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I. CURRENT STATUS

When the Writing Program drafted its last self-study more than six years ago, it was, after some years of serious retrenchment, just starting some new and hopeful ventures (e.g., the first stage of General Education reform, redefining lower division composition requirements, had just been completed, offering an opportunity and responsibility for the program); and it was on the verge of engaging in other ventures that have since materialized and matured. Fundamental to these developments was the new funding model brokered by the Humanities Division and the Division of Undergraduate Education (then under the leadership of current Humanities Division Dean Ladusaw) that has stabilized curricular planning and hiring and thus created a climate suitable for innovation. Also essential to these developments is the nature of the program itself, comprised of a faculty of professionals committed to their field and to developing the program’s ability to adapt to changes such as the significant, rapid increase in English language learners among our incoming population. The program has partnered with colleges, departments, and the campus library on curricular innovations; has developed an independent tutoring model using reduced resources; has raised funds to support a first-year writing prize; and has imagined—and in several cases already started to implement—additional professional development for faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate student tutors.

In other ways the program has been challenged in this period. Its ongoing and apparently permanent restriction to a largely lower-division curriculum, for example, prevents the program from developing a loyal alumni base and limits productive engagement with faculty across the curriculum. Moreover, that restriction distinguishes UCSC’s Writing Program from other independent writing programs in the country, which have maintained the connection between lower and upper division writing and in many cases have begun to offer undergraduate and graduate degrees in rhetoric and writing. Recent UC system-wide curtailments on uncompensated activities by Unit 18 Lecturers such as formal committee work and independent studies have also presented challenges, as have the complexities posed by sharing responsibility for two lower-division writing requirements with the colleges: a total of eleven units reporting to three divisions. These are among the challenges the program faces as it looks to the next period in its development.

A. Professional Activities, Strategic Direction, Program Effectiveness

The present direction of the Writing Program’s faculty activity and curriculum is primarily five-fold: 1) to address the increasingly multilingual needs of students who arrive at UC Santa Cruz without having satisfied the UC’s Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR—Appendix A); 2) to collaborate with the colleges to ensure a successful Core course writing experience; 3) to create rigorous and diverse
offerings of Writing 2; 4) to build cross-divisional alliances and writing opportunities for students prior to their major’s Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirements (Appendix B); and 5) to prepare graduate students to teach first-year writing at UC Santa Cruz and comparable institutions. Collectively, these pedagogical responsibilities align the Writing Program’s educational mission with that of the campus at large: to enhance and celebrate diversity, and to encourage inter-discipline research and overall academic excellence.

1) The Writing Program recognizes the multi-lingual reality of California middle and high school students. UC Santa Cruz moved closer to Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) status in fall 2012, and enrolls many students with complex linguistic histories; the Writing Program joins the campus in thoughtfully addressing the pedagogical challenges of teaching first-year writing to new university students whose literacies, increasingly, are affected by their multiple cultures and languages. In addition, the Committee on International Education (CIE) issued a report to UCSC’s Faculty Senate calling for a concerted effort to recruit larger numbers of international undergraduate students (Appendix C). As a result, many Writing Program faculty members are actively engaged in conducting scholarship on best teaching practices for multilingual students in ELWR courses, in Core/Composition 1 (C1) courses, or in Writing 2/Composition 2 (C2) courses—and all faculty members receive regular opportunities throughout the academic year to learn about and adopt new reading and writing strategies during faculty-led brown-bag lunches, presentations, and informal colloquia.

2) The Writing Program has worked productively in tandem with several colleges as they developed and rolled out new versions of their first-year Core courses to meet the needs of the most academically unprepared frosh writers. All entering first-year students enroll in their college’s Core course, a course that “emphasizes the theme of the college” and trains students in the “critical thinking and writing skills necessary for success in university work” (UCSC Housing). While the Writing Program at UC Santa Cruz does not offer courses in English as a Second Language (ESL), a number of courses are available to or required every quarter for ELWR-unsatisfied students—including classes that are increasingly focused on grammar. At the heart of the program’s robust and multilayered iterations of practice and assessment, over the past few years particularly distinct pedagogical experiments have been tested, especially the two-quarter pilot “Stretch” sequence of Core courses (Appendix D): 11 sections over three Colleges for fall 2012 and winter 2013, with more than 15 sections planned over five Colleges in 2013-2014. Inspired by Gregory Glau’s Arizona State University study (Appendix E) “Stretch” sections allow ELWR-unsatisfied students to take two quarters to read, discuss, and write about the Core course materials; students’ assimilation of university discourse and scholarly habits is thereby stretched to accommodate their linguistic and/or cultural challenges and to more fully prepare them for academic success. Writing Program “Stretch” faculty members have worked closely with Provosts to craft quality instruction for students most at risk for not passing Core in only one quarter. Writing Program Core instructors have also employed new and more targeted
tutoring options for the most academically vulnerable of the Core students to ensure efficient and effective support for them in their first quarter as they strive for ELWR-satisfied status—a key to the campus’s retention goals.

3) One of the great strengths and distinctive qualities of the Writing Program at UC Santa Cruz resides in its stable cadre of teachers who are professionally trained in writing pedagogy—similar to other UC campus writing programs (e.g., UC Berkeley’s Campus Writing Program, UC Santa Barbara’s Writing Program), and different from others (UC Irvine’s lower-division writing classes are largely taught by graduate students). Nearly 100% of the roughly 40 Writing Program faculty members have annual campus appointments, generally made up of a fall quarter appointment in one or two of the college Core classes (funded by the Writing Program) and winter and spring classes with the Writing Program. These practices align the Writing Program with hiring and staffing guidelines as articulated by the National Council of Teachers of English (2010), the largest professional organization for writing teachers in higher education. One direct result of providing annual campus appointments is that the Writing Program currently experiences virtually no personnel turnover during the academic year, in part because of the program’s personnel process that effectively evaluates competence (the standard for pre-six year Lecturers) and excellence (the standard for post-six year Continuing Lecturers. However, the greater significance of the program’s dedication to humane working conditions should not be underestimated, as it is the WP’s hiring and compensation practices that allow it to develop its faculty in all senses – as teachers, as scholars, and as members of the larger university community.

More than 1/3 of Writing Program Lecturers hold PhDs in disciplines traditionally associated with first-year writing, such as English but also as diverse as Cultural Geography, Environmental Studies, and Comparative Literature; more than 1/4 have joined the Writing Program after completing UC Santa Cruz degrees—all receiving solid mentorship in first year writing pedagogy at this campus. As a result, the Writing Program offers UC Santa Cruz students an array of Writing 2/C2 classes with a variety of thematic orientations but also with a set of common guiding principles around reading and writing skills.

4) Writing Program faculty, for the most part, do not teach upper-division courses, but several have been actively involved in successful cross-unit writing partnerships, most notably with Latin America and Latino Studies (LALS) and Environmental Studies (ENVS), that the Writing Program has embraced: working with upper-division students and the faculty in the disciplines reminds us of the writing challenges that await lower-division students and also helps familiarize faculty in the majors with writing pedagogy. Understanding and articulating with high school teaching is particularly important as well, especially given the high percentage of our students who arrive at UCSC not yet having satisfied the ELWR. Thus, for the past two years the Writing Program ELWR Coordinator has been working with the UC Santa Cruz Education Department, utilizing a now $500K grant to help high school English teachers in the Pajaro Valley Unified School District prepare
(constructing new sets of prompts, for example) for revised state standards in reading and nonfiction writing.

5) The Writing Program accepts graduate students from a range of disciplines and requires a theory and practicum course for most graduate students hired to teach approximately 18 sections of Writing 2 each year. Many of these students are mentored for several years by at least two Writing Program faculty members, and they often receive offers from college Provosts to teach sections of Core. By the time they complete their PhDs at UC Santa Cruz, they are qualified to teach first year composition courses (and to respond to student writing generally across the divisions) at a comparable four-year institution. (Perhaps more important, given that most of these graduate students will go on to jobs teaching in their scholarly field, they are well prepared to respond to student writing generally across the divisions, a point confirmed by participants in a survey of former Writing 203 students as part of the last External Review process.)

In partnership with the Graduate Division, during 2012-2013 the Writing Program initiated a series of writing workshops and a colloquium for graduate students working on their dissertations. Three Writing Program Lecturers with recent PhDs planned and facilitated the workshops and colloquium: a very positive exercise in faculty development. As UCSC moves ahead with its plan to increase the percentage of doctoral students from 7% to 12% of the total student population (excluding Master’s students), the call for programs that support graduate students’ writing—particularly graduate students facing language proficiency problems—will likely increase.

Of course, graduate students’ writing also needs support; and international graduate students in particular facing language proficiency problems often falter in their graduate course work or as they transition to independent dissertation production and sometimes struggle with professional and rhetorical forces that complicate argumentative or organizational strategies. In partnership with the Graduate Division, during 2012-2013 the Writing Program initiated a series of writing workshops and a colloquium for graduate students working on their dissertations. Three Writing Program Lecturers with recent PhDs planned and facilitated the workshops and colloquium: a very positive exercise in faculty development. As UCSC moves ahead with its plan to increase the percentage of doctoral students from 7% to 12% of the total student population (excluding Master’s students), the call for programs that support graduate students’ writing—particularly graduate students facing language proficiency problems—will likely increase. This increase offers an opportunity to increase the Writing Program’s interactions with graduate-student mentoring. Aside from a few isolated experiments, interventions by experienced Continuing Lecturers have been virtually absent for more than a decade now, and the last Writing Program consultant for Anthropology graduate students retired in June 2012. A certificate program in the teaching of writing could reinvigorate valuable Writing Program-Graduate Division collaborations; and a graduate-level language workshop modeled on Writing 22B could immediately
serve the needs of an important but often overlooked campus constituency.

None of the Writing Program's faculty activity and curriculum would be possible without exceptional staff support. Fortunately, the Office Manager is superb in running all aspects of the Writing Program's day-to-day budget, personnel, curricular, and space operations. She also supervises a well-qualified administrative assistant who is responsible for much web management, general student advising, and ELWR logistics throughout the year. In summer 2012 the Writing Program moved its long-time location from Kresge College on the west side of campus; it is now housed in the Humanities Building which has many advantages of space as well as inter-unit and intra-divisional collaboration and coordination. As of April 2013 the position of the administrative assistant was restored after more than two years to 100% in order to sufficiently address the requests that come across his desk and to reduce the Office Manager’s significant workload demands. As a result, despite a staffing sea change in 2010-2011, and despite the many stresses that require continual responses and ad hoc adjustments in an academic unit so large and serving nearly 5,000 first-year students every year, the Writing Program finds itself intelligently and skillfully managed overall.

B. Undergraduate Program

The philosophy and structure of the Writing Program’s curricular responsibilities jointly drive its mission of excellence and innovation for first year writing instruction at UC Santa Cruz. All courses offered are designed to help students become more competent and confident writers of prose: to approach writing as an essential way to make discoveries about themselves and the world, and to communicate these discoveries to others. All courses emphasize the importance of recognizing audience and particular communicative situations and purposes; and all provide students with strategies of free writing, organization, revision, and editing.

Together with the colleges, the Writing Program manages the lower-division writing components (C1, C2) of the campus general education requirements; administers the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR); and advises students about ways to fulfill these requirements. Writing Program instructors in each college participate in the college’s fall Core course. Students’ writing status upon entry (calculated by placement exam score, among other means) determines which Core course level they sign up for: one that satisfies the C2 requirement (about 20% of students annually), one that satisfies the C1, or one that also still requires satisfaction of the ELWR before C1 credit is conferred; for a host of reasons, including stresses on preparatory education and changing California demographics, students needing an ELWR-unsatisfied section of Core has increased over the past three years, from 38% to 42%.

Each year, assuming a frosh class of 3,500 students, the Writing Program offers roughly 112 sections of Writing 2 (a lower-division course that satisfies the C2
requirement); the winter Writing 20 (15-20 sections, not including “Stretch” Core), spring Writing 21 (5-10 sections), and fall Writing 23 (2-4 sections) series to help address the academic needs of students (especially multilingual) who have not satisfied the ELWR during their first four quarters at UCSC; and Writing 169 (two sections with a total enrollment of ~40 students) and Writing 203 (one section of 14-20 students), which offer instruction in the theory and practice of teaching writing for peer tutors and graduate students, respectively.

The educational objectives for both C1 and C2 courses are published on the Writing Program’s webpage under “Quick Links”: “In completing UCSC’s two-quarter General Education Requirement in Composition, students learn how to become effective participants in university discourse, spoken as well as written” (Appendix F). Also published on the Writing Program’s webpage under “Quick Links” are two program assessment documents, both useful contributions to ensure a) that the program improves its overall curriculum effectiveness and b) that the educational objectives remain as uniform as possible across multiple offerings of C1/C2 with different instructors. Since the last Writing Program review, the ELWR curriculum has grown to more than 40% of the program’s first year course offerings—due in part to a burgeoning multilingual student population at UCSC that influences the teaching of Writing 2/C2 as well as C1.

Assessment in the Writing Program takes several forms. Assessment of student performance relies fundamentally on shared assumptions about what constitutes passing work, and so the program has produced documents—and has gone through a programmatic process of developing these documents—to guide teachers as they read student work. Shared assumptions also need to be tested, and this the program does as well during the several times each year that faculty gather as a whole to be normed anew in preparation for reading writing placement exams and portfolios of papers meant to satisfy the ELWR.

The 2007 Writing Program assessment, “Standards for Passing Papers in C2 Classes,” is a 95-page document that annotates nine papers from various C2 classes in order to articulate C2 principles and to demonstrate a range of student writing: sophisticated, competent, satisfactory, and not passing (Appendix G). The 2012 program assessment, “Standards for Passing Essays in Core/C1 Courses,” is a 60-page document that annotates eight essays from several college Core courses in order to articulate C1 principles and to demonstrate a similar four-step range of student writing (Appendix H). This pilot study raised significant questions about how students write (and how Writing Program and Core course instructors should evaluate that writing) about distinctly different subject matter and in response to diverse assignments; it also provided a model for each college to conduct its own assessment and more precisely calibrate faculty and student expectations of successful (and unsuccessful) writing given each college’s particular Core curriculum.

The educational objectives for the ELWR courses—Writing 20, 21, and 23—are also
published on the Writing Program’s webpage under “Quick Links”: these ELWR courses “are taken by students who have been assessed or self-described as needing additional work on their writing after Core and before moving on to C2. Like all writing courses, Writing 20, 21, and 23 offer practice in both reading and writing . . . on multiple levels. While the topics addressed in Writing 20, 21, and 23 will overlap with those in C2, these topics will generally be addressed in Writing 20, 21, and 23 with more explicit scaffolding and with more detailed articulation of the distinct strategies and skills that can be applied at any stage of the composing process” (Appendix I). Increasingly with each subsequent course in this series, the classes address the demands of standard written English and formal grammar. Students who take “Stretch” Core do so in lieu of taking Writing 20, but both pathways—“Stretch” Core and Core/Writing 20—are suitable for students needing at least two quarters of intensive writing instruction to satisfy the ELWR.

The Writing Program is currently in the midst of several tutoring and assessment projects relevant to ELWR courses and to ELWR-unsatisfied sections of fall Core. Towards the end of each quarter, as select Writing Program faculty members gather to determine whether students’ portfolios have satisfied the ELWR requirement, the ELWR Coordinator leads norming sessions and provides examples of passing vs. not passing student essays. An assessment document with annotated sample essays will soon be published on the Writing Program webpage under “Quick Links.” Moreover, the Writing Program is continuing its ambitious multi-year assessment of the use of writing tutors for ELWR-unsatisfied students (a ~$50K annual budget that involves 70-75 writing tutors serving roughly 1,000 students); a four-year report on best practices, ELWR pass rates, and subsequent student success at the upper-division level is expected by spring 2014.

