Direct Assessments: This ability is fostered throughout students' programs of study and will be directly assessed (1) through a review of a portfolio which each M.A. candidate will present at the conclusion of course work but prior to taking the M.A. oral examination that includes what the candidate regards as the strongest research paper s/he has produced during course work, and (2) through a review of the student's performance with respect to Learning Objective C on the M.A. oral examination which each student takes at the conclusion of his/her degree program. Indirect Assessment: Each student's ability with respect to Learning Objective C will be indirectly assessed through annual faculty reporting on the student's course work, especially that in 6000-level seminars, as well as through relevant data from graduate course evaluations.	Direct Assessments: (1) A departmental faculty committee will review each student's portfolio for evidence of the student's ability to engage productively with relevant critical debates and then assess individuals using a departmental rating form expressly prepared for this purpose; in addition, (2) information regarding each student's competence in this area will gleaned from the M.A. oral evaluation form referenced under Objective A above. Indirect Assessment: Faculty reports on each student's oral and written performance in seminar courses will be shared with the student's faculty mentor, who in turn will include information about the student's ability to engage productively in relevant critical debates in the annual student report filed with the department's director of graduate studies. Aggregated data from course evaluations bearing on Learning Objective C will also be considered.	Feedback on Direct Assessment: The director of graduate studies will collect and aggregate the results of the portfolio reviews and the relevant sections of the M.A. oral examination forms, looking for patterns of overall success as well as specific areas of relative strength or weakness. In turn, the director will report the aggregated results of student performance to the faculty at the department's annual August retreat so that recommendations for changes to our program may be considered. Feedback on Indirect Assessment: Annual reports from faculty mentors will form the basis both for reviewing each student's progress toward successful degree completion and for meeting Learning Objective C. The director and faculty mentor will meet individually with any student who is lagging and larger patterns of poor performance, if identified, will be shared with a departmental faculty committee for possible recommendations that could produce revisions to our program. Such recommendations would be considered at one of the department's monthly faculty meetings.

Appendix B: WP External Evaluator's Report

FINAL REPORT

EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY WRITING PROGRAM

Submitted by CWPA Consultant-Evaluators

Dr. Chris M. Anson
North Carolina State University

Dr. Deborah H. Holdstein
Columbia College Chicago

February 18, 2019

Introduction and Context for the Report

On Feb. 3-5, 2019, Professors Chris Anson and Deborah Holdstein[1] visited St. Louis University (hereafter SLU) for the purpose of evaluating its University Writing Program (hereafter UWP), which is administratively and budgetarily part of the English Department. The visit was arranged under the auspices of the Council of Writing Program Administrators by Dr. Shirley Rose, Director of the Consultant-Evaluator Service, in consultation with Dr. Paul Lynch, Director of the UWP at SLU. A description of the CWPA Consultant-Evaluator Service is included as Appendix C of this report.

Our charge was to provide a review of the UWP and to ascertain its contribution to the university's developing core curriculum.

Prior to our visit, we examined the UWP's website and received the following documents:

- "WP Self-Study Report" (Draft 6.0, 12/10/18), prepared by Dr. Lynch
- Sample assignments from ENG 1500, 1900, 1920, and 4000
- Course outcomes for ENG 1500, 1900, and 4000
- Sample syllabi from ENG 1500, 1900, 1920, and 4000
- Results from the 2017 NSSE survey at SLU and peer institutions
- Draft proposal for the *Eloquentia Perfecta* writing-intensive program
- ENG 1500 Portfolio Equivalency (April 2018)
- ENG 1900 Revised Curriculum Outline (Fall 2017)
- Writing Program Draft Assessment Report (Spring 2018)

Our visit included meetings with the Director of the UWP and English Department Chair; incoming and previous Writing Program Administrators (WPAs); the Director of the Writing Center; members of the Adjunct Faculty; the Vice President for Student Life; the Writing Program Administrator at the Madrid campus; graduate students in rhetoric and composition; the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; Graduate Instructors; the Director of the CAI Labs; and tenure-line faculty in the Department of English. A full visit schedule is included as Appendix B of this report.

We found a well-managed writing program under excellent leadership by the writing program administrator, a hospitable department with a knowledgeable and strong chair, a principled curriculum informed by current theory and research in the field of writing studies, and a

[1] Brief biographies of Professors Anson and Holdstein are included as Appendix A to this report

remarkably open and willing spirit among those with whom we met to consider ways to improve an already strong program. Indeed, we rarely see this extent of cooperation and support for writing in most traditional English departments; we are pleased to see that faculty members in literature are enhancing their knowledge and teaching foundational writing courses. This is a welcome development.

Overall, we believe that the UWP is in fine shape, innovating in important ways. However, the UWP is anticipating the need to address and support several significant campus-wide initiatives. There is also widespread concern across campus that SLU is moving away from its roots in the Jesuit tradition, emphasizing professional programs separated from and at the expense of equally important preparation in the liberal arts and sciences. This separation threatens not only programs, but more significantly, the value and significance of a Jesuit education for SLU's graduates.

