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Executive summary

In late fall of 2006, the once and future Vice-Presidents for Instruction, Del Dunn and Jere Morehead, charged our Task Force. They asked us to identify barriers to writing on the UGA campus and suggest ways to get more undergraduates writing. We divided our investigation into four areas: new programs, support needs, faculty development and funding, and research implications. Initially we worked in subcommittees, but then met as a whole for discussion and analysis. Our recommendations build on existing recommendations from 2005 Undergraduate Education Task Force Report and fall into three categories:

- Increase writing instruction for UGA students (five recommendations).
- Provide the structure and support that writing instruction requires (six recommendations).
- Improve faculty development programs and rewards for writing instruction (four recommendations).

A complete list of these recommendations is at the end of this report. The most expensive of these recommendations closely track the 2005 Undergraduate Education Task Force Report. Other recommendations are for small changes at a modest expense that will have a significant impact, such as a writing certificate program, awards for student writing, or a writing lab add-on for undergraduate courses.

In all, the recommendations constitute a request for a coherent writing initiative to affect every college on the campus. While such an initiative requires significant funding, ignoring students’ need for writing will have grave costs.

This request for a writing initiative comes from the faculty. It was a faculty member who approached the Vice President for Instruction to request the Task Force; it is faculty members who have asked for help with the teaching of writing or complained about the difficulty of using writing in their classes. As members of the Task Force, we have certainly drawn on staff and administrators for their expertise and advice, but it as teachers that we have made our recommendations: we want our students to write because they will learn more effectively.
If I had a pretty good poem on the third draft, I would think, Boy, this is going to be really good when I have really worked on it!

James Dickey
Georgia writer

A Writing Initiative

University of Georgia students who write well think well. Writing is a cognitive process that helps students analyze and synthesize information, interpret and extend ideas, and communicate their learning clearly, coherently, and cogently. Further, undergraduates with training in communication—which includes writing, speaking, and new technology—enjoy greater success in their chosen fields after they graduate. (This report focuses on writing, but also touches on the institutional need for more investment in communication broadly defined.) Pragmatically, people who write well are more successful.

Imagine that UGA were offered a plan that guarantees these results: more students who will receive Rhodes, Marshall, or Gates fellowships; more hired by prestigious firms; more gaining admission to top-flight post-graduate institutions; and more graduate students winning external grants. Professors who participate would also obtain more external grants and more easily publish their research results, as well as becoming better classroom teachers. Finally, the plan guarantees to reduce instances of academic dishonesty. All of those results come from a writing initiative.

By “writing initiative” we mean a coordinated effort across all colleges to offer courses that include writing as an integral part of instruction, to help faculty learn effective ways to teach with writing, and to follow the best research and methodology in the field of writing. We envision a program that helps students and faculty understand how communication works in instruction and research. Ideally UGA will consider all forms of communication, written and spoken, individual and collaborative, manual and virtual. But this report focuses on writing, following the Task Force’s original charge, as a place to begin.
A central part of any writing initiative is to make more writing-intensive courses available to students. A writing-intensive course is one that helps a student develop writing skills by using a variety of writing assignments, that emphasizes revision by using sequenced writing, and that teaches the conventions of writing for a specific audience such as readers in a particular discipline. Generally the instructor has a combination of training and experience in how to teach writing, either formally, through classes or development programs, or experientially, through years of practice. The 2005 Undergraduate Task Force recommended that all undergraduates take two upper-division writing-intensive courses before graduation. Until the university has in place a screening process to identify particular courses as writing intensive, that recommendation cannot be implemented. Such courses not only improve the way that students think and write, but also have other benefits. For example, training in writing skills can eliminate most student plagiarism. Moreover, studies of writing-intensive curricula show that students are substantially more engaged by their work and retain information longer when they have to write about the subject. Finally, as UGA creates research opportunities in a new learning environment for its students, opportunities to think and write are central to that environment and to their research.

The initiative would address a documented need. (For a detailed account of UGA reports on student writing, see appendix “Data about Writing at UGA.”) University of Georgia students need to learn and then to communicate that learning. A decade ago, the Academic Literacy Committee (ALC) surveyed faculty to establish that while instructors thought writing mattered, they had a low opinion of the writing that students did (1996-97). The UGA Report of the Committee on the Quality of the Undergraduate Experience (1997) included a position statement that listed seven abilities that a UGA graduate should have. One of them was “to demonstrate effective written and verbal communication skills.” Our students consistently agree with that goal: they tell every survey that writing and communication matter, but that they do not feel well-prepared. Such responses might seem trivial. After all, one might get a similar set of responses were students asked about exercise or keeping up with current events. In 2003, however, a survey produced more disturbing results. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) revealed that students at UGA actually wrote less and spent less time studying than students do at peer and aspirational institutions. A repeat of NSSE in 2005 gave similar results.
We do a fine job in serving that need for writing when students enter UGA: our First-year Composition (FYC) program is excellent, and our students invariably have the highest pass rate in the system on the Regents’ Exam essay test. Yet they receive relatively little training after that FYC sequence. Additionally transfer students enter the university with uneven training: some meet UGA standards, but many more do not. After finishing FYC, students may reach graduation without having written another essay.

A writing initiative will bring UGA more clearly in line with its peer institutions. Of our fifteen peer institutions, seven have writing requirements beyond First-year Composition: Indiana University, University of Colorado, UC-Davis, University of Maryland, Michigan State University, University of Missouri-Columbia, and Virginia Polytechnic. Franklin College funds an excellent and popular Writing Intensive Program, and students seek out WIP courses. Yet that program cannot fund every faculty request. Furthermore, while faculty in other colleges want to offer WIP courses, funding issues make it difficult to grant such requests. (See the appendix: 2006-2007 WIP courses.)

Finally, both faculty and students at the University of Georgia have said that writing matters. Faculty would like to use more writing in their classes, although they are deterred by class size and time pressures. (In a 50-seat course, assigning a 10-page paper means the professor first has to help students produce 500 pages of work and then has to comment on and assess the equivalent of two books.) Students value communications skills and recognize that writing well will help them succeed, both in their classes and in their future careers, although the pressure of time and concern about grades may keep them from seeking courses with substantial writing assignments. Mark Dawkins interviewed one of his colleagues about the logistics of teaching with writing:

Professor Linda Bamber is a chaired professor in the School of Accounting who is well known in the Terry College of Business for the writing assignments required in her . . . managerial accounting classes. Linda explained that it is important to get the students to “buy into” the importance of improving their writing skills. She provides them with a PricewaterhouseCoopers document that discusses four (4) gaps the firm finds in most new hires’ skill set, and one of the gaps is oral and written communication. . . . She identified two barriers that faculty face in
incorporating writing assignments in their classes: time and incentives. Incorporating writing assignments in class is extremely time-consuming for faculty to grade and provide feedback, and there are few (if any) incentives for faculty to do so.

