



UNIVERSITY OF
REGINA

Meeting the Challenge:
Academic Reading and Writing
in the Faculty of Arts

Report of the Dean's Task Force on Reading and Writing
Faculty of Arts
May 2004

Table of Contents

Table of Contents ii

Executive Summary iv

List of Recommendations v

Background 1

Introduction 3

The Transition from the Secondary School System to University 8

 Recommendations 10

Reading and Writing: First Year and Beyond..... 11

 Reading and Writing Across the Disciplines in the Faculty of Arts: An Integrated
 Program 12

 Required First-year English Courses..... 13

 Upper-Level Reading and Writing Courses..... 15

 Writing-Intensive Courses 17

 Recommendations 19

Reading and Writing for Undergraduate and Graduate Students Who Speak English as a
 Second Language..... 21

 Recommendations 23

Reading and Writing for Indigenous Students..... 24

 Recommendation 26

The Role and Place of a Centre for Academic Reading and Writing..... 28

 Recommendations 29

Resources and Implementation..... 31

 Recommendations 32

Conclusion..... 34

Bibliography 35

Appendices..... 37

 Appendix I: Individuals Interviewed by the Task Force 38

 Appendix II: List of Written Submissions to the Task Force 39

Appendix III: Luther College's English and Science Group	40
Appendix IV: WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition	42
Appendix V: Reading and Writing Centres at Other North American Institutions	45
Appendix VI: Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Administration	52

Executive Summary

The Dean's Task Force on Reading and Writing was created in response to a recommendation in *We Who Serve*, the Faculty of Arts planning document ratified in December 2003, and was designed to address concerns about the quality of student competencies in academic reading and writing in the Faculty. The Task Force heard from interested parties both within and outside the Faculty and the University and considered carefully a number of ideas relating to this issue. This Report emphasizes that student success in reading and writing is grounded in an ongoing and extensive engagement with language and text. The focus on reading and writing should not be limited to required first-year courses in English, but should remain constant throughout a student's degree program across the disciplines and at all levels. The recommendations of this Report deal comprehensively with the challenges of this approach and the supports that should be made available for both faculty and students to meet such challenges successfully. At the heart of these recommendations are the revision of student degree requirements, including the creation of new courses and the designation of writing-intensive courses; support for the creation of a University-wide English language centre geared specifically to the needs of those for whom English is second language; the establishment of a Faculty of Arts Centre for Academic Reading and Writing; acknowledgment and celebration of faculty and student achievements in academic reading and writing; and collaboration with others inside and outside the University who have a shared interest in questions of academic reading and writing. The Task Force concludes that many of the resources needed to fulfill its recommendations are already in place within the Faculty; however, some new resources will be required. But if these resources are committed to the goal of enhancing student capabilities in academic reading and writing, there will be tangible benefits to both the Faculty of Arts and the students it serves.

List of Recommendations

1. Create a liaison committee composed of members of the Faculty of Arts and representatives of the secondary school system to deal in an ongoing way with issues of transition from secondary schools to university as this relates to questions of academic reading and writing.
2. Consider the creation of student cohorts in the Faculty of Arts.
3. Establish a committee to examine offering UNIV 100 as a three-credit hour course that would be available as an elective for all students enrolled in the Faculty of Arts and would serve as a required course for students who choose to participate in a cohort.
4. Renumber ENGL 100 so that it becomes ENGL 100A and ENGL 100B. ENGL 100A would, like the current ENGL 100, consist of two-thirds literature and one-third composition. ENGL 100B would consist of one-third literature and two-thirds composition. ENGL 100A or ENGL 100B would be the prerequisite for ENGL 110 and ENGL/HUM 111.
5. Create a new three-credit hour course, ENGL/HUM 111 (Reading and Writing in the Humanities and Social Sciences). The specific content of the course would be determined by the English Department in consultation with other departments in the Faculty of Arts. ENGL/HUM 111 would be administered by the Department of English but sections of it could be taught by instructors in other departments. Prerequisites: ENGL 100A **or** ENGL 100B.
6. Create two new courses, HUM 240 (Reading and Writing in the Humanities) and SOST 240 (Reading and Writing in the Social Sciences). These two courses would carry on where ENGL 111 left off. Prerequisite: ENGL 110 or ENGL/HUM 111. Enrollment in these courses should be kept low, between 16 and 20.
7. Explore the possibility of offering ENGL 100B over two semesters in recognition of the fact that all students do not, or cannot, acquire reading and writing competencies at the same rate.
8. Require ENGL 100A or ENGL 100B **and** either ENGL 110 or ENGL/HUM 111 within core requirements of the Bachelor of Arts degree.
9. Require that ENGL 100A or ENGL 100B **and** either ENGL 110 or ENGL/HUM 111 be successfully completed within the first 60 attempted credit hours.
10. Require students to fulfill **one** of three 'writing-intensive' options to complete a Bachelor of Arts degree.
11. Invite all departments to designate appropriate upper-level courses as 'writing-intensive courses.' When approved by the Faculty of Arts, such courses should be

included in Option 2 of Recommendation 10. Approximately the same amount of writing should be required in all courses designated by the Faculty as 'writing-intensive,' the exact amount of writing to be recommended by an implementation committee in consultation with all departments.

12. Provide resources and support, in the form of workshops, seminars and training, for instructors teaching HUM 240, SOST 240, and writing-intensive courses, with the details of this support to be worked out by an implementation committee after consultation with the Faculty and the Teaching Development Centre.
13. Continue to engage senior administration in the designing of support systems for international undergraduate and graduate students and to fully implement Goal 5, Internationalization, of the 2002-2006 *Framework*. This should be done in close collaboration with the English as a Second Language Program, International Student Services and Exchanges, and other faculties and units.
14. Urge that serious consideration be given to the establishment of an English Language Support Centre for undergraduate and graduate students. This could be part of the larger initiative already in place within the International Student Services and Exchanges.
15. Discontinue ENGL 090 and ENGL 091 in light of the recommendations involving UNIV 110, ENGL 100 and 110, whereby the range of options at the first-year level for the fulfillment of the degree reading and writing requirements in the Faculty of Arts is to be expanded. This new range of options will be structured to ensure that the distinctive needs of Indigenous students that were addressed by ENGL 090 and ENGL 091 will be more effectively met under the new requirements.
16. Create a permanent Centre for Academic Reading and Writing in the Faculty of Arts that would function as a truly faculty-wide initiative and resource. It should be located in a prominent location such that its visibility and accessibility are maximized and should complement existing programs. It would provide support for students and faculty engaged in the delivery of reading and writing requirements, and undertake research with regard to issues posed by 'writing across the curriculum,' particularly with respect to new courses such as the proposed HUM 240 and SOST 240, the writing-intensive courses, and courses designed by departments specifically to provide opportunities to develop reading and writing capabilities. The Centre would also function more comprehensively as a resource for faculty as they work to integrate writing into their courses, and students as they respond to these initiatives.
17. Appoint a paid, full-time co-ordinator to provide strong leadership of the Centre on issues of academic reading and writing.
18. Establish an advisory board for the Centre, the members of which could include representatives from the Department of English, the English as a Second Language Program, the First Nations University of Canada, Luther and Campion Colleges, the Saskatchewan secondary school system, and other faculties at the University.

19. Establish as part of the Centre a student writing clinic with an on-line component to provide advice about grammar, style and composition.
20. Impress upon senior administration the urgency of continuing University support, both financial and otherwise, for essential initiatives concerning reading and writing issues as they are addressed through the Centre.
21. Provide appropriate recognition of faculty innovations in the teaching of academic reading and writing.
22. Undertake initiatives to recognize student writing and so encourage students to more fully value their writing experiences. These could include the establishment of a journal of student writing, graduate and undergraduate, and the provision of assistance to students to help them construct writing portfolios. In addition, the Faculty should organize at the earliest convenience a symposium on student writing. Faculty of Arts alumni could serve as prospective reading and writing mentors for students who need assistance in more fully developing and successfully exercising their capabilities.
23. Organize, during the year following the release of this Report, a Faculty-wide colloquium on academic reading and writing that would provide a forum for the discussion of relevant issues and the opportunity to highlight teaching initiatives.
24. Establish links with other units across the University currently responding to issues of academic reading and writing.
25. Identify resources both inside and outside the Faculty of Arts that are required to support the initiatives suggested in this Report.
26. Assign responsibility for implementation of the recommendations of this Report to a committee within the Faculty of Arts.

Background

The Dean's Task Force on Reading and Writing was created in January 2004 in response to Recommendation A8 of *We Who Serve*, the faculty plan ratified by Faculty Council in December 2003. This recommendation emerged from the faculty planning process, during the course of which several individuals who made presentations before the faculty planning body indicated a concern with student competencies and capabilities in the area of reading and writing. The issue was deemed sufficiently important to warrant independent examination outside the overall planning process.

The original membership of the Task Force included six members from the Faculty of Arts: Dr. Phillip Hansen, Department of Philosophy and Classics (Chair); Dr. Nils Clausson, Department of English; Dr. Allison Fizzard, Department of History, Campion College; Dr. Andrew Stubbs, Department of English; Dr. Lynn Wells, Department of English; and Dr. John Whyte, Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy and Department of Political Science. Because of illness, Dr. Stubbs was forced to withdraw from the Task Force and was replaced by Dr. Bernard Thraves, Department of Geography. The Task Force also included Dr. Sandra Blenkinsop, Faculty of Education; Prof. Jo-Ann Episkenew, First Nations University of Canada; Ms. Judy Chapman, First-Year Services; and Ms. Simone Hengen, Centre for Continuing Education. While Ms. Hengen was absent because of illness, she was replaced temporarily by Ms. Loanne Myrah, Centre for Continuing Education. In addition, Ms. Stephanie Jeanes, a Faculty of Arts student intern in First-Year Services, joined the Task Force as a researcher and recording secretary. Her contributions were invaluable in support of the work of this body, as were those of Ms. Kristy Ogradnick from the Faculty of Arts office who undertook the administrative planning for our meetings.

The terms of reference for the Task Force were as follows:

- Consulting widely inside and outside the Faculty of Arts on the issue of reading and writing competence;
- Examining secondary school curricula in language arts with a view to bridging the apparent gulf between high school and university expectations in reading and writing;

- Examining the variety of courses in reading and writing currently offered by the Faculty of Arts, First-Year Services, and the Centre for Continuing Education;
- Thinking through the implications for the teaching of reading and writing of recommendations in the Faculty Plan for a 20% increase in student numbers over the next five years, and for a much greater emphasis on the recruitment and retention of students from diverse backgrounds;
- Developing a clear strategy to improve student confidence, competence, and success in reading and writing, at both first-year and subsequent levels.