In this respect, the timing of our visit was propitious, especially in the context of SLU's work on a University-wide core and the reaffirmation of the Jesuit tradition to inform and shape that core. In addition, the UWP has developed a proposal for the establishment of a writing-across- the-curriculum (WAC) program as part of the new core. Our report focuses primarily ways that the UWP can be strengthened in light of these developments, and we offer specific suggestions for the creation and sustainability of the WAC effort.

1. The UWP Curriculum

The UWP has innovated its curriculum in exciting ways over the past several years. For instance, in 2015, as part of an effort to enlist tenure-track faculty to teach ENG 1900 ("Advanced Strategies of Rhetoric and Research"), the UWP created a suite of theme-based courses geared toward realizing the same set of foundational outcomes, which focus on rhetorical principles, analysis of arguments, text-based skills, and the evaluation of one's own and others' in-process drafts. Tenure-track faculty who have taught these courses were uniformly excited about their experience, in some cases testifying that it changed the way they teach *all* of their courses.

Alongside these theme-based courses, the Department has fashioned a "teaching rotation" by which tenure-track faculty have regular assignments in the writing program. (We are aware that in the past, it was expected in a number of Jesuit institutions that tenure-track faculty members always taught both literature and composition courses in departments of English, so, again, this is a welcome development in emphasizing the investment of all faculty in students' education

regarding writing.)

English 1900 has been revised to include these themed focuses, with faculty members also creating a systematic assessment plan. These and other efforts have, we find, transformed the first-year writing experience and for the better. The words of the self-study are accurate: the program offers SLU students "a rhetorically and technologically robust curriculum, taught by tenure-line faculty and extensively trained graduate students and adjunct faculty." English 1900 is appropriately challenging, offering "a rich variety" of types of "intellectual inquiry and service learning opportunities." The Program's carefully-delineated outcomes provide the foundation and framework for students' work—no matter the major—at SLU.

Clearly, employers seek college graduates who have these highly-developed abilities, and employers expect such preparation, especially from those graduating from Jesuit institutions. Indeed, these strong rhetorical and writing abilities form the cornerstone of students' education at SLU and should be widely supported across the entire institution by additional instruction in writing past these foundational experiences. (We will suggest directions for writing-intensive or writing-across-the-curriculum initiatives later in this report.)

Recommendations:

- We affirm that the UWP is an integral and essential part of the new University core. English 1500 and 1900 are the foundational courses upon which any further cross-curricular efforts must be based. Because a significant number of students come into SLU with AP and dual-credit courses (and therefore do not take any foundational writing courses *at SLU*), they lack the crucial experience and continuity of instruction that such foundational courses provide. (Moreover, SLU students currently are required to write far less than their counterparts at other Jesuit institutions.)

  Consequently, we recommend that a second semester of writing be restored in the English Department. This would ensure that transfer students and those bringing in credits earned in high school for the first course will, in the second required course, receive appropriate instruction in the complex rhetorical practice that is fundamental to the Jesuit tradition SLU is seeking to reemphasize. Moreover, a second semester of composition at the foundational level will enhance and make more comprehensive the effort to accurately retool and assess the outcomes of the program—with more SLU students taking the course than at present.

2. Personnel in the UWP

Writing Program Administrator (WPA): The UWP has been managed effectively by a series of knowledgeable WPAs, and it is currently under excellent (and universally lauded) leadership. It

was not clear to us whether there is any explicit succession plan or renewable term limits on the position, but there have been enough well-trained individuals in the past decade for this not to have been a concern.

At the same time, it is important to understand that a WPA is not the equivalent of a course overseer who manages routine tasks such as scheduling and curricular offerings. Demands on WPAs' time are extensive, requiring oversight of teaching assistants, adjuncts, and tenure-line faculty assigned to writing courses; the continued monitoring and development of the curriculum; near-constant liaison work with a host of stakeholders; personnel management; reviews of teaching; communication with students; the setting and enforcing of policy; and program assessment, not to mention the usual faculty responsibilities of teaching, other service, and research. The energetic and positive outlook of the current WPA should not mask the need for significant support in the form of course release and administrative help (from specially-assigned TAs, secretaries, or professional administrators), along with the system of rotation, which apparently is the norm at present.

Adjunct faculty: The number of adjunct faculty members has decreased recently because of the new recruitment of tenure-track English Department faculty to teach writing courses. In the context of serious national problems with the increasing exploitation of non-tenure-track faculty, we support this effort, as long as adequate faculty-development opportunities exist to help those tenure-line faculty who have not taught composition before or have not done so recently under the direction of experts.