Linda requires her students to turn in a memo about every two-three (2-3) weeks, or a total of six (6) memos a semester. Her writing assignments are done using teams. In a typical semester she forms 22 teams of 6 students, so the total memos submitted in a semester is 132 (22 teams x 6 memos per team) . . . vary[ing] in length and complexity . . . . Linda allows 20 minutes to grade each memo, so the total grading time is 44 hours. Linda has done all of the grading in past semesters, and has also used a graduate of the English program to grade in past semesters. She pays the grader $20/hour, or $880 per semester (actually $1,000 per semester). Linda notes that it is imperative to have reasonable class sizes to implement her approach, and each faculty must be able to use a TA to grade. It is also imperative that TAs have discipline-specific knowledge to be effective.

The other issue Linda raised is the need to change teaching evaluations for faculty who add writing to their classes to avoid penalizing professors who assign writing assignments. Based on student complaints I hear during the semester, I can attest that Linda’s stellar teaching evaluations would be even higher if she did not assign writing in her classes. (Email from Mark Dawkins, 31 January 2007)

This example shows the potential problems that will arise if UGA simply mandates more writing without the needed support and development. Professor Bamber points out that class size is a crucial factor, as is finding support. As an experienced instructor, she finds that assessing her writing assignment takes over a full work-week.

UGA needs to provide more courses and occasions that use writing and provide incentives to attract faculty and students to those programs: those incentives include simply explaining to students the importance of writing after graduation, modification of teaching evaluations, providing assistance for grading, and reducing class
sizes. We need to have a writing initiative because it is the responsible thing to do, given the shortcomings revealed by NSSE, and because it will serve our students’ needs in the classroom and beyond graduation. UGA can begin a writing initiative by taking advantage of several existing programs that we already have and that we know work well. Such an initiative will allow us to use the best practices in the field, as do our peer institutions, and it also makes it likely that, when it comes to writing, we shall soon overtake our peers.
To teach writing is to educate yourself first, then you pass on whatever you have learned as an offering to your students. . . . [I]n teaching writing there is not one way, one model, or one voice for everyone, so I make it a buffet. But the discipline comes in the actual writing.
Judith Ortiz Cofer
Georgia writer

Building on Strengths

While measuring the University of Georgia against its peers can be useful, UGA has features that make it unique: the situation that we face with regard to writing is quite different from that at comparable universities. When our Task Force began work, we looked at a number of universities to determine what were the best practices across America. Some universities used a writing initiative to shore up weak writing programs at the introductory level. Others used a writing initiative to help a school of education instigate changes in writing programs for secondary education schools. Still others had an initiative to train faculty and students in new communication technologies. None of these programs seems appropriate to the needs of UGA. We have strengths at this university that other public research universities lack, so it makes sense to work on developing an initiative resting on those strengths: a increasingly qualified student body and a flexible curricular structure that allows students freedom to design their own educations through majors and certificate programs.

Therefore, we choose to focus on present strengths that can, with a small investment of resources and an administrative commitment, become a nationally significant plan. In doing our work we learned about a range of UGA initiatives that work well, but that are not well coordinated across the campus. The Franklin College Writing Intensive Program (WIP), the Department of English, the Department of Language and Literacy Education, the Division of Academic Enhancement, and the Center for Undergraduate
Research can collaborate on projects that will increase writing instruction.

Finally, many of our recommendations parallel those made by the 2005 Undergraduate Education Task Force. In other words, the Writing Task Force is not requesting a huge new investment: we want to build on an existing institutional commitment of resources.

**Increasingly Qualified Student Body**

Our students are better each year, and they arrive well-prepared. As a result, more students place out of First-year Composition each year. Many transfer students, attracted to UGA, arrive with uneven preparation in writing. Since students may not write in many upper-division classes, their ability to write atrophies, and they receive little training in how to write for an audience in their discipline.

UGA’s First-year Composition program is exemplary, for the way in which it trains graduate assistants, the way it incorporates technology and academic honesty in its classes, and for the way it trains and assesses students’ work. Small wonder that UGA has always led all University system schools in the number of students who pass the Regents’ Essay Exam. Yet because those skills are not often reinforced in upper-division courses or within the training of a student’s major, our students lack the writing skills that they need by graduation. Most universities concentrate on strengthening writing in lower-division or even developmental courses: we are unusual in needing to strengthen writing in upper-division courses so that our students excel in their chosen fields. Our weakness is not in the usual place: UGA needs to push its students harder when it comes to writing within their upper-division courses so that after graduation they can excel on the national and, increasingly, the international scene.

**Flexible Curricular Structure**

The University is in the process of strengthening our general education program by instituting the changes recommended by the 2005 Undergraduate Task Force through the University Council’s Curriculum Committee. UGA is also redesigning the course application process. Finally, UGA’s students can supplement traditional majors with ancillary work on a variety of certificates. We propose a number of changes that will continue the development of curricular flexibility and a strong general education.
The first proposal is to allow Academic Enhancement to develop an “add-on” writing course that could be offered in conjunction with the university’s courses for one or two hours of credit. Staff from Academic Enhancement and from the libraries would work with a professor to craft writing assignments suitable to the main course’s content, to coach students through various research and writing activities, and to assess the final writing assignment. While Academic Enhancement offers its regular courses in the lower-division, we recommend permitting an exception in this instance because it will assist faculty who want to use writing in their courses, allow students to receive writing instruction from those who are trained in the field, and generate additional credit hours. An essential partner in the development and instruction of these “add-on” courses and in the fostering of critical thinking and academic inquiry is the University of Georgia Libraries. The Association of Research Libraries ranks the UGA Libraries thirty-first among the 113 major U.S. and Canadian research libraries and sixth in the size of its government documents collection. Already, Libraries staff have co-taught Academic Enhancement courses, including UNIV 1109: Resources for Research and UNIV 1120: Computer/Information Literacy. In addition to these collaborations, the Libraries’ twenty-eight teaching staff and subject specialists regularly collaborate with other teaching faculty to bring information literacy instruction into classrooms across campus. In 2006, the staff reached 9,122 undergraduates and 1,584 graduate students, through classes in a wide variety of disciplines. All of these efforts improved student and faculty skills in using GIL, GALILEO databases, bibliographic management tools like EndNote and RefWords, in finding primary resources, and in assessing information on the Web. Beginning in spring 2007, the Libraries will offer “seven awards for CURO students which will provide cash prizes for excellence in research and academic inquiry” (http://www.libs.uga.edu/researchaward/). The UGA Libraries’ participation in a writing initiative such as the one proposed here will bolster students’ knowledge about and responsible use of information resources, thereby promoting critical thinking and intellectual curiosity. We endorse the Libraries’ continuing involvement in cross-curricular teaching activities and recommend that it provide necessary support for staff members who co-teach the Academic Enhancement add-on course sections.