Throughout the academic year, all Writing Program Continuing Lecturers with an “a” 1/6th course equivalency take part in several program tasks essential to curriculum development, implementation, and assessment: the September Analytic Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) that requires dozens of faculty proctors; the November AWPE and appeals readings to determine student ELWR status; winter and spring writing placement exams; regularly scheduled faculty meetings; etc. The process begins each September with the program’s annual retreat. Until recently, the retreat offered faculty the opportunity to sign up for Writing Program-sanctioned committees: grading (Appendix J), library collaboration (Appendix K), C2 research and pedagogy (Appendix L), ELWR and “Stretch,” etc. Committees typically met at least once per quarter, and committee chairs reported on their progress at least once per year at a program faculty meeting and submitted a short document to the Writing Program Chair at the end of the academic year. Because of limits on uncompensated voluntary work, during 2012-2013, this process was primarily faculty-organized.

Since the Writing Program’s last external review, several faculty committees have taken active and effective roles in developing and presenting useful pedagogical approaches in response to changing UCSC contexts. They have offered reports on
their work at annual and quarterly faculty meetings, and at brown-bag lunches and other forums for interested faculty. The Library Committee, for instance, has worked closely with UCSC librarians to develop interactive and results-oriented library research sessions, and has prepared many useful worksheets and handouts suitable for use now that the library can no longer offer in-site, librarian-led sessions. Thus Writing Program faculty members have continued to work together on matters of personal interest to them. For instance, at a winter 2013 program meeting, a group of faculty presented to their colleagues a substantial report on workload and especially on pedagogy that included a “summary of some of the instructional practices” that best inform the teaching of composition. “Best practices” collected from Writing Program faculty offered the following: innovative use of writing groups; grading matrices and rubrics; individual and group office conferencing; integrating shorter with longer writing assignments; diversely crafted student research presentations; targeted reading quizzes; student annotations of instructor essay comments for revision purposes; digital feedback, such as voice dictation and editing; eCommons for posting materials and managing student writing groups (Appendix M). This group also held a valuable pedagogy forum at the end of winter 2013 focused around writing groups and ways of teaching sentences through specific in-class activities and exercises. Another forum is tentatively planned for fall 2013.

The Writing Program attempts to ensure active participation of the whole faculty in developing writing skills across the curriculum include different kinds of retreats and intellectual gatherings. For the last two years, several faculty members have partnered with Retention Services to lead a mid-September skills course for at-risk Bridge students new to UC Santa Cruz. “Stretch” faculty members, both new and experienced, also met in 2012 for their first September retreat to exchange ideas and begin to draft a best practices teaching handbook. Brown bag pedagogy lunches are also a regular feature of the Writing Program at which Continuing and pre-six Lecturers discuss topics ranging from strategies for teaching multilingual students to proposals for upcoming regional or national writing conferences. Partly as a result of these ongoing brown bag pedagogy lunches, during 2012-2013 several Lecturers presented papers at important regional and national writing conferences. The Writing Program has also targeted professional development efforts at pre-six Lecturers who have been increasingly integrated into teaching the ELWR curriculum’s full spectrum—including the 3rd and 4th quarter ELWR courses, Writing 21 and 23.

Assessment of faculty performance comes via the detailed work of the Writing Program Personnel Committee, a group comprised of all sitting Lecturers with Security of Employment (and in past years, some recalled emeritus LSOEs), and Continuing and pre-six Lecturers elected by their peers annually. (Personnel procedures are included in Appendix N.) Reviews involve class visits and consultations with the faculty under review, and frequently offer mentoring advice as well as evaluation. The Writing Program's primary internal mechanism to obtain feedback and assessment data from students on teaching and course effectiveness
comes in the form of end-of-quarter student evaluations. These evaluations are central to Lecturers’ academic reviews. Lecturers are expected to read each student’s assessments and comments and, in their statements of pedagogy, to address any areas of concerns. Members of the Personnel Committee read all student evaluations relevant to a Lecturer’s review—as do the Humanities Dean and the Divisional Committee on Academic Personnel. The evaluation form for Writing 2 is especially detailed and thorough in covering an array of skills, and was designed specifically to reflect the C2 objectives and provide a measure for faculty to measure their success in communicating these aims to students. (A revised course evaluation form for students in the Writing 20 series, reflecting C1 objectives, has been in the works, though both may be rendered obsolete with the development of a new online course evaluation slated for roll-out in fall 2013.)

The Writing Program is also committed to helping local students arrive prepared for college-level writing, and to celebrating high achievement among our own first-year students. Partnering with UC Santa Cruz’s Education Department, for the past two years the Writing Program has helped local high school teachers prepare their students for the rigor of college and career work through analytical reading and writing, as required by the new Common Core State Standards. The program, called Alliance for Language and Literary Instruction Effecting Standards (ALLIES), works with up to 40 English teachers from Watsonville, Pajaro Valley, and Aptos high schools.

Now in its third year, the Humanities Don Rothman Writing Award honors the academic achievements of first year students at UC Santa Cruz. An annual October awards ceremony in front of family, friends, and writing faculty (who are also recognized for their pedagogical excellence) celebrates Rothman Endowment winners with a certificate, monetary compensation, and essay publication on the Writing Program’s webpage. In fall 2012, four student winners (1st and 2nd place, plus two Honorable Mentions) were acknowledged; their essays were selected from among more than 70 submissions as the most impressive in demonstrating—as the award guidelines articulate—“serious engagement with issues raised in the class, including the importance and impact of other writers’ ideas.” Named for founding Writing Program member and emeritus LSOE Don Rothman, the Endowment at the end of 2012 had reached the sustainable mark of $25,000 and has received donations from more than 50 contributors; the Humanities Rothman award for first year student writing offers the campus a visible reminder of outstanding academic prose produced by first-year students and of a successful program in the process of positive change.

C. Contributions to Graduate Education

As an academic unit now essentially concerned with first year student writing, the Writing Program offers only one course for graduate students: Writing 203, “Theory and Practice of Teaching Writing”—a one-quarter course co-taught by two Writing
Program faculty members that prepares graduate students from multiple intellectual trainings to teach first year composition to students at UC Santa Cruz and comparable institutions. Each year 14-20 graduate students receive a brief history of writing as an academic discipline, and read key figures in the field of composition and rhetoric. By the end of the quarter, these graduate students have visited at least two sections of Writing 2; they have also prepared, tested, and defended in front of their peers a substantive 10-week curriculum informed by their readings and observations.

Select graduate students receive appointments as Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs) to teach sections of Writing 2 for the Writing Program. They meet with their faculty mentor (one of Writing 203’s co-teachers) four times during the quarter they are assigned to teach in order to discuss curriculum, class management, and campus procedures. Assessment includes review of course syllabus, assignments, written feedback on essays, and student course evaluations; the mentor also visits two classes each quarter the GSI is hired to teach. If the overall teaching performance is judged competent, and the Chair receives a positive recommendation, a GSI may be hired by the Writing Program for a second (and sometimes a third or fourth) quarter.

The Writing 203 curriculum is in the process of revision in order to incorporate new perspectives and research on the teaching of writing. This reassessment also focuses on how to balance various concerns: providing a succinct overview of the field of first year composition studies, contextualizing that field for the UC Santa Cruz campus and its distinct history around writing requirements, and transitioning graduate students from disseminating the context of their subject areas to teaching writing courses that privilege the process of writing for first year students.

As noted above, the Writing Program is partnering with the Graduate Division to formalize a series of workshops and a colloquium for students at different stages of writing their dissertations. An even more ambitious project is envisioned beginning 2013-2014: creating a Certificate in Writing (or TA Training Certificate) for graduate students who complete Writing 203, teach at least two quarters for the Writing Program, and then commit to a quarter’s Independent Study work mentoring new graduate students and writing a report about that professional development experience. The benefits of a Certificate in Writing for graduate students would extend not only to Writing 2 students, but also to the campus generally whose recent PhD graduates might strengthen their candidacies at other four-year institutions by virtue of holding a unique pedagogical certificate.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the training graduate students receive in Writing 203 has been helpful to them in other contexts. Participants in Writing 203 are sought-after candidates for teaching positions in the college Core courses; they also report (in course evaluations, and in a survey conducted as part of the follow-up to the last external review) that their teaching in all contexts, both at UCSC and at other colleges and universities, both in writing and in their fields of origin, has been
informed and improved by the systematic approach to learning about teaching that the course provides. UCSC no longer supports a Center for Teaching Excellence, and support for graduate student teaching is patchy and often run by graduate students themselves. In this context, Writing 203 has provided a valuable and possibly unique pedagogical training.

D. Administrative Staffing, Equipment, and Space

As noted earlier, the Writing Program administrative support services are currently outstanding. The Office Manager is superlative and day-to-day demands are professionally addressed. In April 2013 the administrative assistant position was restored to 100%. This divisional decision was much appreciated, as a full-time administrative position has long been required for the program to function effectively. The positive impacts have allowed the Writing Program Manager, to delegate some additional clerical duties to the administrative assistant and focus more on helping the Chair and Associate Chair with the program’s long-range vision. Also, some of the bureaucratic duties of the ELWR Coordinator can now be handled by the administrative assistant: booking exam rooms, filing, photo copying, etc.—perhaps even monitoring ELWR-unsatisfied students not enrolled in an appropriate course in their second and third quarters at UC Santa Cruz. Since the Writing Program has moved its operations into the Humanities Building, space needs are somewhat less problematic. A conference room specifically designated for Writing Program personnel needs would be more optimal than the current arrangement of sharing conference rooms with other Humanities academic units; and additional offices for instructors newly hired into the Writing Program Lecturer Pool remain as yet unsecured. Having noted those concerns, there have been improvements to access to equipment, furniture, and IT support; and overall the Writing Program finds itself in good management hands, with strong collaborative support from other academic units within the division.
II. CRITICAL ISSUES AND STRATEGIES

The Writing Program has identified five critical issues that it plans to address over the next several years: 1) to hire two new LSOEs, at least one of whom should possess demonstrated expertise in ESL and multilingual pedagogy; 2) to reorient the focus of the Writing Program’s curriculum, especially as the campus approaches HSI status and admits greater numbers of international students, so as to serve an increasingly diverse student body of English Language Learners and to continue innovating its “Stretch” Core curriculum; 3) to improve coordination among the multiple tiers of College Core courses, C1 (80A) as well as C2 (80B or Writing 2); 4) to respond to a widening gap in writing opportunities for students between their first and final years at UC Santa Cruz; and 5) to increase fund raising for the Humanities Don Rothman Writing Endowment and for new academic projects envisioned for the Writing Program’s future, such as TA Training for graduate student instructors. All five of these critical issues impact undergraduate education in essential ways.

1) Two new LSOEs are vitally needed in the Writing Program. At present, only three Senate faculty members are providing program leadership; one is a very recent hire, one is currently serving 50% time as a College Provost, and one may retire by 2016. With 40+ Writing Program Lecturers with annual campus appointments, 4-5 LSOEs at minimum are required to effectively lead the program for the next seven years: to serve as Chair, as Associate Chair, as ELWR Coordinator, as Provost liaison and convener of the College Writing Coordinators, as head of C2 curriculum development, as assistant of personnel committee matters, as supervisor of Writing 203 curriculum and graduate students, as director of fund raising, as point person for outreach or cross-divisional curriculum collaboration, and so forth.

In January 2013 the Writing Program submitted its request to the Humanities Division for two new LSOE positions. By spring 2013 permission had been secured, and the Writing Program will proceed with a national search in 2013-2014 similar to the search of 2011-2012 (Appendix O). Despite limited campus resources, the Writing Program believes that two new LSOE hires will be fully merited and will receive wide campus support because of their expected positive impact on undergraduate education at UC Santa Cruz. LSOEs have served on the Committee on Committees (including the current COC Chair), and committees on Educational Policy, Planning and Budget, Faculty Welfare, Teaching, and Preparatory Education; they have served as campus representatives to system-wide committees and projects; and they have served on search committees for campus administrators. In such efforts, they represent the Writing Program to faculty colleagues and administrators within and beyond the campus, a particularly critical ambassadorial role given the small size of the Writing Program’s Senate faculty cohort.

At least one of the Writing Program’s new LSOE hires should have a strong background working with multilingual students as well as broad and deep experience in managing a complex curriculum that addresses the academic needs of
the current generation of California students. This hire should be someone with the credentials to serve as ELWR Coordinator, a position that requires significant administrative acumen and expertise in the field. The Writing Program expects the successful candidate to have regular interactions with multiple campus units and agendas, contribute knowledgeably at UC-wide ELWR meetings, and present papers at regional and national conferences on ESL, ELL, and Generation 1.5 pedagogy. Other possible areas of expertise might include K-12 education and the research abilities to promote collaboration with the Education Department; or specialization in disciplinary or professional writing, especially the sciences and engineering. Successful candidates should have sufficient background in the history, theory, and practice of rhetoric so as to speak authoritatively on the field that defines the primary work of the Writing Program.

2) As noted in section I of this Self Study, more than 40% of the Writing Program's curriculum and more than 50% of its budget now respond to the demands of the campus's ELWR-unsatisfied students. Nearly all of the ELWR-unsatisfied students are multilingual, and Spanish is the first and home language for many of those students. In addition, UCSC expects to see a sharp increase in the number of international undergraduates. According to the office of the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VP/DUE), in a public affairs email of 27 March 2013, for fall 2013 “the international non-resident admit pool climbed 165% to 1204” students. While increased admissions have not yet resulted in significantly increased international student yield, it is only a matter of time before they do. In part, the UC system views these students as a potential revenue stream (CIE report, Appendix C). In any case, financial and political implications aside, as a Hispanic Serving Institution with aspirations of enrolling larger numbers of international students over time (as many as 125 are expected to accept admission to UCSC for fall 2013), the campus must be conversant with current theory and must adopt best teaching practices for multilingual students.

The Writing Program has taken part in some important steps towards anticipating a larger cohort of international students. At a meeting facilitated by the VP/DUE’s office on April 2nd, for example, a group of administrators and faculty—mainly from the Writing Program but also from the Language Program, Retention Services, and the VP/DUE’s undergraduate success team—discussed a number of vital issues concerning “best practices” so that international students might be retained but also thrive academically at UC Santa Cruz. These include pre-university practicums to initiate international students to the ethos and discourse codes of the university, or summer courses that include American pronunciation conventions, idioms, etc.; a fall immersion program with concurrent language labs and assistance in navigating a research university; an increase in the number of sections of Writing 22A, a grammar course for underprepared students and taken concurrently with their College Core course; identifying international students by their distinct linguistic or cultural needs and experience (underscoring, for example, the benefits of ESL course work for international students more than domestic English Language Learners (ELL) or Generation 1.5 students; integrating returning Education Abroad
Program (EAP) students as quarter-long or year-long mentors for internationals students; providing select upper-division students an opportunity to serve as tutors, instructional assistants, or academic mentors in the majors; and offering workshops for all UCSC instructors—to remind them, in part, that ESL markers will remain to varying degrees in the writing of international students throughout their undergraduate career and through graduation.

Though most of its faculty members are not trained in ESL and do not have a diverse linguistic background—especially in Spanish or Chinese—the Writing Program has begun renovating its intellectual mission in order to meet the academic challenges posed by California middle and high school demographics. Four of the Writing Program newest pre-six Lecturers bring either training in ESL or a multilingual background; three of those hires have found an immediate pedagogical home teaching the ELWR curriculum. Another recent pre-six Lecturer has refocused her PhD research interests in cultural geography and Asian American studies and is fast becoming a program resource on best teaching practices for multilingual students. A central Writing Program aim over the next seven years is to strengthen its cadre of faculty members who can provide innovative and effective curriculum to UC Santa Cruz’s multilingual and multicultural student body in the second decade of the 21st century. For this reason, the Writing Program has arranged an inaugural three-day summer workshop for faculty members on teaching English language learners. (See Section III of this Self Study.) Moreover, coming up on year three of partnering with Retention Services, several Writing Program faculty have created relevant curriculum and taught a week-long pre-university practicum for EOP and academically underprepared students from poor-performing California high schools.