Adjunct faculty with whom we met seem to appreciate their assignments and are strongly committed to their work. However, although they receive a per-course payment above what is provided at all but one local institution, they receive no health benefits and are working at multiple institutions (sometimes teaching as many as seven courses per semester), and report being unable to provide the kind of sustained support for students (through office hours, participation in campus activities, etc.) common among full-time instructors. In many ways, they are "shadow" faculty who are not compensated for being part of the life of the campus. As a result, SLU is losing the opportunity to maintain faculty members who are part of the social and intellectual life of the campus in order to realize some (we would argue rather minimal) savings.

Part-time instructors are sometimes thought to be necessary in composition programs for

"flexibility" in case of enrollment fluctuations, because they have no guarantee of employment and only short-term contracts. *But there have been no cases at U.S. universities where such fluctuations have led to the dismissal of most or all non-tenure-track faculty on term*

appointments. Usually some level of attrition takes place annually among instructors, so that adjustments for flexibility can be made on both ends of the longevity scale.

Sensible planning will allow some adjunct faculty members to be given three- or five-year renewable-term, full-time appointments based on seniority, resulting in more dedication to their institutions, greater visibility among the faculty, and stronger, sustained contributions to their departments, writing programs, and, most importantly, to students.[2]

Graduate students: Students with support packages that allow them to teach in the UWP are well prepared and both excited by and committed to their courses. We heard nothing but positive comments about the support they receive. Some concerns were voiced about their abilities to teach to a multimodal assignment that is part of the curriculum, but there is considerable flexibility in the way they can orient this assignment and the modalities they can choose. There is also a need for stronger and more sustained shadowing of TAs, including class observations by the Composition faculty in addition to peer cross-observations. *However, these extra efforts will require the addition of faculty members in the area of writing studies.*

Recommendations:

- Establish clear processes and timelines for succession for the position of Director, and continue to ensure that anyone assuming that role has an advanced degree in writing studies or the equivalent in a related field. Consider appointing an Associate Director who will become familiar with the program and engage in it, succeeding the Director after an appropriate term or number of terms. Increase the material support for the current and future WPAs for this complex and demanding role, including more course release and administrative help.

- Calculate a threshold of risk for the vagaries of enrollment in the UWP sufficient to *create four full-time, benefitted, non-tenure-track positions, reducing the reliance on adjunct faculty.*

  These positions could be opened internally to qualified existing adjuncts (likely filled by the most senior, successful, and well-established among them), *resulting in a cohort that would be able to hold extended office hours, participate in work on the curriculum or assessment, and generally offer more student-centered support at an institution that promises as much to parents and recruits.*

[2] We have no specific recommendations for support of the writing faculty on the Madrid campus because Spanish government regulations provide employment protections and free health insurance.

Work with the union to revise the current employment contracts appropriately. Provide adequate office space and other, customary amenities for these new positions.

- Enhance the training in multimodal instruction for TAs, while allowing for other ways of teaching to meet the same outcomes, and develop ancillary materials that can also be used among tenure-track faculty newly teaching ENG 1900.

  Provide class observations routinely for all TAs, and increase shadowing and faculty support, including stronger oversight for syllabus and assignment development. Provide extended support from tenure-track composition specialists to accomplish these goals (see below on new faculty hires).

  As of now, there are not enough faculty members to accomplish these goals; we recommend that for now, a rotation system be developed to allow for other tenured members of the faculty (who now teach writing) to support this effort. Some type of compensation would be helpful. However, the addition of full-time, non-tenure track faculty members would support the WPA in this type of oversight and coaching.

3. The Writing Center

Currently the writing center (called "University Writing Services," or UWS) is administratively housed in Student Life rather than in academics and administered by a highly capable staff person who fully admits that she does not have the content expertise necessary to run a busy writing center. A qualified person was hired to supplement the Director's work as coordinator and provide some disciplinary expertise, but his qualifications were "accidental" and are not built or embedded permanently into the current structure or requirements for the position. He also has no particular status. The current staffing represents a significant shift after the previous director, who held a PhD in English, was let go because of budget reductions.

Everyone with whom we spoke agreed that the location and staffing of the UWS are problematic. Writing center administration is a fully-developed subfield of writing studies, with its own international organizations and conferences (the International Writing Centers Association, the European Writing Centers Association, the Middle-East/North Africa Writing Centers Association, etc.), along with its own journals and growing body of research and scholarship. The position requires expertise to organize complex activities such as the

appropriate, research-informed preparation of peer tutors and professional tutors and the like.

In fact, the Director of Academic Support recognizes the importance of this expertise and supports an embedded, professional position in writing center administration.

At present, there are 40 UWS tutors who work with over 7,000 students per year. This number will dramatically increase with the creation and implementation of a writing-intensive program, as writing centers are integral to the success of campus-wide writing initiatives. That a new faculty member be hired for this position—to complement the important support and collegial system already in place—is paramount for any number of efforts related to the new core.

