DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 917 CS 212 654

AUTHOR Goetz, Donna
TITLE Evaluation of Writing-Across-The-Curriculum Programs.
PUB DATE 14 Aug 90
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (98th, Boston, MA, August 10-14, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Faculty Development; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods; *Writing Across the Curriculum; Writing Attitudes; Writing Instruction; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS Elmhurst College IL; Teacher Surveys; Writing to Learn

ABSTRACT

An ongoing study evaluated the effectiveness of a writing across the curriculum (WAC) program at a small liberal arts college. Fifty-five out of 99 full-time faculty responded to a survey seeking to compare WAC faculty who had voluntarily participated in at least a 3-day workshop to faculty not involved in the WAC program. Pre- and post-workshop data were also obtained from 14 new WAC faculty who participated in their first WAC workshop. Results revealed that WAC faculty required writing in more of the courses they taught and that they assigned more short papers and used short, ungraded writing exercises during class time. Results also revealed that WAC faculty more often reported providing preliminary feedback to students on rough drafts during the writing process and more often provided written instructions describing the writing assignment's purpose and format in their courses. WAC faculty were more likely to require journals in at least one class and reported using ungraded journals about twice as often as the non-WAC faculty. Pre- and post workshop data obtained from the 14 new WAC faculty revealed similar trends. (Suggestions for future evaluation research, an annotated bibliography of nine resources on WAC programs, and survey results are included.) (KEH)

EVALUATION OF WRITING-ACROSS-THE-CURRICULUM PROGRAMS

Donna Goetz

Elmhurst College

Presented at the Symposium: WRITING IN PSYCHOLOGY: FUTURE DIRECTIONS

American Psychological Association Convention

Boston, MA

August 14, 1990

APA 8/14/90 Symposium: WRITING IN PSYCHOLOGY: FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Evaluation of Writing Across the Curriculum Programs

Donna J. Goetz
Elmhurst College
Elmhurst, IL 60126

Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) programs were begun in the mid-seventies but there are few published evaluation reports. Efforts to evaluate these programs are impacted by two trends in education and composition instruction: the demand for greater accountability which is shown in the increased importance of assessment and the focus on writing as a process, not a final product. This presentation will examine the evaluation of WAC programs, including the author's ongoing project, briefly summarize the research on evaluation of WAC, briefly report on the findings of a survey, and suggest issues for future evaluation research on writing.

There is an increasing emphasis on assessment in higher education. A recent survey indicated that 82 percent of American colleges and universities are engaged in assessment activities. Fifty-five percent of the public institutions are working under a state mandate to assess student instruction (El Khawas, 1990). Yet up to the present time there have been relatively few attempts at assessing Writing-across-the Curriculum programs. Fulwiler (1988) lists several reasons, one of which is, that WAC programs have been result-oriented rather than research-oriented. Most programs are directed by administrators with little time and often no special training in evaluation. This is

a good opportunity for psychologists to become involved in applied research on their campuses.

Surveys of nontraditional writing programs (Haring-Smith, 1985) show that the term WAC describes a variety of programs. The Haring-Smith survey describes 230 programs which include components such as writing centers, peer tutoring programs, writing across the curriculum, and computer-assisted instruction and word processing. WAC means "different things at different institutions" (Fulwiler, 1988). As an example, I will briefly discuss the broad range of activities associated with WAC at our own college and note that our WAC program is still evolving. WAC emphasizes writing to learn by using writing to actively engage the student at a deeper level of cognitive processing. The WAC program at our college began in 1987 with faculty from at least fifteen different disciplines participating in a week-long workshop led by an experienced consultant. Teaching methods such as the use of short, ungraded, in-class writing and peer review of early drafts were demonstrated through faculty participation. Each faculty member selected one course for which they developed new writing assignments. Near the end of the workshop participants shared their revised course syllabi with the other participants though a brief presentation. Follow-up meetings were held about three times each semester for the purpose of sharing successful experiences and also difficulties with WAC. The next two summers, workshops were held to introduce new faculty members to the WAC program and to give more advanced

direction to experienced WAC participants. This past January, fifteen full-time faculty and two administrators participated in the initial WAC workshop, bringing the total number of faculty involved to nearly fifty out of a total of one hundred full-time faculty. This summer, WAC sponsored a workshop on critical thinking.