Another key suggestion is to institute a certificate program in writing (see the appendix that describes what such a program
might be). By pursuing an ePortfolio-based undergraduate certificate in writing, students in every college can document and publish their ability to write effectively when they graduate. Such a program might ask students to build on their work in First-year Composition by taking a course dedicated to the writing process, as well as four more courses that are designated as writing intensive. Those courses would include a mixture of the following:

- classes offered through the Writing Intensive Program (WIP)
- classes that have an “add-on” writing course
- capstone courses that require a substantial essay, work on an honors thesis, or work on a CURO project
- individual courses approved by a coordinator and steering committee

Potential employers, admissions committees, accrediting agencies, and the public would find such a certificate heartening, especially if supported by an online ePortfolio of writing that demonstrated the student’s abilities. In the electronic markup and management application, or <emma>, already adopted across First-year Composition, and in LiveText, used in the College of Education, the university has in place the means to facilitate such electronic portfolios.

**College of Education**

While some institutions needed to help their schools of education effect change in secondary systems, UGA is unusual in its participation in the Georgia Systemic Teacher Education Program (GSTEP), a major initiative that has already helped College of Education faculty work with Arts and Sciences faculty to aid primary and secondary teachers and systems in strengthening their curriculums. Today, UGA’s Red Clay Writing Project reaches out to “K-12 teachers from Northeast Georgia who are interested in literacy teaching and learning for students with diverse needs.” The University of Georgia is a leader, not a follower in this area. The Task Force would like to build upon the work that GSTEP began, by asking the College of Education to collaborate in programs to train undergraduates in communication skills.

Specifically, the Department of Language and Literacy Education would be an excellent place for a Writing Center that would serve East Campus. The department has expressed interest in such a center, which would allow their students to get hands-on teaching experience. Given the department’s strength and national reputation, such a center could provide much needed support for
international students and for speakers of English as a second language, a focus that the department itself suggested.

Writing Centers
UGA is unusual in having two Writing Centers on campus: one run by the English Department in Park Hall and one run by Academic Enhancement in Milledge Hall. At present, both Writing Centers also provide drop-in tutoring in the Student Learning Center. In the past, both have offered tutoring in the residence halls, but resources now permit only minimal tutoring hours in one residence hall. Both centers could expand to a satellite branch on South Campus, share resources or facilities, and collaborate in training and scheduling. Both centers would benefit from additional funds to purchase equipment such as computers to support their work, to develop scheduling software to make collaboration easier, and to expand the number of graduate assistant/instructor tutors. Such support services will be essential if the university wants its faculty to help students develop written and oral communication abilities in its classes. At the moment fewer than twenty Writing Center instructors (a mix of teaching assistants and staff) serve nearly 35,000 students.

The English Department and Academic Enhancement are collaborating with the University Libraries to establish a Writing Center at the Science Library to serve the South Campus, although funds for at least two units of tutoring are necessary to make this plan work, as both centers are stretched to their limits by serving students in the Student Learning Center; future plans include another center headquartered in the College of Education to serve East Campus. Funding will be essential for such expansion.

WIP
UGA has a remarkable writing program already in place within the College of Arts and Sciences. Since 1997, the Writing Intensive Program has worked with faculty who want to include writing in their courses. Offering a development program and a graduate assistant to each faculty member chosen, WIP “serves from 1000-1500 students in approximately 45 diverse courses across the college, ranging from art history, biology, classics, geology, mathematics, music, religion, sociology, and women’s studies. Most of these courses are regular-enrollment sections, but one or two courses each semester are large-enrollment classes.” Yet the program could reach far more undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty with its programs if the recommendations of both the NSSE Report and the Undergraduate Task Force were implemented. Specifically, we recommend that the program be
doubled. Since Franklin College funds WIP, its services are provided to Arts and Sciences faculty; additional funding could permit the program to operate campus-wide.

**CURO**

UGA’s Center for Undergraduate Research Opportunities (CURO), administered by the Honors Program, coordinates campus research opportunities. The undergraduate research courses and thesis course create an intensive research, reading, and discipline-specific writing capstone for undergraduates. The number of students completing a thesis since 1997, when CURO was established as a grant from the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education, has continued to increase from 19 in 1997 to 104 in 2006. In addition, the annual number of credit hours generated from undergraduate research has steadily increased. In 2006, an analysis of the written requirements of students showed that 70-80 percent of all assignments were written and that 100 percent were communication-intensive if not written.

In addition to these course assignments, the CURO Symposium requires that students write discipline-specific abstracts for inclusion in the symposium. The number of UGA students who participated was 74 in 2000 and will exceed 200 in 2007. These students must also write and make oral presentations or poster presentations. CURO facilitates a best paper competition which provides a $100 prize from the UGA Alumni Association for best papers in the sciences, social sciences, humanities, as well as best papers with a civic responsibility and an international focus. Papers presented at the annual symposium may be considered for the *Journal for Undergraduate Research Opportunities (JURO)*, which has published undergraduate scholarly and artistic work since 2001 in an annual electronic peer-reviewed journal (www.uga.edu/juro). The Writing Task Force would like to see CURO continue to grow and become a major component of the writing certificate program.

**ePortfolios**

Some courses allow students to bring their writing to a final stage, a polished demonstration of writing skill present in a writing portfolio or a capstone experiences essay. Learning and writing are so closely involved in such courses as to become symbiotic: the ultimate product of these symbiotic processes, and possibly even the transparency of the processes themselves, should be archived in a writing portfolio showcasing the student’s best work. Electronic portfolios allow students to create writing spaces that
are both public (a demonstration of their writing accomplishments) and private (a record of learning). In-house, UGA has developed <emma>, the "electronic markup and management application" that allows students to maintain an ePortfolio, including all their revisions, and that manages access to that portfolio. At UGA, all students in English 1101 and 1102 produce an ePortfolio of writing for final assessment in each of these courses. In addition to <emma>, a similar electronic portfolio management system is LiveText, which is used extensively in the College of Education and has the virtue of full compatibility with WebCT.

