

Report of the SPU Curriculum Enrichment Task Force

Part 1 First-Year Curriculum

October 13, 2014

Members: Gaile Moe (Chair), Brian Bantum, Katherine Bartholomew, Christine Chaney, Brian Chin, Liz Gruchala-Gilbert, Don Holsinger, Kelly Marley, Karissa Pierce, Melani Plett, Todd Rendleman, Rebekah Rice, Andrew Ryder, Jacqui Smith-Bates, Rod Stiling (added September 2014)

Our charge:

“The Curriculum Enrichment Task Force will review the findings of the Writing Task Force Report and the Cultural Engagement Task Force Report and make recommendations for potential implementation. The mandate for the committee shall include recommendations for changes to and/or replacement of existing curriculum, including courses in the common curriculum and USEM. The Task Force may also make recommendations as needed related to changes in academic advising for freshmen.”

Executive Summary

The Curriculum Enrichment Task Force has been at work since Autumn Quarter 2013 reviewing the curricular changes recommended by our two predecessor task forces, Writing and Cultural Engagement (those recommendations are provided in Appendix 1 and 2). We have respectfully debated at length both the pros and cons of various implementation strategies to meet these recommendations, and have carefully weighed the evidence, such as currently exists, for the effectiveness of our present freshman year courses. We have finally come to a consensus about what we believe to be the best implementation plan that allows us to fully meet the recommendations of both task forces with only a nominal increase of one credit in the General Education courses.

Specifically, we recommend that the two new writing courses outlined in the Writing Task Force Report (WRI 1000 and WRI 1100) and a one credit fall quarter freshman University Colloquium be instituted in the SPU required common curriculum in place of University Seminar (USEM) and University Core 1000 (UCOR 1000), with follow-on recommendations to address cultural engagement beyond the first year, advising, assessment, and faculty training.

Arriving at this recommendation the committee agreed that three elements of our current first-year curriculum -- the writing program, USEM as it is currently constituted, and UCOR 1000 -- are not working effectively enough across all sections and for all students, based on available evidence (from the 2011 Writing Program Evaluation (Appendix 3), Assessment Committee, Associate Provost’s office, and our own evaluation of USEM syllabi). At the same time, new developments in higher-education research increasingly show the importance of first-year writing courses for robust learning across all disciplines and through to graduation.¹

Also, significantly, the proposed new writing courses will provide a substantial framework for first year **cultural engagement** learning in the curriculum, as well. This academic foundation will help provide one of the first cultural engagement threads to be woven throughout a student’s SPU education, as the Cultural Engagement Task Force recommends (Appendix 2). The proposed writing course objectives on digital, database, and library researching skills also dovetail with the more recent recommendations of the Digital Wisdom Task Force (Appendix 4).

Therefore, while we acknowledge the contributions of USEM and UCOR 1000 and concerns about these changes, we also believe the losses are mitigated by the significant academic improvement these new courses will provide to our first year students. We also believe that with these changes, the curriculum will still promote the value of studying the arts and of connecting students to that disciplinary context via the “Ways of Knowing/Arts.” However, we also note that if these potential curricular losses are still not seen to be sufficiently mitigated then a new follow-up task force should convene to address ways to reinstate elements of student learning still deemed necessary -- including in the area of the arts.

President Dan Martin has articulated new strategic goals and objectives for SPU in his new administration – and the very first one is “Academic Excellence and Relevance.” This goal asks for outcomes that “further academic rigor through high quality, well-resourced, and distinctive academic programs.” **In sum, then, and with that goal in mind we recommend replacing USEM and UCOR 1000 with WRI 1000 and WRI 1100 in order to implement the recommendations of both the Cultural Engagement and Writing Task Forces.** We believe this change will truly enrich our first year curriculum, by increasing academic rigor, promoting writing, critical thinking and learning, and establishing the curricular framework for cultural engagement for all students.