Clearly, the UWS *is in need of a director who brings appropriate disciplinary expertise to the position and whose position is not readily eliminated during times of budget duress. Ideally, this person should, again, have expertise in writing centers and hold tenure in the Department of English.*

It is customary for a writing center to be appropriately housed in Academic Affairs, usually under the purview of the Provost. While writing centers serve the entire academic community, it is expected—and appropriate—for that leadership to have a tenure home in the Department of English and with a carefully-delineated, multiple reporting structure: that is, the writing center director reports to the Provost's office as well as to the Chair in English.

At the same time, and through productive conversation with the VP for Student Life, we recognize that there are other aspects of the Office of Student Life that, for the time being, provide helpful and significant support for UWS, including expertise in generating and analyzing large data sets about student characteristics and other information relevant to the advancement of writing abilities across the entire SLU student population.

Recommendations:

- *Mount a search for an advanced assistant*[3] *or tenured associate professor in the field of writing studies as a new Director of University Writing Services who would have a tenure home (again, preferably in English, given the likely pool of candidates) but report simultaneously to the Provost. In our individual conversations with the VP of Student Affairs and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, respectively, both were willing to work collaboratively to argue for this position. This colleague would also be expected to teach the course in peer tutoring, alternating, perhaps, with the pro seminar in writing for graduate students.*

[3] It will be important that this faculty member's scholarly and other credentials "count" towards tenure at SLU so that administrative imperatives do not risk that person's earning tenure.

- *For now, continue to house UWS in Student Life. However, as the WAC program is phased in (see below), relocate UWS – as an academic program supporting a set of academic initiatives across campus – into the same superordinate unit within Academic Affairs.*

4. Writing Across the Curriculum

Data from SLU's 2017 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement show that SLU students write significantly less during their academic careers than students at comparable institutions—and, to reiterate, *SLU students write less than do their counterparts at other Jesuit peer institutions.* (This is exacerbated by the significant number of AP and dual-credit students who are not required to take first-year writing and therefore may have minimal or no writing experience across their entire careers at SLU).

The statistics are common at colleges and universities that have not systematically woven writing into both general-education courses and courses in the major, assuming instead (and falsely) that students are "inoculated" as writers in a first-year composition course and need no further development.

In contrast, and as one might expect, fifty years of research in the field of writing studies has shown that writing is a highly developmental ability, requiring sustained attention, especially as students move into their majors and encounter unfamiliar genres and ways of producing and representing knowledge. The improvement of writing abilities continues throughout university education and well beyond it, especially as learners enter and adjust to new discursive communities defined by specific conventions and criteria for success. In this light, Jesuit institutions that hold to its educational traditions—or who wish to—have an advantage, perhaps a mandate, to provide this sustained practice.

For students to gain the skills and knowledge to produce the writing practiced in their disciplines, they must write regularly in courses both in general education and in the major, receiving some modest instruction and feedback there by discipline-based experts in those majors. These experiences build on the crucial abilities and awareness established in the foundational (first-year) writing course(s) in the English Department.

The UWP, under the leadership of the current program administrator in the Department of English, has developed a proposal for a writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC) program that we

strongly support. Although SLU tried to create grass-roots interest in WAC a number of years ago, the initiative failed to gain a foothold, in part because of inconsistent leadership and

minimal "buy in" across campus. Now, however, with the significant work underway to revise the core, *SLU has an opportunity to create meaningful and lasting change with the establishment of a program for writing in all courses and curricula.*[4] *Such a program, however, must be developed, institutionally "embedded," and supported.*

Decades of experience with WAC in the United States demonstrate that without sufficient administrative and curricular support, new programs lose their original impetus over time and eventually become "innovations set adrift" (White). For writing to become part of the culture of teaching and learning across the campus, *SLU will need to establish a permanent WAC program, directed by a national leader – a tenured faculty member--in this area*. The leadership for the program—complete with faculty-development opportunities, curricular oversight, assistance in course- and program-development, and a detailed plan for assessing the effects of the initiative—cannot be managed by pieces consisting of existing faculty members, a committee, or a staff person.

Rather, a fully-supported WAC program would have oversight for all cross-disciplinary, campus-wide activities (beyond first-year writing, which would still be the important foundational experience that it is, ideally with a second semester) aimed at improving students' writing competencies, including administrative alliances with the libraries, IT support, the professional schools, the Reinert Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning, and University Writing Services, with which it would need a solid administrative connection.

Examples abound of such alliances, such as the Howe Center for Writing Excellence at Miami University of Ohio, which provides tutorial support in a state-of-the-art writing center, campus-wide faculty development in writing across the curriculum, and assessment efforts to gauge the effectiveness of the reforms. We imagine that such an administrative alliance with the Writing Center would take place once the WAC program is established, so as not to disrupt existing operations.