In addition to the workshops, WAC and the Faculty Development Committee sponsored two book discussions in the past year, discussions of William Perry's Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme and discussions of Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, Tarule's Women's Ways of Knowing. Participants find the opportunity to share ideas with colleagues extremely valuable. A professor of biology has begun writing an internal newsletter on published reports of effective writing activities for mathematics and the natural sciences. A music professor had students in his Concerts for Credit course write reviews of the performances, and then the advanced students in Music Theory critiqued the reviews. The review judged to be the best was published in the college newspaper. A professor of nursing held a writing lab twice a week for a semester for students and faculty in her discipline. I began evaluating the WAC program at our college. This spring Jane Jegerski and I collected data at the beginning and end of the semester on the writing apprehensiveness of students in three writing-intensive psychology courses and one non-writing-intensive course.

An active WAC program can provide a good opportunity for ongoing applied research. There are immediate benefits for teaching and sharing with colleagues. Classroom-based research is most relevant for teachers, perhaps, especially at liberal-arts college where the focus has traditionally been on teaching.

As I began trying to evaluate our WAC program which was already three years underway, I did a computer-assisted search of the literature on WAC. Many of the publications on WAC were descriptions of effective writing assignments but very few dealt with the evaluation of WAC programs. As noted, WAC programs vary from one institution to another and have great variety even within one institution, therefore no single evaluation model can be used. There are however, some excellent sources on the principles of evaluation that are applicable to WAC and these are indicated in the annotated bibliography to be distributed at the end of this session.

After I found few sources directly applicable to evaluating WAC program, I began researching the published literature on traditional composition instruction for ideas on how to proceed with the evaluation. I became acquainted with some journals that contained useful material, two of the most helpful are the journals: Research in the Teaching of English and College Composition and Communication.

It is difficult to document significant improvement in a complex activity such as writing during the course of one brief semester (Witte & Faigley, 1983; White, 1985). Also the

measurement of writing skills is not that refined. Early attempts at measurement used indices such as the number of grammatical errors, numbers of words produced in a brief writing session, and sentence length and variety in sentence length as measures of complexity. These attempts were too simplistic and have been abandoned for the most part. There have been attempts to train judges in holistic scoring of essays and sometimes good reliability and inter-judge agreement have been reached. In those studies, judges score essays written before and after a composition course with the topics counter-balanced so judges do not know when the essay was written. However, as White (1985) points out, when pretest and posttest essays are compared, researchers are actually comparing how well students can write first drafts. The current trend in composition is to teach writing as a process. Two important goals are to teach students how to edit and rewrite their own work and to establish a habit of rewriting. What we need are samples and measures of the students' best writing efforts.

I have discussed the difficulties of doing evaluation of WAC programs. However, an evaluation can provide useful information and I think that the research on writing instruction can be applied to WAC programs. There are two key differences between traditional writing programs and WAC programs that influence attempts at evaluation. The first is that since students' exposure to WAC is longer than the one- or two-semester composition course, WAC may be more likely to show an impact.

However, each student's exposure to WAC techniques is different, depending on the unique mix of courses and instructors, and it is notoriously difficult to evaluate the effect of different treatments that have unique components. As noted before, WAC programs comprise a great variety of activities and teaching strategies.

The use of formative evaluation procedures and an outside consultant (Davis, Scriven, & Thomas, 1987) and the use of multiple measures to assess multiple objectives have been recommended (Davis, et al., 1987; White, 1985). Measures can include students outcomes such as dropout rate, attitude about writing such as the Writing Apprehension Scale (Daly and Miller, 1975), improved grades in other subjects, and long-range changes in attitudes or behaviors. Measures of the writing process either sample actual behavior, or use students' self-report on their writing behaviors.

Faculty can be assessed on attitudes toward the subject and towards the students, morale, amount of collaboration with colleagues within one's department and within the institution, conference attendance at writing topics, and publications, and the spread of effect beyond the immediate program. Fulwiler (1988) suggested comparing syllabi before and after WAC's introduction. And of course, one wants to get participants' evaluations after each WAC workshop or WAC-sponsored activity.

Now I will discuss the evaluation just begun on WAC at my college. A survey adapted from Beaver College was used with the

permission of Barbara Nodine of the Psychology Department. Faculty were requested to report what kind of writing assignments they required of students in Fall 1989. Most, but not all, of the items on the survey were techniques that were emphasized in WAC workshops. I compared WAC faculty who had voluntarily participated in at least a three-day workshop to faculty not involved in the WAC program. I was obtained pre- and post-workshop data from fourteen new WAC faculty who participated in their first WAC workshop in January 1990.