Recommendations in Brief

1. Implement the two new inquiry and writing courses (WRI 1000 and WRI 1100, each 5 credits) as recommended by the Writing Task Force, in place of USEM and UCOR 1000. WRI 1000, required either fall or winter quarter in the freshman year, will provide the curricular backbone for academic inquiry for all SPU students, focusing on the development of writing and critical thinking skills. WRI 1100, a research writing seminar course also required in the first year, will help students build on the basics of academic inquiry learned in WRI 1000 by incorporating the elements and standards of college-level research and writing within the context of a specific discipline.
2. Implement a new fall quarter freshman University Colloquium (one credit, P/NC) This new course will begin during freshman orientation and be completed prior to Thanksgiving, taught weekly by a dedicated cohort of faculty eager to engage with first year students around an appealing disciplinary topic, problem, or question. The course is designed to create “connection” and community along with inviting intellectual curiosity and engagement as a first step toward vocational and academic discernment in the freshman year. Colloquium faculty will also serve as the student’s academic advisor during fall quarter.
3. Implement a revised first-year advising model combining new informational and course planning sessions (subsequently referred to as “interest area advising groups”) hosted by related disciplinary sub-groups to supplement University Colloquium faculty mentoring and advising. In these new advising sessions, a small group of faculty will partner with one or two Academic Counselors to outline recommended course tracks and to answer specific questions about careers, majors, academic courses and other registration details. These interest area advising group sessions will provide students with needed practical information and one-on-one help, as needed. At the end of fall quarter students will then be transferred from their Colloquium professor and assigned to a pre-major faculty advisor complementary to their areas of interest (as indicated by intended major selection in Banner). All SPU undergraduate faculty members

(except those in their first year of employment) will be expected to advise first-year students under this model, as their major advising loads allow. The aim will be to distribute advising more equitably across the faculty, recognizing that faculty in our largest majors will advise fewer (if any) first-year students.

4. Hire a new full-time (1.0 FTE) Director of Campus Writing to develop and oversee all writing curricula, and assess all SPU student writing (including that of ESL and developmental students) through to graduation, as recommended in the Writing Task Force Report.
5. Bring specific recommendations to the faculty by February 2015 for implementing a Cultural Engagement curriculum that begins in the first year with content embedded in WRI 1000 (and possibly UFDN 1000), followed in the second year with embedded content in UCOR 2000, and finally with a requirement to complete one or two courses with an approved “CE” designation.
6. Provide the funding for robust faculty development around all new courses, programs, and advising.
7. Acknowledging the loss of USEM and UCOR 1000 we recommend that we follow implementation of this proposal with a thorough evaluation of the Common Curriculum as a whole.

Overview and Background

A few facts about our current SPU curriculum:

Less than one-third of our students take a standard college writing and research course before graduation. However, peer and comparable universities and many community colleges require a multi-course writing sequence for every student. For example, Seattle University, Pacific Lutheran University and North Seattle College each require a two-course sequence and Wheaton College requires three courses in composition, research and writing-based inquiry. Such instruction is considered a standard curriculum in higher education.

- The only such course that SPU offers (English 2201) was, until the 2013-14 academic year, a non-standard (and non-transferable) three credits instead of a full five.
- According to the 2011 Evaluation of Writing Requirements & Related Areas prepared by Tom Amorose, Professor of English and former Director of Campus Writing, writing instruction is inconsistent and “upside-down” with juniors and seniors receiving more instruction than first and second-year students.

In addition and despite the fact that one of the university’s signature commitments is to “be a place that understands and engages our multicultural and complex world,” SPU has never had an explicit academic requirement for exploring this diversity (including topics such as the dynamics of racial, ethnic and gender differences, structural inequalities, cultural competency, conflict resolution, community development and reconciliation).

How did we get here?

In the early 1970s, in response to pressures to increase SPU’s academic rigor, hard choices had to be made about the allocation of limited faculty teaching resources for writing instruction. Many universities across the country, under similar academic and financial pressures in that generation, shifted to adding a large cadre of dedicated

part- or full-time writing specialists to their campuses -- teachers who were not regular, tenure-track faculty members but rather ongoing Instructors or Lecturers in order to continue offering the standard college writing courses. This staffing solution was not ideal but the move was made so that those colleges would not lose universal writing instruction for all the students, one traditional backbone of the liberal arts curriculum. (Seattle University, University of Puget Sound, and Pacific Lutheran University are local examples of this decision.)