Writing Program faculty members—and the College Writing Coordinators in particular—will need to continue improving the quality of tutorial assistance for students in ELWR courses. With a minimal budget, the Writing Program’s autonomous tutorial operation must choose its targets among ELWR-unsatisfied students; in the fall College Core courses, for example, students with AWPE scores of 5 and below receive tutoring in order to help them transition from high school expectations, address the demands of university discourse with greater precision and linguistic control, and cultivate new habits of mind as they prepare for the next steps in their academic career. The Writing Program is currently assessing the efficacy of these tutoring efforts to see if funding increases would lead to improved ELWR pass rates and overall student performance. Over the next seven years the Writing Program will look to forge new partnerships with other campus units to create and reinforce sound pedagogical practices.

3) Writing Program faculty have embraced the educational aspirations of the campus’s 2005 C1/C2 composition requirement by working closely with college Provosts—and, as with “Stretch” Core, developing creative and effective teaching strategies to enhance the delivery of reading and writing instruction for first-year students. Nonetheless, various significant and ongoing challenges remain in the Writing Program’s coordination with the colleges—some having to do with
instructional personnel, many involving administrative logistics, and occasionally involving differing pedagogical visions.

One challenge concerns the staffing of ELWR-unsatisfied sections of Core. In fall 2012, the Writing Program was responsible for 46 ELWR-unsatisfied sections of Core taught by 32 Writing Program Lecturers. However, given an unusually large frosh class (3,859 students instead of the projected 3,500), combined with an anomalously low ELWR pass rate of 58%, the campus needed significantly more ELWR-unsatisfied sections of Core—and the office of the VP/DUE determined that funding for hiring all additional Lecturers would be directed to the Provosts, not the Writing Program. In most cases, existing Writing Program instructors were assigned the additional sections; however, because of the need for more Core course sections, a few temporary College Lecturer Pool instructors unknown to the Writing Program, some with minimal training in writing pedagogy, were assigned these classes. Eleven separate units are responsible for hiring Core faculty, and sometimes the hiring responsibilities for ELWR faculty, which have mostly been delegated to the Writing Program, shift to the colleges. Further, though the Writing Program provides the orientation and training materials for all ELWR instructors, the colleges provide the guidance to each specific Core class and the de facto supervision of Core faculty, whether hired by the College of the Writing Program. Putting aside the complicated budgetary steps (accounts or transfers of funds often taking a year or more to settle), the effectiveness of C1 is sometimes tested by administrative overlap, duplication, and even competing pedagogical purposes.

This first challenge of instructional personnel and funding streams to dual administrative entities (the Writing Program and the Colleges, which themselves operate within three separate divisions: Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences) is very much related to a second challenge: maintaining a coherent educational mission across the multiple C1 Core sections that are now three-tiered at some colleges: ELWR-unsatisfied ("Stretch") ELWR-unsatisfied (but non-"Stretch"), and ELWR-satisfied. Interactions among the mostly Writing Program Lecturers teaching ELWR-unsatisfied section of Core and the mostly non-Writing Program Lecturers teaching ELWR-satisfied sections of Core take place during regular faculty meetings, though teaching strategies, norming exercises, or grading practices may differ from college to college; hence the overall quality of writing instruction cannot always be fully monitored or assessed. Addressing these issues effectively requires even more diligent communication between the Writing Program and the Colleges. The College Writing Coordinators have traditionally had a part in mentoring their Core course peers, though diverse pedagogical philosophies have incrementally evolved at some Colleges. A more robust cadre of Writing Program Senate Faculty LSOEs could play new and unified supervisorial roles and work to improve the delivery of Core/C1 instruction on campus.

A third challenge involves Core/C2. Just as very few Writing Program Lecturers teach ELWR-satisfied sections of C1 Core, an equally small number teach C2 sections of Core where experience integrating research materials and assignments with
course content is essential. If done thoughtfully, assigning writing in a content course can be the same as teaching writing; constructing provocative yet accessible prompts to engender successful, in-depth critical thinking is a skill learned out of considerable practice with first-year students of diverse backgrounds and abilities; facilitating lively and collegial class seminar discussion emerges from wide-ranging familiarity with composition theory. Hence, the pedagogy for teaching C2 Core sections should be reviewed annually so students are held to the same standards across all C2 classes offered by the Writing Program and by the Colleges. Assessment across all classes of that satisfy the C2 requirement would ensure a more consistent teaching and learning environment for C2 students at UCSC.

The program’s 2012 assessment of writing in C1 Core across the Colleges, available on the Writing Program website under “Quick Links” (Appendix H), is a useful step in the direction of standardizing excellence of outcome in C1; the individual Colleges have now been encouraged to assess student writing within the context of their own curriculum and themes. A related and even more ambitious step would be to consider the writing of first-quarter students taking C2 sections of Core. Integrating methods and principles of research (a component of C2 and of Writing 2, which most students take in their second or third quarters at UCSC) requires extra dedication and skill from instructors and students alike; both aim to enhance the intellectual experience of the College Core course by layering research into an already complete and themed curriculum. In winter and spring 2013, the Writing Program Chair initiated a series of conversations around teaching C2 Core; C2 instructors from across the Colleges contributed remarkable anecdotes as well as pedagogical tips and “best practices”—one of which is to hold a half day orientation at the start of each academic year (akin, perhaps, to the Writing Program’s annual meeting for teachers of ELWR-unsatisfied sections of Core) devoted to sharing C2 Core teaching strategies. Ideas for orientation topics included how and when to introduce research, how to scaffold assignments, how to cope with a wide range of students writing ability (students satisfy C1 and place into C2 Core in a variety of ways, resulting in highly uneven skills and a challenging teaching environment), and how best to create and sustain a student-centered class as a mild vaccine against the mostly large lecture courses that students experience for much of their UC Santa Cruz career.

4) In its previous Academic Plan and Self Study the Writing Program wondered whether a superior undergraduate education could emerge from a campus whose resource commitments for writing were concentrated primarily on first-year composition. In the intervening years, UC Santa Cruz has reshaped its General Education plan to include an upper-division “Disciplinary Communication” (DC) requirement, met by courses students take in their majors and taught by faculty in the disciplines (Appendix B). Leaving aside the matter of whether the current range of DC courses addresses the writing needs of juniors and seniors, the campus finds itself virtually free of any mid-level writing courses. The Writing Program believes that this current educational reality may have a problematic impact on diversity insofar as failure to provide mid-level writing courses increases the odds that
students will lose ground, especially those with the most fragile grasp of effective writing strategies. Along with the Academic Senate’s Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and other campus constituents, the Writing Program hopes to positively figure in ongoing conversations about the role of undergraduate writing at a premiere research institution. In 2013-2014, CEP plans to initiate review of DC courses to assess the effectiveness of this new approach to post-C2 writing instruction.

As a backdrop to considering how the Writing Program can once again contribute to writing courses beyond the first-year experience, it is worth underscoring that program faculty continue to mentor tutors (after they have studied the principles and practices of effective tutoring in Writing 169, a required course for all Writing Program tutors) and that these tutors assist at-risk and ELWR-unsatisfied students in their first four quarters at UC Santa Cruz; that their collaborations with Environmental Studies and Latin America and Latino Studies (LALS) continue to yield positive results. Yet the campus needs a more systematic and less ad hoc approach to fostering writing excellence in each year of an undergraduate’s career at UC Santa Cruz. The Writing Program’s current incarnation as a lower-division writing program, however, limits curricular contact with students to the courses they take in their first two years.

Through its close and sometimes repeated contact with students striving to satisfy the ELWR, students who are among the campus’s growing population—now more than 35%—of English Language Learners as well as children of immigrants, the Writing Program recognizes and embraces its leading role in trying to retain a diverse body of students who can succeed and graduate with a university degree. These students, along with the increasing number of transfer students from community colleges struggling to manage the transition to university-level writing, are most likely to under-perform in their DC courses. Often this is because for two or three years after completing Writing 2 they take courses with little to no writing required. Thus, by the time they find themselves in an upper-division DC course, their analytic skills in reading and writing complex prose have atrophied.

In spring 2013 the Writing Program launched a 3-unit workshop (Writing 22B) specifically designed for students who are the weakest writers (having just satisfied the ELWR) so that they can better succeed with the grammar and research expectations of their Writing 2 courses, taken concurrently. Four sections of Writing 22B are planned for spring 2014—and could eventually serve sophomores in need of additional language and writing instruction even after taking Writing 2. Offering this kind of course support during students’ lower-division careers at UC Santa Cruz involve a relatively modest investment given the possible improvement in student retention rates. If the Humanities Division (in conjunction with the offices of the VP/DUE and Retention Services) were to commit to frontloading such academic support, some students might satisfy the ELWR sooner, reduce their need to repeat Writing 2 in order to satisfy the C2 requirement, and demonstrate higher quality work overall in upper-division courses for their majors.
The cost of a course like Writing 22B—for first-year students but also for students in their sophomore or even junior year—could be mitigated by positive impacts on diversity, especially in retaining students admitted to UC Santa Cruz. (The same would likely be true for a new planned pedagogy course on methods of teaching critical reading, Writing 179, intended to offer upper-division students who have completed Writing 169 and Writing 159 the opportunity of earning academic credit and then serving as instructional assistants leading critical reading groups for post-ELWR and especially post-“Stretch” students enrolled in spring Writing 2 courses.) Other than Math, the Writing Program is the only academic unit on campus providing direct support to the significant population of ELL and Generation 1.5 students. In its ELWR courses, the Writing Program interacts with more EOP students than any other campus unit. As noted in the previous Writing Program Academic Plan, the Writing Program “has close and often repeated contact with UC Santa Cruz’s economically disadvantaged students, students from under-resourced California high schools, and students of color” (Appendix P). Many of them academically vulnerable, these students must succeed as critical thinkers and writers in order to move through the curricula required for general education and majors—and then to contribute to the general welfare of society.

5) After two years of aggressive fund raising, in December 2012 the Humanities Don Rothman Writing Award Endowment reached a self-sustaining figure of $25,000 and has inspired several college-based writing prizes. The Writing Program now judges more than 70 essay submissions each year and celebrates up to 4-5 students (including Honorable Mentions) and their instructors at an annual October ceremony. 1st-place winners receive up to $300 for their achievement, and they are recognized in front of friends, family, Writing Program instructors, and major campus administrators such as the Humanities Dean and the Executive Vice Chancellor.

The Rothman Award reflects the Writing Program’s commitment to undergraduate education at UC Santa Cruz: Writing Program instructors introduce first-year students to the challenges and rewards of rigorous intellectual inquiry, to the ideals of scholarship practiced at a research university. Rothman Award recipients see their essays and award statements published on the Writing Program webpage as critical models for subsequent year entrants. As a mark of distinction for first-year student writers at UC Santa Cruz, the Humanities Don Rothman Writing Endowment has drawn donations from more than 50 contributors including alumni, current and former Writing Program faculty, and students’ parents—a significant achievement in light of the reality that while the Writing Program touches 75%-80% of entering frosh, its lack of majors or minors means it does not have an alumni base.
III. FUTURE PLANS

Of the five issues covered in Section II of this Self-Study, two in particular stand out: 1) the hiring of two new LSOEs; and 2) the practice of proven writing pedagogy for UC Santa Cruz students who arrive with linguistic and/or cultural training insufficient to easily internalize the elite intellectual ethos of the university. The Writing Program firmly believes that these two issues can be addressed simultaneously—or at least in tandem can help prepare the campus over the next several years to successfully meet some of the most critical lower division educational needs of the present generation of middle and high school students in California.

The Writing Program also recognizes that other challenges lie ahead: how to collaborate and share its C1/C2 governance even more effectively with the Colleges, especially as the range of different levels and iterations of College Core continues to widen; how to norm Writing Program (and College) instructors more recursively and precisely reading AWPE as well as C2/Writing 2 essays in the face of minimal opportunities, time, and funding for professional development; how to be better collectors of data so that hypotheses and conclusions can be disseminated to the rest of the campus in a transparent, coherent, and programmatic (quarterly, for example) way; and how to join the growing corps of UC Santa Cruz faculty exploring all things online, creating new ways of educating students in traditional classrooms as well as in virtual worlds.

A. Pedagogy Retreat/Institute

An exciting new venture—the program’s first summer Pedagogy Retreat, scheduled for August 2013, Teaching Composition to Multilingual Students—links the Writing Program’s thinking about additional LSOE hires with its recast identity as an academic unit no longer granting degrees in two minors but instead focused on the value of first-year student writing and on promoting literacy in a just and democratic society. Led by Professor Dana Ferris, Associate Director of Lower-Division Writing in the University Writing Program at UC Davis, more than 25 retreat participants in this three-day August workshop will study texts such as Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing and Teaching College Writing to Diverse Student Populations in an effort to develop their skills as teachers of multilingual writers.

Instructors from the Writing Program, from the Colleges, and from among graduate student applicants will participate with the goal of expanding their pedagogical repertoire—learning different teaching strategies to improve the academic skills of their students, especially multilingual writers who enter UC Santa Cruz not yet having satisfied the ELWR. Writing Program Lecturers in particular should emerge from this retreat experience better equipped (i) to converse with their writing
colleagues as well as with their campus colleagues in other disciplines and (ii) to assess the expertise of potential future colleagues who interview for an LSOE position with the Writing Program in winter 2014 and, in public/divisional presentations, offer their views on teaching writing effectively to multilingual and multicultural first-year students.

Assuming the success of this retreat, the Writing Program sees an opportunity to make it an annual event—an institute, if you will, devoted to the study of contemporary theories on teaching composition, critical reading, and general university literacy to domestic multilingual students as well as to international students. (In the 1980s, the campus was home to a distinguished NEH-funded Literary Translation Institute; 30 years later, the Writing Program envisions a modest remodeling of that intellectual and cultural endeavor.) Such an institute could even invite a few middle or high school teachers each summer to participate, thereby serving to build and renew collaborations between local secondary school teachers and UC Santa Cruz writing instructors. Ideally, the finances and pedagogical vision of a yearly summer pedagogy retreat would be managed by a new LSOE hire with the kind of scholarly background and ESL/TESOL training of Dr. Ferris.

B. “Stretch” Core

The ongoing evolution of the Writing Program’s educational ambitions is rooted in the recognition that all pedagogy can improve and that the most underprepared students in the UC system can and should acquire reading and writing literacy in order to communicate their ideas and contribute to the social fabric as informed citizens in a democracy. Because an increasing number of multilingual and multicultural students have been entering UC Santa Cruz’s doors over the past decade, the Writing Program has helped to develop new teaching projects such as the current “Stretch” Core experiment.

Crafted as a response to students with low AWPE scores (5 or below), “Stretch” Core was piloted at College Ten in fall 2009 and winter 2010. The ELWR pass rate results were promising; as noted in spring 2010: “All but one of the 27 stretch students [in two sections of Core] passed ELWR this winter. This is a better rate than the non-stretch College Ten students,” where 5 out of 25 did not pass; and those 25 students “all entered UCSC with a 6 on the [AWPE]” (Appendix Q). These initial results were sufficient to request approval from CEP to extend the “Stretch” endeavor for another year and to include College Nine and Oakes College, even while allowing for the possibility that two other factors may have played a role in the high pass rates: “stretch sections were smaller than the average ELWR sections and were taught by very experienced instructors” (Appendix D).

The spring 2010 proposal to CEP noted that some students “initially had negative
feelings about being assigned to stretch, but most came to see its value”—even if the proposal’s pledge to CEP to “solicit student and instructor evaluations and look at the ELWR pass rates” (Appendix Q) has been incompletely or imprecisely realized. Nonetheless, the collective decision of the Writing Program and the Provosts of College Nine and Ten and Oakes College was that additional monitoring and data would prove useful in determining the value of “Stretch” Core beyond 2010-2011.