The Task Force commenced regular meetings in February 2004 to define issues, undertake analyses and plan the structure and content of the final Report. At these meetings, interviews were conducted with a wide range of interested parties. Initially, prospective participants were selected from among those who had in their appearances before the Faculty of Arts planning body expressed a concern for questions of reading and writing. Individuals who had appeared before the planning body on behalf of the federal and provincial public service commissions designated representatives to meet with the Task Force. Additional interviews were arranged with individuals, who offered specific insights into the challenges faced by indigenous students in confronting the demands of reading and writing in English and the challenges and experiences of teaching reading and writing to high school students. Sessions were scheduled to accommodate other interested faculty who wished to make presentations. A consultation was organized for students to discuss with Task Force members their experiences with reading and writing in their academic programmes. Finally, formal meetings concluded in April with a Faculty-wide public forum featuring Dr. Janet Giltrow, Department of English, University of British Columbia, a specialist in the teaching of academic reading and writing. A website made available the minutes of Task Force meetings and provided an additional means by which interested parties could make submissions.

A list of those who appeared before the Task Force, or made formal written submissions, is appended to this Report. The members of the Task Force wish to thank all those who through their efforts contributed to its deliberations.

Introduction

Literacy is the hallmark of a university education. At the heart of the intellectual contribution of university graduates to society are criticism and communication. These qualities make it possible to probe the inadequacies of our current knowledge and understanding, challenge established wisdom and entrenched paradigms, and discover new facts, new causes, new consequences, and new connections. Only when our graduates can fully, freely, and effectively express insights and understandings will their gifts of intellectual power, good training, complex skills, inspiration, and discovery be shared for the benefit of all.

The fear that universities, and in particular faculties of arts, are failing to turn out graduates capable of writing grammatically, clearly and critically, has long been a staple of university life. Periodically, this fear triggers the sense there is a 'crisis' requiring immediate action and 'solutions' that would set things right. We seem now to be in one of those periods.

While not denying the importance of this issue or the necessity of actually ensuring that graduates possess the language capabilities reasonably expected of them, we believe it important to place such matters and the accompanying sense of crisis into an appropriate context. In this Report, we stress the need to view reading and writing as dynamic and comprehensive activities that are themselves part of, and core expressions of, the aspirations and purposes of a faculty of arts. Four of these are particularly crucial for the issue of reading and writing:

1. The desire to ensure that our students function as 'educated persons.' At the heart of this is the development of a strong language capacity. This might mean that students have impressive comprehension and compositional skills, that they are able to understand and use complex expressions, and finally, that they are able to write clear and effective prose not undermined by grammatical error, inappropriate language, misused words, and confusing expository organization.
2. The willingness to aid students in acquiring courage, confidence and self-consciousness in reading and writing and, in effect, developing an ability to

be in the world linguistically. Such an ability is rooted in the sense that they could come to acquire the competencies to enable them to express their insights with skill and assurance.

3. The commitment to develop in students a recognition of the role of a university education in broadening perspectives, inspiring the imagination, and developing the capacity to reflect critically about society. University graduates, ideally, should be good citizens, people who subscribe to the value of intellectual engagement and possess the boldness to make their views and ideas part of the public discourse.
4. The responsibility to educate students in the languages of the intellectual communities they aspire to join. University graduates should have a sense of intellectual practices and the abilities to engage in them—that is, to read and write from the perspective of the intellectual and critical rigour associated with working within a discipline.

These diverse purposes suggest that reading and writing represent not only tasks or problems, but ongoing processes intrinsically tied to experiences we have as members of both the Faculty of Arts in general and our disciplines in particular. Our primary concern is with academic reading and writing: we engage with and, in turn, induct students into specific discourse practices, or discourse communities. English is not just one language. As Professor Peter Dorrington of the Department of French put it, even for students whose first language—their everyday language—is English, academic English is literally a second language. Hence, 'acquisition' of language 'skills' cannot be considered apart from immersion in a specific content and the capacity of our students to connect self-reflexively the material they study with the experience of their lives.

The view that writing is not simply a technical skill, or even a complete set of skills, underpins our conception of literacy. We need to get beyond the view that student reading and writing are problems to be fixed and instead envision them as integral parts of what takes place in a liberal arts education. The most obvious signs that a student has not acquired literacy in this broader sense are the surface errors that immediately jump off the page: incomplete sentences, mangled syntax, misused words, misspellings, violations of idiom. It is tempting to see these transgressions of standard usage as 'errors' to be corrected and to believe that if only students could eliminate

them, then instructors could get on with the real task of teaching history, economics, geography. But if students have gone through twelve years of public schooling without having these 'errors' extirpated from their writing, it is unlikely that one or even two courses covering the basics will remedy these problems.

Hence, what constitutes good academic reading and writing, and, therefore, what must be done to correct perceived deficiencies in student performance, is complex and a matter of contention. For some, the problem of competence in reading and writing is centrally one of successful mastery of the basic rules of grammar, syntax, diction, and style. From this vantage point, the critical issue is the alleged inability of a disturbingly large number of students to display such mastery. The appropriate response is remedial: the provision of some mechanism, such as a writing clinic, that offers a corrective approach to perceived difficulties, one that stresses the disciplined acquisition of formal skills. Usually, although not always, this approach is associated with the claim that a key source of the problem is the failure of the secondary school system to ensure that those entering university are adequately equipped with the language skills essential for success at the post-secondary level. But whatever the source or cause of the problems, linguistic competence is associated with the capacity to write in a formally correct way that permits the clear and coherent presentation of ideas and information.

By contrast, others view the development of competence in reading and writing as inextricably linked to immersion in a creative process. Student writing difficulties, including those of grammar and style, are seen less as a failure to acquire skills and more as a reflection of the lack of opportunity and encouragement for students to approach writing as an expressive activity. From this perspective, the task of ensuring that they possess appropriate qualities of literacy requires they be provided opportunities to develop their powers of articulation in and through confrontation with the demands of a body of material that can be shown to 'speak' to them in meaningful ways. The core idea here is that meeting the standards of successful and critically oriented reading and writing is not only a matter of conformity with externally imposed rules and precepts, but also, and perhaps primarily, the recognition and acknowledgement of capacities possessed by all who become competent language users as members of a language culture and community. Thus any mechanism to deal with writing problems must do more than drill students in the correct use of grammar and

style. It must also more fully encourage them to respond to the demands of reading and writing by drawing 'from within.'

We offer here no judgements about the relative merits of these two approaches. Clearly, each tells us something important about the successful development of critical reading and writing capabilities. Our proposals in this report provide our students and instructors with opportunities to accomplish both sets of aims, which we see as inseparable: to give students a sense of disciplinary language and conventions, while they also receive adequate and useful instruction on the requirements of academic reading and writing.

This conception of reading and writing makes addressing literacy concerns both more and less daunting. It is more daunting because writing is difficult. As writers ourselves we already know what it means to struggle in, with and against the demands of academic discourse, and this inevitably and profoundly shapes how we present material to students, instruct them in our 'ways' and in general strive to make what we do accessible and meaningful. But it is less daunting because it builds upon what we always and already do in the course of our teaching, research and writing.

We have been pleased to discover throughout our consultations and deliberations that the responses to this challenge can largely be found within the existing practices and facilities of this Faculty. While we recommend the creation of some new resources for both students and faculty members, much of what is needed to ensure that our students come away from their degree studies with successful reading and writing competencies is an enhancement of what we do every day as teachers and researchers who work intimately with language and text. By becoming more self-conscious about the central role that language plays in our scholarly and pedagogic activities and by foregrounding it in our classrooms, we will convey to our students a sense that reading and writing are intrinsic to the project of learning, not troublesome obstacles and incidental burdens. Reading and writing are not just means to an end, not simply tools to communicate knowledge of content existing apart from them. They are ends in themselves, manifestations of learning. For example, Dr. Giltrow brought to light the importance of inducting students into disciplinary languages, and making them aware of the fit between what they are being taught and the ways in which those ideas are written and spoken about within particular scholarly communities.

The key element in our approach to academic reading and writing—we might even call this our foundational recommendation—is that we build upon the resources in our Faculty that are both already in place and already in use, especially the very practices of teaching, research and writing that define the academic life. At one level, this involves making more clear and explicit to students how reading and writing are central to the material they are called upon to explore and master. If many of the resources we need are already present and utilized, this also means that, given the diversity that is the strength of our Faculty, each department and federated institution may have alternative, equally effective ways of attaining our goals with respect to reading and writing capabilities. The specific sections of our Report, and the recommendations flowing out of these, strive to reflect faithfully this diversity of elements and approaches. We thus view issues of reading and writing not as problems requiring solutions, but as ongoing challenges demanding engagement. Reading and writing are not just what we *do*. They define who we *are*.

The Transition from the Secondary School System to University

During the course of our consultations, we were reminded of the difficulties faced by students making the transition into the University. It seems to us that at least some of the problems students face in acquiring competence and confidence in academic reading and writing arise from these difficulties.

On the basis of our interview with Mr. Frank VanDrimmelen, Head of the Department of English at Winston Knoll Collegiate and an active participant in curriculum development for high school English, we learned how complex are the demands of English language teaching at the high school level. Teachers of English are sensitive to the need to prepare adequately those students planning to attend university. But just as not all undergraduate students in the Faculty of Arts proceed to post-graduate studies, so not all students graduating from high school proceed to university. High schools, indeed the secondary school system generally, must address the needs of a student population with a broad range of abilities in reading and writing and different post-secondary goals. We cannot nor should not assume that the task of the secondary school system is or should be solely to prepare students for admission to the Faculty of Arts, although it clearly has a vital role to play in this respect. In view of the complexity of the issue of transition into university, we concluded that given the constraints of time and resources, we were not in a position to examine extensively secondary school curricula, nor develop wide-ranging suggestions about how to bridge the perceived gulf between high school and university expectations with regard to reading and writing. We believe that these questions require the creation of a permanent and ongoing forum within which the Faculty of Arts and representatives of the secondary system can meet and discuss mutual concerns.

We should also therefore examine additional approaches to the continuing development of academic reading and writing competencies in students. A survey made available to us of students enrolled in UNIV 100, a course designed to address the transition needs of incoming students, indicates that student success is linked to their ability to forge ties with each other in a common learning environment, while at the

same time developing recognition of appropriate learning abilities. One possibility raised during the course of our consultations and deliberations was the creation of student cohorts: groups of students enrolled in clusters of courses central to the core requirements of their degree programmes.