In spite of the many strengths of the UWP, an academic department is not the best physical or symbolic place from which *cross-campus writing activities* beyond foundational courses should emerge and be managed. Most WAC programs across the United States have their own administrative structures and budgets, often with a direct reporting line to a Provost's office. In part, this independence is symbolic: *it places the effort at the center of the university and not in association with an English department, and it values these departments as specific disciplinary*

[4] We recognize that "programs" and "centers" usually have specific institutional meanings tied to funding,

research, and pedagogical, administrative, and other considerations. We are using the term "program" as a common designation, recognizing that a "center" might be the more appropriate name for the unit.

areas with their own body of content, methods of scholarship, outlets for disseminating new knowledge, and conventions of writing.

English departments also are sometimes erroneously viewed from the outside as having only a special interest in certain kinds of writing (literature, belle lettres, etc.) or, falsely, as preoccupied with grammar and other basic skills of writing. Moreover, if a WAC program is located in the English department, the perception prevails that writing is only an "English teacher issue." *While leadership of WAC programs traditionally and legitimately comes from English, WAC nonetheless must prove to be and be visible as a campus-wide commitment beyond the foundational courses within the department.* (Similarly, the eventual location of the writing center within academic affairs would also debunk the myth that the center's work is "just remedial.")

All this does not mean, however, that the director of such a program would not him- or herself have a disciplinary orientation and tenure home. It is essential that the person leading the effort have academic credentials and an academic position for there to be respect for the initiative across campus. There is now considerable Ph.D. preparation in the study and pedagogy of writing in the disciplines, which should be one of the desired characteristics of applicants. *No search will yield a strong pool nationally unless provisions are made for a* de facto *tenure home for the hire; again, given the national pool of candidates with preparation in WAC, this is likely to be the English Department*.[5] To reiterate, the director could support graduate-student coursework and TA preparation, especially in digital technologies.

For obvious reasons, there is interest in the improvement of students' writing *ability*. Yet scholarship on WAC also strongly supports the use of writing as a powerful tool to improve student learning. Initially, it is easier to attract faculty members to the idea that they are improving their students' *learning of content* when writing is woven into instruction (including lower-stakes writing activities) than to start by telling them they need to "teach" writing in their subject-matter courses in order to build "skills."

In fact, the single strongest deterrent to a healthy WAC program is lack of shared understandings and methods among diverse faculty members teaching in different disciplines. Those involved in WAC are not alone in their concern that faculty in many disciplines look upon the prospect of paying more attention to communication as an "add-on," or an additional set of

[5] The provision of a tenure home for a director should not reduce the number of positions requested by the English Department in its current hiring plan. Furthermore, it should be clear in the negotiations and in the

contractual arrangements that the new hire will have central responsibilities in his or her capacity as director of the program. The letter of offer for this position should also be clear about the administrative nature of the job, the length of administrative term (and procedures for its review and renewal), and the reporting lines.

responsibilities and content "layered" over existing, already burdensome amounts of course coverage. This concern is often responsible for the creation of limited additional "intensive" requirements, isolated in specific, designated courses or programs, *when the real solution is for every teacher in every course to provide at least some systematic experience in and support for writing.*

Students should receive a clear message everywhere they go at SLU that writing is valued, important, and assigned, and, for SLU, that it supports the mission of creating principled, critically thoughtful rhetoricians and communicators—*as is delineated in the Jesuit educational tradition.* Ideally, and again, these broader perspectives and strategies will need support through a WAC program directed by a national leader in the field.

The details of the current proposal from the current WPA, which focuses on the establishment and maintenance of writing-intensive courses, will need to be further developed. The long-term challenge of this initiative will be to help faculty members understand that writing is not an intrusion on their already full courses and curricula; that they are not being called upon to support another "unfunded mandate"; and that with some attention to pedagogy, writing activities can usually enhance the learning experience for students.

In addition, it will be important to develop broader models of WAC so as not to silo writing into specific courses—this in spite of the structure of a WI requirement. For example, the WEC (writing-enriched curriculum) model does not isolate writing experiences into a few WI courses but enjoins departments to create writing plans for their majors, implement those plans, and assess the results (see Anson; Anson and Dannels; Anson, Carter, Dannels, and Rust).

Recommendations:

- Establish a University-wide WAC program. This program would have in its purview all campus-wide activities *beyond first-year composition* that are associated with the cross- curricular integration of writing: faculty development, student support (eventually including the Writing Center), curricular development, departmental consulting, and University-wide assessment of writing abilities. The program would need national leadership from a director provided with a tenure home and hired in a faculty rank.

  Additional associate director(s) could be added as the program develops, including the Director of the Writing Center. The many activities of such a program—such as scheduling events, managing documents and data, arranging committee meetings, reserving rooms for

activities, arranging the travel and scheduling of guest presenters, and so on—should be supported by administrative staff hired to serve it. It should have good space and a budget sufficient to fund faculty stipends for sustained work on course revision; special events;

perhaps a grant program for departmental work on writing; visiting speakers and workshop leaders; and some level of secretarial support.