In response to that same resource pressure, SPU surrendered universal writing instruction. The 1974-76 SPU course catalog is the last one that required all students to take a dedicated college writing course. Open-ended expectations for writing instruction were instead spread across the General Education program (in varying courses) until the new Core Curriculum was instituted in the 1990s. Originally, in that new curriculum, USEM and UCOR 1000 included at least some writing assignments, but explicit training in college-level writing was never the main purpose of either course -- and it remains a limited and inconsistent element today. Finally, SPU's only form of universally assessing writing competency has remained until today its incoming high school placement threshold (emphasizing "college readiness") rather than verifiable college writing proficiency at graduation.

The importance of college writing

Many national higher education leaders are finding that increased college writing instruction is one of the single most effective ways to foster all learning in students. Several prominent leaders (such as Vincent Tinto) and books (such as *Academically Adrift* by Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa) articulate the need for writing instruction in clear and compelling language:

“[H]aving **demanding faculty who include reading and writing requirements in their courses** (i.e. when faculty require that students both read more than forty pages a week and write more than twenty pages over the course of a semester) is **associated with improvement in students' critical thinking, complex reasoning, and writing skills**.Even after we control for a range of individual attributes, including academic preparation, students...still improved their skills significantly more than did students lacking those experiences.” (Arum and Roksa 93-94)

Additionally, according to a 2010 survey conducted by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, 89% of surveyed employers want colleges to “place more emphasis” on written and oral communication, positioning this essential learning outcome at the top of 18 outcomes rated by employers. ⁱⁱ

We applaud the faculty members across SPU who care deeply about the issue of effective student learning through writing. In fact, data from the National Survey of Student Engagement collected spring 2012 show that our freshmen are significantly more likely to write and read more than students in CCCU and Carnegie comparable groups. However, this data also shows that they are less likely to revise papers and integrate ideas and information from multiple sources. Additionally, our *ad hoc* system of helping students learn writing and research skills is not effective and comprehensive for all SPU students, as the 2011 writing review indicated. These recommendations seek to redress these shortcomings.

In addition and fortuitously, recent advances in the cognitive sciences have also impacted the field of writing pedagogy, leading to a new and stronger academic consensus about writing's role in effective student learning

across all majors on campus. This emerging consensus particularly incorporates “transfer of learning” cognitive data findings.ⁱⁱⁱ In brief, this research has shown that students across all disciplines greatly benefit from freshman-year writing instruction that emphasizes rhetoric (such as in the new WRI 1000 and WRI 1100 courses). Through both reading and writing assignments, these newly-framed classes teach students to see what makes a *good research question*, what counts as a *claim*, what counts as *evidence*, and how to assess whether this information is *reliable*. And, in addition to gaining concrete research and inquiry skills, the classes help students become aware of writing strategies for various contexts in order to produce clear, analytic and persuasive academic arguments and to develop skills in proofreading, revising and editing. Through the process as a whole, students learn to become aware of themselves meta-cognitively as learners located in a particular context, as well. Rhetorical instruction such as this, therefore, “transfers” much more successfully into disciplinary learning for students as they move into major programs, the research has shown – far more than the traditional “English composition class” where basic writing and grammatical conventions were emphasized.

Academic advising

Finally, while the development of writing and inquiry skills are critical for student success and retention, the role of the faculty advisor should not be ignored. Our current system of academic advising for first-year students mandates that USEM faculty serve as faculty advisors throughout the first year and often into the sophomore year. While in many cases this model provides a durable connection between our new students and a faculty member, it places a high burden on USEM faculty, especially those who teach the course year after year. In October 2013, advising loads ranged from a high of 70 (for a USEM faculty) to a low of 0. In a survey conducted in June 2012 by the Admissions, Advising and Retention Committee, results indicated that 55% of faculty agreed that the USEM advising model might work well for students but only 30% found that it worked well for faculty. Slightly more than half (51%) agreed that addressing the disparity in advising loads was necessary.