As students move forward into their majors and towards the capstone course that defines their Writing Certificate experience, students can add to, trim, reflect on, and develop the artifacts in their writing portfolios. These ePortfolios can move with them into the world of work. More important, perhaps, the ePortfolio can provide an important intellectual bridge between the student’s experience in First-year Composition and in classes across the curriculum and beyond. And even more important, the ePortfolios can provide the opportunity for peer communication and peer review both within and across disciplines, which could be a major rhetorical dynamic of the Writing Certificate. Finally, writing ePortfolios allow for the related operations of revision and reflection, demonstrate rhetorical and disciplinary growth, and at the same time publish the student’s best work. Here again, the Writing Task Force wants to see such ePortfolios become a major component in the writing certificate program.

*   *   *   *   *

Given these various institutional strengths—strong students, a flexible curriculum, and the various programs around campus—the Task Force thinks that UGA should build on them. To encourage more writing within a discipline, we would encourage every undergraduate major to make a statement about how its students will solidify their communication skills, through courses in the major or through courses taken in other units, such as Academic Enhancement, English, or Speech Communication. We would encourage the administration to fund such efforts: we offer too few seats in such courses now, and staffing problems will continue. Administrative priority should be given to hiring faculty who can help undergraduates with writing and other communication skills. Certainly further support is required for the Writing Centers, as well as more publicity: many faculty do not realize that they can use these services. Academic Enhancement
and University Libraries staff are working to modify and condense two existing courses, “Resources for Research” and “Introduction to the Research Paper,” into a one- or two-hour “add-on” courses for upper-level courses, analogous to a lab section. This program deserves full administrative support.

Because ours is a unique situation, and because such an initiative would require substantial funding, UGA needs to apply for a major grant to help us create a writing initiative across campus. It would cover a Writing Certificate program, allow the Writing Centers to hire additional staff and purchase the computing tools they need, fund expansion of an online portfolio system for undergraduates, and train faculty to incorporate writing in their classrooms.
I worked with Frank [Loesser]. . . . I would write, and I learned a lot. . . , but the end result of what I learned has applied to everything I’ve ever written. Frank believed in clarity, he believed in purity, he believed in ‘say it as simply as you can, and don’t go in for elaborating.’ And I’ve tried to follow that for years.

Alfred Uhry  
Georgia writer

A Coherent Plan

Key elements in putting together this writing initiative at UGA will be collaboration among different units, a plan grounded in the best research available in writing research, and an increase in resources so that a particular unit does not have to choose between serving its own majors and serving the university as a whole. While the administration will have to provide the resources, someone has to manage them and foster collaboration, as well as staying abreast of research in the field. The key figure in such an initiative would be a Coordinator of Writing for the University of Georgia.

Initially the Writing Task Force thought that appointing a Writing Coordinator ought to have top priority. We considered such a position ideal for a candidate who was ABD or a recent PhD. As we discussed the responsibilities involved, however, we realized that the number of tasks the Writing Coordinator would carry out and the nature of the work required a candidate who had faculty status and administrative experience. Instead of rushing such an appointment, we recommend that in the next year we begin with a pilot faculty development program to train faculty in writing instruction. Since the WIP already offers such faculty development, we would like to see Michelle Ballif, the director of WIP, work with Nelson Hilton and the Center for Teaching and Learning to select and train the inaugural class of seven Writing Fellows.

Meanwhile, we hope the Vice President for Instruction will appoint a Writing Board to prepare a certificate program, institute curricular changes, and search for a Writing Coordinator. Christy Desmet, Director of First-year Composition, has agreed to work towards creating such a certificate program. Although all of us would be willing to serve on such a board, it needs to be a small body of about five people for the sake of efficiency. We would
suggest representatives from WIP, Academic Enhancement, the English Department Writing Center, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Department of Language and Literacy Education (i.e., Michelle Ballif, Christopher Hayes, Christy Desmet, Nelson Hilton, and JoBeth Allen). Funds will be needed to support that group.

Finally, we thought that an additional Writing Center was essential: we can hardly ask faculty to use more writing instruction without support. The University Libraries has welcomed the idea of a center in the Science Library, on which English and Academic Enhancement will collaborate.

Once the Writing Board appoints a Writing Coordinator, they will work with that individual to carry out these tasks over the next 3-4 years:

- Oversee writing certificate program, which encourages students to learn discipline specific writing skills across campus, as well as strengthening move to capstone or thesis experiences and CURO projects.

- Coordinate student writing certificate ePortfolios and provide guidance on document creation, ePortfolio management, and logistic support for ePortfolio certificate assessment.

- Help the university identify writing-intensive courses that will be needed both for the writing certificate and for the commitment made by the 2005 Undergraduate Task Force Report.

- Liaise with the Writing Centers in English and Academic Enhancement, and help Language and Literacy Education to establish an additional Writing Center.

- Pursue external funding through grants to support the writing initiative and endowments for specific programs.

- Assist with Faculty Development.

While this list of tasks is substantial, so are the benefits that the university will receive from having a Coordinator who can supervise the writing initiative.
A tentative timetable and budget for a writing initiative follow; we include the expansion of WIP ($200K) in our plan because it is central to our goals, although our recommendation duplicates that made by the 2005 Undergraduate Education Task Force; other new fund will be $80K for two Writing Centers, $20K for the Writing Fellows Program, and $60K for a Writing Coordinator:

**Condensed Plan**

**2007-08**
Initiate curricular changes for writing-intensive “add-on” courses and begin work with CAPA so student records note writing-intensive courses. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and the Writing Intensive Program (WIP) will pilot a Writing Fellows Program ($13K). The Director of First-year Composition (FYC) will set in motion the construction of a Writing Certificate Program and direct the initiative until a Writing Coordinator can be hired to assume directorship and other duties ($7K). Department of English and Academic Enhancement will collaborate to set up a South Campus Writing Center ($40K). These projects could be overseen by a committee. Total commitment for the Vice President for Instruction: $60K.

**2008-09**
Continue Writing Center on South Campus ($40K). CTL, CURO, Teaching Academy offer various opportunities to discuss writing instruction. Offer more rewards for excellent student writing. Hire a Writing Certificate Program Coordinator and start a certificate program ($60K), expand the Writing Fellows Program ($20K), add more writing intensive course options (ideally the Writing Fellows would add course options), expand the WIP ($80K). Total commitment: $200K.