The data that the Writing Program has now collected (though not always completely or systematically) indicates that in 2010-2011 the 10 sections of campus “Stretch” Core (3 at College Nine, 3 at College Ten, and 4 at Oakes) totaled 170 students. The ELWR pass rates for “Stretch” students at the end of winter 2011 were as follows: College Nine, 87%; College 10, 80%; and Oakes (with many EOP students), 82%. These numbers did not quite fulfill the promise of the previous year—i.e., the “Stretch” students did not pass the ELWR at a better rate than the ELWR-unsatisfied students overall at College Nine (93%), College Ten (91%), and Oakes (88%). Nonetheless, the average “Stretch” pass rate at the end of winter 2012 was somewhat better than the Writing 20 pass rate of 85%. In other words, “Stretch” students who entered UC Santa Cruz with AWPE scores of 5 or less outperformed their first-year counterparts who entered with AWPE scores of mostly 6. Moreover, “Stretch” instructors reported that (i) after 20 weeks their students demonstrated greater mastery of the College Core course material than would have been possible after only 10 weeks and (ii) the ELWR pass rates likely would have been even lower for the “Stretch” students had they completed (or failed) Core in the fall and then proceeded into Writing 20 in the winter. (See the following paragraph.) Thus, the consensus among instructors, Provosts, and the Writing Program was that the “stretch” experiment should be given another two years.

In 2011-2012, the 9 sections of campus “Stretch” Core (2 at College Nine, 3 at College Ten, and 4 at Oakes) totaled 160 students. The ELWR pass rates for “Stretch” students at the end of winter 2012 were as follows: College Nine, 60%; College Ten, 65%; and Oakes, 73%. This compares unfavorably with overall College ELWR pass rates of 90% at both College Nine and College Ten, and 84% at Oakes—but is respectably close to the Writing 20 pass rate of 72%. In 2012-2013, the 12 sections of campus “Stretch” Core (3 sections at College Nine, 3 sections at College Ten, and 6 sections at Oakes) totaled 217 students. The ELWR pass rates for “Stretch” students at the end of winter 2013 were as follows: College Nine, 59%; College Ten, 76%; and Oakes, 78%. As with the previous year, these percentages compare unfavorably with overall College ELWR pass rates of 87% at College Nine, 90% at College 10, and 88% at Oakes—but the 2012-2013 “Stretch” students on average still outperformed Writing 20 students (including students with AWPE scores of 6 as well as some students, from non-“Stretch” colleges, with AWPE scores of 5 and below) who passed at a rate of 64%. In 2013-2014, the projected number of campus sections of “Stretch” Core is 15-18.

While the Writing Program in spring 2011, 2012, and 2013 did not conduct formal assessments of “Stretch” Core (in part because of campus budget cuts that
eliminated technical support for creating Cognos reports), a few thoughts are relevant. First, pass rates in general are trending down slightly; and Writing 20 pass rates are noticeable lower over the past three years. The campus needs to prepare for the possibility of this pattern continuing; and these decreasing pass rates may accelerate if UCSC follows through with its goal of doubling or tripling the number of international students. Second, College Ten and Oakes College fared relatively well at the end of winter 2013, though part of Oakes’ success could reflect the inclusion of “stronger” writers (with AWPE scores of 6) in “Stretch” sections of Core. The College Nine drop may be correlated with the Core course content or other factors still to be discovered. On the whole, however, the results of “Stretch” Core after four years would seem to support campus continuation of this two-quarter educational experiment for students with deficient reading and writing skills upon entering UC Santa Cruz.

In 2010-2011, having moved on from its 10-year partnership with UCSC’s Learning Support Services (LSS), the Writing Program assumed full responsibility for its tutoring operations for ELWR-unsatisfied students. In part because ELWR pass rates for winter 2011 Writing 20 students remained unchanged from the previous year despite a significant reduction in tutoring hours, the Writing Program adopted a new assessment model—challenging the prevailing assumption that high amounts of tutoring for all ELWR-unsatisfied students (i) necessarily enhances quarterly ELWR pass rates, (ii) equates to greater assimilation of Core course materials, (iii) quantifiably improves student analytic skills, and (iv) does not risk masking students’ writing deficiencies (through extensive/excessive correction vs. appropriately guiding students to discover their own analytic and linguistic improvements) that will be revealed in later university course work. The Writing Program directed its tutors to assist students with entering AWPE scores of 5 or below and provide them with roughly 3 hours of tutoring—four 45-minute sessions or six 30-minute sessions—in fall and winter quarters to develop their reading and writing skills. The Writing Program believes that “Stretch” Core students in particular will continue to benefit from increased opportunities for collaboration with more able peers (i.e., the tutors themselves) and for the cultivation of habits of mind that the writing process in tutorials provides. (A parallel pilot assessment in fall 2012 included the progress of students who entered UCSC with AWPE scores of but did not receive any tutoring; the results of that parallel assessment will be available by fall 2013.)

C. THE HORIZON

In considering its educational partnership with the Colleges around ELWR, C1, and C2 Core, the Writing Program continues to assess first-year student writing through annual review of standards expected of students passing Core—either C1 or C2. As the preface to the most recent pilot assessment document notes, the Writing Program hopes that each College will (i) apply general campus writing standards to
particular Core themes and content purposes (for example, texts of fiction vs. nonfiction) and (ii) train each College Core instructor in composition pedagogy—making extended use of the College Writing Coordinators (perhaps by ensuring early fall writing pedagogy workshops for the College around class management for student-centered discussion, assignment construction, essay margin comments, etc.) or conducting their own assessment of Core essays written by first-quarter students in the College.

Just as 2005-2006 saw the rollout of the campus new C1/C2 requirements, and 2009-2010 initiated the “Stretch” experiment, over the next several years the Writing Program will be actively monitoring new first-year writing experiments. For example, at least one College is hoping to mount a winter Core course for students who fail the fall Core course for reasons ranging from poor study habits to linguistic or analytical deficiencies. Students must pass Core before enrolling in Writing 2, a class that must be passed before the end of students’ sophomore year. As it stands now, if students fail Core, they must wait until the following fall to repeat Core or leave the university to satisfy the C1 requirement (for instance, at a community college) and then apply to the College Provost for a waiver for the non-C1 component of the course (i.e., the college-specific content). In addition, if students fail core, their enrollment in Writing 2 will be delayed until the winter quarter of the sophomore year (presuming they pass Core the second time), thus leaving that student with only two opportunities to take and pass Writing 2.

Other Colleges would like to see the campus design a hybrid, pan-College winter Core course for any UCSC student who fails in the fall; such an offering would not be College-specific, but could nonetheless still allow students to satisfy their individual College Core course requirement for graduation with Provost approval. The Writing Program finds much merit in this proposal because the curriculum of the independent winter Core course could be designed to meet the needs of students who for a variety of reasons failed Core in the fall. Many students, for example, need additional training in critical reading practices (one aspect of the Core course). Other students simply need help adjusting to the expectations of university-level work. Winter Core could provide the support that they need.

Still other Colleges advocate placing entering fall ELWR-unsatisfied students into writing courses (such as Writing 20) prior to enrolling in a winter Core course; this could mean a pre-“Stretch” fall course prior to a new winter-spring (vs. fall-winter) “Stretch” experience. This proposal claims a potential retention upside in that academically underprepared students would not fail a required writing course, C1, in their first quarter); it also accepts the risk of further marginalizing students for whom the culture of the university is already foreign territory. In every case, the Writing Program wants and needs to contribute its faculty resources to ensure the broadest possible pedagogical assistance for the most vulnerable first-year students in the academy.

Just as crucial for the Writing Program in the years ahead will be its role in
responding to national and UC pressures to investigate and instantiate examples of online education. While a major national study from February 2013 (Appendix O) confirms the worry of most composition theorists across the country that adaptability to online learning is problematic and not particularly favorable to significant student populations and academic subject areas, many Writing Program instructors are actively exploring various geographical niches of the online education terrain. As the UC system pursues online education opportunities, the Writing Program seeks to integrate aspects of online education that will enhance the mission of the program. These initiatives—which at this time do not include plans for fully online writing courses—are led by Writing Program faculty members who find pedagogical value in using online educational tools.

A Senate faculty member as well as a non-senate faculty member will continue to represent the Writing Program on CEP in 2013-2014 when the conversation around online education joins that around WASC accreditation more pointedly. A few Writing Program Lecturers and graduate student instructors have been experimenting in their sections of Writing 2 with software packages such as SWoRD (Scaffolded Writing and Reviewing in the Discipline) to enhance student writing in online communities and with new technological grading/feedback resources. Several other program faculty have enrolled in a Duke MOOC (Massive Open Online Course), comparing notes after completing brief writing modules and considering how portable such online lessons might prove for the Writing Program to adopt for international, ELL, and/or Generation 1.5 students.

Other online possibilities include the following:

- Using UCSC’s online course management system (eCommons) to administer the timed-writing essay (often similar to the AWPE, but administered during one hour instead of two) for the Writing 20/21 ELWR portfolio. Currently, face-to-face class time is used to administer the timed-writing component of the portfolio. Many instructors offer students more than one opportunity to produce a timed essay, so multiple class sessions are devoted to this task. In Spring 2013, the eCommons approach will be piloted in two class sections. These same sections will also produce an in-class timed essay. The resulting essays will be compared against each other to see if significant qualitative differences exist. Feedback from students enrolled in these sections will be solicited: Did they prefer the in-class timed essay, the eCommons timed essay, neither, and why?

- Creating online modules that cover material that could be communicated in a lecture format—for instance, an online module covering the basics of APA formatting or describing the general differences between high school and university writing expectations. These modules could then be viewed outside of class time or even prior to enrolling in a writing class at UCSC.

- Inviting first-year students to help produce a video for the Writing Program
website in which they reflect on writing at the university. Many first-year students are proud of the growth they achieve as writers at UCSC, and their insight about this growth could be invaluable to high school students who intend to apply to UCSC. Work on this project is slated to begin in summer 2013.
Entry Level Writing Requirement

(Formerly Called Subject A)

This requirement has existed from the beginnings of the University of California, and is described in Academic Senate Regulation 636:

*The University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement is a reading and writing proficiency requirement. Each student must be able to understand and to respond adequately to written material typical of reading assignments in freshman courses. This ability must be demonstrated in student writing that communicates effectively to University faculty.*

All students who enter UCSC as freshmen must demonstrate their command of the English language by fulfilling the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) by the end of their fourth quarter of enrollment.

At UCSC, students who have not yet satisfied the ELWR are required to take classes that help them satisfy the requirement. ELWR-unsatisfied students must enroll in the appropriate writing class (ELWR-required sections of *College Core*, Writing 20, 21, or 23) every quarter until they have met the requirement.

There are many different pathways to satisfying the ELWR. University of California regulations stipulate that students may satisfy the ELWR by multiple means prior to beginning a degree program at a UC campus, but that once they've begun a degree program at a specific UC campus, they must satisfy the ELWR at that campus.

Before starting a degree program at UCSC, students can satisfy the ELWR (and the C1 writing requirement) by taking and passing an appropriate college writing course at a community college, among other methods of satisfying the ELWR before matriculation. (Students should confirm that the testing agency or school has sent its official score report or transcript to UCSC.)

After starting a degree program at UCSC: Incoming frosh who have not fulfilled the ELWR by the time classes start will be placed in a college Core course section with an instructor qualified to help them with their writing, and they will be assigned to a weekly group tutoring session facilitated by a trained peer writing assistant.

At the end of each quarter, ELWR-unsatisfied students will have the opportunity to demonstrate whether they have satisfied the requirement by means of a writing placement exam and/or a portfolio of papers from an appropriate course (*College Core*, Writing 20, 21, or 23). (Students having trouble satisfying the requirement may still pass courses and make progress toward their degrees, even though they have not yet fulfilled the ELWR.)

Students who have not satisfied the ELWR by spring of their first year at UCSC may wish to take an appropriate summer school or community college course to accumulate a portfolio of papers to submit for consideration of satisfying the ELWR prior to the start of fall quarter classes. (To satisfy the ELWR in this manner, students must also take the September Analytical Writing Placement Exam to meet the UC requirement that the ELWR be satisfied at the UC campus where the student matriculated.) Students are strongly encouraged to contact the ELWR Coordinator Sarah-Hope Parmeter (shparmet@ucsc.edu) before summer begins to discuss these procedures.
Disciplinary Communication (DC)

The new Disciplinary Communication (DC) general education requirement will replace the W requirement for students enrolling at UCSC fall quarter 2009, and after. Students will be required to acquire five credits in writing-intensive classes appropriate to their academic major during their junior or senior year. Students must complete the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement and satisfy the Composition C1 and C2 requirements before enrolling in a course satisfying the DC requirement.
To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

**Executive Summary**

While the numbers of international students seeking an education in the United States are rising to record highs, international enrollment at UCSC has fallen to an embarrassing low. We rank last among the UC campuses, with international students comprising less than 0.3% of our undergraduate population. This tiny proportion of international students deprives our campus not only of valuable exposure to diversity, but also of much needed funds from nonresident supplemental tuition. Our campus loses millions of dollars each year by not reaching the nonresident enrollment targets established by UC Office of the President.¹

*Chart 1: UC Percentages of Undergraduate International Enrollments 2002 to 2011²*

This financial loss compounds the budget crisis already threatening so many areas of campus, particularly our ability to send our own students abroad to study. Our students’ desire to study abroad has increased sharply, and cuts in staffing and support for our International Education Office (IEO) have led to unreasonable workloads for staff and low levels of support for these students. Faculty-led programs abroad and financial aid for students participating in independent study abroad experiences have also been cut.

Serious action, upfront investment, and change in admissions practices are necessary. The Office of Admissions’ “Non-Resident Recruitment Plan 2012” touts the hiring of a new International Recruiter³, but in December 2012 that recruiter, frustrated with the approach UCSC
was taking to international recruitment, resigned her position. This international recruiter was a “canary in the coal mine.” When the canary dies, one does not simply hire another canary and keep working. One must investigate the toxic gas that caused the loss of the canary. Simply refilling this international recruiter position will not address the serious shortfalls in international enrollments at UCSC. A larger structural change is necessary.

UCSC’s current low international enrollment is primarily an admissions problem. In the absence of firm targets for international enrollment and adjustments to the applicant review process, our campus has let the yield rate for international applicants fall to startling lows. Since 2009, UCSC has received the second lowest number of international applications of all the UC campuses. In those five admissions cycles, we received a total of 5,968 applications; UCR received 6,221 and the next lowest, UCSB, received 15,646.4 Despite the low number of applications, UCSC also has the third lowest average admission rate for international students since 2009, and the only two campuses with lower rates of admission are UCB and UCLA, who receive so many more applicants that their low admissions rates still garner those campuses over 500 more international students per year than at UCSC.5 The UCSC Office of Admissions believes that an increase in the number of international applicants for fall 2013 (2,480 applicants up from 1,485 for fall 2012) is indicative of success in this area, but much more must be done.

The burden of the problem is distributed throughout our campus. CIE looks forward to the forthcoming recommendations of the International Recruitment and Graduation Committee, formed by VPDUE Richard Hughey in March of 2012. In exploring different components of the international education system at UCSC, CIE recommends a series of possible solutions, in a holistic manner:

**Recommendations for improving the state of international education at UCSC:**

- Consider reform of the architecture of international engagement at UCSC. Several UC campuses have high-level faculty, such as a Vice Provost, leading their overseas research, collaboration, recruitment and study abroad.

- Hire more staff to support the ‘import’ of students from abroad and ‘export’ of students to excellent and affordable abroad experiences.

- CIE recommends that Senate adopt the CAFA suggestion that 100 international students be enrolled this year. This is still a small proportion of 2,480 applicants, a number that can readily be justified by applicant qualifications, and one the campus could readily support. Further investigation is required to explain the low enrollment yields for international students.