We acknowledge that SPU will remain with a faculty-advising model, given both our putative success with this model and that resources to change to an alternate professional advising model are not available. Improvements in our system, however, could result in a more even distribution of faculty advising loads, provide easier and better access to information about majors for students, and make better use of faculty advising time, training, and resources.

New frameworks for cultural engagement

As we have seen, the new writing pedagogy is a key building block for teaching students “academic inquiry” itself – that is, in many ways, “how to be a successful college learner.” But equally important, it also proves to be an ideal curricular structure for initiating the cultural engagement recommendations that were presented to the faculty spring of 2013. Cultural engagement, as the recommendation tells us, needs a solid academic foundation in the first year to help students begin to understand how identity and culture have shaped them as thinkers, learners, and believers. The metacognitive focus of the new WRI 1000 course provides an ideal foundation from which to begin to understand the social and cultural factors that shape identity. In fact, one reason why freshman year writing courses are frequently adopted across the higher education landscape is that they provide such robust locations for global and local cultural inquiry and awareness.^{iv} Therefore, we recommend that WRI 1000 (and when appropriate, WRI 1100) be seen as one necessary and important place from which the woven fabric of cultural engagement at SPU also emerges.

As the Cultural Engagement Task Force recommendation states, “cultural growth [is] a lifelong journey” that should be “integrate[d] throughout the student’s experience at SPU.” The goal of the CE requirement, as currently constituted, is to “introduce students to aspects of racial, ethnic, and gender difference as well as the structural injustices that are present in society.” The requirement also “seeks to promote a process of reflection and engagement (whether personal, social or political) toward becoming people of wisdom that can be cultivated throughout students’ lives.” Achieving these goals necessitates a multi-year template for weaving questions about identity and culture throughout the curricular, theological, and co-curricular programs. This comprehensive map for growth requires more than the first year curriculum enrichments alone.

Finally, these shared recommendations also help us to see more clearly the strong need to provide a universal and robust academic foundation for all students at the beginning of their college careers. In a white paper prepared by the provost’s office in the summer of 2013 as one framework for this task force, overarching goals for the freshman year for all students were delineated:

- Providing support for students to successfully transition from high school to college;
- Enacting a curriculum that encourages high standards and the support for students to achieve those standards;
- Teaching foundational set of academic and personal skills essential for college success;
- Creating connections between faculty, staff and other students.

We believe that this implementation plan fully meets those goals.

Recommendations in Detail

#1 Implement the two new inquiry and writing courses recommended by the Writing Task Force (WRI 1000 and WRI 1100) in place of USEM and UCOR 1000

WRI 1000: Academic Writing Seminar (5)

Explanation and Rationale:

WRI 1000 will be required either fall or winter quarter in the freshman year. This course, focusing on writing and critical thinking, provides the curricular backbone for academic inquiry at SPU for all students. It will be taught by a combination of regular English faculty members (or interested others) and a cohort of regular Instructors/Lecturers with specialized training in writing pedagogy, as is standard at most colleges and universities nationwide. It will use a standard shared syllabus, shared content around cultural engagement, and shared text(s). Student enrollment limited to approximately 20, freshman only (or transfers, as needed). Course goals and outcomes include:

- Understanding the basic elements of academic inquiry in both reading and writing at the university level -- identifying key ideas, formulating questions, evaluating evidence, and developing claims, including meta-cognitively understanding themselves as learners located in global-local culture..
- Understanding writing situations, strategies, and conventions.
- Practicing college-level composition, including sentence and paragraph-level writing conventions and the importance of revision for developing and deepening ideas.
- Summarizing and documenting sources (and avoiding plagiarism).

Example textbooks:

Understanding Rhetoric: A Graphic Guide to Writing (Bedford/St. Martin's, 2014)

Everything's An Argument (Bedford/St. Martin's, 6th ed, 2013)

From Inquiry to Academic Writing: A Practical Guide (Bedford/St. Martin's, 2012)

Writer's Help: A Bedford/St. Martin's Online Handbook.