Such an approach has proven successful at Luther College and the First Nations University of Canada. Dr. Noel Chevalier of Luther College informed the Task Force of its English and Science group. Each Fall semester, new students register concurrently in ENGL 100, BIOL 100, and CHEM 102. In the English course, Dr. Chevalier focuses on the literary study of scientific issues, while celebrating the writing competencies of scientists. Biology and Chemistry professors were aware that students within the classroom were in the English and Science group, but no requirements were placed on their instruction within their courses. A Biology professor made a guest appearance in the English class to discuss the challenges faced by writers in the sciences. The goal of this cohort formation was to foster a sense of community among the students, to intentionally create a common learning experience, and to use existing resources in new ways to encourage the development of a discourse or learning community. The First Nations University of Canada has adapted Luther College's cohort system for its mature admissions students in its STAR (Student Transition and Retention) Program. These students on its three campuses take a prescribed group of courses in their first and second semesters. At the end of the second semester, successful students are eligible to enter the Faculty of Arts. Because of the success of this program, the First Nations University plans to expand it to include all of its first-year students, not just its mature admissions students.

These examples suggest the range of possibilities opened up by our emphasis on reading and writing within the disciplines, across the curriculum and over the entire degree program. With minimal effort, existing resources and common registration patterns could be utilized to build more learning communities within the Faculty of Arts. One resource currently available that should be considered in this respect is UNIV 100, which could be given credit status in the Faculty of Arts and made compulsory for students who choose to participate in cohorts.

Recommendations

1. Create a liaison committee composed of members of the Faculty of Arts and representatives of the secondary school system to deal in an ongoing way with issues of transition from secondary schools to university as this relates to questions of academic reading and writing.
2. Consider the creation of student cohorts in the Faculty of Arts.
3. Establish a committee to examine offering UNIV 100 as a three-credit hour course that would be available as an elective for all students enrolled in the Faculty of Arts and would serve as a required course for students who choose to participate in a cohort.

Reading and Writing: First Year and Beyond

"In teaching writing, we are not simply offering training in a useful technical skill that is meant as a simple complement to the more important studies in other areas. We are teaching a way of experiencing the world, a way of ordering and making sense of it."

- James A. Berlin, "Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories," *College English*, 44.8 (Dec. 1982): 776.

Traditionally, the Department of English has been delegated the primary, though certainly not exclusive, responsibility for ensuring that students in the Faculty of Arts receive basic literacy and writing skills necessary for success at university. Although we foresee a continuing central role for the English Department in fostering reading and writing among students, the Task Force believes that ENGL 100 and 110, either or both of which may not actually be taken by students in their first or even their second year, cannot fulfill by themselves the goal of fostering academic literacy. But if, as current research in composition suggests, reading and writing are not simply skills that can be learned in one class, then developing reading and writing proficiencies becomes the continuing responsibility of all faculty members engaged in delivering a liberal arts program from the first-year English course to the fourth-year honours seminar. Therefore, in keeping with the idea that each discipline has a language particular to its subject matter and that reading and writing are an integral part of all disciplines in the Faculty of Arts, the Task Force has reached the conclusion that students' programs should involve substantial writing as well as reading. We assume that writing at university is always writing in a particular discipline and not simply an 'add-on,' ancillary skill that the student learns somewhere else and then applies to the content of history, or anthropology, or geography.

Of course, there will always be entering students who will not demonstrate a command of English grammar, syntax, idiom and sentence structure required for success at university. The Task Force's proposed modifications to compulsory first-year English courses may partly address this issue, but an excellent way to respond to the

'problems' of these students would be through one-on-one instruction in the context of a writing centre, one component of which would be an on-line 'grammar clinic.' We address this issue in the section on the creation of a centre for academic reading and writing.

Reading and Writing Across the Disciplines in the Faculty of Arts: An Integrated Program

"The value of writing in any course should lie in its power to enable the discovery of knowledge."

- C. H. Knoblauch and Lil Brannon, "Writing as Learning through the Curriculum," *College English* 45.5 (Sept. 1983): 466.

Since writing is an integral part of what humanists and social scientists do, and since students cannot learn history, or economics, or philosophy, or any discipline without simultaneously learning to write in that discipline, the Task Force believes that students, beginning in the first year and continuing throughout their studies, should be required to take a number of writing and/or writing-intensive courses designed to ensure that they will graduate with the ability to read critically and write effectively. The focus of this approach is on the literacy level of students when they leave the University, not their lack of reading and writing skills when they enter. What we are proposing, therefore, is an integrated program over four years designed to ensure that academic reading and writing remain at the centre of each student's education. If this is done, we confidently expect that our graduates would be the equals of any in Canada in their ability to read critically and write effectively.

The requirements of this program consist of the following:

- Within the first 60 credit hours of registration Faculty of Arts students would be required to successfully complete:
 - ENGL 100A or ENGL 100B and ENGL 110 or ENGL/HUM 111 (a new credit course to replace UNIV 110).
- Following successful completion of ENGL 100A or ENGL 100B and ENGL 110 or ENGL/HUM 111, students would be required to complete **one** of the following three options:

- Option 1: HUM 240 (Reading and Writing in the Humanities) or SOST 240 (Reading and Writing in the Social Sciences). These are proposed new courses for which the prerequisite would be any two 100-level English courses.
- Option 2: Three courses, numbered 200 and above, designated as 'writing-intensive.'
- Option 3: A discipline-specific course in writing, such as ENGL 251 (Expository and Persuasive Writing) or ECON 380 (Writing for Economists).

These would be the *minimum* requirements imposed by the Faculty of Arts.

Required First-year English Courses

First-year English courses are likely to provide most first-year students with their initial encounter at the University with intensive reading and writing. The Task Force heard no proposals to abolish the current requirement of two 100-level English courses, and we are convinced that this requirement, made more flexible, should be retained as the first stage, the foundation, of the liberal arts student's ongoing engagement with reading and writing. However, we feel that Faculty-wide requirements can be modified so as to meet more effectively the needs of our students and to contribute to a successful program of reading and writing across the disciplines.

Currently, ENGL 100 consists of two-thirds literature and one-third composition. This format probably meets the needs of the majority of students, but given our admission policy and the Faculty of Arts plan to increase enrolments by 20% over the next five years, there is a strong pedagogical argument to increase our flexibility in how we offer ENGL 100. Two of the concerns repeatedly raised in submissions and presentations to the Task Force are the transition of ESL students to ENGL 100 and the difficult transition, at least for some students, from high school or mature entrance to university. For all of these groups, ENGL 100 can be a seemingly insuperable obstacle to their success at the University.

To address these concerns, we are recommending that ENGL 100 be renumbered ENGL 100A and that ENGL 100B be created, with either serving as a prerequisite for subsequent English courses. ENGL 100B would consist of one-third

literature and two-thirds composition and would be designed to appeal to students whose needs are not being addressed by the current ENGL 100. Its primary purpose would not be to introduce students to the study of literature (that would be the role of ENGL 100A). By emphasizing both literary and non-literary texts and by devoting more class time to instruction in academic reading and writing, ENGL 100B would focus on the centrality of critical reading and writing to a university education and thus prepare students for the kinds of reading and writing tasks expected of them throughout their degree program.

As an example of how such a class might be constituted, we attach Dr. Noel Chevalier's syllabus of ENGL 100 for science students in Luther College. This course, while designed to appeal to science students, still contains substantial literary content and is just as engaging and as academically challenging as other ENGL 100 courses. Another example of innovation in the area of first-year English is Campion College's Tutor/Mentor program, in which a senior student is matched with a section of ENGL 100. The Tutor/Mentor serves as a resource for students requiring assistance in achieving competence in academic reading and writing.

The creation of ENGL 100B would also address what to do with ENGL 090 and ENGL 091, which are currently offered by First Nations University of Canada. Student funding for these two courses is in jeopardy because they are not university-level courses. The creation of ENGL 100B would at least partly address this problem, since students who now take ENGL 090 or 091 could take ENGL 100B, where they would get more instruction in composition. But that would still not address the issue of students who enter the University inadequately prepared for ENGL 100. To address this issue the Task Force recommends an alternative arrangement for offering ENGL 100B, whereby some sections of the course would be offered over two semesters rather than one (the course would still have three credit-hours). The rationale for this proposal is that not all students can acquire in 13 weeks all the skills necessary to succeed in ENGL 100. As a result, we now have students repeating ENGL 100 a second and a third time (and in rare cases a fourth time). This is not a pedagogically sound, economically efficient, or humane way of ensuring that all graduating students meet the minimum standards of literacy. Taking the course over two semesters might also be a pedagogically effective and less painful way for the increasing numbers of international students to meet the University's compulsory English requirement. Mathematics 104 and 105 provide a

precedent for this proposal; if the Faculty of Science can do this, there is no reason the Faculty of Arts cannot.

Our major addition to the first-year English program is the creation of ENGL/HUM 111. This course would continue the work of ENGL 100A by instructing students in the reading of and writing about a wide range of literary and non-literary texts in the humanities and social sciences. The course would be administered by the English Department and taught primarily by instructors from the English Department; however, a few sections of it could, and ideally should, be taught by instructors in other departments. (If this creates administrative problems, the course could be called HUM 111 when taught by instructors from outside the English Department.) The content of the course would be developed by the English Department in consultation with other departments in the Faculty. Because of this interdisciplinary focus with a specific orientation to the needs of students in the Faculty of Arts, ENGL/HUM 111 would accomplish what the current UNIV 110 is designed to achieve.

In its submission to the Task Force, the English Department expressed its full commitment to the principle of reading and writing across the disciplines, as well as its willingness to take a leadership role in implementing such a program. The Task Force believes that our proposal for two distinct but parallel ENGL 100 courses and for ENGL/HUM 111 responds to the English Department's offer, while at the same time respecting the academic integrity of the existing first-year courses as foundation courses for upper-level English courses.

The proposed set of first-year English courses is designed to provide maximum flexibility for students in planning their studies and to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse enrolment in the Faculty of Arts. Students could fulfill their first-year academic reading and writing requirements by taking either ENGL 100A or 100B and either ENGL 110 or 111. Students who have successfully completed either ENGL 100A or 100B could enrol in either ENGL 110 or 111. Beyond the matter of requirements, all of these proposed first-year courses would be available to all students as electives.

Upper-Level Reading and Writing Courses

In its *Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition*, the Council of Writing Program Administrators claims that "[l]earning to write is a complex process, both individual and social, that takes place over time with continued practice and informed

guidance" (see Appendix IV). We, therefore, propose the creation of two new 200-level courses: HUM 240 (Reading and Writing in the Humanities) and SOST 240 (Reading and Writing in the Social Sciences). A committee with representatives from across the Faculty would design these courses (the same committee struck to design ENGL/HUM 111). These courses, which would be taught by members of all departments in the Faculty, would not be only composition courses. Students in them would read, critically engage with, and write about primary and secondary texts drawn from several disciplines, but the courses would not presuppose any knowledge of these disciplines or be introductions to them. (The prerequisites for these courses would be two 100-level English courses.)