- Restore summer programs to provide language and cultural support for foreign students enrolled at UCSC.

- Build a centralized database of existing international links current UCSC faculty have, and mobilize these networks for student recruiting and exchange.
CIE is aware of the ethical questions about increasing the number of students from generally wealthy families. As increased international enrollments bring revenue to campus, CIE sees a number of justifiable liens on these funds and offers the following:

**Recommendations for the use of additional funds brought to campus through increased international enrollment:**

- Use a portion of the nonresident supplemental tuition from international enrollment to support low income students from California and overseas, through scholarships and other creative means.
- Support the internationalization of UCSC by bolstering the study abroad options and scholarships for undergraduate students.
- Restore staffing levels at the International Education Office (IEO) to facilitate faculty-led programs abroad.
- Bolster current support systems for international students on campus and explore new ways to adequately care for a more internationalized student body.

The benefits to the campus are clear. Two of Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Alison Galloway’s “5 for 2015” initiatives—financial stability and increase nonresident student enrollment—can be achieved by increasing the number of international students attending UCSC. Ultimately, success in international recruitment will create a series of positive feedback loops not only bringing in much needed funding to campus, but also enhancing UCSC’s global reputation.

**International Enrollment at UCSC**

The number of international students in the U.S. has increased by 40% since 2001 to reach a total of 764,495. California hosts more international students than any other state, with 102,789 in 2011-12, boasting a 6.5% increase from the previous year. But enrolling international students has been a struggle at UCSC for many years.

Contrary to national trends, UCSC’s undergraduate international enrollment percentage has been decreasing since 2004-05. At our height in the last decade, 2004-05, we had 172 international undergraduate students enrolled, representing 1.3% of total undergraduate enrollment. In 2011-12, we had 40 international undergraduate students enrolled, representing less than 0.3% of total undergraduate enrollment. This percentage did not improve with the incoming frosh of 2012-13. UCSC and Merced are the only UC campus with shrinking international enrollment. (See Chart 1)

The downward trend in international enrollment at UCSC is troublesome not only in comparison to other UC campuses but also in comparison to universities around the country. Based on data from the 2011-12 academic year, US News and World Report listed over 230 institutions with international enrollment percentages of 1.0% or higher. Among the top U.S. institutions hosting international students are the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (#2), Purdue University (#4), Northeastern University (#7), Indiana University Bloomington (#11), University of
Minnesota (#14), and SUNY Buffalo (#19).\textsuperscript{10} We feel strongly that UCSC, with its research credentials, beautiful campus, and advantageous geography has as much if not more to offer than these universities currently attracting higher numbers of international students.

**The Admissions Problem**

Enrollment is a process of four phases: (1) application; (2) admission; (3) submission of Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs); and (4) enrollment. Looking at these phases at each of the UC campuses from 2009 to 2012, our main obstacle to the enrollment of more international students appears to be in the second phase: selection of admitted students from the applicant pool. If we consider only those UC Campuses that received on average less than 3,000 international applicants for 2009 to 2012, UCSC is the only one that rejected over 50% of these applicants.\textsuperscript{11} UCSC rejected over 60% of international applications in fall 2012, admitting only 589 students compared to 2,137 admitted at UCD, 2,488 admitted at UCI, 865 admitted at UCR, and 2,102 admitted at UCSB.\textsuperscript{12} CIE suggests that the applicant review process be reexamined and procedures established for international applicants to receive a fair opportunity for admission to UCSC.

There is also a problem with the first phase: we currently attract too few applicants. The UCSC Office of Admissions points to an increasing number of international applicants as a measure of success, but the numbers remain relatively small. UCSC saw an increase in international frosh applications for fall 2013 admission (2,480), but this is still less than half the applications of comparable UC campuses (UCSB, UCD, UCI) and less than a quarter of others (UCSD, UCB, UCLA).\textsuperscript{13} Moreover, applications numbers are not an adequate measure of progress. UCSC received 473 international applications for fall 2011 and enrolled only 8 students. In 2012, we received 1,172 international applications and we enrolled 15 students.\textsuperscript{14} If this current yield rate of less than 2.0% persists, the class of 2013 will have only 36 international students. This is unacceptable.

The final phases of the enrollment process, SIRs and enrollment, are yet another struggle for UCSC. From 2009 to 2012, UCSC admitted 1,518 international applicants (from a pool of 3,488). Of those admitted, only 83 provided a SIR. Our average SIR percentage from 2009 to 2012 was only 5.7%. This SIR percentage is lowest of all UC campuses.\textsuperscript{15} UCSC is losing not only to the universities listed in the section above but also to our own sister campuses. CIE refuses to believe that UCSC cannot compete with the other UCs for international enrollment. If we would just get into the game of effective recruitment and enrollment measures for international students, then we would see the success that others have seen.

**Why International Enrollment Matters**

International enrollment provides a unique opportunity to increase tuition receipts and generate revenue for various campus ventures. 2012-13 undergraduate nonresident supplemental tuition is $22,878.\textsuperscript{16} Since 2007, when the UC Office of the President established nonresident enrollment targets for each campus, UCSC has fallen short of our target each year. Failing to reach these targets, which are assumed as a part of our base budget, results in millions of dollars in shortfall annually, and nearly $4 million in 2010-11.\textsuperscript{17} International education is an investment, not a cost. Our campus lost over $3.5 million dollars in 2010-11 because of under-
enrollment of nonresident students. Surely an investment of $0.5 - $1.0 million in staffing to increase our international enrollment will yield that missing $3.5 million and more.

There can be no question about the educational benefits of bringing qualified international students to campus. The National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC) provides a concise summary of the benefits of boosting international enrollment:

*Increasing the number of international students on campus can add cultural diversity to college communities, boost tuition receipts, and stimulate regional economies. During the 2008-09 academic year, foreign students and their dependents contributed approximately $17.6 billion to the US economy.*

Increasing the number of international students on campus is an important way to embrace the first two of UCSC’s Principles of Community: diversity and openness. In 2011-12, 96.2% of all students on campus, undergraduate and graduate, were from California; 98.6% were United States citizens. In a globalized world, our campus cannot be considered diverse and open with this makeup.

The problem of low international enrollments contributes to the larger problem of low nonresident enrollments at UCSC. In 2002-03, UCSC boasted 5.7% nonresident undergraduate enrollment (733 students), on par with the UC average of 6.0%. Since then, however, the nonresident population has plummeted, comprising only 2.2% of undergraduate enrollment (348 students) in 2011-12, compared to the UC average of 8.4%. On November 17, 2011, the UCSC Office of Admissions produced its “Non-Resident Recruitment Plan 2012,” detailing many of the efforts being made to improve nonresident enrollment. Unfortunately, the report lacked definitive targets and admitted that “we do not have an effective way to measure specific efforts throughout the cycle…we are another year or so away from a position to effectively measure outcomes.”

UCSC is missing out on more than the diverse backgrounds and opinions brought to campus by international students. Increasing international enrollment will increase nonresident enrollment, bringing in valuable nonresident supplemental tuition. We currently have the lowest percentage of international students of all UC campuses (see Chart 1). If we aimed low, and made it our goal to just become the second lowest and surpass Merced, the 0.7% increase in international enrollment would result in tuition revenue of over $2.7 million. *For comparison, this is a larger amount of funds being brought to the campus by Rebench.* Part of this revenue can be held centrally to be used throughout the campus and part can be earmarked to help recruit more international students and support them when they are on campus.

**CIE Recommendations for Use of Nonresident Supplemental Tuition Revenue**

There are ethical questions about increasing the number of students from generally wealthy families. These questions can be addressed by using some proportion of the money, perhaps 10%, in creative ways that support low income students from California and overseas, and to support faculty and student engagement with low income communities overseas.
In 2011, international students comprised around 18% of the freshman class at the University of Washington. This represented a 16% increase from 2005, and was accomplished with minimal recruiting. The additional revenue generated from nonresident supplemental tuition at UW is used to aid low-income Washington residents in affording their higher education.

Also in 2011, the State University of New York (SUNY) announced its plan to increase its international enrollment to 32,000 students over five years. This would represent a 75% increase over the 2011 enrollment of nearly 18,000 systemwide. The plan includes explicit goals for the use of the supplemental tuition revenue from increased international enrollments. According to the university announcement, “If objectives are met, within five years SUNY will be able to offer more than 3,000 study abroad scholarships per year, 125 faculty internationalization grants, and fund many other campus internationalization activities.”

Revenue generated from nonresident supplemental tuition can be used to make the prospect of an international education—through programs abroad—a reality for any UCSC student that is interested. UCSC students’ interest in studying abroad has been steadily increasing over the past three years. The major avenue to study abroad is the UC Education Abroad Program (EAP). Looking at the numbers of EAP participants (not just applicants) we find that UCSC has emerged as a programs abroad leader.

Chart 2: Percentage of Undergraduate Population Participating in EAP by UC Campus

The Staffing Crisis in the International Education Office (IEO)

The large number of applicants for programs abroad creates a strain on the depleted staff in the International Education Office (IEO). The office handles two distinct facets of international education: Programs Abroad (PA) and International Scholar and Student Services (ISSS). The ISSS component of IEO is responsible for facilitating and monitoring immigration compliance for international students, visiting students, visiting scholars, UCSC employees, and any dependents of someone in these categories. PA staff members assist with program selection and help incorporate study abroad into student academic plans. Currently, UCSC only has two FTE
dedicated to PA. The low staffing for the IEO at UCSC coupled with the fact that most EAP applicants fill out multiple applications means that our programs abroad staff must handle a much larger number of applications per staff member (~450) than on other campuses. The next highest are UCLA (~275) and Davis (~125).27

CIE called attention to the staffing crisis at IEO in 2006-07. In its annual report, the committee noted,

The UCSC Office of International Education (OIE) has suffered repeated financial crises during the past several years. OIE has been burdened with an unusually high workload in comparison to comparable offices on other UC Campuses. High workloads combined with low wage classifications have caused high staff turnover, adversely affecting the ability of the office to service UCSC...The current senior leadership of this office has been effective in dealing with the financial/staffing crises but cannot continue at their current level of effort.28

Since then, the office has been stripped to skeletal form. The recent addition of an International Student Adviser has been the exception. Since 2008-09, IEO has lost: 0.5 FTE Process Manager (in-house tech support); 0.5 FTE Education Abroad Program Academic Integration; and 1.0 FTE Office Administrative Support. Most alarmingly, the leadership structure of IEO has crumbled. Whereas the office used to function with an IEO Director, an Associate Director for ISSS, and an Associate Director for Programs Abroad (commensurate with IEOs at other UC campuses), UCSC IEO lost the Director and Associate Director for Programs Abroad positions, leaving the Associate Director for ISSS to serve as the interim director of the office. The interim director was appointed Director of International Education in January 2013, leaving the two Associate Director positions empty and collapsing all management functions into one position.

**Limited Study Abroad Options for UCSC Students and Faculty**

This loss of staff and failure to hire an Associate Director for Programs Abroad has had a devastating effect on UCSC’s ability to provide meaningful faculty-led study abroad experiences for students. UCSC has a long history of faculty-led programs abroad, involving education in areas such as Poland, France, Argentina, Costa Rica, and Mexico. In 2011, the only two remaining faculty-led programs were cancelled, including UCSC’s only international service learning program. In response, CIE initiated a call for faculty-led programs abroad proposals and ten faculty members submitted high-quality study abroad ideas. CIE recommended seven of these ten proposals to the administration, but the administration did not go forward with the implementation of any, again saying it lacked the staff needed to support these programs. Other UC campuses have enormously successful faculty-led programs. UCD, for example, is currently enrolling 41 programs in 26 countries with 44 faculty members who will provide a range of study options for students from the arts, literature and culture to science and engineering.29

The new director of UCSC Summer Session hopes to work with CIE to sponsor faculty-led programs abroad for 2014. Currently, IEO is far too understaffed to undertake the programmatic structure of faculty-led programs abroad and the university now prefers that such programs be run in partnership with third-party providers. In the absence of any formal structure for such partnerships, CIE is exploring services offered by third-party vendors with plans to offer faculty a simple path to taking their students abroad. Even with Summer Session equipped to handle
operational issues such as instructor contracting, stipends, and collection of student fees, IEO would still need at least one additional staff member in Programs Abroad to handle administrative issues including faculty preparation to lead programs, vendor and risk management, program marketing/outreach, advising, and pre-departure orientations for students.

This lack of UCSC faculty-led study abroad is inexcusable for a university seeking global standing. Currently, our students have only two options for study abroad, neither of which engages UCSC faculty: they can either select a program from the menu of options at UCEAP or they can undertake an independent study abroad experience—something that over 200 of our students did in 2011-12. However, in fall 2012, the UCSC Financial Aid Office decided to discontinue federal financial aid to students participating in independent study abroad programs, a decision that further imperils international education opportunities for our students. This aid must be restored at UCSC.

**Conclusion**

The state of international education at UCSC presents both a serious problem and a powerful opportunity. We have fallen woefully behind in international recruitment and enrollment, depriving students, faculty, and the Santa Cruz community of the many benefits that come from having international students on campus. At the same time, other institutions like SUNY and many of our own UC campuses have shown that now is the time for ambitious goals in the area of international enrollment. By increasing the presence of international students on campus and using part of the revenue from nonresident supplemental tuition to support the International Education Office and programs abroad, we have an opportunity to change the tide and move UCSC towards the top of the list for institutions with a global focus.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Peter Limbrick  
Rasmus Winther  
Jin Zhang  
Mark Cioc, *ex officio*  
Ben Crow, Chair

February 21, 2013

---
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Appendix A

UCSC
Nonresident Supplemental Tuition1

Beginning in 2007-08, UCOP assigned campuses nonresident enrollment targets for undergraduate and graduate students. General funds were withdrawn from each campus with the expectation that this funding would be replaced with nonresident tuition revenue.

In addition to paying all the fees paid by resident students, non-resident students pay Supplemental Nonresident Tuition, as shown on the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-13 Undergraduate Fees</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Non-Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Fee</td>
<td>$ 972</td>
<td>$ 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$11,220</td>
<td>$ 11,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Fees</td>
<td>$1,224</td>
<td>$ 1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Supplemental Tuition</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$22,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 13,416</td>
<td>$ 36,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonresident Supplemental Tuition Shortfall
Campuses retain the nonresident tuition revenue generated by their own nonresident enrollments. They are also responsible for addressing any shortfall in nonresident tuition revenue that results from enrolling fewer students than the assigned non-resident enrollment target.

UCSC currently meets or exceeds its graduate nonresident target and does not meet its undergraduate nonresident enrollment target. The budget shortfall - shown below - must be made up from campus funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Nonresidents:</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Enrollment</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Enrollment</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>348.5</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Nonresidents:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Enrollment</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Enrollment</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Shortfall*           | -$530,000| -$1,440,000| -$1,988,000| -$3,570,000|

*The shortfall results in reductions in other areas. Income that exceeds the revenue target is available to address campus priorities.

1 UCSC Office of Planning and Budget, updated 1/13
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A Proposal to Stretch the College Ten Core Course
Helen Shapiro, Provost, College Nine and College Ten
Submitted to CEP in April 2009

1. Rationale
Many students in College Ten are underprepared for the kind of reading, writing, and analysis expected of them in the core course and college in general. We have one of the highest percentages of students in ELWR-required sections; our November pass rate for the ELWR exam has been going down and last fall, we had one of the lowest pass rates of all the colleges. Anecdotally, our instructors have noticed that students are having great difficulty keeping up with and understanding the readings.

We have concluded that it is not feasible for many students to satisfy all of the core requirements in one quarter. Therefore, we propose a "stretch" course that combines intensive writing with the usual content requirements over two quarters. In order to satisfy core, Cl, and T, these students would be required to take both quarters.