Fifty-five out of ninety-nine full-time faculty responded to the survey. Table 1 shows that most of the results were in the expected direction, however, only a few of the comparisons were statistically significant at the .01 level. The conservative .01 level was used to compensate for the use of multiple T-tests. WAC faculty required writing in more of the courses they taught and they assigned more short papers and used short, ungraded writing exercises during class time. However, both groups reported a low level of use of peer review of students' drafts. Slightly more than half of each faculty group reported stressing the need for the student to define the audience for whom the paper is written. It was not expected that so many non-WAC faculty were stressing the importance of audience. Both groups were equally likely to require long papers of six or more pages. A high percentage of both groups reported using essay questions.

The use of multiple drafts and the importance of giving feedback to students as they are in the process of writing are

emphasized in WAC. Table 2 shows that WAC faculty more often reported providing preliminary feedback to students on rough drafts as they are in the process of writing. However, there is little difference between the percent of WAC and non-WAC faculty reporting that they require topics, outlines, first paragraphs, or bibliographies to be submitted before the final draft. These last four items were not stressed in the WAC workshops held on our campus. This fact increases my confidence that the differences we do see are due to the influence of the workshop and not just that WAC instructors are requiring more writing of all types. Table 1 indicates that there is no difference between the two groups in assigning long papers, which again, was not emphasized in WAC.

Table 3 shows that WAC faculty more often provided written instructions describing the writing assignment's purpose and format in their courses. However, for faculty who use an assignment sheet, the mean length of the written instructions is equivalent. WAC faculty consciously target writing assignments to a particular cognitive level (e. g., Bloom's taxonomy or Perry's scheme) three times as often as non-WAC faculty do. Bloom's taxonomy was briefly discussed in one of the WAC workshops, but some of the influence may be due to the fall discussions of Perry's book, rather than the workshop per se. This was an item we added to our survey which was not on the Beaver College survey.

WAC faculty were more likely to require journals in at least one class and reported using ungraded journals about twice as often as the non-WAC faculty. Table 4 shows faculty responses to an open-ended question added to the survey. WAC faculty stated that their major purpose for requiring students to write is "to help the student to learn the material better." The second purpose was to stimulate the student to use higher cognitive levels and thirdly, to foster communication skills. Non-WAC faculty stressed the fostering of communication skills and then encouraging the student to use higher cognitive levels and to think independently.

Table 1a shows the comparison of pre-and post-workshop responses of fourteen new WAC faculty who participated in a workshop in January 1990. These faculty completed a questionnaire in December of 1989 and in May or June of 1990. Most of the trends follow those trends shown in Table 1 which compared the WAC and non-WAC faculty. After the workshop, new WAC faculty required writing in more of their courses and reported using short, ungraded writing exercises during class time. There is one puzzling item in that new WAC faculty reported that "I provide some preliminary feedback to students on papers they are in the process of writing.." in fewer courses after the workshop. This also seems to contradict Table 2a which would seem to indicate that new WAC faculty are <u>more</u> likely to require the student to submit a rough draft for peer or instructor review before submitting the finished draft.

Perhaps the answer is that new WAC faculty report using peer review more frequently, up from 16 percent before the workshop to 28 percent after the workshop(Table 1a). Therefore the facult may be indicating that although students are receiving feedback, the feedback does not always come from the instructor.

While it would appear that the WAC workshops caused the differences that have been noted, it is possible that faculty who selected themselves to participate in the WAC program are different than other faculty. It is also possible that WAC participants are more likely to report using more writing assignments of all types. This appears unlikely though, based on analyses of other data. There was only a slight difference between WAC and non-WAC faculty in requiring a statement of topic, or outline, first paragraph, or bibliography during the writing process. The WAC group was only slightly more likely to recommend that students visit the Learning Center for assistance in writing. There was no difference in the assignment of longer papers of 6 pages or more. None of these techniques was emphasized in the WAC workshops. These items provide a control for the alternate hypothesis that WAC faculty use more writing assignments of all types. It seems that the main differences in faculty teaching behaviors between WAC and non-WAC participants were consistent with those stressed in the workshop.