The purpose of the proposed courses will be to introduce students more fully than 100-level courses can do to the discursive practices of disciplines, and not just to teach decontextualized 'writing skills,' such as the introduction, or paragraph unity, grammar, or sentence variety. As Dr. Giltrow pointed out in her presentation to the Task Force, reading and writing capabilities are best acquired in the context of a substantive engagement in a disciplinary discourse that the student is also learning. Students do not simply learn to write; they learn to write in a disciplinary context. Thus SOST 240 would address the important questions raised by Dr. Marion Jones, Department of Economics, in her submission to the Task Force: "There is an urgent need," she wrote, "for training in the conventions of reasoning and rhetoric in the construction of social science essays. In particular, the marshalling of theoretical material, secondary data and the sides in policy debates should be a priority." We concur with her recommendation to create a course in writing in the social sciences: "The demands of writing for the social sciences," she rightly points out, "are different from the textually-based analysis of the humanities, and as a result, a course on writing for the social sciences would be highly beneficial."

One of the benefits of extending the writing requirements beyond first-year English would be to dispel the misconception, shared by many students, that writing, especially in the form of compulsory first-year English, is an obstacle placed in the way of achieving what they really came to university to accomplish. These requirements, as the Task Force envisages them, would keep critical reading and writing at the centre of the liberal arts education rather than marginalize their importance by delegating the primary responsibility of teaching them to one department, which is then perceived by

students as a gatekeeper. If students in the Faculty of Arts understood that their two required first-year English courses were only the *beginning* of a continuing engagement with reading and writing that will be carried on in whatever disciplines they later study, then they will perhaps be more likely to see these courses as part of their arts education rather than as a hurdle to be gotten over so they can then begin their real education.

The same rationale behind the proposal to create SOST 240 also applies to HUM 240. Since, as Dr. Jones stresses, the humanities are a textually-based set of disciplines, it would make sense to offer a separate course on the protocols of reading and writing expected of students in humanities courses. Some departments may wish to follow the model of Economics and create a specific course on writing in that discipline.

One option for teaching HUM 240 and SOST 240 would be for some sections of them to be team taught by three instructors from three different disciplines; when an instructor has taught the course three times, he or she would have 'banked' the equivalent of a 3 credit-hour course. A committee designing these courses might also wish to consider having a core text for all sections, or a choice of designated texts (we include suggestions in the Bibliography).

Writing-Intensive Courses

In order to extend the importance of writing beyond specific writing courses and to reiterate the idea that writing is not separate from an area of study, that writing, in Dr. Giltrow's words, "constitutes a position in the world, and shared methods of thinking about it" (*Academic Writing*), the Task Force proposes that departments designate writing-intensive courses. These are courses that self-consciously emphasize the inseparability of writing in a discipline and mastering the content of that discipline.

Many institutions have successfully implemented such courses. The Writing Intensive Program at The Franklin College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Georgia, for example, identifies seven compelling reasons for writing in all the disciplines:

Writing promotes and deepens learning and understanding.

"One way to facilitate students' learning about a subject," say C. H. Knoblauch and Lil Brannon, "is to have them write, because learning and articulating are inseparable activities" (*College English*, 45.5 [Sept. 1983]: 467). As all of us know, one way to learn something is to teach it. Another way is to write about it.

Writing increases students' involvement in intellectual tasks and promotes engagement with the subject.

Our own enthusiasm for our research interests is inseparable from sharing the results of that research with colleagues through writing. Why should our students' engagement with writing be substantially different?

Writing is an essential part of much testing designed to 'measure' learning.

"If you can't write it, you don't know it" is an assumption of much testing. While there are other modes of learning, and while students admittedly learn differently, academic culture asks students to demonstrate learning in writing in their courses throughout their academic careers. More often than not, the students who can write effectively—that is, those who have adopted and mastered a process of presenting their learning in a disciplinary context—have an advantage. Writing intensive courses give students more practice with the skills on which their performance is often assessed, and so not to give them this practice is to put them at a disadvantage. If we are going to judge our students by their writing, then we have a responsibility to teach them how to write successfully.

The process of writing generates thinking and hence learning.

An over-emphasis on writing as communication and as a way to formally demonstrate learning has meant that attention to writing as a generative process of acquiring and developing learning has been neglected. "I write to find out what I'm thinking," said Julia Alvarez. "I've always thought best when I wrote," remarked Toni Morrison. And finally John Updike: "Writing and rewriting are a constant search for what it is one is saying." Scholars and all kinds of professionals use writing to create, reflect on, elaborate, and revise what they think: the sociologist uses field notes; the biologist, a lab notebook; the business executive, a Palm Pilot. We do not think and then write; we write to think.

The multiple assignments possible in writing-intensive classes enable students to practice the discourse of a discipline.

Such assignments introduce students to ways of researching, developing, and communicating knowledge that are specific to disciplines and professions. Students learn that what it means to think like an economist is inseparable from what it means to write with credibility for an audience of economists.

Writing, receiving meaningful feedback, and revising all improve the quality of writing.

"The beautiful part of writing," says Robert Cormier, "is that you don't have to get it right the first time—unlike, say, brain surgery." But when students write only a major essay due at the end of the semester there is little opportunity to practice writing as a *process*. Writing intensive courses provide the students with more opportunities to write and to engage thoughtfully with the writing process, as well as with more occasions for guidance, feedback and revision. Good writing is rewriting.

Writing intensive courses prepare students for the writing they will have to do in their careers.

Many students do not believe that they will need to write after they complete university. But in the age of information, technology encourages, indeed requires, thinking in writing and, more than ever, sharing that writing with others. Writing is thus not only central to a liberal education but to professional success as well.

In our view, should the recommendations in this section be implemented, our Faculty would provide our students with an even stronger grounding in academic reading and writing. And they would also possess the capabilities that employers value in the university graduates they hire. When they appeared before us, representatives of the federal and provincial public service commissions stressed how important it is that graduates have the capacity to think critically, reason logically and write clearly. We believe that students emerging from our degree programs with this extensive background in reading and writing would have a significantly enhanced ability to meet these challenges.

Recommendations

4. Renumber ENGL 100 so that it becomes ENGL 100A and ENGL 100B. ENGL 100A would, like the current ENGL 100, consist of two-thirds literature and one-third composition. ENGL 100B would consist of one-third literature and two-thirds composition. ENGL 100A or ENGL 100B would be the prerequisite for ENGL 110 and ENGL/HUM 111.
5. Create a new three-credit hour course, ENGL/HUM 111 (Reading and Writing in the Humanities and Social Sciences). The specific content of the course would be determined by the English Department in consultation with other departments in the Faculty of Arts. ENGL/HUM 111 would be administered by the Department of English but sections of it could be taught by instructors in other departments. Prerequisites: ENGL 100A **or** ENGL 100B.
6. Create two new courses, HUM 240 (Reading and Writing in the Humanities) and SOST 240 (Reading and Writing in the Social Sciences). These two courses would carry on where ENGL 111 left off. Prerequisite: ENGL 110 or ENGL/HUM 111. Enrollment in these courses should be kept low, between 16 and 20.

7. Explore the possibility of offering ENGL 100B over two semesters in recognition of the fact that all students do not, or cannot, acquire reading and writing competencies at the same rate.
8. Require ENGL 100A or ENGL 100B **and** either ENGL 110 or ENGL/HUM 111 within core requirements of the Bachelor of Arts degree.
9. Require that ENGL 100A or ENGL 100B **and** either ENGL 110 or ENGL/HUM 111 be successfully completed within the first 60 attempted credit hours.
10. Require students to fulfill **one** of the following options to complete a Bachelor of Arts degree:
 - Option 1: HUM 240 **or** SOST 240.
 - Option 2: Three courses identified by the Faculty of Arts as 'writing-intensive.'
 - Option 3: A discipline-specific writing course, such as ECON 380 or ENGL 251.
11. Invite all departments to designate appropriate upper-level courses as 'writing-intensive courses.' When approved by the Faculty of Arts, such courses should be included in Option 2 of Recommendation 10. Approximately the same amount of writing should be required in all courses designated by the Faculty as 'writing-intensive,' the exact amount of writing to be recommended by an implementation committee in consultation with all departments.
12. Provide resources and support, in the form of workshops, seminars and training, for instructors teaching HUM 240, SOST 240, and writing-intensive courses, with the details of this support to be worked out by an implementation committee after consultation with the Faculty and the Teaching Development Centre.

Reading and Writing for Undergraduate and Graduate Students Who Speak English as a Second Language

Undergraduate and graduate students who speak English as a second language confront increasingly complex demands as they acquire the reading and writing capabilities needed for a university education. The Faculty of Arts should vigorously support students for whom English is not their first language as they strive to develop academic competence in a second language. This body of students within our Faculty includes, but is not limited to, those formerly enrolled in the University of Regina's English as a Second Language Program. Students for whom English is a second language could be Indigenous, international, immigrant or francophone. Indeed, there are students with English as their first language who learned it from family members for whom it was not. These students, too, encounter similar and significant difficulties with the demands of academic reading and writing.

Our proposal in the previous section to create ENGL 100B is one measure the Faculty of Arts can take to address the challenges confronting this group of students and to support the University's goal of internationalization as identified by the *University of Regina 2002-2006 Framework*. In fact, Objective 5.3 of this document indicates a desire to increase and improve "support services for international students and collaborations in teaching, research and service." Presenters to the Task Force and the members of the Task Force agree that if the University is to expand international enrolments, it must dedicate adequate resources to this purpose. The key action required to meet the internationalization goal of the University is to build on existing strengths and identify creative ways of increasing international experiences, and in this case, experiences in language for all students.

The Faculty of Arts can contribute to the achievement of this goal by celebrating and enhancing the second language abilities of all our students. Both the University and our Faculty would, through the cultivation of enhanced competencies in academic reading and writing, thereby fulfill our fundamental ethical responsibility to ensure as fully as possible that students we recruit from other cultures and countries are provided effective encouragement, support and opportunity to succeed in their degree programs.

If we do not invest sufficiently now in this task, in the long run the reputation of the University will suffer.

The English Department asked the Task Force to make “recommendations on, how best to meet the needs of students whose first language is not English, especially those students whose English is inadequate to pass ENGL 100” (March 17, 2004). In their appearances before the Task Force, Professors Ken Mitchell and Susan Johnston of the Department of English reiterated these concerns and in particular stressed the difficulties confronting those speakers of English as a second language who must repeat ENGL 100 a number of times before successfully completing it. They recommended additional courses, seminars, and workshops on academic reading and writing for such students as a way of creating conditions under which they would be more likely to succeed.