<http://writershelp.bedfordstmartins.com/ebooks/helphandbook.php>

Acts of Inquiry (UW custom textbook)

WRI 1100: Inquiry or Research Seminar (5)

Explanation and Rationale:

WRI 1100, a research writing seminar course, will help students build on the basics of academic inquiry learned in WRI 1000 by incorporating the elements and standards of college-level research and writing within the context of a faculty member's area of interest. Like USEM (many of which could be adapted to meet WRI 1100 requirements), this content-rich course will be drawn from multiple disciplines. Students will learn to evaluate appropriate research materials and then use those materials in effective research writing. (See example assignment in the Natural Sciences from Seattle University.) The SPU librarians will partner with faculty to help

develop each course's discipline-specific research materials. However, all WRI 1100 sections will frame that content using a shared syllabus template with shared learning objectives, including cultural engagement where appropriate, and a shared set of foundational writing and inquiry assignments. Student enrollment would be limited to approximately 20, freshman only (or transfers, as needed).

Course goals and outcomes include:

- Understanding the elements, situations, and conventions of research writing at the university level, deploying them effectively within the course's particular disciplinary framework, and taking into account relevant implications for cultural engagement.
- Finding and evaluating academic sources of various kinds (including textual, database, and field research) – including a required library and “digital wisdom” component.
- Synthesizing research information accurately and effectively and summarizing from sources.
- Using research sources in writing a culminating, in-depth research paper or project. .

Example syllabi and assignments:

“Freshman Inquiry Seminar” (PLU)

Seattle University Core Curriculum diagram

Seattle University sample writing assignment from “Inquiry Seminar in the Natural Sciences”

Example textbooks:

They Say, I Say: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing (Norton, 2nd ed, 2012)

Staffing Specifics

Implementing these two new courses will require 68 sections at a minimum (34 sections for each of the two courses). However, we will also be eliminating 68 sections (34 USEM, 21 UCOR 1000 and 13 ENG 2201). While the WRI 1000 course will have to be taught by specialists – writing instructors (similar to those who teach ENG 2201), English and other interested faculty, the WRI 1100 courses will be taught by regular SPU faculty possibly including, but not limited to, current USEM and UCOR 1000 course instructors.

One possible staffing model for WRI 1000 is as follows:

34 sections per year, 20 students per section

8-10 sections from regular English faculty and interested others

2-3 sections from Director of Campus Writing (a full-time position)

13 sections from current ENG 2201 (this course will be eliminated)

8-11 sections require additional staffing

With this model, 21-24 sections (or 105-120 credits) are from instructors or adjuncts and not regular faculty. A half-time instructor in English with employee benefits might be expected to teach 20 credits or 4 courses. A full-time instructor would need to teach 35 credits or 7 courses. Thus, this model requires that we hire three full-time instructors or a mix of full-time, half-time and adjunct instructors.

UCOR 1000 is taught by five different departments – Art, Communications, English, Music, and Theater. The historical department contributions to UCOR 1000 are given below. We expect that the English teaching load devoted to UCOR 1000 will primarily migrate to WRI 1000.

Department	A 2009 - Sp 2014 Five Year Average	2013-14
Art	2.2	3
Communications	2.2	2
English	6.6	11
Music	6	7
Theater	1.2	2

#2 Implement a new fall quarter faculty freshman University Colloquium (one credit, P/NC).

The University Colloquium, offered fall quarter, is designed to introduce students to a disciplinary topic as well as to provide opportunities for connection and relationship with a regular SPU faculty member or administrator in the context of a weekly discussion-based seminar. In general, student attendance will be mandatory but, with the exception of weekly reading or activity assignments, homework and grading expectations will be minimal (graded P/NC). Colloquium faculty will be encouraged to help first year students to investigate big ideas related to the faculty member's discipline, research interests, or other relevant topics at a level appropriate to new college learners and through appropriate pedagogies. (Some draft sample University Colloquium course synopses are included in Appendix 5.) In addition, faculty will be encouraged to work with student mentors (ideally an upper-division student in the faculty member's major program) to help model academic community and intellectual curiosity and help students transition into college. Colloquium faculty will also serve as academic advisors to their students until a pre-major advisor is assigned at the end of fall quarter. In this capacity faculty will help students learn about SPU academic requirements, using the Banner system as a tool for understanding and managing one's academic career, and the role of the faculty advisor in a student's academic career. They will require students to attend one or more of the interest area advising groups described in the next section.