A further check on the self-selection hypothesis was made by comparing responses on the December survey within the non-participant group, contrasting those fifteen faculty who

subsequently did and those who seventeen who did not participate in the January WAC workshop. Investigation of those groups shows no indication that they were systematically different before the initial workshop. Before the workshop, new WAC faculty were actually less likely to require writing in their courses, less likely to use essay questions, and less likely to consider written expression in evaluating essay questions than the group of faculty who never participated in WAC. However, the new WAC faculty were more likely than the non-participants to target writing assignments to cognitive levels even before the workshop. This may reflect the WAC-sponsored discussions of Perry's theory of intellectual development in college students held in the fall term rather than the workshop per se. Some of the January 1990 WAC participants took part in the discussions of Perry's book prior to their participation in a WAC workshop. This illustrates the spread of effect that undoubtedly occurs when nearly half the faculty are participating in a broad-based WAC program.

At this point I would like to discuss future directions for the evaluation of WAC programs. I will continue to survey our faculty regarding the use of WAC techniques. I will collect pre- and post-workshop data on all faculty as they begin the WAC training program. The WAC workshops will be monitored regarding the amount of time spent practicing or learning about various techniques. Since the content of the workshops shifts over time, I need to know how to relate the workshop to changes in faculty

behaviors. I am recruiting two faculty members from each of the three academic divisions to participate in an intensive study of their classes, with experimental groups using WAC techniques and control groups of different sections of the same course. I also plan to begin longitudinal tracking of individual students and to begin portfolios of student work to assess the impact of WAC on individual students through their college careers.

In the future, I think that we will see more use of portfolios of students' writing and the development of more systematic ways to evaluate these. A recent survey indicated that 30 percent of colleges are collecting portfolios of student work (El-Khawas, 1990). At the June 1990 meeting of the Association for Assessment in Higher Education, several sessions were devoted to the use and assessment of portfolios. I think that we will see more use of portfolios of students' writing as representative pieces of the students' best writing. There will be more emphasis on longitudinal tracking of a student through his or her college career. I think we will see more small-scale, classroom-based research as teachers take more responsibility for conducting research on teaching methods.

References

Belenky, M. F.; Clinchy, B. M.; Goldberger, N. R.; Tarule,J. M. (1986). Women's Ways of Knowing. New York: Basic Books,Inc.

Davis, B. G.;Scriven, M.; & Thomas, S. (1987). The evaluation of composition instruction (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Daly, J., & Miller, M. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 9(3), 250-256.

El-Khawas, E. (1990). Campus Trends, 1990. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

Fulwiler, T. (1988). Evaluating Writing across the curriculum programs. In S. H. McLeod (Ed.), Strengthening programs for writing across the curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Haring-Smith, T. (Ed.) (1985). A guide to writing programs. Glenview, Il.: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

Witte, S., & Faigley, L. (1983). Evaluating college writing programs. Carbondale, Il. : Southern Illinois University Press.

White, E. M. (1985). Teaching and assessing writing. San Francisco Jossey-Bass, 1985.

		WAC n=23 X̄ / SD	Non-WAC n=32 X̄	T-Test Value	2-Tailed Probability Level
1.	___% of the courses I teach require student writing.	X̄ 97 SD 9	84 27	2.53	.015
2.	I require long papers of approximately 6-7 pages or more in ____% of my courses	X̄ 44 SD 39	47 34	0.30	
3.	I require short papers (1-5 pp) in ____% of my courses.	X̄ 72 SD 36	50 38	2.19	.033
4.	When I assign a paper, I alert my students of the need to define the audience for whom the paper is written in ____% of my courses.	X̄ 56 SD 46	55 43	0.03	
5.	I use peer review of drafts in ____% of my courses.	X̄ 14 SD 25	10 23	0.52	
6.	I suggest or require that students visit the Learning Center for assistance in writing in ____% of my courses.	X̄ 36 SD 41	30 43	0.48	
7.	I provide some preliminary feedback to students on papers as they are in the process of writing in ____% of my courses.	X̄ 69 SD 40	51 40	1.69	
8.	I use short, ungraded writing exercises during class time (for example, answers to discussion questions, summaries of lectures or readings, reactions) in ____% of my courses.	X̄ 53 SD 46	24 42	2.38	.022
9.	I use short, ungraded writing exercises that are required to be done out of class (for example, reactions to readings, questions written by students on the readings, answers to questions I assign, reactions to or summaries of class activities) in ____% of my courses.	X̄ 42 SD 42	39 42	0.27	
10.	I use essay questions for in-class exams in ____% of my courses.	X̄ 70 SD 40	67 41	0.22	
11.	When I evaluate and grade essay exam questions, I give some consideration to the written expression, as well as the content in ____% of my courses.	X̄ 89 SD 26	75 39	1.46	