**2009-10**
Continue previous work ($200K), substantial expansion of the WIP to support the growing number of courses ($120K), additional Writing Center growth to serve East Campus ($40K). Total commitment: $360K.

While students are here at UGA, they will learn more deeply since studies show that when students write about their studies, they are more deeply engaged by them. Writing instruction that covers the entire writing process cuts out plagiarism: a panicked student might buy a term paper, but cannot buy a topic, outline, rough draft, peer-edited draft, and final draft. After graduation, students who can write clearly and effectively will have a competitive edge.
Confident writers will receive more major fellowships, admission to more prestigious graduate programs, and better jobs. Training graduate assistants and faculty to use writing instruction has the collateral effect of improving the writing that instructors do. They will teach better, receive more grants, and publish more easily.

When I was little, I was always that girl who knew that she wanted to spend her life telling stories. I grew up in Macon, Georgia, a mid-sized town in the South, in the 1950s and 1960s, surrounded by an African-American culture that respected reading, writing, stories and storytelling.

My grandfather told us ghost stories before we went to sleep. The folks who came to my father’s juke joints told me the stories of their lives. My great aunt Elizabeth Lee, a good Christian woman, told us morality tales to keep us on the straight and narrow. Even my mother gossiping on the phone to her friends seemed to my little ears to be fascinating and imaginative stories.

I grew up at a time when the written word was respected and appreciated by black folks. In my household, books were everywhere, and everyone was always reading different books that interested them: love stories, Westerns, adventures, contemporary fiction. I grew up hearing my family say, “Oh, you know, Tina’s going to be a writer” because I had expressed interest in writing and telling stories.

Tina McElroy Ansa
Georgia author
I can get past anything if I've got something to read. I've been reading all my life. As a matter of fact, people who do not read, I feel this great sympathy for them. I want to go up and hug them and say, “Don't you, darling, realize what you're missing? Why aren't you reading?”

Harry Crews
Georgia writer

Task Force on Writing
Recommendations

I. To Increase Writing in UGA Classrooms

I.a Expand the Writing Intensive Program. (Adapted from 2005 Task Force Recommendation I.2.1 and I.2.2)
 Implementation Official: VP for Instruction and the Dean of Franklin College
 Means of Implementation: Administrative action.
 Time and Resource Implications: Begin in 2008-2009 with $80K, and add $120K the following year to double the size of program. Substantial.

I.b Allow Academic Enhancement to offer “add-on” sections of UNIV [XXXX] for other courses. (Following 2005 Task Force Recommendation I.2.2)
 Implementation Official: Academic Enhancement and the University Council
 Means of Implementation: Recommendation from the University Council Curriculum Committee.
 Time and Resource Implications: None. Move changes through committee system 2007-2008

I.c Faculty in each major will document how students develop written, oral, digital communication skills as part of the program review process.
 Implementation Official: Office of Institutional Effectiveness
 Means of Implementation: Administrative action.
 Time and Resource Implications: None. Action during 2007-2008
I.d **Hire a Writing Coordinator.** (Following 2005 Undergraduate Task Force Recommendation I.2.1 and I.2.2)  
*Implementation Official:* Vice President for Instruction  
*Means of Implementation:* Administrative action.  

I.e **Institute a writing certificate program.** (Following 2005 Undergraduate Task Force Recommendation I.2.1 and I.2.2)  
*Implementation Official:* Office of the Registrar (Curriculum Systems) and the University Curriculum Committee  
*Means of Implementation:* Committee and administrative action.  
*Time and Resource Implications:* The application to have certificate approved will take about a year, so the first students should begin fall 2008. To start the process, provide $7K to the Director of FYC so she can prepare the materials.

II. Provide the Structure and Support Writing Instruction Requires

II.a **Give priority to the hiring of new faculty members who can help undergraduates with writing and other communication skills.** (Following 2005 Task Force Recommendation II.2.1.)  
*Implementation Official:* Office of the Provost.  
*Means of Implementation:* Administrative action.  
*Time and Resource Implications:* None

II.b **Continue to support COE’s Red Clay Writing Project.**  
*Implementation Official:* Dean of the College of Education  
*Means of Implementation:* Administrative action.  
*Time and Resource Implications:* Continue matching funds for annual federal grant, currently $43K.

II.c **Establish a Writing Center for South Campus in the Science Library, under the joint sponsorship of the English Department and Academic Enhancement.**  
*Implementation Official:* Departments of English and Academic Enhancement.  
*Means of Implementation:* Administrative action.  
*Time and Resource Implications:* $40,000 to equip and maintain room, and to train and staff center. Implemented for 2007-08.
II.d **Establish a Writing Center for East Campus in Aderhold Hall, which focuses on international students and graduate students, under the sponsorship of Language and Literacy Education.**  
*Implementation Official:* College of Education.  
*Means of Implementation:* Administrative action.  
*Time and Resource Implications:* $40,000 to equip and maintain room, and to train and staff center. Begin when funds are available.

II.e **Graduate assistants / instructors receive training from English, Academic Enhancement, and possibly Language and Literacy Education or WIP to serve as tutors.**  
*Implementation Official:* CTL with the Departments of English, Academic Enhancement, and Language Education  
*Means of Implementation:* Administrative action.  
*Time and Resource Implications:* Moderate. Release time or other funding for faculty who train the graduate assistant/instructor tutors.

II.f **Expand ePortfolios across campus.**  
*Implementation Official:* CTL and FYC  
*Means of Implementation:* Administrative action.  
*Time and Resource Implications:* Modest

III. **Improve Faculty Development and Rewards for Written and oral communication Instruction**

III.a **Establish a University-wide faculty review system that encourages, recognizes, and rewards high quality undergraduate teaching of written and oral communication.**  
(Adapted from 2005 Task Force Recommendation II.3.1)  
*Implementation Official:* University Council Faculty Affairs Committee and deans.  
*Means of Implementation:* Committee action.  
*Time and Resource Implications:* None.

III.b **Institute a Writing Fellows Program.**  
(Following from 2005 Task Force Recommendation II.3.4)  
*Implementation Official:* CTL  
*Means of Implementation:* Administrative action.  
*Time and Resource Implications:* Modest. CTL hopes to work with the WIP director to begin a pilot version in fall 2008 with 7 faculty,
expanding in subsequent years. Beginning with $13K, increasing to $20K.

III.c Expand written and oral communication instruction programs through the Teaching Academy and CTL, and through new faculty and new graduate assistant orientation programs.

*Implementation Official:* Vice President for Instruction and CTL

*Means of Implementation:* Administrative action.