- Establish a University-wide writing board within the new WAC program, with representatives from all the colleges, student support services, the library, IT, the Reinhart Center, and other relevant stakeholders—perhaps even a member of the Board of Trustees. As the WI program is established, this board could serve as reviewers of course proposals to ensure that they meet the requirements for certification as WI courses. It could also promote writing more generally if a WEC model is pursued.

- Consider a departmentally-focused model of outcomes development, implementation, and assessment of writing in addition to the WI requirement. Require departments to report on their progress annually. Provide support in the form of course release to faculty assigned major responsibilities for overseeing departmental efforts.

  Eventually, even if this program becomes robust and widespread, the campus-wide oversight and support should help to sustain and ensure the embeddedness of the initiative as a whole.

5. The Madrid Campus

We had only a brief opportunity to Skype with the director of the writing program on the Madrid campus. The relationship between the two programs is another example of exemplary collegiality. Clearly, the Madrid campus provides a somewhat different set of challenges for the teaching of writing because of its mixed student population and their more diverse language histories.

However, both campus writing programs have valiantly aligned their curricula (with the exception of the themed 1900 courses), so that SLU students who study in Madrid receive the same course preparation, driven by the same set of outcomes, that they would at home, and students enrolling from Spain or other countries experience a course similar to what they would experience in St. Louis. The program is run by a seasoned director who has been on the campus for many years. Because of the distance of the campus, occasionally there are lapses in communication, but the collegiality and good work of colleagues at both campuses keep alignments fresh.

Recommendations:

Increase routine communications between the two UWPs, perhaps using digital technology to track and share discussions of curriculum, assessment, and so forth. This will be especially

important as the new core is established. Provide opportunities for a new WAC director on the St. Louis campus to travel to Madrid for purposes of faculty development, and/or send a national WAC expert to do the same.

6. Assessment

SLU believes that "a hallmark of Ignatian spirituality and pedagogy is the iterative cycle of critical self-examination, reflection and action" (Office of the Provost). The current WPA and his colleagues have made strong headway towards an accountable system of assessment in keeping with this philosophy. For example, for several years, they have been collecting random samples of student essays and analyzing the papers with a course-level rubric. These analyses have revealed some mismatches with the program's student learning outcomes, suggesting a simultaneous revisiting of the outcomes and work on teacher and course development. Further analyses of paper samples, including the challenging *Dissoi Logoi* assignment, have also provided excellent data about student success writing the different genres assigned in ENG 1900.

The UWP acknowledges that there is other work to do. We support the continued, direct assessment of student writing. For example, a portfolio program—more ambitious and requiring careful planning—could become an excellent means of longitudinal data collection.

If provided with sufficient support, the UWP could also conduct some indirect assessments to provide formative information for program improvement. For example, instructor surveys can collectively offer an index of satisfaction with student writing or progress in different courses. Student reflections, administered as part of concluding coursework, can provide information about the quality of students' meta-level awareness of their own development.

The creation of a WAC/WID program will require much more robust efforts at institution-wide assessment of student writing (again, suggesting the need for a full-time director of such an initiative). The WI approach will require continuous assessment of student learning outcomes across multiple courses and disciplines. A more localized WEC approach requires departmental-level assessments to gauge the extent to which the department is reaching its writing-related learning outcomes (see Anson). Other work with departments may require instructor surveys; analyses of types and amounts of writing; outcomes-focused curricular grids showing the strength with which each outcome is associated with which required and elective courses; and direct assessment of student writing using whatever assessment method the department

chooses. Because continuous assessment is at the core of the sustainability of a WAC/WID program, we cannot overemphasize the importance of this work (see Cox, Galin, and Melzer).

Recommendations:

- Extend assessments from those that are direct to those that are survey-based.

- Consider that the development of a writing-across-the-curriculum program will demand further, more expansive forms of assessment, supporting further the argument for professional expertise at the writing center and in the leadership of the WAC program, both of whom would work collaboratively with those leading the foundational courses in the Department of English.

- Partner with the university assessment coordinators to collect data for correlational analysis of outcomes assessment with other indices of student status and achievement. Seek support from the office of assessment for direct assessment of student writing, but recognize that the expertise for the design and analysis of such assessments lies with the writing experts.

7. Development

Enhanced attention to students' writing is, put simply, a highly fundable initiative. Dozens of institutions across the country have attracted private and corporate donors who believe that the future workforce (as well as an informed citizenry) requires strong writing and communication abilities.

As we noted earlier, among all the desired characteristics of new hires, many corporate surveys place oral and written communication (and skills of teamwork often enhanced by collaborative writing and peer review) *first on the list*.[6] Private donors often credit their financial and occupational success with the development of their writing abilities and the centrality of a rhetorical education such as what is promised at SLU.[7] We understand that Development offices have their priorities; we hope that by coordinating with the Development office, along with the contextual knowledge of those at SLU, writing can become one of these priorities.