Table 1 Comparison of WAC and Non-WAC faculty responses.
Data collected in December 1989

While students are working on a major paper, I require them to submit for peer review or instructor preview before they submit the finished draft: (Circle one)

	WAC (n=23)			Non-WAC (n=32)		
	Always	Sometimes	Never	Always	Sometimes	Never
a. A statement of topic or proposal	48%	13%	26%	48%	25%	22% *
b. Rough draft	32	35	22	20	38	44
c. Outline	13	22	48	16	22	50
d. First paragraph	-	5	74	-	4	75
e. Bibliography	31	31	26	28	28	34

* Percentages are rounded to the nearest integer. Totals do not add to 100% due to missing data on some forms.

Table 2 Comparison of WAC and Non-WAC faculty responses.

	WAC n=23 % yes	Non-WAC n=32 % yes
1. When I assign a paper, I give students a written assignment sheet describing the paper's purpose and format: ____yes ____no. (If yes), the description of the assignment is approximately ____lines in length. (Mean length of format sheet is 29 lines for WAC and 25 lines for non-WAC faculty,)	78	62
2. When I give definition or identification questions, I require that students answer in full sentences for full credit: ____yes, ____no ____do not use such questions. (39% WAC and 35% non-WAC do not use such questions.)	52	19
3. Do you consciously target writing assignments to particular cognitive levels (e.g., Bloom or Perry?) ____yes ____no.	65	22

* *

4. I use journals which are ____ungraded, ____graded and count for ____% of the final course grade.

WAC (n=23)			Non-WAC (n=32)		
Ungraded	Graded	% Course Grade	Ungraded	Graded	% Course Grade
35%	17%	20 (median) *	16%	19%	21 (median) *

* Medians were used to offset two extreme scores in this group.

Table 3 Comparison of WAC and non-WAC faculty responses to survey.

	WAC (n=23) Rank	%	Non-WAC (n=29) * Rank	%
To help student learn material better.	1	30	4.5	13**
To stimulate higher cognitive levels: e.g., analysis or synthesis.	2	22	2.5	17
To foster communication skills.	3	17	1	25
To help students learn to think independently.	5	9	2.5	17
To encourage expression of ideas in and out of class.	5	9	6	3
To promote personal growth and self-understanding: e.g., clinical journals.	5	9	-	0
To provide practice for professional skills: e.g., terminology or report writing.	7	4	6	6
To assess learning and/or to make students prepare for class.	-	0	4.5	13

* There were two missing responses and one unclassifiable response to this question for the non-Wac group.

** All percentages are rounded to the nearest integer.

*** A total of 104 purposes were listed by 55 faculty members. For this analysis only the first purpose listed was counted.

Table 4 Faculty responses to open-ended question: "My major purpose for requiring students to write is ____". ***

Table 5 Writing Apprehension

			$\bar{X}$	SD	T Value	2-tail Probability
Control Group (n=20)	Gen. Psy with Computer Simulation	Pre	88.75	16.44	-0.97	
		Post	90.85	14.45		
3 Writing Intensive Group (n=53)		Pre	84.28	12.64	-2.05	.046 *
		Post	86.74	13.03		
Gen Psy with Writing (n=11)		Pre	82.73	17.18	0.13	
		Post	82.27	11.96		
Psy 312 Writing Intensive (n=21)		Pre	88.48	13.12	-1.54	
		Post	91.57	16.00		
Psy 319 (n=21)		Pre	80.90	7.99	-2.33	.031 *
		Post	84.24	8.46		