The course will begin during freshman orientation and end prior to Thanksgiving (approximately 8 sessions). Enrollment will be limited to 20 students. All faculty, academic administrators, librarians, and interested others will have the opportunity to offer a colloquia. Faculty will not receive additional compensation for teaching a University Colloquium, but it can count towards the standard 33 teaching credits required of most undergraduate faculty, or it may be considered a contribution to a faculty's university service requirement. Colloquium faculty who already have a full teaching load (as determined by their Deans) will be eligible to apply for additional Professional Development Funds.

Course goals and outcomes include:

- Introducing an interesting disciplinary topic through a combination of reading and/or activities and discussion, helping students begin the process of becoming college-level learners through both an academic and relational context.

- Providing an additional early connection with the SPU community through close interaction with a regular faculty member, fellow students, and an upper-division student mentor.

Providing initial academic advising and mentoring, including requiring student attendance at interest group sessions, reviewing course selections, and preparing the student for the ongoing SPU academic advising experience.

#3 Implement a revised first-year advising model combining interest group sessions with University Colloquium faculty mentoring and assignment to a faculty advisor by the end of autumn quarter.

During fall quarter, faculty members in various majors, departments, divisions, or interest area advising groups will provide information sessions for students, in partnership with Academic Counselors from Student Academic Services. During these sessions, students will have the opportunity to explore vocation by making connections between majors, minors, careers, and graduate or professional school information. Faculty and SAS staff members will present recommendations for course selection appropriate to the majors in each interest area, helping students decide which courses they need to take and in what recommended order (including all the Core, Exploratory, and major program requirements). Faculty and staff members will follow up that group presentation with one-on-one and table discussions further helping each first year student make specific course choices, as needed. (And while these information and course planning sessions are targeted at first-year students, other students could also attend if desired.) Additionally, first year students will be encouraged to attend more than one session in the ongoing process of major program and vocational discernment.

Possible interest areas include:

1. Science and Technology (sub-divided as needed)
2. Health Sciences
3. Policy, Law, Government Service, Social Justice and Social Services
4. Ministry and Missions
5. Business
6. Fine and Performing Arts
7. Design
8. Education
9. Humanities

Further details:

- University Colloquium faculty member will require that their freshman students attend one or more interest area advising session. The faculty member will also review course selections with students, provide feedback and remove the faculty advising hold as appropriate.
- Students will be assigned to a pre-major faculty advisor at the end of fall quarter. All SPU undergraduate faculty members (except those in their first year of employment) will be expected to advise first-year students, either as Colloquium faculty, interest session leaders, regular major (or pre-major) advisors – or a combination of all three.
- AAR will provide guidance for establishing a new advising model and integrating it with post first-year advising.

All faculty members will be provided training for thorough and effective advising with special attention to working with students who are undecided about choice of a major.

#4. Bring specific recommendations to the faculty by March 2015 for implementing a Cultural Engagement curriculum.

We anticipate that the recommendations we have already developed and will bring forward will include specific details about the following:

- a. Develop cultural engagement content in the Common Curriculum. This will include WRI 1000 with explicit content focused on students coming to understand themselves as learners located within global-local culture. Additionally, the Cultural Engagement Task Force suggested that UCOR 2000 be explored as a place for students to learn of global cultural issues and recommended that the course be adapted to focus more tightly on global cultural engagement. Other courses in the Common Curriculum may also contribute to meeting this requirement.
- b. Begin the process to implement a one or two course “CE” requirement for graduation. Determine which courses, experiences, and internships should carry the “Cultural Engagement” label required for graduation and under what framework(s) should they be so designated and approved. Examples of possible learning goals for courses with the CE designation are listed below.
 - Understanding patterns and histories of inequity – Students are introduced to the systemic and/or historical forces that create racial, ethnic, and/or gender inequality.
 - Understanding culture/s, dynamics of cultural and racial, ethnic and gender differences interpersonally and in society – Courses fulfilling this objective will focus on either a) self-understanding of their racial/ethnic/gender identity not only as an individual, but also within the larger cultural context or b) will examine non-dominant cultures (open to discipline-specific sources and methods) giving particular attention to racial/ethnic/gender-specific cultural expressions or other specific challenges, histories, or methods.
 - Preparing students for vocations with cultivation of diverse workplaces, conflict resolution, peacemaking, and community development – Students are introduced to ways of navigating diverse workplaces with cultural competency, trained in skills of conflict resolution, and/or learn ways to identify effective methods of cultivating diverse environments, community needs and development strategies, and strategies to advocate for the poor, dispossessed, or marginalized.
 - Articulating reconciliation as participation in God's reconciling work in the world – Students examine how the process of identifying patterns of inequality, developing a self-understanding of one’s cultural history and present, developing skills of peacemaking and/or justice all contribute to God’s reconciling work with and in the world.
- c. Identify how to strengthen curricular and co-curricular collaborative efforts to infuse cultural engagement in the SPU undergraduate experience.