*Time and Resource Implications:* None

III.d Provide a teaching award for faculty who use written and oral communication to teach innovatively, and annual awards for students who produce excellent written and oral communication.

*Implementation Official:* Dean and department heads

*Means of Implementation:* Administrative action.

*Time and Resource Implications:* Modest.
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APPENDIX: Data about Writing at UGA
prepared by Christopher Hayes and Fran Teague

In 1996-97, a year before UGA implemented the semester calendar, a small group of UGA researchers, the Academic Literacy Committee (ALC), conducted a formal survey of faculty who taught core courses (Burrell, Tao, Simpson, and Mendez-Berrueta, “How Do We Know What We Are Preparing Our Students For? A Reality Check on One University’s Academic Literacy Demands,” in Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 13.2 [1997], 55-70). In particular, the survey investigated three related topics: (1) the literacy demands that faculty believed necessary for undergraduates’ academic success in the core courses; (2) the varying literacy expectations and demands across disciplinary courses; and (3) faculty concerns about and recommendations for improving students’ abilities to meet those expectations. Although the primary purpose of the study was to guide UGA faculty as they and their students adjusted to the curricular demands of the semester system, many of the findings foreshadowed those of subsequent NSSE and FSSE surveys and of the more recent UGA Writing Alliance survey.

According to the ALC researchers, the “most prevalent” faculty expectation was that students be able “to analyze, synthesize, problem-solve, apply, argue persuasively, or critique, and to demonstrate these processes in their papers, library projects, and exams” (66). However, of the 440 respondents to the ALC survey, only 54% reported using writing as a means of evaluation (e.g., in-class essays, research papers, lab reports). As one would expect, the uses and genres of assigned writing varied across disciplines, with faculty in the humanities and social sciences assigning the most written work. Of the 120 respondents who assigned writing, a slight majority (53%) rated students’ writing quality as “acceptable,” while 26% rated it as “weak,” 14% as “good,” 4% as “poor,” and 2% as “excellent.” Nearly three quarters (73%) stated that the quality of student writing affected student grades either “significantly” or “somewhat.” The most common writing flaws included problems in focus (77%), organization (77%), word choice (65%), superficiality of topic (64%), grammar (64%), and syntax (54%).

Perhaps even more instructive than faculty attitudes toward the quality of student writing were faculty attitudes toward undergraduate students’ academic behaviors and cognitive
abilities, attitudes, once again, that presaged later FSSE and NSSE findings. Specifically, 67% of respondents reported that students failed to spend sufficient time out of class preparing for their courses or doing assigned reading. Contrary to their expectations, respondents also lamented that “their students could not do research papers or lengthy papers requiring analytical thinking” (65). These perceptions are likely reasons that only 19% of respondents said that they assigned projects requiring research.

As early as 1996-97, then, faculty expressed concerns about the quality and level of undergraduate students’ academic attitudes and behaviors, cognitive performance, and writing experiences. Faculty members’ reluctance to assign and comment on student writing perpetuated a climate in which many students failed to receive writing practice and instruction beyond the required first-year requirement, so students continued to hand in flawed written or research-based assignments in their upper-level courses.

In 2003 the NSSE Survey gave UGA disturbing results when students were asked about their communication skills. Seniors reported reading fewer books for class than did first-year students; overall students said they read rarely on their own. Almost all said they had not written a paper of 20 pages or more; most said they had written only 1 to 4 papers between 5 and 19 pages. In other words, once they left FYC, students were infrequently asked to write papers of substantial depth and sustained analysis. When the NSSE was re-administered in 2005, little had changed as far as writing. The results from 2005 NSSE showed that “problem areas that surfaced in 2003 were still evident in 2005. UGA students continued to report a lower number of reading assignments, fewer writing assignments, and studying or spending less time on academic work than their counterparts at peer and aspirational institutions” (Sharron Hannon, “National survey compares student experiences at University of Georgia, other institutions,” Columns 28 November 2005). The 2003 study included a pilot program FSSE (Faculty Survey of Student Expectations). About half the faculty surveyed said they did not ask students to write papers that were 5 pages or longer. Eighty percent of the faculty respondents did not ask for a paper of 10 pages or more.

In the 2003 NSSE students said communication and thinking skills mattered “very much” or “quite a lot”:
- Writing clearly and effectively, 72% first-years, 74% seniors
- Speaking clearly and effectively, 50% first-years, 66% seniors
- Thinking critically and analytically, 80% first-years, 85% seniors
Following receipt of the NSSE results, Vice President for Instruction Del Dunn held a series of conversations with faculty and student groups and discussed the results; a committee put together information from the NSSE and FSSE with those conversations in a substantial advisory report. Of writing, the committee said,

The NSSE and FSSE results made it clear that while both faculty and students consider writing one of the most important skills in the classroom and after graduation, students receive fewer writing assignments and faculty assign less writing than at comparable institutions. Faculty spoke of their frustration because while they want to use more writing assignments, they are unsure of how to make such assignments without radically increasing their workload, nor are they confident of how to assess such assignments. Students, too, expressed a lack of confidence in their ability to handle a variety of writing tasks, especially in their fields of concentration. While the Writing Intensive Program offers some guidance for faculty, it is limited to the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences and has limited resources so it can affect relatively few classes each term.

Those concerns about writing that faculty and students raised in the conversations also touch on the themes of Curriculum, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Writing, suggesting the centrality of this issue to UGA. Furthermore, a substantial body of research shows such anxiety can be addressed and writing skills can be improved. In other words, writing is an area in which the University of Georgia faculty and staff fell short of where we want to be, and it is an area in which we can make straightforward changes that should have an impact by the time of the next NSSE administration.

The 2003 NSSE Report added:

From a SACS perspective, our participation in NSSE and these follow-up activities are closing the loop on assessment—learning about our strengths and weaknesses, what we are doing about the weaknesses, how we are folding changes back in to the curriculum, and then re-assessing.
The following year, Provost Arnett Mace convened a Task Force on UGA undergraduate education. Like the previous committees, the Task Force underscored the problem: students do not write enough, nor do faculty assign enough writing. Yet writing is one of the most important ways of learning a subject. In its report, the 2005 Undergraduate Task Force said:

Effective Writing
President Michael Adams stated in his 2005 State of the University Address: “Writing is the synthesizing exercise of an educated mind.” Currently, many students are not required to write a substantial paper after they complete the composition courses, English 1101 and 1102. Across the curriculum and across all four years of university education, the faculty must reinforce and sustain a commitment to excellence in writing. Expanding an existing program like the Franklin College Writing Intensive Program across the University by incorporating significant writing assignments into upper-level departmental courses would help to standardize writing education across the University.