There is research that shows that "stretch" courses can help students succeed. The term comes from Arizona State University, where Gregory Glau has headed a "stretch" program in first-year composition for a dozen years. Reporting on nearly 8000 students, Glau observed that their "program helps a range of at-risk students succeed" (See Appendix A. "Stretch at 10").

2. Student Selection

We will select students based on their AWPE scores. If we offer only one section, we would require it of all students scoring 4 or less. If we offer two sections, we would require it of all students scoring 5 or less.

This would be the most straightforward method of selection. Alternative methods discussed but discarded included EOP/Bridge or ELL students. With regard to ELL students, we felt that the "E" designation on the AWPE was not a reliable indicator. We also agreed that we did not want this to be only an ELL program. Nonetheless, we encourage UCSC to consider whether an ELL program should be implemented, given the changing demographics of our student body. (College Ten has a relatively high percentage of students who do not come from English-only homes. See Appendix B.)

In addition, data from last year's class indicate that students with these entry scores have a very slim chance of satisfying ELWR in November. (Of the 18 students who came in with scores of 4 or less, only 4 passed in November. Of the 26 who came in with a 5, 12 passed.) Therefore, they would be taking an additional writing course (Writing 20) in the winter, anyway. This stretch course would allow them to get more out of both courses.

3. Instructors:
We have two experienced instructors who would teach this class. Susan Gorsky has been College Ten's CWC for a number of years. She currently teaches ELWR-required
sections for us, as well as Writing 2 courses in the WP. She is also a writing instructor at Cabrillo College. Erica Halk is affiliated with the WP and will be teaching in College Ten for the first time next fall. She is an experienced writing instructor who teaches Writing 20.

4. Funding:

Assuming we have two sections of the stretch course offered winter quarter, College Ten will fund one and the Writing Program will fund the other. College Ten would not be able to fund this course indefinitely, but we hope that if the pilot proves to be a success, other funding sources can be attained. Given that the WP would have had to provide at least one section of Writing 20 for these students in the absence of this stretch course, this is simply a transfer of resources.

5. Assessment:
We plan to offer this as a pilot program. Methods of assessment may include: (1) student self-evaluations about competence and confidence at the start and end of fall quarter and again at the end of winter quarter; (2) instructor responses after each quarter; (3) a comparison of AWPE scores in May/Sept and November; (4) ELWR pass rates in December and March; (5) pass rates or grades in Writing 2; (6) student self-evaluations after completing Writing 2; (7) responses of Writing 2 instructors.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsoring Agency</th>
<th>Course#</th>
<th>Catalog Title</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Ten</td>
<td>80C-1 and 80C-2</td>
<td>Introduction to University Discourse: Social Justice and Community Writing Intensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. How the course will proceed:
Stretch Core will fulfill the requirements for both College Ten Core, Cl, and T3 (see Appendices C and D). To this end, it will follow the topics and use the readings from Core, supplemented with appropriate materials, but will stretch that material over two quarters. At the same time, it will provide additional practice in reading, thinking, and writing, based on strategies and subjects suited to fulfilling the C requirement.

Topics: To meet one of the goals of Core, namely to help entering students make connections with their classmates and their college, during the fall, Stretch students will consider the same topics as the other College Ten Core students. However, they will delay reading many of the Core texts, especially the most challenging, until winter. The College Ten Reader provides many options for instructors to choose among, and Stretch can add appropriate texts as needed. (Please note that we are using the readings from the 2008 syllabus for the purposes of this proposal; we anticipate some minor changes to the readings for 2009.) The draft schedule (Appendix F) offers examples of how this might work. For instance, in the fall, weeks 1-2, Stretch students might read 3-4 articles on education, when their classmates read 10-12, and all can attend the same "evening event" on education. Then, in the Winter, Stretch students can use the remaining Core readings (and supplementary materials) to explore topics about education for underrepresented groups.

Reading: Stretch students will "read a variety of texts, including a significant amount of nonfiction that employs argument and analysis" (Cl Requirement. Goal 1). They will read the same texts as their classmates in 80A, plus additional relevant readings, spread over two quarters. In the fall, Stretch students will focus on strategies of reading and analysis and will read supplementary materials on these subjects. In the winter, they should be able to read more quickly with good comprehension, analysis, and critical thinking; thus they can complete the Core reading. In winter, students will choose an outside book from a short list to read and discuss in "reading groups"; the groups will do a formal presentation on the book and individual students will write an essay on it. In both quarters, they will address Cl Goal 2 ("learn strategies for reading challenging texts") and Goal 3 ("learn strategies for analyzing and criteria for evaluating opinions, interpretations, and arguments...").

Writing: In each quarter, Stretch students will write "at least five relatively short essays (up to 1250 words)" (Cl requirement, Goal 1). The assignments will be "scaffolded" over two quarters, so that early assignments introduce skills in reading and thinking as well as writing, and later assignments build on those skills to lead to more complex analyses. For instance, early assignments will focus on specific skills (summarizing a challenging text, crafting a coherent argument, etc.), while later assignments will require synthesizing multiple texts in support of more complex argument and analysis. Grammar and sentence structure work will supplement other writing assignments, based on individual or class needs.
Through reflections on their work as well as through meetings with a writing assistant, conferences with their instructor, and editing their peers' writing, students will "learn to analyze their processes as writers, develop strategies for enhancing those processes, and evaluate the results, all in relation to the particular demands of particular assignments" (CI Requirement, Goal 4).

Classroom activities, group tutoring, collaborative work: Students will be expected to participate in discussion, writing workshops, debates, presentations, and other activities, many of which will require collaboration and/or allow students to work on CI Goal 5: "Learn oral communication skills for effective participation in discussions as well as for formal presentations."

2. Reading List: Stretch students will use the College Ten Core Reader and additional texts assigned for Core, supplemented as necessary. (See Appendix E, the Table of Contents from the 2008 Reader.) All Core (and Stretch) students read selected texts from the Reader, but SOB students read virtually the entire Reader while 80A instructors choose from among the offerings. In 2008, two additional texts were used: Charles Fishman’s The Wal-Mart Effect and a writer's handbook. The Stretch students will read a book-length work in winter (for example, Ruben Martinez, Crossing Over, Maxine Hong Kingston, Woman Warrior, or Barbara Ehrenreich, Nickel and Dimed). This allows us to address the themes of the course in new genres, to encourage collaborative learning, and to help the students become more independent at the end of the second quarter.

3. Evaluation: Students will be evaluated as they are in College Ten Core and in the Writing Program. Assessment will be based on formal and informal writing assignments as well as preparation for and participation in class, writing groups, conferences, and presentations, and projects, and on formal and informal writing assignments. Students will submit a portfolio in the tenth week demonstrating their 'best work'; it will include substantial revision of a major essay.

4. General education codes: The two courses will fulfill the CI, Core, and T3 -Social Sciences requirements. The first course is a prerequisite for the second; the codes will apply to the second course.

5. Other courses: The course combines College Ten Core (CLTE 80A) and Writing 20.

6. Resource requirements: tutoring (individual or group, to be determined)
### First Language* x College

**Enrolled Frosh: Fall 2005 - Fall 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cowell College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Total</strong></td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Crown College** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| English          | 194 | 64.0% | 208 | 61.9% | 222 | 61.7% | 272 | 64.6% |
| English + Other  | 73  | 24.1% | 73  | 21.7% | 80  | 22.2% | 114 | 27.1% |
| Other            | 36  | 11.9% | 55  | 16.4% | 58  | 16.1% | 35  | 8.3%  |
| **College Total** | 303 | **336** | 360 |     | 421 |     |

| **College Eight** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| English          | 231 | 72.0% | 247 | 73.5% | 263 | 66.6% | 302 | 67.9% |
| English + Other  | 62  | 19.3% | 59  | 17.6% | 86  | 21.8% | 109 | 24.5% |
| Other            | 28  | 8.7%  | 30  | 8.9%  | 46  | 11.6% | 34  | 7.6%  |
| **College Total** | 321 | 336   | 395 |     | 445 |     |

<p>| <strong>Kresge College</strong> |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| English          | 210 | 75.5% | 228 | 76.0% | 261 | 74.8% | 290 | 73.4% |
| English + Other  | 46  | 16.5% | 51  | 17.0% | 61  | 17.5% | 80  | 20.3% |
| Other            | 22  | 7.9%  | 21  | 7.0%  | 27  | 7.7%  | 25  | 6.3%  |
| <strong>College Total</strong> | 278 | 300   | 349 |     | 395 |     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merril College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + other</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Nine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Other</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Total</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakes College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Other</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Total</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Other</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>260 86.7%</td>
<td>303 82.3%</td>
<td>311 81.2%</td>
<td>354 77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Other</td>
<td>33 11.0%</td>
<td>33 9.0%</td>
<td>54 14.1%</td>
<td>80 17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 2.3%</td>
<td>32 8.7%</td>
<td>18 4.7%</td>
<td>25 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Total</td>
<td>300 100%</td>
<td>368 100%</td>
<td>383 100%</td>
<td>459 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Ten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>175 61.0%</td>
<td>217 63.5%</td>
<td>202 56.9%</td>
<td>186 47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + other</td>
<td>73 25.4%</td>
<td>87 25.4%</td>
<td>106 29.9%</td>
<td>164 41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39 13.6%</td>
<td>38 11.1%</td>
<td>47 13.2%</td>
<td>46 11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Total</td>
<td>287 100%</td>
<td>342 100%</td>
<td>355 100%</td>
<td>396 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: College totals as of 12-17-08.

'First language as reported on application.

"In fall 05, Crown and Porter each had one frosh student whose first language was unknown. In fall 06, Cowell had one frosh student whose first language was unknown. These students were not included in the totals."
APPENDIX C

CATALOG DESCRIPTION

COLLEGE TEN CORE, CLTE 80A

80A. Introduction to University Discourse: Social Justice and Community. F

Explores rhetorical principles and conventions of university discourse and provides intensive
practice in analytical writing, critical reading, and speaking. Examines social justice
issues; topics include racism, sexism, and other forms of prejudice and discrimination; poverty and welfare;
civil liberties; and community involvement and citizenship. Students cannot receive credit for this
course and course SOB. Enrollment restricted to first-year college members who have not satisfied
the Cl requirement. Enrollment limited to 22. (General Education Code(s): T3-Social Sciences,
Cl.) The Staff

APPENDIX D:

Educational Objectives of the C Requirement and the Specific Goals of Cl
(from Teaching the C Requirement, pp. 4-6)

Educational Objectives

In completing UCSC's two-quarter General Education Requirement in
Composition, students learn how to become effective participants in university
discourse, spoken as well as written.

To this end:
1. Students learn -when reading, writing, listening, or speaking – to analyze rhetorical situations
so as to understand that different purposes and contexts call for different strategies, different
conventions, and different techniques.

2. Students learn to recognize and discuss propositions (their own as well as others') that cannot
be merely demonstrated -that is, to analyze, evaluate, and argue matters of opinion and
interpretation as well as to describe matters of fact.

3. Students learn to develop effective processes for writing in different contexts and to use a
variety of strategies for discovering, developing, and analyzing data and ideas, for making sense,
for revising, and for editing.

4. Students learn to produce writing that:
   • Establishes and maintains an appropriate purpose or coherent set of purposes in
     relation to the assignment and the audience.
   • Employs appropriate strategies of development that accomplish their purpose in
     relation to the assignment, its context, and its audience.
   • Uses sources' information and ideas accurately and effectively and cites sources
     appropriately.
   • Communicates in accurate, appropriate, effective prose.

5. Students learn strategies for becoming accurate readers and critical analysts of all texts
   including their own.

6. Students learn how to collaborate appropriately with others (including their peers) in doing
   research, generating and evaluating ideas, and revising texts.
Composition 1: Introduction to University Discourse
As they make the transition from writing in the schools to writing in a variety of academic and professional contexts, students learn to apply rhetorical principles rather than rely on rule-driven formulas. They also experience and come to understand the connections among composing, thinking, and learning.

Students will:

1. Write at least five relatively short essays (up to 1250 words) and read a variety of texts, including a significant amount of nonfiction that employs argument and analysis.

2. Learn strategies for reading challenging texts – that is, to understand a text's purpose or purposes and to follow its train of thought, to begin to be aware of nuance and emphasis, and to be able to relate specific examples and statements to larger topics or claims.

3. Learn strategies for analyzing and criteria for evaluating opinions, interpretations, and arguments (propositions about things that cannot be proved) and learn the academic uses of words such as argument, hypothesis, theory, assumption, claim etc.

4. Learn to analyze their processes as writers, develop strategies for enhancing those processes, and evaluate the results, all in relation to the particular demands of particular assignments. Students' attention to process includes:
   - Learning specific strategies for invention and revision in relation to the quality of content as well as its clarity and accuracy
   - Learning the importance of a writer's purpose and audience and relevant conventions in relation to focus, coherence, and effectiveness.
   - Learning to take charge of their proof reading and editing in standard professional English by analyzing their weaknesses and developing a plan for eliminating error.

5. Learn oral communication skills for effective participation in discussions as well as for formal presentations.
APPENDIX E:

College Ten Readings 2008

WEEK 1: Social Justice and Education
Moyers, Bill. "Economic Inequality Is a Serious Problem in America."

Kekes, John. "Efforts to Promote Economic Equality are Misguided."


Sacks, Peter. "Public Schools, Private Privilege."
Tearing Down the Gates: Confronting the Class Divide in American Education.

Sacks, Peter. "Class Matters."
Tearing Down the Gates: Confronting the Class Divide in American Education.

Sacks, Peter. "A Dangerous Man."
Tearing Down the Gates: Confronting the Class Divide in American Education.

WEEK 2: Social Justice and Education


Rose, Mike. "I Just Wanna Be Average." 50 Essays: A Pmiable Anthology.


Race, Class, and Gender in the United States: An Integrated Study.