[6] Hundreds of employer surveys ranking desired characteristics of new hires have consistently placed writing and communication skills at the top of their lists. A recent survey administered by Burning Glass, Inc., found that "writing, communication skills, and organizational skills are scarce everywhere. These skills are in demand across nearly every occupation—and in nearly every occupation they're being requested far more than you'd expect based on standard job profiles. Even fields like IT and Engineering want people who can write" (Burning Glass, 2015).

[7]We recommend studying the history of the writing-focused gifts at Miami of Ohio, Rice University, the University of Michigan, Clemson University, the University of Minnesota, and Cornell, for starters.

Recommendation:

Work with members of the upper administration and colleagues in Development to make writing a development priority, write a funding prospectus for support of the WAC program and/or Writing Center, and ensure that it is among the initiatives presented to potential donors who are not already determined to fund something else.

Orient the prospectus toward the values potential donors associate with SLU, including the place of rhetoric, accountable argument, and strong, able writing in the Jesuit tradition.

Conclusion

We came away from our visit to SLU with admiration for what the UWP is accomplishing in its provision of first-rate writing instruction to thousands of SLU students. We cannot emphasize strongly enough the importance of this work in the University's overall mission; we would argue that the kinds of advanced, college-level literacies it is providing stand at the center of students' education and are essential to their retention, success, and completion and to their career performance and advancement.

In addition, this work directly supports SLU's Jesuit mission in what one person with whom we spoke described as "the ability to think ethically and argue well and understand agon *in healthy and functional communities."* Moreover, writing, argument, and reason are heralded in the Jesuit tradition as *part of "respect for intellect and reason for discovering truth."*

We are sincere in commenting that the faculty, administrators, staff, and graduate students in the UWP are strongly committed to their work, which they conduct in a context of mutual respect, collaboration, and outreach. The recommendations in this report will, we believe, strengthen the operation of the UWP as well as the role of writing across the entire institution.

We wish to thank the many people who took time from their busy schedules to meet with us, who made our visit so enjoyable, and who saw to our every need. It was a pleasure working with so many dedicated faculty and staff and participating briefly in the intellectual life of the campus.

References

Anson, Chris M. "Assessing Writing in Cross-Curricular Programs: Determining the Locus of Activity." *Assessing Writing* 11 (2006): 100-112.

Anson, Chris M., and Deanna P. Dannels. "Profiling Programs: Formative Uses of Assisted Descriptions in the Assessment of Communication Across the Curriculum." *Across the Disciplines* 6 (2009), http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/assessment/anson_dannels.cfm

Anson, Chris M., Michael Carter, Deanna Dannels, and Jon Rust. "Mutual Support: CAC Programs and Institutional Improvement in Undergraduate Education." *Journal of Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 6.3 (2003): 26-38.

Burning Glass Technologies. *The Human Factor: The Hard Time Employers Have Finding Soft Skills*. Boston: Burning Glass Technologies, 2015. http://www.burning-glass.com/wp-content/uploads/Human_Factor_Baseline_Skills_FINAL.pdf

Cox, Michelle, Jeffrey R. Galin, and Dan Melzer, *Sustainable WAC: A Whole-Systems Approach to Launching and Developing Writing Across the Curriculum Programs*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2018.

White, Edward M. "The Damage of Innovations Set Adrift: Change for the Worst." *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin*, 43.3 (1990): 3-5.

Appendix A: Brief Biographies of the External Evaluators

Dr. Chris Anson is Distinguished University Professor, Alumni Association Distinguished Graduate Professor, and Director of the Campus Writing and Speaking Program at North Carolina State University, where he teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in language, composition, and literacy and works with faculty across the curriculum to reform undergraduate education in the areas of writing and speaking. Before joining NCSU in 1999, he spent fifteen years at the University of Minnesota, where he directed the Program in Composition from 1988-96 and was Professor of English and Morse-Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor. He received his Ph.D. and second M.A. in English with a specialization in composition studies from Indiana University, his first M.A. and B.A. from Syracuse University.

Dr. Anson has received numerous awards, including the North Carolina State University Alumni Association Distinguished Graduate Professor Award, the State of Minnesota Higher Education Teaching Excellence Award, the Morse-Alumni Award for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education, and the Minnesota Governor's Star Service Award. He is a member of the Academy of Outstanding Teachers at NCSU. He was an NCTE Promising Researcher Award Finalist and has been a PI or co-PI on over $2.1 million in grants.

Dr. Anson has published 16 books and over 125 journal articles and book chapters and is on the editorial or reader's boards of a number of journals, including *College Composition and Communication*, *College English*, *Research in the Teaching of English*, *Across the Disciplines*, *Written Communication*, *Assessing Writing*, and *The Journal of Writing Assessment*. He has recently published a co-edited collection of essays on the transfer of writing knowledge and ability across contexts. He has given over 550 conference papers, keynote addresses, and invited lectures and faculty workshops across the U.S. and in 31 other countries.