Students for whom English is a second language expressed to us concern over the lack of instruction they receive on the reading and writing tasks at all levels, including the graduate level. It can be particularly difficult for second-language students registered in the Humanities and Social Sciences, where the language of the discipline often draws on a cultural fabric with which they have little familiarity. This can lead to a number of problems, including unintended plagiarism.

The expertise of the English as a Second Language Program should be engaged in the task of supporting the reading and writing goals of our Faculty. In its submission to the Task Force, the Centre for Continuing Education, under whose auspices the ESL Program is delivered, recommended, for example, that faculty from the ESL Program or the Regina Public Library ESL Tutor-Training Program could provide expertise in language-learning pedagogy to students who could then mentor students and conduct seminars.

In his presentation to the Task Force, Dr. Sam Nie, who has researched in the area of English as a second language and has taught second language students in ENGL 100, recommended the development of a campus-wide English language support centre and a series of short intensive writing courses or workshops in the evening or on weekends. While much of Dr. Nie’s proposal requires action at the University level and is thus beyond the mandate of the Task Force, nonetheless it raises issues relevant to

this section because the proposed centre would be specifically designed to support success in academic reading and writing.

A submission from the Department of French emphasized the importance of supporting improvement in the reading and writing ability of graduates in two languages. The Department recommends that the Faculty continue to encourage its students to develop capability in a second language, and to do so in order not only to help them develop competency in that particular language, but also to develop the critical abilities that will enable them to better read and write other languages, including English. Perhaps the University might consider ways to extend the 'bilingual mention' notation (40-60% of the courses must be taken in French) for students within the Faculty of Arts and continue to support the offering of courses in French.

Recommendations

13. Continue to engage senior administration in the designing of support systems for international undergraduate and graduate students and to fully implement Goal 5, Internationalization, of the 2002-2006 *Framework*. This should be done in close collaboration with the English as a Second Language Program, International Student Services and Exchanges, and other faculties and units.
14. Urge that serious consideration be given to the establishment of an English Language Support Centre for undergraduate and graduate students. This could be part of the larger initiative already in place within the International Student Services and Exchanges.

Reading and Writing for Indigenous Students

It would be impossible to compose a common description of the Indigenous students—First Nations, Métis, and Inuit—attending the University of Regina today because of the tremendous diversity within that population. Most current students belong to the six Indigenous groups of Saskatchewan. They come from cities, towns, reserves, and Métis settlements. A small number come from other provinces and belong to other Indigenous groups. Some students speak their Indigenous languages and often have learned English as their second language. For other students, English is their first and only language. Although increasing numbers of Indigenous students come to university having completed grade twelve, significant numbers still enter as mature students without having completed secondary school. What all these students hold in common is their relationship to the English language and their shared ambivalence towards the instruction of reading and writing in English.

Indigenous students are well aware that the English language has been imposed on them and their people and that the vehicle of this imposition is the educational system. At the same time, they comprehend that success at university depends on their becoming adept at reading and writing in English. Many have endured painful experiences in the educational system at residential schools or as members of a cultural minority in town or city schools. Some of the younger students have only attended school on reserves or in small northern communities where Indigenous people comprise the majority. At university, they must cope, for the first time, with the experience of being a minority. Although these students did not attend residential schools, themselves, they are often the children or grandchildren of residential school survivors and, as such, have acquired their attitudes towards and fears of the education system from those elders. Still, these same elders have impressed upon them the importance of obtaining an education. Many Indigenous leaders tell the young people that “today, education is our buffalo.”

Because most Indigenous students belong to the first generation of family members to attend university, they rarely understand what expectations the university will place on them, especially in the area of reading and writing. Prof. Angelina Weenie,

Department of Indian Education, First Nations University of Canada, informed us that many Indigenous students have been discouraged from expressing their original thoughts in the elementary and secondary systems. When they shared their reality, they were deemed to be “wrong again.” As a result, they learned that, to be successful, they must censor their own ideas and parrot the ideas of others. In addition, few Indigenous students come from homes where reading is a common pastime. As a result, they lack the proficiency in reading that university education demands.

Most Indigenous students register through either the First Nations University of Canada or the Gabriel Dumont Institute. However, these students often take many, and sometimes most, of their courses through the Faculty of Arts. At both the First Nations University of Canada and at the Gabriel Dumont Institute, students are exposed to reading materials that are relevant to them and that reflect their realities. These institutions provide safe environments in which students hone their reading abilities, while learning to appropriate the language of the colonizer and then use it to improve the lives of their people. Learning proficiency in English becomes a political act, an act of resistance.

Often, those students who are unable to speak their Indigenous languages have learned their English from people for whom it is a second language. Some of these students often seem to be ‘between’ languages, only knowing a few words and phrases in their Indigenous language but not having the grasp of English necessary to succeed at university. Others are skilled in the rich, non-standard English that is the communication standard in their communities and that is the language used in many successful works of contemporary Indigenous literature and drama. Often when these students arrive at university, they learn that words commonly used in their communities have different meanings and, indeed, the function of discourse differs radically. The First Nations University’s ENGL 090 and 091 courses and the Gabriel Dumont Institute’s English Updates have successfully assisted students to begin the transition to university-level English instruction. In these courses, students learn the basics of reading and writing at a university level. In numerous short writing assignments, students respond to a variety of written works, including literary texts, thus developing and expressing their ideas. Because the students who enrol in these courses have not completed grade twelve, they also learn some basic grammar, style, and organizational skills. Rather than attempting to purge these students of their non-standard English idiom, the First

Nations University faculty and Gabriel Dumont Institute instructors introduce students to the variety of “english(es)” that they will encounter and teach them how to determine how and when to use them appropriately. However, academic reading and writing remain an on-going challenge.

Unfortunately, because students cannot use ENGL 090 and 091 to fulfill degree requirements, many First Nations will not fund students who need this preparation. Currently, these students must obtain student loans; however, this is not a long-term solution. The governments of both British Columbia and the Yukon now refuse to provide students with loans to take pre-university courses at universities, and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada supports this change. It is only a matter of time until Saskatchewan alters its policy to fall into line with this national shift. To ensure that Indigenous students succeed, the University must find a way to provide additional course work in reading and writing that students can use as credit toward their degrees. Our recommendations to reconfigure first-year English courses are meant to address some of these issues by making these courses more adaptable to the needs of a diverse student population.

Indigenous students come to the University of Regina already aware of the chasm of misunderstanding between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Saskatchewan, and more generally across Canada. The University has made strides towards bridging this knowledge gap through the Indigenous Peoples’ Education Projects Fund, but this is only a small step. In this respect, we fully support the recommendations set forth in the Faculty of Arts planning document, which call for closer links between the Faculty and the First Nations University of Canada. We agree that there needs to be ongoing institutional contact between the Faculty and both the First Nations University of Canada and the Gabriel Dumont Institute to continue to examine issues of reading and writing as they apply to Indigenous people; we will expand on the implications of this recommendation in the next section of this Report.

Recommendation

15. Discontinue ENGL 090 and ENGL 091 in light of the recommendations involving UNIV 110, ENGL 100 and 110, whereby the range of options at the first-year level for the fulfillment of the degree reading and writing requirements in the Faculty of Arts is to be expanded. This new range of options will be structured

to ensure that the distinctive needs of Indigenous students that were addressed by ENGL 090 and ENGL 091 will be more effectively met under the new requirements.

The Role and Place of a Centre for Academic Reading and Writing

As noted in the Introduction to this report, much of what we propose can be accomplished using existing resources. However, in order to develop strong leadership in the area of academic reading and writing, the Faculty will have to undertake new initiatives that will require additional resources. The primary initiative we propose is the creation of a permanent Centre for Academic Reading and Writing in the Faculty of Arts. Such a centre is necessary for a number of reasons. It would provide support for students and faculty engaged in the delivery of the new reading and writing requirements. It would function comprehensively as a resource for all faculty and students. Finally, it would foster and disseminate on-going research and scholarship into the various dimensions of academic reading and writing as central components of a liberal arts education.

The Task Force received several oral and written presentations arguing that encouraging the development of good reading and writing capabilities among students was a responsibility of all faculty. Some faculty members have devoted considerable energies devising improved methods of introducing reading and writing components in the courses they teach. We heard from Dr. Andrew Stubbs, Department of English, about innovative composition programs that treat writing as a process involving on-going feedback and revision, rather than as a product to be submitted at the end of the semester and evaluated at a time and in such way that the students derive very little benefit from instructor comments. From Dr. Jeanne Shami, also from English, we learned of her system of engaging students with reading through quizzes and in-class discussions that precede the formal lectures on the material. Prof. Annabel Robinson, Department of Philosophy and Classics, shared the success of her course on etymology, in which students learned that words carry within them signs of their own historical origins. And in its submission to the Task Force, the Department of French indicated how it sees immersion in a second language as critical for developing a greater awareness of the qualities of the first.

No doubt, other faculty members have undertaken similar initiatives. However, those who develop them do so independently and without an opportunity to share them with colleagues. The Centre for Academic Reading and Writing would provide such opportunities, as well as additional support for the development of individual and collaborative faculty initiatives. The Centre would also acknowledge and celebrate these. In addition, it would serve as a resource for students as they pursue the various activities associated with reading and writing throughout their degree programs, all the more so given the emphasis our Report places on the centrality of reading and writing.

Our proposed Centre is not intended to replace but rather to complement the work already being done in other writing clinics across the campus, which are not intended to serve the Faculty of Arts as a whole. In particular, the Department of English Writing Centre is limited to students enrolled in ENGL 100 and ENGL 110, while the Writing Centres at the federated institutions are restricted to students registered in their courses.

In our deliberations on the establishment of the Centre for Academic Reading and Writing, we became aware of the large number and wide range of such centres across North America and of the Writing Program Administrators Council that informs their development. Details about these bodies are provided in the Appendices to this Report.

Recommendations

16. Create a permanent Centre for Academic Reading and Writing in the Faculty of Arts that would function as a truly faculty-wide initiative and resource. It should be located in a prominent location such that its visibility and accessibility are maximized and should complement existing programs. It would provide support for students and faculty engaged in the delivery of reading and writing requirements, and undertake research with regard to issues posed by 'writing across the curriculum,' particularly with respect to new courses such as the proposed HUM 240 and SOST 240, the writing-intensive courses, and courses designed by departments specifically to provide opportunities to develop reading and writing capabilities. The Centre would also function more comprehensively as a resource for faculty as they work to integrate writing into their courses, and students as they respond to these initiatives.