WEEKS 3 and 4: The Case of Wal-Mart


WEEK 5: Income Inequality and Health


WEEK 5: Income Inequality and Health

WEEKS 6 and 7: Immigration, Assimilation, and Culture


WEEKS 8 and 9: Debate on Community


WEEK 10: Issues in Social Justice and Community

For this unit, instructors selected texts from the Reader or added their own texts.
# Appendix F

## COURSE SCHEDULE - FALL

(Notes: Page numbers refer to the Course Reader; Appendix C. Comparisons with the standard Core course readings and assignments are italicized)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date to be determined</strong></td>
<td><strong>SEPTEMBER 24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORE ORIENTATION</strong></td>
<td>Class: Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPTEMBER 29</strong></td>
<td><strong>OCTOBER 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1:</strong> Social Justice and Education</td>
<td><strong>Reading:</strong> Angelou (114); &quot;Reading&quot; (Stretch supplement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment due: draft personal essay on educational experience (Essay 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard Core:</strong> Essay 1 due: Personal response to an article from 9129 and/or oped piece on the readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading:</strong> Rose (106); &quot;Reading&quot; (explanatory materials by the instructors on reading strategies)</td>
<td><strong>Standard Core class:</strong> Moyers, Kekes, Kozo/, Sacks Chapter 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Due: read and annotate with purpose.</td>
<td>Assignment Due: Essay 1 due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Core:</strong> For any one article, summarize the author's main points and fist his supporting evidence. (1 page; please bring two copies)</td>
<td><strong>Standard Core:</strong> Essay 2 draft for workshop [textual analysis on topic for wks 1-2; 3 pp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 2:</strong> Social Justice and Education</td>
<td><strong>Standard Core:</strong> Choose one set: Omi and Winant plus Angelou, or Lorber plus Tyre, Bombardieri, and Leonhardt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment Due: Summarize Kozol in one well-written paragraph; reread your annotations to find evidence of how Kozol's ideas appear in either Rose or Angelou.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading:</strong> Kozel (25); supplement on reading strategies</td>
<td><strong>Standard Core:</strong> Essay 2 draft to instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening Event:</strong> &quot;First to Worst&quot; (film) &amp; Wendy Strimling, Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3: Social Justice and Education</td>
<td>OCTOBER13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Core: Wal-Mart</strong></td>
<td>Reading: Sacks, Chapter 6 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Core: Fishman, Chapter 1. Review Hacker, &quot;Integrating Sources&quot; (161-65) and &quot;APA documentation style&quot; (165) as needed.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard Core: Fishman Chapters 6, 7, 9; optional afterword.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assignment Due: Summarize either Sacks Chapter 5 or Sacks Chapter 6 in one well-written paragraph; reread your annotations to find evidence of how Sack’s ideas appear in either Rose or Angelou.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assignment due: Draft of Essay 2 (analysis of either Rose or Angelou using either Sacks or Kozol)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Core: write a discussion question on the reading and draft a one-paragraph answer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard Core: preliminary writing for Essay 3, textual analysis with multiple sources on Wal-Mart. (Draft must be ready for WG by 10/12)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 4: The Case of Wal-Mart</th>
<th>OCTOBER20</th>
<th>OCTOBER22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assignment due: Essay 2 due.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assignment due: TIPS+ strategy (reading/writing exercise)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Core: Essay 2 final</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard Core: Essay 3 draft for workshop.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening Event: &quot;is Wal-Mart Good for America&quot; (film)</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRACTICAL ACTIVISM CONFERENCE 10/25</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 5: The Case of Wal-Mart</th>
<th>OCTOBER27</th>
<th>OCTOBER 29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading: Fishman Chapter 7. Standard Core: Krugman, Lowenstein, and Public Policy Institute.</td>
<td>Reading: Selected Wal-Mart readings from Reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assignment due: TIPS+ (reading/writing exercise)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard Core: Daniels and Kawachi, Scott, Woo/handler and Himmelstein, Marmot and either Pear or Bakalar.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Core: Essay 3 draft to instructor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assignment due: draft of Essay 3 (op/ed: Is Wal-Mart good for the community?)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Core: preliminary writing for Essay 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard Core: preliminary writing for Essay 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>NOVEMBER 3</td>
<td>NOVEMBER 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Reading: Fishman, Chapter 9.</td>
<td>Reading: Review Wal-Mart readings for debate; readings on persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Core: Huntington, Fox, and Citrin</td>
<td>writing (Stretch supplement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Core: List and summarize Huntington’s main points.</td>
<td>Standard Core: a preliminary writing for Essay 4 [on topics from wks 5-7;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-5 pp; textual support from several articles]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Stretch, moved to Winter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>NOVEMBER10</th>
<th>NOVEMBER12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debate on</td>
<td>Reading: Stretch supplement on persuasive writing.</td>
<td>Reading: no new reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Standard Core: Chavez plus one of the following: Tan, Anzaldua, Liu,</td>
<td>Standard Core: One the following: Tan, Anzaldua, Liu, Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodgers</td>
<td>Assignment due: Essay 4 to instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Core: Essay 3 final to instructor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>NOVEMBER17</th>
<th>NOVEMBER19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debate on</td>
<td>Reading: Putnam (&quot;Disappearance,&quot; 377)</td>
<td>Reading: selections from Valelly (389), Skocpol (391), Schudson (396),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Standard Core: Putnam (&quot;Disappearance&quot;). Valelly, Skocpol, Schudson, Wills</td>
<td>Wills (400), Portes and Landolt (404), Galston (409), Putnam (&quot;Responds,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(dis)</td>
<td>414).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment due: Personal response to Putnam's argument.</td>
<td>Standard Core: Pollitt, Kamin, Shapiro, Stelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Core: Essay 4 draft to instructor [or see 11/19].</td>
<td>Assignment due: reading response or prepare for in-class essay on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evening Event: Hurricane Katrina and its Aftermath</td>
<td>Community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Core: Essay 4 draft to instructor, if not done 11/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELWRIA WP EXAM: Saturday 11/21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:30-12:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9: Debate on Community</td>
<td>NOVEMBER 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Selections from Pollitt (413), Kamin (418), Shapiro (421) and Stelter (427).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Core: <strong>Find and bring to class a tile “Making a Difference” presentation.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment due: revision work for portfolio (on essay 2 or 4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Core: <strong>Draft Essay 5, course Reflection, for in-class review.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10: Issues in Community and Social Justice</td>
<td>DECEMBER 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: no new reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment due: Portfolio (if used for appeal; must include substantial revision of either Essay 2 or Essay 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Core: <strong>ELWR sections - optional appeals due.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DECEMBER 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: bring your Reading Group book to class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment due: Portfolio (if not being used for appeal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Core: <strong>Essay 4 final due either today [if draft returned 11/24] or Monday morning 12/18.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1: Social Justice and Equality</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANUARY 5</strong></td>
<td>Reading: Bring your Reading Group book</td>
<td>Reading: Moyers (17) and Kekes (21) From Standard Core, week 1 Assignment due: Essay 1 Personal definition of social justice in a community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 2: Defining the members of a community</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANUARY 12</strong></td>
<td>Reading: Rothenberg, (121) and Omi and Winant (124) From Standard Core, week 2 Assignment due: reading response for Omi and Winant</td>
<td>Reading: Lorber (130) and Miller (136) From Standard Core, week 2 Assignment Due: annotate the readings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 3: Education for underrepresented groups</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANUARY 19</strong></td>
<td>Reading: Valdes (67) or Louie (82) From Standard Core, week 2 Assignment due: prepare to teach your essay to the other students; preliminary writing for Essay 2.</td>
<td>Reading: Tyre (140), Bombardieri (145), Leonhardt (148) From Standard Core, week 2 Assignment due: Essay 2 draft (text-based analysis of educational opportunities for a specific underrepresented group)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 4: Income Inequality and Health</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANUARY 26</strong></td>
<td>Reading: Krugman (209). Standard Core week 5: Krugman, Lowenstein, and Public Policy Institute Assignment due: Essay 2.</td>
<td>Reading: Lowenstein (221) and Public Policy institute (225) Standard Core week 5: Daniels and Kawachi, Scott, Woolhandler and Himmelstein, Marmot and either Pear or Bakalar. Assignment due: reading response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 5: Income Inequality and Health</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEBRUARY 2</strong></td>
<td>Reading: selections from Daniels and Kawachi (244) Scott (233), Woolhandler and Himmelstein (260), Marmot (263), Pear (278), Bakalar (281). From Standard Core Week 5 Assignment due: reading &amp;response</td>
<td>Reading: see February 2 Assignment due: preliminary writing for Essay 3 (analysis of income inequality and health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6: Immigration, Assimilation, and Culture</td>
<td>FEBRUARY 9</td>
<td>FEBRUARY 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading: Huntington (283).</td>
<td>Reading: fox (299)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Core: Huntington, Fox, and Citrin</td>
<td>Standard Core: Fraga and Segura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment due: List and summarize Huntington's main points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Core: same</td>
<td>Assignment due: Essay 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 7: Immigration, Assimilation, and Culture</th>
<th>FEBRUARY 16</th>
<th>FEBRUARY 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading: Citrin (304)</td>
<td>Reading: Fraga and Segura (332) plus one of the following: Tan (345), Anzaldua (349), Liu (356), Rodriguez (365)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Core: Clichez plus one of the following: Tan, Anzaldua, Liu, Rodriguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment due: reading response</td>
<td>Assignment due: preliminary writing for Essay 4 (personal response to Huntington's article using one of the other texts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks: Reading Groups on social justice and community</th>
<th>FEBRUARY 23</th>
<th>FEBRUARY 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading: outside book</td>
<td>Reading: finish outside book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment due: notes on book and draft of Essay 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 9: Reading Groups on social justice and community</th>
<th>MARCH 2</th>
<th>MARCH 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading: no new reading</td>
<td>Reading: no new reading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment due: draft portfolio letter; preliminary writing for essay 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups prepare for presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment due: Portfolios for ELWR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 10:</th>
<th>MARCH 9</th>
<th>MARCH 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment due: group presentations; draft of Essay 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students fill out evaluations for instructor and course this week; ELWR students evaluate tutors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment due: finish group presentations; Essay 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**ABSTRACT:** Arizona State University’s basic writing Stretch Program has now been in existence for more than ten years. Statistical data for nearly 8,000 Stretch Program students continues to indicate that the program helps a range of at-risk students succeed. This is true, also, for students from under-represented groups, who comprise roughly 40% of Stretch Program students. Stretch has been replicated at other colleges and universities, but as with any basic writing program, there are still problems and political issues that crop up and that must be dealt with.
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In the fall of 1992, Arizona State University (ASU) had just completed several years during which its “basic writers” had been outsourced to a local community college.¹ There had been the usual conversations about whether or not “basic writers” belonged at the university, and that perhaps the local community college would serve them better. But what Director of Composition David Schwalm had originally feared had come to pass: once these students were told to take a community college “remedial” writing class (ENG 071), only a few of them ever returned to ASU to take other classes, and those who did were unprepared for the university-level work expected of them. The remedial classes (in which ASU controlled neither the curriculum nor the teachers nor the class size) simply did not serve these particular students well. In addition, students paid university tuition but received no college
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credit for these outsourced classes. Schwalm was determined to somehow bring these basic writing students back to ASU and to do so in a way that would help them succeed and be retained at the university (for more about the issues and problems involved, see Schwalm).

Working with John Ramage, then Director of ASU’s Writing Across the Curriculum program, Schwalm and Ramage together determined that what ASU’s basic writing students needed more than anything else was more time: more time to think, more time to write, more time to revise. And they wanted to ask ASU’s basic writers to do what Andrea Lunsford long ago suggested, to “...continually be engaged in writing in a full rhetorical context, solving problems and practicing conceptual skills in a carefully sequenced set of assignments” (288).

Schwalm and Ramage designed two pilot programs, both intended to give students more time, and both requiring students to use the same textbooks and to work with the same assignments as did the students in “traditional” ENG 101 classes. The following academic year (1993/1994) ASU piloted two versions of classes for students identified as basic writers. One was called Jumbo—a six-semester-hour basic writing class. The results for Jumbo were mixed, and student response to the approach and their subsequent writing performance did not seem to be at the same level produced by the other approach. That other approach was labeled Stretch, a two-semester sequence designed to “stretch” ENG 101 over two semesters. Unfortunately, both the Jumbo and the Stretch pilots were pretty small, but the consensus was that Stretch helped students more, and, unlike Jumbo, clearly the Stretch model was faithful to Ramage and Schwalm’s original notion that ASU’s basic writers needed more time. So, beginning in the fall of 1994, ASU’s Stretch Program was initially launched, with 512 students enrolled.²

Both of these pilot programs attempted to do what David Bartholomae had suggested: to change the curriculum by first “chang[ing] the way the profession talked about the students who didn’t fit” (“The Tidy House” 21). Schwalm and Ramage in effect were arguing that the students accepted into ASU but placed into a basic writing class did not give “evidence of arrested cognitive development, arrested language development, or unruly or unpredictable language use” (Bartholomae, “Error” 254). Rather, they saw ASU’s basic writing students as capable, and able to do the university-level writing the Department of English required. But they also believed that this subset of students could use more time and more directed writing experience, so they would not only write more but also receive more feedback and revision suggestions on their writing. Also, they wanted ASU to move away
from an outsourcing approach and toward a mode of *embracing* those basic writers, to move from a view that these students are defective to one that, as Mina Shaughnessy taught us, understands that “students write the way they do, not because they are slow or non-verbal, indifferent to or incapable of academic excellence, but because they are beginners and must, like all beginners, learn by making mistakes” (5).

**Program Design**

Since ASU’s computer system would not allow Schwalm and Ramage to name the two-class *Stretch* sequence something like ENG 101A and ENG 101B, they decided to have the first class carry the Writing Across the Curriculum label as WAC 101. So, even if the course was viewed as “remedial” (as so many basic writing programs are), this connection to the Writing Across the Curriculum program provided some political protection. Because the WAC 101 classes were to be directly connected to specifically-designated sections of ENG 101, the *Stretch* sequence was created to be *part* of first-year composition, rather than something *outside* and thus vulnerable to political attack.

Schwalm and Ramage wanted to give ASU’s beginning writers more time to work on and revise and think about their writing, so instead of doing all the ENG 101 assignments in one semester, they wrote three papers each semester, each with multiple drafts, along with a portfolio analysis of their writing, which served as a final examination. Just as it is important that *Stretch* students use the same textbooks that “traditional” ENG 101 students use, the direct connection between ENG 101 and *Stretch* assignments is critical.

To put this notion—that *Stretch* is a version of first-year composition—into a wider context, see Table 1 for the “tracks” students can take to fulfill their first-year writing requirement at ASU.

**Table 1: Placement into ASU’s Writing “Tracks”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Stretch</em> sequence</td>
<td>WAC 101 → ENG 101 → ENG 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional sequence</td>
<td>ENG 101 → ENG 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated sequence</td>
<td>ENG 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL <em>Stretch</em> sequence</td>
<td>WAC 107 → ENG 107 → ENG 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL traditional sequence</td>
<td>ENG 107 → ENG 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These several tracks are all seen (and represented to the administration and the public) as part and parcel of the same thing: the first-year writing requirement. What this new approach does is give our basic writing program protection from those who see such programs as remedial—if you want to attack Stretch, then you also have to attack the traditional version of ENG 101, as well as the accelerated version of first-year writing (ENG 105).

Contrast this model, where the basic writing program is part of the first-year writing program, uses the same books, asks students to construct the same assignments, etc., with one in which the basic writing program is seen as pre-English 101. That view makes it easier for BW programs to be attacked as “not belonging at the university” and as “high school courses.” Not so with Stretch.

Since Stretch classes are college-level classes, Stretch Program students earn three hours of elective credit for the first part of the Stretch course sequence (WAC 101), credit that counts toward graduation at ASU, and then three hours of ENG 101 credit for their second semester’s work (ENG 101). The list that follows gives a few more administrative details that will be useful to anyone contemplating a Stretch model for their own college or university:

- **WAC 101/107** began as a pass/fail course, where the grades Stretch students earned for their papers and other work accumulated and counted as 50 percent of their ENG 101 grade. The original notion was that the pass/fail designation would take some of the pressure off of students during their first semester in college. However, students generally did not like the pass/fail aspect of WAC 101/107, as the class then did not help their GPA. So, in 2007, WAC 101/107 was changed to a graded class (largely because of those student concerns).

- **ASU** tries to keep the same teacher with the same group of students for both semesters. This doesn’t always work out, of course, but it does most of the time, and Stretch students tell us that they very much like having the same classmates and the same teacher for two semesters. One thing we’ve noticed is that students who are together for two semesters generally build a useful “writing community.” It takes some time for students to learn to trust each other in terms of peer feedback, and Stretch teachers almost always see, in that second semester, much improved peer review.

- **Students** place into all of ASU’s writing classes based on their ACT or SAT scores.6
ASU also offers sections of Stretch Program classes for international students, as these students especially benefit from more time to work on their writing. Stretch classes were initially capped at 22 students, as compared to 26 in traditional ENG 101 classrooms, so Stretch students would receive more personal attention. Beginning in the fall of 2004, all 100-level English classes were capped at 19.

Long-Term Results

Not all of our data paints Stretch in a perfect light; frankly, there are areas we need to improve on. At the same time, however, most of the data indicates that the Stretch concept actually works and that thousands of students have benefited from the extra time and guided writing experience they receive with the WAC 101—ENG 101 Stretch sequence.

To track accurately what happens with Stretch students, we use a step-model:

- A number of students register for WAC 101
- A percentage of these students pass WAC 101
- A percentage of these students register for ENG 101
- A percentage of these students pass ENG 101
- A percentage of these students register for ENG 102
- A percentage of these students pass ENG 102

There are a number of ways to consider this data, and for our purposes here we will provide information on:

Student Profile
- Stretch student ACT/SAT scores compared to traditional ENG 101 students.
- Enrollment by students from historically under-represented groups (at ASU, we consider these to be students who self-identify as African American, Asian American, Hispanic, or Native American students).