RECOMMENDATION: Incorporate significant writing assignments into more courses across the University so that students are exposed to rigorous writing experiences throughout their undergraduate career.

Writing Intensive Courses
Task Force members suggested expanding the system that designates courses as writing intensive. Expansion of this system would allow the University Curriculum Committee to designate additional courses that meet a minimum number of writing assignments as “writing intensive.” Each graduating student should take at least two writing intensive courses.

RECOMMENDATION: Expand the current system that designates selected classes as “writing intensive” or containing a “writing component” across the University.

To date, however, UGA has done little. Writing intensive courses cannot yet be shown on the transcript, students do not receive more significant writing assignments, nor are faculty making such assignments.

Why don’t faculty use writing in their classrooms? In conversations with faculty at Teaching Academy meetings, presentations on
teaching with writing, and informal discussions with Task Force members, the same reasons keep showing up. Mark Dawkins interviewed a colleague known for her exemplary teaching, and her experience might serve as an illustration of the difficulties:

Professor Linda Bamber is a chaired professor in the School of Accounting who is well known in the Terry College of Business for the writing assignments required in her classes (she is equally well known for her teaching excellence). I met with Linda Wednesday morning to discuss how she incorporates writing into her managerial accounting classes.

Linda explained that it is important to get the students to “buy into” the importance of improving their writing skills. She provides them with a PricewaterhouseCoopers document that discusses four (4) gaps the firm finds in most new hires’ skill set, and one of the gaps is oral and written communication. This allows Linda to say that she is assigning writing assignments to help students address a problem identified by an employer, rather than to merely torture students (i.e., she is not the bad guy, the market requires these skills).

Linda emphasized that she must continually “market” the benefits of the writing assignments to students throughout the semester. She identified two barriers that faculty face in incorporating writing assignments in their classes: time and incentives. Incorporating writing assignments in class is extremely time-consuming for faculty to grade and provide feedback, and there are few (if any) incentives for faculty to do so.

Linda requires her students to turn in a memo about every two-three (2-3) weeks, or a total of six (6) memos a semester. Her writing assignments are done using teams. In a typical semester she forms 22 teams of 6 students, so the total memos submitted in a semester is 132 (22 teams x 6 memos per team). The memos vary in length and complexity, and team members grade each other at the end of the semester.

Linda allows 20 minutes to grade each memo, so the total grading time is 44 hours. Linda has done all of
the grading in past semesters, and has also used a graduate of the English program to grade in past semesters. She pays the grader $20/hour, or $880 per semester (actually $1,000 per semester). Linda notes that it is imperative to have reasonable class sizes to implement her approach, and each faculty must be able to use a TA to grade. It is also imperative that TAs have discipline-specific knowledge to be effective.

The other issue Linda raised is the need to change teaching evaluations for faculty who add writing to their classes to avoid penalizing professors who assign writing assignments. Based on student complaints I hear during the semester, I can attest that Linda’s stellar teaching evaluations would be even higher if she did not assign writing in her classes. (Email from Mark Dawkins, 31 January 2007)

Bamber’s concerns were echoed by other faculty with whom we talked. Undergraduate classes are too large to guide and assess writing. The faculty member’s office hours have to expand to accommodate students who are unhappy or baffled by the assignment. Most faculty are unaware that support services like the Writing Centers exist. Nor have they received any faculty development training in how they can use writing effectively. Writing assignments can create student resentment if other sections are not being asked to write, as well as student anxiety that weak writing skills will obscure their mastery of the subject. The end results are not good: even students who take the trouble to avoid mechanical or grammatical errors have no facility in the sort of communication skills that a particular discipline demands. As an assistant professor observed, she wanted to teach her undergraduates as she had herself been taught, but she found her own research went neglected because of the time demands, while her student evaluations were disastrous. An associate professor in the life sciences commented that his students tried to write research reports as if these were English themes instead of discipline-specific reports. Such problems come not from a lack of ability among students, but rather from a lack of training and of support.
APPENDIX: A Partial List of Current Writing Courses at UGA, Thoughtfully Categorized
Prepared by Christy Desmet and Christopher Hayes

Foundations in Writing and Critical Thinking (Required University Writing Courses)

The following courses, which are part of Area A or B in the current UGA General Education core, provide an introduction to university-level ways of thinking, reading, and writing – an introduction to academic discourse. Courses marked by an asterisk are open only to multilingual students.

- UNIV 1115: Introduction to Academic Writing or UNIV 1117: Basic Composition for Multilingual Writers* (elective prerequisite to ENGL 1101)
- ENGL 1050H: Composition and Literature (Honors)
- ENGL 1060H: Composition and Multicultural Literature (Honors)
- ENGL 1101: English Composition I (required) or ENGL 1101: English Composition I for multilingual students*
- ENGL 1102: English Composition II (required) or ENGL 1102: English Composition II for multilingual students*
- ENGL 1102M: Multicultural English Composition

Advanced Writing Skills (Elective Courses)

As students move beyond their first year through their General Education courses and into their major, they may want to target particular aspects of the writing process for further work and exploration. These three-hour classes provide that focused and intense instruction in writing tasks and processes.

- UNIV 1105: Improving Grammar, Usage, and Style
- UNIV 1109: Resources for Research
- UNIV 2201: Introduction to the Research Paper
- UNIV 2202: Academic Writing for Multilingual Students
- UNIV 2203: Improving Academic Writing
- ENGL 3600: Advanced Composition

Writing in the Disciplines, model A (Course-specific Writing Courses or Labs)
Teachers of a particular course in any department may choose to include a "lab" component that is co-taught by a faculty member from the Division of Academic Enhancement and one from the University Libraries. These courses are offered for variable credit (1-2 hours) and emphasize the research and writing processes/products for specific assignments in the associated disciplinary course.

- UNIV 3000: Research and Writing for the Discipline (Lab)
- HONS 4960H/4970H/4980H/4990H: Honors Undergraduate Research

Writing in the Disciplines, model B (Writing Intensive Program designated courses)

Approximately 45 classes each semester are designated as writing-intensive by the Franklin College Writing Intensive Program. These courses are regularly offered courses in a variety of disciplines (e.g., Chemistry, Geology, Sociology, Classics, Music) and provide significant writing opportunities as well as writing instruction via a specially trained Teaching Assistant, who supports the course by serving as a writing coach. The list of all designated and supported Writing Intensive Program courses can be found at www.wip.uga.edu.

Specialized Writing Courses

For students who seek to become a writing specialist, whether in industry, business, science, or academia, these courses focus on teaching students how to write within a range of professional contexts.