17. Appoint a paid, full-time co-ordinator to provide strong leadership of the Centre on issues of academic reading and writing.
18. Establish an advisory board for the Centre, the members of which could include representatives from the Department of English, the English as a Second Language Program, the First Nations University of Canada, Luther and Campion Colleges, the Saskatchewan secondary school system, and other faculties at the University.
19. Establish as part of the Centre a student writing clinic with an on-line component to provide advice about grammar, style and composition.
20. Impress upon senior administration the urgency of continuing University support, both financial and otherwise, for essential initiatives concerning reading and writing issues as they are addressed through the Centre.

Resources and Implementation

As we have stressed throughout this Report, most of the resources needed to carry out our recommendations already exist within the Faculty. However, as we have also noted, there are two recommendations that might require the commitment of additional resources: the creation of a University-wide English language centre and the establishment of a Faculty of Arts Centre for Academic Reading and Writing. While the creation of an English language centre would clearly require resources provided by the University as a whole, we acknowledge that support for a centre on reading and writing would have to come largely from the Faculty itself, although we should engage the senior administration on the necessity for additional contributions. Because the Faculty of Arts is primarily responsible for the development of academic reading and writing competencies for the entire University, we believe we have a compelling case in this respect.

Given these resource implications as well as the scope of our recommendations, the Faculty of Arts should assign the task of implementation to a committee as soon as possible. This committee's responsibilities would obviously include a fuller consideration of the resource issues we have identified. But it could also involve the creation of the proposed new courses ENGL/HUM 111, HUM 240 and SOST 240; the development of criteria for writing-intensive courses; the formation of student academic reading and writing cohorts; and the design of the proposed Centre for Academic Reading and Writing.

As much as we have emphasized in this Report the need for modifications to faculty practices and institutional innovations, we must remember that our primary concern must be our students and their needs. The University itself is currently developing strategies to ensure as fully as possible that our students succeed in their programs and experience their university lives as rewarding and fulfilling. It is evident that successful mastery of the demands of academic reading and writing constitute an essential component of student success. Therefore the University's "Student Success" campaign should also emphasize reading and writing issues, along with its other

important and worthy goals. Resources produced by this campaign could help support the initiatives proposed by this Report.

Support for the goal of enhancing student capabilities in academic reading and writing could take a number of additional forms. One such form could be the creation of a journal for student writing, which would publicize and celebrate the outstanding work of our students that up until now has not been recognized as fully as we all would wish. Student writing awards in the humanities and the social sciences could also be established. No doubt other possibilities with respect to the encouragement and recognition of student writing accomplishments could be identified and pursued; our recommendation dealing with this provides additional suggestions.

We have already noted the significant and creative innovations that faculty members have successfully undertaken to promote and encourage the development of student competencies. We believe these not only address student reading and writing needs, but also emphatically re-emphasize the fundamental importance of undergraduate teaching to our Faculty. Such innovative measures should be more explicitly recognized and rewarded. One means to do so would be to establish a Faculty award for innovation in the teaching of academic reading and writing. Here, too, other possibilities could well emerge as our proposed changes are implemented.

Indeed, the acknowledgement of faculty innovations could serve as a springboard for a more extensive consideration of professional development around, and research about, academic reading and writing. To this end, the Faculty of Arts should organize a colloquium for its members on questions of reading and writing, which would discuss issues of reading and writing and provide a showcase for existing initiatives as well as the exploration of new ones.

Finally, we recognize that other units on campus, such as the University of Regina Libraries and the Teaching Development Centre, are currently pursuing initiatives that complement our own. We strongly encourage the Faculty to collaborate with these prospective partners in meeting the challenges of academic reading and writing.

Recommendations

21. Provide appropriate recognition of faculty innovations in the teaching of academic reading and writing.

22. Undertake initiatives to recognize student writing and so encourage students to more fully value their writing experiences. These could include the establishment of a journal of student writing, graduate and undergraduate, and the provision of assistance to students to help them construct writing portfolios. In addition, the Faculty should organize at the earliest convenience a symposium on student writing. Faculty of Arts alumni could serve as prospective reading and writing mentors for students who need assistance in more fully developing and successfully exercising their capabilities.
23. Organize, during the year following the release of this Report, a Faculty-wide colloquium on academic reading and writing that would provide a forum for the discussion of relevant issues and the opportunity to highlight teaching initiatives.
24. Establish links with other units across the University currently responding to issues of academic reading and writing.
25. Identify resources both inside and outside the Faculty of Arts that are required to support the initiatives suggested in this Report.
26. Assign responsibility for implementation of the recommendations of this Report to a committee within the Faculty of Arts.

Conclusion

The terms of reference for this Task Force entailed a sweeping examination of the development of effective student capabilities in academic reading and writing. While the Faculty of Arts has considerable scope to address this matter, the responses of other parts of the University community will prove as decisive for our ability to carry out our recommendations as any actions we as a Faculty would take. This said, we must recognize that the demands of effective student achievement in academic reading and writing go to the heart of a liberal arts education and hence to what we do in the course of our teaching and research. We intend our recommendations to be considered as interconnected and mutually supportive. Our hope is that they will be treated as a whole, and that individual recommendations not be singled out in isolation from the broader context in which they are vitally embedded. We believe that to do so would be to weaken significantly the potential impact of implementing them as part of a comprehensive strategy.

During the course of our work, we were constantly reminded how strongly our colleagues in the Faculty of Arts support the growth of student confidence and competence in academic reading and writing. And while there are understandable concerns about this question—perhaps this is inevitable given the nature of universities and faculties of arts—we should not forget that our students overall are remarkably successful. In fact, our recommendations are designed to raise awareness of what we are already doing well and provide ways of enabling us to do it even better.

Bibliography

- Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." In. *When a Writer Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composing Process Problems.* Ed. Mike Rose. New York: Guilford, 1985: 134-65. This classic essay explores how student writers have "to appropriate (or be appropriated by) a specialized discourse."
- Bean, John C. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001. An extremely helpful guide by the director of the writing program at Seattle University and chair of the University Task Force on Teaching and Learning.
- Behrens, Lawrence, et al. *Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum.* Canadian Edition. Toronto: Longman. 2003. An anthology of essays from political science, psychology, philosophy, education, biology, folklore, and film studies.
- Berlin, James A. "Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories." *College English* 44.8 (December 1982): 765-77.
- Boice, R. "Faculty Resistance to Writing-Intensive Courses." Special Issue: Psychologists Teach Writing. *Teaching of Psychology* 17.1 (1990): 13-17. Responds to the most common objections to writing-intensive classes.
- Franklin College of Arts and Sciences Writing Intensive Program. Franklin College. Arts and Sciences at the University of Georgia. <http://www.english.uga.edu/~wip/> This site offer valuable information and advice about writing-intensive programs, including support for instructors; source of the "Seven Reasons for Writing in the Disciplines" included in this Report.
- Giltrow, Janet. *Academic Writing: Writing and Reading In the Disciplines.* 3rd ed. Peterborough, Ontario: Braodview Press, 2002. This seminal book is an excellent introduction to the conventions of academic writing and could be used in HUM and SOST 240.
- Giltrow, Janet. (ed.) *Academic Reading: Reading and Writing In the Disciplines.* 2nd ed. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2002. A reader to accompany her *Academic Writing.*
- Knoblauch, C. H. and Lil Brannon. "Writing as Learning through the Curriculum." *College English* 45.5 (Sept. 1983): 465-74.
- Rose, Mike. "The Language of Exclusion: Writing Instruction at the University." *College English* 47.4 (April 1985): 341-59. Rose refutes five common myths about writing: that writing is a skill or tool rather than a discipline; that students lacking this skill need to be remediated; that some students are, for all intents and

purposes, illiterate; and that the university's remedial efforts can be phased out once the 'literacy crisis' is solved by the public school system.

Russell, David. R. "Writing and Genre in Higher Education and Workplaces: A Review of Studies That Use Cultural-Historical Activity Theory." *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 4.4 (1997): 224-37. Reviews the tradition of North American research on writing in the academy and the workplace that has grown out of college and university composition courses, writing-across-the-curriculum programs, and technical and business writing courses.

Appendices

- I. Individuals Interviewed by the Task Force
- II. List of Written Submissions to the Task Force
- III. Luther College's English and Science Group
- IV. Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition
- V. Reading and Writing Centres at Other North American Universities
- VI: Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Administration

Appendix I: Individuals Interviewed by the Task Force

- Dr. Noel Chevalier, Department of English, Luther College
- Ms. Diane Crease, Public Service Commission, Province of Saskatchewan
- Dr. Janet Giltrow, Department of English, University of British Columbia
- Dr. Kathy Heinrich, Vice-President (Academic), University of Regina
- Dr. Susan Johnston, Department of English, University of Regina
- Dr. Darlene Juschka, Coordinator, Women's Studies, University of Regina
- Dr. Harvey King, Associate Dean (Undergraduate Affairs), Faculty of Arts, University of Regina
- Dr. Cameron Louis, Head, Department of English, University of Regina
- Ms. Helen Oko, Public Service Commission, Government of Canada
- Prof. Ken Mitchell, Department of English, University of Regina
- Dr. Sam Nie, Department of English, University of Regina
- Dr. Jeanne Shami, Department of English, University of Regina
- Dr. Andrew Stubbs, Department of English, University of Regina
- Mr. Frank VanDrimmelen, Winston Knoll Collegiate, Regina, SK
- Prof. Angelina Weenie, Head of Indian Education, First Nations University of Canada

Appendix II: List of Written Submissions to the Task Force

- Department of English
- Department of French
- Dr. Marion Jones, Department of Economics
- Dr. Sam Nie, Department of English
- Prof. Annabel Robinson, Department of Philosophy and Classics
- Dr. Cannie Stark, Department of Psychology
- Dr. Andrew Stubbs, Department of English
- English as Second Language Program, Centre for Continuing Education

Appendix III: Luther College's English and Science Group

Some general information about the Learning Community

What is the "English & Science Group?"

Luther College has arranged a set of first-year courses commonly taken by Science students into a block schedule. Thirty-six students will take three common courses each semester as follows:

Fall semester	Winter semester
BIOL 100	BIOL 101
CHEM 102	CHEM 240
ENGL 100	ENGL 110
MATH 110 (optional)	

ENGL 100 and ENGL110 function as integrating courses each semester, focusing on technical writing skills and the literary study of scientific issues and figures. Dr. Noel Chevalier of Luther College will teach both English courses. (See English course descriptions below.)

Common laboratory sections in Biology and Chemistry have been arranged to allow students to work together in their labs.

Students are free to choose up to two electives in each semester. The scheduling allows for the inclusion of PHYS 109 and PHYS 119, taken by some first-year science students.

Rationale

Students studying in the natural sciences have many similar interests and learning needs. New students have a common set of concerns and needs. By providing a set of courses which students attend together we hope to foster:

- A sense of community for students
- A common learning experience targeted to the natural sciences
- Use of existing resources (in this case, courses) to meet particular needs of new students.