		Pre-WAC (n=14)	Post-WAC (n=17)	T-Test Value	2-Tailed Probability Level
1. ___% of the courses I teach require student writing.	$\bar{X}$	81.64	95.86		
	SD	27.23	11.88	-2.31	.038
2. I require long papers of approximately 6-7 pages or more in ____% of my courses	$\bar{X}$	46.36	34.07		
	SD	36.20	32.05	1.21	
3. I require short papers (1-5pp) in ____% of my courses.	$\bar{X}$	58.36	69.71		
	SD	9.76	30.01	-1.03	
4. When I assign a paper, I alert my students of the need to define the audience for whom the paper is written in ____% of my courses.	$\bar{X}$	43.79	64.21		
	SD	43.63	39.75	-1.60	
5. I use peer review of drafts in ____% of my courses.	$\bar{X}$	16.43	28.79		
	SD	30.54	38.62	-1.62	
6. I suggest or require that students visit the Learning Center for assistance in writing in ____% of my courses.	$\bar{X}$	22.57	32		
	SD	38.95	45.56	-0.98	
7. I provide some preliminary feedback to students on papers as they are in the process of writing in ____% of my courses.	$\bar{X}$	61.50	48.36		
	SD	36.70	35.16	1.01	
8. I use short, ungraded writing exercises during class time (for example, answers to discussion questions, summaries of lectures or readings, reactions) in ____% of my courses.	$\bar{X}$	14.29	47		
	SD	36.31	41.82	-2.76	.016
9. I use short, ungraded writing exercises that are required to be done out of class (for example, reactions to readings, questions written by students on the readings, answers to questions I assign, reactions to or summaries of class activities) in ____% of my courses.	$\bar{X}$	36.29	24.64		
	SD	42.22	36.18	0.89	
10. I use essay questions for in-class exams in ____% of my courses.	$\bar{X}$	60.31	78.07		
	SD	38.07	31.90	-1.48	
11. When I evaluate and grade essay exam questions, I give some consideration to the written expression, as well as the content in ____% of my courses.	$\bar{X}$	62.42	55.93		
	SD	43.90	50.46	0.52	

Table 1a Comparison of Pre-WAC and Post-WAC faculty responses. Data were obtained from 14 out of 15 eligible faculty.

While students are working on a major paper, I require them to submit for peer review or instructor preview before they submit the finished draft: (Circle one)

	Pre-WAC (n=14)			Post-WAC (n=14)		
	Always	Sometimes	Never	Always	Sometimes	Never
a. A statement of topic or proposal	43%	21%	29%	36%	14%	36%
b. Rough draft	21	29	36	29	29	29
c. Ontline	14	7	57	14	14	57
d. First paragraph	-	7	71	-	7	79
e. Bibliography	14	36	36	14	14	57

Percentages are rounded to the nearest integer. Totals do not add to 100% due to missing data on some forms.

Table 2a Comparison of faculty responses of those who took WAC workshop in January 1990 the semester prior to the workshop and the semester following the workshop.

	Pre-WAC (n=14) %yes	Post-WAC (n=14) %yes
1. When I assign a paper, I give students a written assignment sheet describing the paper's purpose and format: ____yes ____no. (If yes), the description of the assignment is approximately ____lines in length. (Mean length of format sheet is 24 lines for pre-WAC and 38 lines for post-WAC faculty.)	64	71
2. When I give definition or identification questions, I require that students answer in full sentences for full credit: ____yes, ____no, ____do not use such questions. (21% pre-WAC and 43% post-WAC faculty do not use such questions.)	14	14
3. Do you consciously target writing assignments to particular cognitive levels (e.g., Bloom or Perry?) ____yes ____no.	36	43

* *

4. I use journals which are ____ungraded, ____graded, and count for ____% of the final grade.

Pre-WAC (n=14)

Ungraded	Graded	% Course Grade
7%	36%	28% (median =17)*

Post-WAC (n=14)

Ungraded	Graded	% Course Grade
14%	43%	17% (median =17)

* Medians are given for comparison with Table 3

Table 3a Comparison of pre-WAC and post-WAC workshop responses of faculty who participated in their first WAC workshop in January 1990.

	Pre-WAC (n=14)		Post-WAC	
	Rank	%	Rank	%
To help student learn material better.	-	-	1	43
To stimulate higher cognitive levels: e.g., analysis or synthesis.	-	-	3	14
To foster communication skills	-	-	2	2.2
To help students learn to think independently.	1.5	14	5	7
To encourage expression of ideas in and out of class.	3.5	7	5	7
To promote personal growth and self-understanding: e.g., clinical journals.	-	-	-	-
To provide practice for professional skills, e.g., terminology or report writing.	1.5	14	5	7
To assess learning and/or to make students prepare for class.	3.5	7	-	-
No response.	-	57	-	-

Table 4a Faculty responses to open-ended question:
"My major purpose for requiring students to write is ____"

Annotated Bibliography of Selected Resources on Writing-Across-the Curriculum Programs and Evaluation

Compiled by Donna J. Goetz
Elmhurst College

Davis, B. G.; Scriven, M.; & Thomas, S. (1987). The evaluation of composition instruction. (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

A necessary reference book for those planning an evaluation. Guidelines are given for readers who come from a variety of disciplines to help them get the most from this book. The book provides valuable information on composition instruction and program evaluation techniques. The authors recommend using formative evaluations, seeking input from an outside evaluation consultant and the use of multiple measures to assess multiple objectives.