#5 Hire a new full-time (1.0 FTE) Director of Campus Writing to develop and implement a new writing program and assess the effectiveness of this program to improve writing and learning in all SPU students (including those of ESL and developmental students) through to graduation, as recommended in the Writing Task Force Report. The Director of Campus Writing will report to the Office of Academic Affairs.

#6 Provide required initial training for faculty teaching WRI 1000, WRI 1100, the University Colloquium, and CE courses followed by required additional training as updates.

As stated above, training for WRI 1000 and WRI 1100 is the responsibility of the Writing Director, along with any other faculty development related to writing instruction. Diversity and cultural engagement training, along with oversight of the University Colloquium will be coordinated by the General Education Director..

#7 Acknowledging the loss of USEM and UCOR 1000, we recommend that the university follow implementation of this proposal with a thorough evaluation of the Common Curriculum as a whole.

Estimated Financial Costs

According to the Office of the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs, the full cost to operate this program is \$185,000 to \$200,000. However, the University is already incurring much of this cost with the provision of USEM, UCOR 1000 and the current writing program. New costs are estimated at \$65,000 to \$75,000 and include additional sections by adjunct writing instructors, faculty training and assessment of the program and student writing. If two new full-time writing instructors (instead of adjuncts) are employed, the cost increases by approximately \$100,000.

Overall New Proposed Freshman Year Curriculum Options

Track 1: Student takes WRI 1000 autumn quarter

Autumn quarter: WRI 1000, WK and/or major requirements, University Colloquium

Winter quarter: WRI 1100, UFDN 1000 (*or spring*), WK or major requirements

Spring quarter: WK and/or major requirements

Track 2: Student takes WRI 1000 winter quarter

Autumn quarter: UFDN 1000 (*or winter or spring*), WK and/or major requirements, University Colloquium

Winter quarter: WRI 1000, WK and/or major requirements

Spring quarter: WRI 1100, WK and/or major requirements

ⁱ Several examples include R.T. Kellogg, "Training Writing Skills: A Cognitive Developmental Perspective," *Journal of Writing Research*, 2008. 1, 1, pp 1-26 and J.E. Zull, *The Art of Changing the Brain: Enriching the Practice of Teaching by Exploring the Biology of Learning*, Sterling, Va: Stylus, 2002. A fuller list of references can also be found in John C. Bean, *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011 as well as through the website of the University of Washington's Expository Writing Program. See also Appendix 6: Bibliography: Knowledge Transfer and Composition compiled by Dr. Anis Bawarshi, Director of Expository Writing, University of Washington

ⁱⁱThis 2010 study conducted by AAC&U is cited in A. Finley "Making Progress? What We Know About the Achievement of Liberal Education Outcomes" pp 1-4. Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2012.

ⁱⁱⁱ See ⁱ above.

^{iv} See ⁱ above.

^v This is a standard element of higher education writing pedagogy today. See any recent volume of *College English*, the website of the National Council for the Teaching of English (ncte.org), or the current most-commonly-adopted college writing textbooks in the United States such as *From Inquiry to Academic Writing* (Boston: Bedford/St.Martin's, 2012) or *They Say/I Say: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing* (New York: Norton, 2012).