Eligibility

- Any first-year student enrolled in Science or a pre-professional health science major may register for the English & Science group. The program is offered by Luther College in co-operation with the Department of Biology and Chemistry. **It is not limited to Luther students.**
- The courses will be of particular interest to students who wish to major in biology, pre-dentistry, pre-medicine, pre-nutrition, pre-optometry, pre-physical therapy, or pre-veterinary medicine.
- 36 spaces will be reserved. Students who anticipate receiving credit for International Baccalaureate courses in English and Biology may not enroll in this program.

English Course Descriptions

ENGL 100: The composition element of the course will focus specifically on strategies for effective writing in the Sciences. Emphasis will be placed on clarity and word-usage, organization, and correct use of graphics. Strategies for effective reading in the Sciences will also be covered. The literary texts studies in this course all reflect a concern with science, particularly with science as a particular (though not the only) tool for understanding the physical world. In addition, we will read *Frankenstein* as a text that embodies numerous ethical and political challenges raised by the practice of modern science.

ENGL 110: The composition element of the course will focus on writing in the sciences. The emphasis will be on research, particularly journal and web-based research. The literature component will be divided into two main groups. The first will consider ways in which literary works represent the Scientist as hero and, in some cases, villain. The second section will look at 20th century scientific utopias and dystopias. Again, the focus will be on how writers both celebrate science and fear its implications for humanity.

For more information, contact

Mary Jesse, Registrar or
585-5083
Mary.Jesse@uregina.ca

Dr. Noel Chevalier, English
585-4852
Noel.Chevalier@uregina.ca

Appendix IV: WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition

Adopted by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA), April 2000.

For further information about the development of the Outcomes Statement, please see <http://comppile.tamucc.edu/WPAoutcomes/continue.html> (link updated 11/03)

For further information about the Council of Writing Program Administrators, please see <http://www.wpacouncil.org> A version of this statement was published in *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 23.1/2 (fall/winter 1999): 59-66

Introduction

This statement describes the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes sought by first-year composition programs in American postsecondary education. To some extent, we seek to regularize what can be expected to be taught in first-year composition; to this end the document is not merely a compilation or summary of what currently takes place. Rather, the following statement articulates what composition teachers nationwide have learned from practice, research, and theory. This document intentionally defines only "outcomes," or types of results, and not "standards," or precise levels of achievement. The setting of standards should be left to specific institutions or specific groups of institutions.

Learning to write is a complex process, both individual and social, that takes place over time with continued practice and informed guidance. Therefore, it is important that teachers, administrators, and a concerned public do not imagine that these outcomes can be taught in reduced or simple ways. Helping students demonstrate these outcomes requires expert understanding of how students actually learn to write. For this reason we expect the primary audience for this document to be well-prepared college writing teachers and college writing program administrators. In some places, we have chosen to write in their professional language. Among such readers, terms such as "rhetorical" and "genre" convey a rich meaning that is not easily simplified. While we have also aimed at writing a document that the general public can understand, in limited cases we have aimed first at communicating effectively with expert writing teachers and writing program administrators.

These statements describe only what we expect to find at the end of first-year composition, at most schools a required general education course or sequence of courses. As writers move beyond first-year composition, their writing abilities do not merely improve. Rather, students' abilities not only diversify along disciplinary and professional lines but also move into whole new levels where expected outcomes expand, multiply, and diverge. For this reason, each statement of outcomes for first-year composition is followed by suggestions for further work that builds on these outcomes.

Rhetorical Knowledge

By the end of first-year composition, students should

- Focus on a purpose
- Respond to the needs of different audiences
- Respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations

- Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation
- Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality
- Understand how genres shape reading and writing
- Write in several genres

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn

- The main features of writing in their fields
- The main uses of writing in their fields
- The expectations of readers in their fields

Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing

By the end of first-year composition, students should

- Use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating
- Understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources
- Integrate their own ideas with those of others
- Understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn

- The uses of writing as a critical thinking method
- The interactions among critical thinking, critical reading, and writing
- The relationships among language, knowledge, and power in their fields

Processes

By the end of first-year composition, students should

- Be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text
- Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading
- Understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and re-thinking to revise their work
- Understand the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes
- Learn to critique their own and others' works
- Learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part
- Use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn

- To build final results in stages
- To review work-in-progress in collaborative peer groups for purposes other than editing
- To save extensive editing for later parts of the writing process
- To apply the technologies commonly used to research and communicate within their fields

Knowledge of Conventions

By the end of first-year composition, students should

- Learn common formats for different kinds of texts

- Develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics
- Practice appropriate means of documenting their work
- Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn

- The conventions of usage, specialized vocabulary, format, and documentation in their fields
- Strategies through which better control of conventions can be achieved

Appendix V: Reading and Writing Centres at Other North American Institutions

Writing Centres at Canadian Universities

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA WRITING CENTRE

Taken from <http://www.writingcentre.ubc.ca/index.html>

UBC has a number of writing resources. The Writing Centre provides a tutorial clinic, writing workshops, drop-in tutoring, appointment tutoring, and a tutor registry. Unlike many of the other universities, UBC has a number of resources that deal with grammar and other structural aspects of writing. UBC also offers a number of writing courses.

The UBC Writing Centre offers Writing 098: Preparation for University Writing plus non-credit writing courses for academic, professional and personal advancement. In addition, a free tutoring service is available for UBC students.

The Writing Centre's Tutorial Clinic

The Writing Centre provides a tutorial clinic at no charge for UBC students.

The Writing Centre Workshop Series

In conjunction with the UBC Library, the Writing Centre offers several workshops that are free of charge to UBC students:

- AMS Tutoring Services for UBC Students
- Free Drop-in Tutoring
- Appointment Tutoring
- Tutor Registry
- Online Resource Centre
- Tutoring Skills Workshops

The Writing Centre's Online Writers' Workshop

This useful web site provides assistance to those who have specific questions about grammar and composition and includes:

- The Writers' Toolbox, with instruction and exercises addressing various writing concerns, and writing samples with accompanying analysis.
- The Writers' Workbench, with an email text-submission tool.
- Reference Links, with information on dictionaries (from traditional to avant-garde), grammar and composition, and style guides.
- Fun Links that offer you a diversion when you need a break from your work

Writing 098

The primary mandate of the Writing Centre is to help UBC students develop the writing and editing skills necessary to achieve a level 5 on the Language Proficiency Index examination (LPI), required for admission into first-year English courses at UBC. This service is extended to prospective UBC students and the public. Applicants for Writing 098 do not have to be native speakers of English or UBC students to register for the course, but they must have an advanced level of English and be at least 18 years of age. Grade 11 and 12 students can take

the online version of Writing 098 in the Fall and Winter semesters and the day-time, evening or weekend courses on campus during the Spring and Summer semesters as long as they have the support of a school counsellor. Students with English as an additional language and without Canadian university or college experience should call 604-822-1555 or view www.eli.ubc.ca for information on UBC's English as a Second Language (ESL) courses.

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN WRITING CENTRE

Taken from <http://www.usask.ca/english/writing>

The Writing Centre at the University of Saskatchewan provides intensive one-to-one instruction in the process of writing. The Centre focuses specifically on writing as a process—it is not for proofreading and editing. The Department of English and Student Services sponsor the Writing Centre.

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY EFFECTIVE WRITING PROGRAM

Taken from <http://www.comcul.ucalgary.ca/Web/efwr/efwrhome.html>

The Effective Writing Program at the University of Calgary is an academic service of the Faculty of Communication and Culture. Their Writing Program is based on the pedagogy of Writing Across the Curriculum. "The Effective Writing Program hopes to foster not only improved writing skills among students but also a University-wide culture that values student writing and sees it as essential—not just in evaluating what students have learned but in promoting that learning and in helping students to become literate members of their disciplines, their professions, and their communities". Students can meet with instructors to improve their writing process and learn strategies to write more effectively.

YORK UNIVERSITY CENTRE FOR ACADEMIC WRITING

Taken from <http://www.arts.yorku.ca/caw/>

The Centre for Academic Writing offers practical instruction in all aspects of writing to all students in the Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Fine Arts, the Faculty of Graduate Studies, and the Schulich School of Business. Some tutors specialize in working with ESL students, and in working with students who have disabilities affecting language learning and language skills. The chief method of instruction is individual tutoring where sessions usually last 25 or 50 minutes. We now also provide electronic tutoring. The Centre offers credit courses and a number of group workshops that deal with the major elements of effective essay writing. The website provides students with up-to-date information about the Centre for Academic Writing activities, and links to academic resources, such as style guides, dictionaries, an encyclopaedia, and an on-line writing center.

American Writing Initiatives

PURDUE ONLINE WRITING LAB

Taken from <http://owl.english.purdue.edu>

The University of Purdue has a busy writing lab that offers writing assistance of all kinds to U of P students. The focus is on individual instruction. The writing lab exists within the university's large English department, which offers many writing courses and a

graduate program in rhetoric and composition. Within the lab, there is a diversity of approaches, but all work from the same basic assumptions of collaboration and individualization that define writing center tutoring. The writing lab at Purdue is provided by the English department. The lab is equipped with computers, self-instruction manuals and handouts. The lab also conducts workshops and operates a grammar hotline. Students can schedule an appointment with a tutor or just drop in. The writing lab is intended primarily for students involved in Purdue's extensive writing program, but all students are welcome.

There are three different types of tutors:

- Writing lab instructors (15) – graduate students who handle general traffic. These students must have taught composition courses. A tutoring assignment is the equivalent to a course assignment.
- Writing consultants (4-6) – peer tutors that deal with business writing.
- Undergraduate teaching assistants (8-10) – peer tutors for students Purdue's developmental composition program.

New instructors undergo 1 semester of formal training that focuses on theory and practice of collaborative learning and strategies for tutoring. The English department funds all salaries.

They keep track of student use of the writing center by asking students to fill out a slip indicating the type of help they needed, the class for which help was needed, and how they heard about the writing center. The writing center publicizes through bookmarks, brochures and information sheets. This information is included in orientation packages sent to new students. Each semester, students are asked to fill out evaluation forms for the help they received. See also:

Harris, Muriel. (1993). "A Multiservice Writing Lab in a Multiversity: The Purdue University Writing Lab." *Writing Centers in Context*. Ed. J. Kinkead and J. Harris. Urbana: National Council on Teachers of English. 1-27.

Purdue University now has extensive online writing services including a complete Online Writing Lab (<http://owl.english.purdue.edu>). The Online Writing Lab includes a webpage with a number of materials and resources, an e-mail tutoring service, and a weekly newspaper on writing. The Online Writing Lab also offers a number of interactive presentations and workshops.