- UNIV 1106: Basic Report Writing for College and Beyond
- ENGL 3600: Advanced Composition
- ENGL 3590: Technical and Professional Communication
- ENGL 4830: Advanced Studies in Writing: Writing for the World Wide Web
Writing Certificate Program (tentatively proposed for fall 2008)

Description of the Program
The writing certificate program (WCP) serves the university’s students by allowing them to learn about writing as a cognitive process and to hone communication skills. Students who seek the certificate will learn about the process of writing for various purposes, learn research and planning skills that will help them in their other coursework, and be able to demonstrate their skills to potential employers. Students who wish to do so may concentrate their study on writing essays, but other students can concentrate on producing presentations or proposals.

Offering a portfolio-based undergraduate certificate in writing allows students in every college to document and publish their ability to write effectively when they graduate. In <emma> and LiveText, already adopted across First-year Composition and in the College of Education respectively, the university has in place the means to facilitate such electronic portfolios. Qualified students who have not taken the first-year sequence on this campus will meet with the WCP coordinator, who can set up an appropriate portfolio for them.

Coursework
The coursework for this certificate will fall in three phases: a course of introduction to the writing process, several writing-intensive courses, and an intensive individual writing project. Students will build on their work in First-year Composition by taking a three-hour course dedicated to the writing process: UNIV 2201, 2202, 2203, ENGL 3590, 3600. They should also take nine to twelve hours of courses designated as writing intensive. Those courses could include

- classes offered through an expanded Writing Intensive Program
- other courses that have as a one- or two-hour section on writing (Since these courses vary from term to term, students should consult the WIP website [http://www.wip.uga.edu] or the WCP Coordinator to see what is available.)
- courses that have been approved, such as ENGL 3590 (Tech Writing), 3600 (Advanced Composition), 4830 (Advanced Studies in Writing); UNIV 2201 (Research Paper), 2202 (Academic Writing for Multilingual Students), 2203 (Improving Academic Writing); HONS 3010, 3040, 3070 (Research Methods in various disciplines); SPCM
2100 (advanced public communication), 2300 (business and professional communication).

- courses that the WSC Director approves on an ad hoc basis because of an individual student’s needs.

Ideally, students will conclude the WCP with three to six hours of coursework on an independent writing project. To prepare for this project, students may enroll in three hours of HONS 3010, 3040, or 3070, as well as HONS 4590 or the appropriate course in their major. This project might be produced either in a capstone course in their major that requires a substantial essay or by work on an honors thesis; students who do not take a capstone course or produce a thesis should take part in the CURO symposium to produce an independent writing project.

Throughout the program, the student compiles an electronic portfolio for evaluation. Such a portfolio should be planned to fit a student’s individual needs. For example a student preparing for graduate school or a professional school might include a statement of professional intent, writing samples in the appropriate discipline, a curriculum vitæ, and a cover letter. Another student seeking employment could include a sample job letter, a résumé stating professional goals, and examples of career-specific reports.

The WCP Coordinator will appoint an assessment committee to review the portfolio and offer suggestions; if the committee finds the portfolio especially strong, it may signal that excellence by adding a letter to the file that notes the student has performed “with distinction.”

Advising
Depending upon the student’s degree program, Certificate courses may count toward general studies, the major, or elective offerings. A grade of C or better is required in each course. Interested students will need to discuss their plans for the Certificate with their own advisors early in their academic careers so that proper sequencing of prerequisites, where required, can be allowed for. They must also contact the program advisor to complete an application, to establish an electronic portfolio, to declare a proposed course of study, and to secure information about semester course offerings.

Potential employers, admissions committees, accrediting agencies, and the public would find such a certificate heartening, especially since it will be supported by an online portfolio of writing that demonstrates the student’s abilities.
WIP Courses 2006-07
Prepared by Michelle Ballif

Fall 2006
ARED 2000, Foundations in Art Education (Richard Siegesmund)
ARED 3350, Elementary Methods (Richard Siegesmund)
ARHI 3070, American Architecture (Tom Polk)
BIOL 1108L, Principles of Biology (Kathrin Stanger-Hall)
BIOL 1103L, Concepts in Biology I (Norris Armstrong & Peggy Brickman)
BIOL/ECOL 3500, Ecology (Jim Richardson)
LATN 1001, Elementary Latin I (Richard LaFleur)
LATN 2001, Intermediate Latin I (Erica Hermanowicz)
CLAS 4140, Punic and Roman Carthage (Naomi Norman)
CHEM 3110, Physical Chemistry (Geoffrey Smith)
CHEM 3511L, Experimental Methods (Jim Anderson & Michael Duncan)
GEOL/ANTH 4700, Archaeological Geography (Ervan Garrison)
HONS 4960H, Undergraduate Research (Pam Kleiber)
MATH 5035, Algebra for Middle School Teachers (Sybilla Beckmann)
MATH 5020, Arithmetic for Middle School Teachers (Sybilla Beckmann)
MUSI 3210, History of Music I (Susan Thomas)
SOCI 3220, Sociological Theory (Belisa Gonzalez)
WMST 3250, Feminism and the Body (Blaise Parker)
WMST 4011, Understanding Research (Patricia Richards)

Spring 2007
ARED 2000, Foundations in Art Education (Richard Siegesmund)
ARED 3360, Secondary Methods in Art Education (Tracie Costantino)
ARHI 4000, Early Greek Art (Frances Van Keuren)
ARHI 4916, American Landscape Painting (Janice Simon)
BIOL 1108L, Principles of Biology (Kathrin Stanger-Hall)
BIOL 1103L, Concepts in Biology I (Norris Armstrong & Peggy Brickman)
BIOL/ECOL 3500, Ecology (Mark Bradford)
CLAS 4340, Ancient Athens (Naomi Norman)
CLAS/HONS 2115H, Reacting to the Past (Keith Dix & Karin Myhre)
CMLT 4600, East Asian Literature I (Masaki Mori)
GEOL 4503, Sedimentary Geology (Steve Holland)
LATN 2001, Intermediate Latin I (Elena Bianchelli)
MATH 5030, Geometry and Measurement for Middle School Teachers (Sybilla Beckmann)
MATH 5003, Algebra and Problem Solving (Sybilla Beckmann)
MUSI 3220, History of Music II (David Schiller)
MUSI 2120, Music Theory IV (John Turci-Escobar)
SOCI 3220, Sociological Theory (Belisa Gonzalez)
WMST 4900, Senior Seminar (Patricia Richards)