Faigley, L.; Cherry, R. D.; Jolliffe, D. A; & Skinner, A. M. (1985). Assessing writers' knowledge and processes of composing. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

The literature on composing and revising writing is reviewed. There is a critical discussion of methodologies for assessing the writer's own meta-cognitions about the composing process. How to assess change in composing skills and the need for a theory of writing assessment are also discussed.

Fulwiler, T. (1980). Evaluating writing across the curriculum programs. In S. H. McLeod (Ed.), Strengthening programs for writing across the curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

After discussion of seven reasons why it is difficult to evaluate WAC programs, the author gives practical suggestions for conducting an evaluation. He seriously suggests that faculty development may be a major benefit of the writing-across-the-curriculum movement. He recommends using a variety of measurements including examining course syllabi before and after participation in WAC, interviewing faculty members, evaluating WAC workshops, and documenting professional involvement of the faculty in attending and giving presentations on writing, and the writing of articles on WAC by involved faculty.

Haring-Smith, T. (Ed.). (1985). A guide to writing programs. Glenview, Il.: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

This report is based on a survey of 500 institutions chosen to represent a cross-section of American college and universities. About 300 schools responded and 230 were selected for inclusion in this book. The survey of nontraditional writing programs shows that the term WAC describes programs which include components such as writing centers, peer tutoring programs, writing across the curriculum, and computer-assisted instruction and word processing.

Maimon, E.; Belcher, G. L.; Hearn, G. W.; Nodine, B.; O'Connor, F. W. (1981). Writing in the arts and sciences. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.

This is a cross-disciplinary textbook for undergraduates in a composition course. The writers stress that writing is a way to learn, that writing and learning are ongoing processes, and that the social context of writing is important. The authors assert that instructors can teach writing better when students are exposed to a wider variety of written works.

Witte, S.; & Faigley, L. (1983). Evaluating college writing programs. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

The authors analyze four major empirical evaluations of writing programs and critique the methodology of each study including their own. In summary, they write there are two major questions addressed by the quantitative studies: "Does college writing instruction positively affect the development of writing abilities?" and "Is one approach to the teaching of composition more effective than another?" At the end of their book they pose a list of questions that an evaluation design should address. This book presents a sophisticated analysis of methodological pitfalls in evaluation research.

White, E. M. (1985). Teaching and assessing writing. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

The author was the first director of the California State University Freshman English Equivalency Examination and writes from his considerable experience and expertise. White covers the issues and difficulties of teaching and assessing writing. He provides practical advice on writing and administering writing tests including holistic scoring methods. A chapter on program evaluation provides a useful orientation and he provides advice on how to avoid pitfalls when designing a program to test writing skills. This book is an extremely useful resource for beginning and experienced evaluators.

White, E. M. (1989). Developing successful college writing programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

White summarizes research on existing college writing programs. He discusses issues related to the assessment of writing ability, favoring essay testing over multiple choice tests and criterion-referenced testing over norm-referenced testing. He warns about the difficulties in the interpretation of pre- and post-test measurements. The last section is an analysis of institutional politics which affect involvement of faculty in a writing program including support and rewards for participating faculty.

Young, A. & Fulwiler, T. (Eds.). (1986). Writing across the disciplines: Research into practice.

This book is an excellent introduction to a variety of writing-across-the-curriculum techniques and strategies for evaluating those techniques. There are enough concrete details to give one a feel for the important issues in the WAC movement.

Resources in Journals

College composition and communication. All issues. This journal regularly deals with the teaching of writing.

Special section: Writing. (1990) College teaching, 38, 43-60.

Research in the teaching of English. All issues. This journal publishes empirical research on writing.

Nodine, B. (Ed.). (1990) Psychologists teach writing. [Special issue]. Teaching of psychology, 17 (1).