Dr. Anson has served as Chair of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (2011-14; Chair, 2013) and as President of the Council of Writing Program Administrators (2002-2005) and spent seven additional years on the WPA Executive Board. He has also served on the CCCC Executive Committee (1993-96 and 2011-14) and 11 other CCCC committees, as well as several NCTE committees. He chaired the NCTE Assembly for Research in 1992-3 and was program co-chair of the NCTE Global Conference on Language and Literacy in Utrecht, Netherlands. He chaired the WPA Task Force on Plagiarism and the WPA Task Force on Internationalization, and formed the MMLA's Writing-Across-the-Curriculum section.

His full c.v. is located at **http://www.ansonica.net**

Dr. Deborah H. Holdstein

Deborah H. Holdstein is Professor of English (and currently Associate Chair) in the Department of English and Creative Writing at Columbia College Chicago. She is a former editor of the premier journal in composition and rhetoric, *College Composition and Communication.*

For seven years (2007-2014), Holdstein served as Dean of the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Columbia, and from 2005-2007 was Chair of the Department of English at Northern Illinois University. Before that, she was Professor of English and Faculty Assistant to the Provost at Governors State University and developed and chaired the institution's graduate council, directed the writing program, and coordinated study in English. Holdstein holds the B.A. in English and French from Northwestern University and the A.M. and PhD in Comparative Literature from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where she also trained in composition and rhetoric.

Holdstein has published numerous books and has published widely in such journals as *Pedagogy* (Duke University Press), *College Composition and Communication, and College English.* Her current research involves the influence of *conversos* on the early Jesuit order and their imprint on Jesuit approaches to rhetoric and education.

In addition to her scholarly work, she has written or co-written numerous textbooks, including *Who Says?* (now in its second edition), *Food: A Reader for Writers*, and the 2019 imprint *Methods of Argument*, all with Oxford University Press. Another volume, *The Oxford Reader,* is in preparation. An early adopter of technologies, her first monograph was *On Composition and Computers,* published by the MLA in 1987. She regularly presents at conferences nationally and internationally, and she has been part of the founding group in Jesuit Rhetoric for the International Society for the History of Rhetoric.

In addition to serving on numerous committees, serving as an Officer of the organization, and having been elected to several terms on the executive committee of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Holdstein was appointed for two terms on the eight-member Publications Committee of the Modern Language Association, representing composition and rhetoric. For eleven years, she served as Director of the Consultant-Evaluation Service of the Council of Writing Program Administrators, and she continues to be an active consultant to colleges and universities in areas related to the humanities.

Appendix B: Visit Schedule

CWPA Consultor-Evaluator Visit
February 4-6, 2019

Sunday, February 3, 2019

6:00 pm:	Dinner with Paul Lynch (WPA), Toby Benis (Chair)--Mangia

Monday, February 4, 2019

8:00 am:	Breakfast with incoming/outgoing WPAs: Nathaniel Rivers, Jan McIntire-Strasburg, Vince Casaregola, Café Ventana
9:15 am:	Meeting with Kelly Herbolich, Director of Academic Support
10:00 am:	Open Forum with Adjunct Faculty
11:00 am:	Break
11:30 am:	Meeting with Kent Porterfield, VP for Student Life
12:15 pm:	Meeting with Madrid Faculty via Skype
1:00 pm:	Lunch with R/C graduate students
2:15 pm:	Meeting with CAS Dean Christopher Duncan
3:00 pm:	Open forum with Graduate Instructors
3:45pm:	Tour of CAI Labs with Dr. Nathaniel Rivers
4:00 pm:	Open forum with tenure-line faculty members
5:00pm	Back to Hotel
	Working Dinner for Consultant-Evaluators

Tuesday, February 6, 2019
Back to airport in morning…

Appendix C: About the Consultant-Evaluator Service of the Council of Writing Program Administrators

The Council of Writing Program Administrators is a national association of college and university faculty with professional responsibilities or interests as directors of writing programs. Operating on a method similar to regional accreditation agencies, WPA evaluations have several stages. CWPA requests a written program self-study, sends a team of two trained consultant-evaluators to campus for interviews and on-site evaluation, and then compiles a final report. A six-month follow up report from the campus completes the process. The select panel of WPA consultant-evaluators comprises leaders in the field of composition. They come from four-year colleges, community colleges, and universities. All are experienced writing program administrators and recognized scholars with a national perspective on composition teaching and program administration; several are past presidents of the organization. As evaluators, their primary goal is to determine a program's unique strengths and weaknesses, not to transform all writing programs into their own. They recognize that every program must retain its individual character, serve a particular community, and solve special problems. The Director of this Program is Dr. Shirley Rose, Arizona State University. Dr. Rose reports on the C-E Program to the WPA Executive Board, which oversees its operation. Its associate director is Dr. Michael Pemberton, Director of the University Writing Center at George Southern University. WPA Website: www.wpacouncil.org

The Consultant-Evaluator Service also emphasizes its panel of evaluators' independence from the WPA leadership and others associated with the organization.