THE WRITING CENTER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Taken from <http://www.usc.edu/dept/LAS/writing/writingcenter/index.html> and <http://www.usc.edu/dept/LAS/writing/>

The University of Southern California has had a Freshman Writing Program since 1978. At first, the Writing Lab was a place for students to work on grammar and surface errors. There were lots of materials (books, cassettes, etc.), but few instructors. Editing was deliberately kept separate from composition. Composing skills (such as pre-writing and revision) were to be learned in a classroom 'workshop' setting, while the Writing Lab was primarily for editing. The University later decided to take a more collaborative approach, reorganised the lab and renamed it the Writing Center. Communication is the essence of the new Writing Center. The program stresses dialogue as the basis for the instructional relationship.

The University of Southern California requires all undergraduate students to “demonstrate the ability to write acceptable college-level expository prose to fulfil the university’s general education skills requirement” (Clark, 1993:98). The university has a Freshman Writing Program (FRP) that is responsible for this. The Writing Center is an important part of the program. The Program has four permanent members: FRP director, Writing Center director, director in charge of testing and evaluation, and a director for English as a Second Language. The directors have a collaborative working relationship. Together they compose course content and curriculum (including ESL), and determine policy and programs for the Writing Center.

There are now approximately 100 tutors, called consultants. Conferences in the Writing Center focus on global areas of writing such as thesis, focus, organisation, and audience. Most of the consultants are English graduate students who teach freshman writing courses as well as tutor in the Writing Center. In exchange, the student consultants receive free tuition and a salary.

The Writing Center is open to all students, but is most frequently visited by Freshmen. Approximately 10% of Freshmen at the university are students for whom English is a second language. There is some uncertainty as to how to best the needs of ESL students. Many ESL students visit the Writing Center for help with grammar and surface areas on a particular paper, but the pedagogy of the program focuses on global areas of writing. Consultants want to help students develop an effective writing process beyond a single assignment. Most visitors to the Writing Center have a one-on-one conference with a writing consultant. Some students have weekly standing appointments. See also:

Clark, I. (1993). “The Writing Center at the University of Southern California: Couches, Carrels, Computers, and Conversation.” *Writing Centers in Context: Twelve Case Studies*. Ed. J. Kinkead and J. Harris. Urbana: National Council on Teachers of English. 97-113.

The University of Southern California now has a wide range of online resources including an online dictionary, grammar information, grammar exercises, and a guide to proper referencing and avoiding plagiarism

INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON - CAMPUS WRITING PROGRAM

Taken from <http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/wts/wtsinfo.html>

The CAMPUS WRITING PROGRAM is composed of two interrelated units. One unit, the *Writing Program* proper, administers the second, *Writing Tutorial Services* (WTS), which is the writing center on the IU Bloomington campus, with several satellite locations.

The primary function of the Writing Program is to provide consultation to faculty members on the use of writing in classes; it also offers course development grants and conducts research into the efficacy of writing instruction.

The Campus Writing Program is dedicated to improving undergraduate education by promoting writing as a way of learning and teaching. The emphasis on writing is not merely an attempt to give students additional practice in basic composition skills, but is intended to foster the ability to articulate complex positions without adding to their complexity.

The Writing Program has three missions:

- to assist IUB faculty through consultation as they work to integrate writing into their courses
- to assist IUB students as they do that writing
- to research the claims of “writing across the curriculum.”

Writing Tutorial Services

About thirty-five tutors—graduate students and undergraduates—are employed on an hourly basis to assist IU students working on writing assignments for any of their courses.

The Writing Program also regularly investigates the effectiveness of the tutoring provided in Writing Tutorial Services by surveying students, interviewing faculty members whose students use WTS, and by studying in various ways the interactions between tutors and students.

On Writing Assignment Design

The Writing Program offers consultation and advice to faculty members concerning any aspect of the use of writing in their classes, ranging from the design of a particular assignment to elicit the kind of response from students that the instructor wants, to the design or redesign of a course syllabus to incorporate sequenced writing assignments over the entire semester.

General Information about Writing Tutorial Services

WTS is intended for anyone working on a paper for any class offered on the Bloomington campus--not just composition courses, and not just students who are having difficulty with their writing. The people at WTS know that revision is a fundamental part of writing a clear, well-organized essay. They are there to provide feedback to any student who wants to improve his or her thinking on paper.

In addition to help with required composition courses, WTS provides "discipline-specific" tutoring. WTS tutors come from a variety of academic disciplines, and a student seeking tutoring is assigned to the tutor whose interests and background provide the best match with the demands of the course and the student's needs. For example, if you're working on a paper for a history class, we'll try to arrange a tutorial with a graduate student in history, someone who might have actually taught or graded for history classes at IUB before.

WTS also offers faculty and students "course-specific" tutoring. A faculty member can call the Campus Writing Program and request that a tutor be assigned to a course. A graduate student tutor with enviable writing and teaching skills will then be assigned to work with students from that course. The tutor will meet with the instructor to discuss the syllabus and writing requirements, and whenever a student from the class calls to make an appointment, every effort will be made to schedule the student with the assigned tutor. Because that will not always be possible, however, WTS tutors are organized into working groups dealing with similar or allied disciplines (humanities, social sciences, physical or biological sciences ...); members of the working group meet regularly to share their knowledge about the courses to which they're assigned. This way, whenever it's possible students will be working with someone familiar with their specific class.

WTS is a free service for all IU students. WTS can help with any kind of writing project and at any stage of the writing process: brainstorming, revising, polishing, etc. WTS

works with good writers as well as struggling ones. WTS doesn't send reports about tutorials to professors (or anyone else!).

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND WRITING CENTER & WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

Taken from <http://writing.richmond.edu/wac/information.htm>

Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) at University of Richmond is based on the Brown and Swarthmore models whose success is well documented. Swarthmore's "Writing Associates Program" is an adaptation of Brown's "Writing Fellows Program." It is particularly suited to the needs of an intensive, small, liberal arts college.

In our program, specially selected undergraduates are trained to help other students improve their writing skills. They complete a course in composition theory and practice as well as gain experience in the Writing Center. Once accepted into the WAC program, Writing Fellows, as they are called here, are assigned to individual courses whose professors have requested assistance with writing.

Fellows are responsible for reviewing first drafts of course papers for no more than fifteen enrolled students and offer individual conferences about each paper, suggesting more detailed strategies for problem-solving. Students then have one week to consider these suggestions and revise their drafts. Professors receive both the first draft, with annotations by the Writing Fellows, and the final version. Students receive detailed commentary (helpful, not judgmental) on at least two papers during the semester and often benefit from the close relationship that develops between Writing Fellow and student.

This relationship is truly collaborative: Writing Fellows are learners as well as teachers. Both Fellow and student have expertise. The Fellow has a special knowledge of writing, and the student, special knowledge of the subject matter. In such situations, writing and learning become truly collaborative.

Besides improving their own writing, Fellows develop strong interpersonal skills in consulting with both their peers and professors. The privilege of being a Writing Fellow carries with it a clear message to future employers and educators about the student's academic accomplishments and leadership skills.

To be eligible for Writing Fellow assistance, instructors participate in two basic workshops and meet minimal criteria for implementing writing in their courses. The professor must agree to require all students enrolled in the course to submit a first draft of all papers to the Writing Fellow and to structure the course so that it requires at least two papers of substantial length and complexity, or several (three to five) shorter writing samples.

One of the greatest concerns among educators in the field of composition and rhetoric is that students do not receive continued close attention to their writing beyond freshman English. Consequently, even students who perform well in basic composition courses often lose their skills or fail to develop them as they pursue their interests in major content areas. Writing Across the Curriculum is designed to meet students' continued need for the reinforcement and development of communication skills. In a Writing Fellows program, that reinforcement comes not only from professors in other disciplines at all levels, but also from a student's peers.

It is compatible with disciplines across arts and sciences. Writing Fellows can be placed in any course. The procedure allows a faculty member to increase the emphasis on writing without having to feel obligated to teach writing itself. That task will be primarily left to the Fellows, who may also refer a student to the Writing Center. Students will be given specific direction in curing writing problems pointed out by both the faculty member and the Writing Fellow. The program will be a visible indication of widespread concern for writing at the university, while simultaneously strengthening that concern by encouraging faculty university-wide to stress the importance of clear written communication in their classes.

Because the Writing Fellows are undergraduates, they need not threaten their peers. Students who are aware of their writing deficiencies may find instruction by Writing Fellows more helpful and easier to manage.

This program encourages students to think carefully about their writing and to revise consistently. Those who submit careless first drafts know that this draft, along with the Writing Fellow's comments, will be seen by the professor. Furthermore, students are encouraged to revise all drafts so that each paper a faculty member sees should have been through at least two versions. Since thoughtful revision is the key to improving writing, the Fellows program will help students adopt the best of writing habits. The program will reach a large number of students for a relatively low cost. Finally, the program will be highly beneficial to those students who serve as Fellows. It will provide an opportunity to learn by teaching and to gain practical experience in helping others. The title--Undergraduate Writing Fellow--should help students convince future employers and educators of their special strengths.

According to Tori Haring-Smith (and others who have adopted the Brown model), the program succeeds precisely because it is collaborative. Whereas most writing-across-the-curriculum programs ask faculty to spend large amounts of time in being retrained and grading papers, this program offers a service to faculty. Pedagogically, then, it responds to the need for students to become more actively involved in their education. It solves an educational problem not by demanding more of the already overworked faculty, but by asking more of the students. It also demonstrates that education need not be based on competition; cooperation is a more successful educational strategy. The above information derives from material sent by Thomas Blackburn (Swarthmore) and Tori Haring-Smith (Brown).

Appendix VI: Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Administration

Taken from: <http://www.wpacouncil.org/positions/intellectualwork.html>

Council of Writing Program Administrators

Preamble

It is clear within departments of English that research and teaching are generally regarded as intellectual, professional activities worthy of tenure and promotion. But administration--including leadership of first-year writing courses, WAC programs, writing centers, and the many other manifestations of writing administration--has for the most part been treated as a management activity that does not produce new knowledge and that neither requires nor demonstrates scholarly expertise and disciplinary knowledge. While there are certainly arguments to be made for academic administration, in general, as intellectual work, that is not our aim here. Instead, our concern in this document is to present a framework by which writing administration can be seen as scholarly work and therefore subject to the same kinds of evaluation as other forms of disciplinary production, such as books, articles, and reviews. More significantly, by refiguring writing administration as scholarly and intellectual work, we argue that it is worthy of tenure and promotion when it advances and enacts disciplinary knowledge within the field of Rhetoric and Composition.