Pass Rates
- For WAC 101 compared to pass rates for the previous community-college class (ENG 071).
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• For Stretch ENG 101 students compared to pass rates for students taking traditional ENG 101.
• For Stretch students once they’re done with Stretch and take ENG 102, compared to traditional ENG 102 students.
• For students from historically under-represented groups.

Continuation Rates
• Fall-spring retention (for Stretch students, that is from WAC 101 to ENG 101; for traditional students, it’s from ENG 101 to ENG 102).

The step model, then, will examine:

A number of students register for WAC 101 [student profile]
A percentage of these students pass WAC 101 [pass rates]
A percentage of these students register for ENG 101 [continuation rate]
A percentage of these students pass ENG 101 [pass rates]
A percentage of these students register for ENG 102 [continuation rate]
A percentage of these students pass ENG 102 [pass rate]

We have—after a full ten years of Stretch’s existence and because ASU is such a large institution—some pretty large data sets. To provide a sense of the numbers we will detail below, here are a few statistics from those data sets:

• Number of WAC 101 students, fall semesters 1994 through 2004: 7,826
• Number of ENG 101 students, academic years 1994-95 through 2004-05: 45,668
• Number of WAC 101 students from under-represented groups, fall 1994 through fall 2004: 2,856
• Number of ENG 101 students from under-represented groups, academic years 1994-95 through 2004-05: 9,873
• Number of ENG 102 students, academic years 1994-95 through 2004-05: 53,516
• Number of ENG 102 students from under-represented groups, academic years 1994-95 through 2004-05: 10,531
Who Our Students Are

Arizona State University is a large, urban university with roughly 50,000 students on the Tempe campus. There are now versions of Stretch at the other three ASU campuses, but their data is so new that it is not included here.

As noted above, we place all of our students—roughly 9,000 in our first-year classes—into either Stretch, traditional ENG 101, or ENG 105 based on their standardized test scores. While from time to time we have conversations on whether we might somehow move to a form of directed self-placement (see Royer and Gillis, “Directed” and “Basic Writing”), we haven’t yet figured out how to do this with so many new students each fall semester. To make matters worse, ASU (as of this writing) does not have mandatory orientation, so we wouldn’t be able to provide placement information and advice to all incoming students. So for now we’re continuing to place students based on their SAT verbal or ACT English scores (this appeals to the university administration since the students pay for this testing). At the same time, there do seem to be significant differences in the average scores of Stretch students, as compared to those placed into ENG 101. The following data is from fall semesters, as that’s when most of our students start their classes here. For the 11 fall semesters (since Stretch was put into place: fall 1994—fall 2004):¹⁰

- 5,362 WAC 101 students had an SAT verbal score, averaging 425.
- 28,113 ENG 101 students had an SAT verbal score, averaging 544.

On average, then, the SAT verbal score for Stretch students is about 120 points lower than their counterparts who place in traditional ENG 101 classes. (There is roughly the same difference—120 points—between students placed into ENG 101 and those placed into ENG 105, our one-semester class that fulfills the composition requirement.) The same is true for ACT scores:

- 4,408 WAC 101 students had an ACT English score, averaging 16.
- 20,185 ENG 101 students had an ACT English score, averaging 23.

In addition, more Stretch students—by a large margin—are identified as belonging to an historically under-represented group (at ASU, we consider...
these to be students who self-identify as African American, Asian American, Hispanic, or Native American). Students from these populations—since the majority of them, historically, have not attended college—are sometimes seen as at-risk in terms of university success (and since twice as many place into our basic writing sequence of classes, they also are seen as at-risk based on their test scores):

- Over the 10 fall semesters (1994—2004), 36.49% of the students registered in WAC 101 were from these under-represented groups.
- Over the past 10 academic years (1995-96—2004-2005), 21.62% of the students registered in traditional ENG 101 were from these under-represented groups.

ASU has made great progress at including more students from under-represented groups: in the fall of 1995, 18.7% of our new students came from under-represented groups. By the fall of 2006, however, some 25.6% came from those groups. At the same time, Stretch’s population was also changing: in the fall of 2006, 43.2% of WAC 101 students came from those under-represented groups.

In effect, then, while traditional ENG 101 classes have about one student in five or so from one of these under-represented groups, Stretch classes have almost twice that number—almost two in five. This data reflects, of course, any cultural bias in standardized testing, in addition to how effectively (or ineffectively) a student’s grammar-, middle-, and high-school education has prepared that student for the ACT or SAT. In Arizona such preparation is often worse than in other states, as our continually conservative state legislature constantly refuses—even under court order—to properly fund schools in poorer Arizona communities.

In any case, that’s a snapshot of Stretch students: they’re seen as the most at-risk because they have the worst test scores (by a significant degree), and more of them come from groups that historically have not attended universities.

**How Our Students Perform**

One way to measure how Stretch students perform is to consider how they do in comparison to other groups of students. You may recall that WAC 101 replaced the community college ENG 071 class. For the final five
years (before we implemented *Stretch*) we asked our basic writing students to take **ENG 071**, the pass rate was **66.22%**. In comparison, students pass **WAC 101** at a **90.15%** rate. This pass rate—reflecting student success—is significant because when many students fail a class, they simply stop coming to school. So when ASU implemented *Stretch*, our retention rate immediately improved.

While our basic writing students clearly did better in WAC 101 than in the class they had been taking, ENG 071, how did they fare against their ENG 101 counterparts? To properly compare the two sets of students, we need to compare how both groups did when taking ENG 101 (this data covers academic years 1994-1995 through 2004-2005):

- The pass rate for **Stretch ENG 101** students averages **92.65%**.
- The pass rate for traditional **ENG 101** students averages **88.88%**.

Clearly, the WAC 101 semester, which gives these at-risk students more guided writing experience, helps them. **Stretch Program** students consistently pass ENG 101 at a higher rate than do their counterparts who take traditional ENG 101.\(^\text{11}\) Incidentally, these pass rates hold true over time (see Figure 1).

**Figure 1: Comparative Year-to-Year Pass Rates**

How do **Stretch** students perform when they leave the program and take ENG 102? Again, **Stretch** students consistently pass ENG 102 at a higher rate than do their traditional ENG 101 counterparts (see Figure 2).
Figure 2: Comparative Pass Rates for Stretch ENG 101 and Traditional ENG 101

We see similar data sets—a higher pass rate—for students from historically under-represented groups. These students pass ENG 101 at a higher rate when they’re in the Stretch Program (as above, this data covers academic years 1994-95 through 2004-05):

- Students from under-represented groups pass Stretch ENG 101 at an average rate of 90.81%.
- Students from under-represented groups pass traditional ENG 101 at an average rate of 87.34%.

As with students in our general student population, the data for students from under-represented groups also holds true over time. They consistently pass ENG 101 at a higher rate than do those students in traditional ENG 101 classes:
For both our general group of students, then, as well as students from under-represented groups, the extra semester of guided writing experience enhances their success in ENG 101. But it’s important to note that we’re not quite comparing apples-to-apples here. That is, the Stretch Program students we’re examining have already taken and passed WAC 101, usually with the same teacher and group of students—so even with the lower test scores and even though more come from under-represented groups and are seen as at-risk in the university . . . perhaps they should pass ENG 101 at a higher rate, since as part of the Stretch Program they have more time to spend on their writing, and are with the teacher for two semesters.

So how do Stretch students do when they move to the next semester and take ENG 102? Former Stretch students from under-represented groups—the ones with the worst test scores—appear to benefit from the extra semester of guided writing experience: they pass ENG 102 at a higher rate than do traditional ENG 102 students (this data covers academic years 1994-95 through 2004-05):

- **Stretch** students from under represented groups pass ENG 102 at an average rate of **88.65 %**.
- Students from under represented groups taking **traditional** ENG 101 pass ENG 102 at an average rate of **84.17 %**.

\[\text{Figure 3: Comparative Year-to-Year Pass Rates for Students from Under-Represented Groups in ENG 101}\]
As with data for our general student population, these pass rates are as outlined in Figure 4. While recently the comparative pass rates have been getting closer, students who had the benefit of taking WAC 101 clearly benefit—in terms of passing—when they do take ENG 102.

Figure 4: Comparative Year-to-Year Pass Rates for Students from Under-Represented Groups in ENG 102

Pass Rates, Stretch students taking ENG 102 vs. traditional 102 students
(all students from under-represented groups)

It’s important to note that Stretch doesn’t seem to help one group of students as well as it helps others. That is, when we compare how, say, Asian American students succeed in ENG 101 as compared to WAC 101, we don’t see much difference. While Asian American students pass ENG 101 at a 90.97 % rate, their passing rate for WAC 101 is only slightly lower, 89.50 %. But for our Native American students, the results are somewhat starker. Native American students pass ENG 101 at a rate of 86.22 %; they pass WAC 101 at a rate of 81.68 %. In effect, about five percent more of our Native American students fail WAC 101 than fail ENG 101.

The other two groups of students from under-represented groups (Hispanic and African American) pass both ENG 101 and WAC 101 within two percentage points of each other. The only big difference is the poor pass rate of Native American students in our WAC 101 classes, and at this point we do not have an answer as to why.
**How Stretch Program Students Persist**

Finally, how do Stretch students persist? One way to consider student persistence is to look at, for example, the percentage of students who pass ENG 101 in the fall semester and subsequently register for ENG 102 the following semester. Likewise, we can track Stretch students who took WAC 101 in the fall and then registered to take ENG 101 the following semester. The cumulative percentages are:

- **90.90%** of Stretch students who pass WAC 101 in the fall take ENG 101 the next spring.
- **86.52%** of traditional students who pass ENG 101 in the fall take ENG 102 the next spring.

Figure 5 shows student continuation data from fall 1994/spring 1995 to the fall of 2004/spring 2005, demonstrating that during each fall-spring period, Stretch students continued to the next class at a somewhat higher rate than their traditional counterparts.

**Figure 5: Comparative Continuation Rates for Stretch and Traditional Students in ENG 101 & ENG 102**

Continuation Rates:
Passed WAC 101 fall & took ENG 101 the next spring
Passed ENG 101 fall & took ENG 102 the next spring
From a more qualitative point of view, Stretch students indicate that they feel the sequence improved their writing (about 90% say so). What they like most about the program is having more time to work on their writing, which validates Schwalm and Ramage’s initial concept. Students also like being able to work with the same group of students and have the same teacher for both the WAC and ENG portions of the program.

**Where Do We Go From Here?**

The most recent modification to Stretch, as noted earlier, was to change the first class in the Stretch sequence from pass/fail to graded.

We continue to monitor the program, especially in light of the fall 2004 modification that dropped the cap on all 100-level English classes to 19 students. One area we’re all concerned with is retention, usually measured by the number of first-time full-time freshmen who take classes one fall and then return the subsequent fall. As of this writing, we have two full years of data (2004-2005, and 2005-2006) and can say that “retention” rates for students taking WAC 101, ENG 101, ENG 102, and ENG 105 are all higher than they were when class sizes were larger. I’d hesitate to give all of the credit for student retention to the smaller class size, but it only makes sense that smaller classes help everything else the university is doing to aid retention.

We also have an eye on what our sister institution, the University of Arizona, is doing to help their basic writers. For the past two years the U of A has offered what they call ENG 101+, essentially a writing studio model in which students classified as basic writers are required to attend an additional one-hour session along with their writing class. These sessions are facilitated by the regular U of A writing teachers, and their preliminary results are very promising.

Is Stretch the correct model for every institution? Of course not: it works very well at ASU, and has for more than ten years now, and we expect it to continue to serve our basic writing student population. At the same time, we’re cognizant of how other colleges and universities help their own basic writers and we’ll continue to monitor and modify Stretch as time goes on.

**A Postscript**

In 2003, Stretch won ASU’s President’s Award for Innovation. My thought at the time was that such an award would give Stretch some political protection. After all, how could anyone attack a program that was not only
a national model but that also won our own President’s award?

Alas, in August of 2007 (as I’m writing this), our new Dean, under enrollment pressure, raised the caps of half of our WAC 101 sections from 19 to 22 (they must have felt they needed about 100 extra WAC 101 seats, as they raised the caps on 34 WAC 101 sections by three students in each section).

The Dean did so over my objections as well as the strong objections of the Chair of the Department of English. The Dean’s decision to raise the caps was made on the Friday before classes started, at 4:45 in the afternoon.

Since then, we’ve met with the Dean and shared with him the kinds of information on success rates, ethnic mix, and so on that we’ve reported in this article. The Dean was apologetic; he seemed to understand the student population involved; he seemed to realize that, under enrollment pressure, he’d made an unfortunate decision; he spoke of more resources for us “now that I’ve seen this information.” Time will tell, of course, so stay tuned, as what seemed to be a lemon on the Friday before classes began might yet turn into lemonade. At least with our basic writing program, there’s never a dull moment!

Notes
1. For a discussion on the problematic terms “basic writer” and “basic writing,” see Adler-Kassner; DeGenaro and White; Rosendale Rethinking and “Investigating”; Rosen-Knill and Lynch; Shaughnessy (40).
2. There are, of course, other approaches designed to help students identified as basic writers. See, for example, Crouch and McNenney; Fitzgerald “The Context” and “Basic Writing;” Goen and Gillotte-Tropp; Gleason; Grego and Thompson; Lalicker; Smoke; Soliday and Gleason; Winslow and Mische; Wiley.
3. For more details on the overall Stretch Program design, see Glau, “The Stretch Program,” “Mainstream Plus,” and “Bringing Them Home;” also see Lalicker.
4. For more on why basic writing programs often need “political protection,” see Adler-Kassner and Harrington; Collins and Blum; Gilyard; Goto; Harrington and Adler-Kassner; Mutnick; Rodby and Fox; Soliday; Stevens.
5. When Stretch started, ENG 101 students wrote six papers, so it made logical sense for WAC 101 students to write three papers, followed by three more in their ENG 101 semester. Today (2007), traditional ENG 101 students write four papers over the course of a semester, so now Stretch students are both stretched (more time) and expanded (they write six vs. four papers in traditional
ENG 101 classes) in terms of the work they do for their writing classes.

6. Students with an SAT verbal score of 530 or lower, or an ACT Enhanced English score of 18 or lower are placed into the *Stretch Program*. Students with a TOEFL score of 540 or less are placed in the ESL version of the *Stretch Program*. Students with a 620 or higher on the SAT verbal or 26 or higher on the SAT English can take our one-semester class, ENG 105. For a more comprehensive look at placement, see White.

7. As of this writing we have three full years worth of data with these smaller class sizes. Since we dropped the class size to 19, pass rates are higher for WAC 101 and ENG 101 and 102 than they’ve historically averaged; DWE (drop-withdraw-failure) rates are lower, continuation from fall to spring is better, and student evaluation numbers are *all* better than they have been, historically, for all ranges of teachers (Professors, Lecturers, Instructors, Teaching Assistants, and Faculty Associates).

8. For a long-term look at basic writers using a longitudinal case study approach, see Sternglass.

9. Eleanor Andrew and Margaret McLaughlin provide a useful discussion that focuses on African American BW students; Laura Gray-Rosendale, Loyola K. Bird, and Judith F. Bullock provide a thoughtful discussion of Native American student experience in BW and other classes. For a useful discussion of how we teachers represent race in our own research and writing, see Center.

10. Some students, of course, had both an ACT and SAT score, so there is some overlap in student populations for these score groups.

11. Students exit from the *Stretch Program* based on the teacher’s judgment of progress, which is in turn based on the Writing Program’s goals and objectives as articulated in our version of the WPA Outcomes Statement.

12. Of course, some students who pass WAC 101 or ENG 101 in the fall simply don’t take an ENG class the following spring semester. Our thinking is that the small percentage of such students is probably about the same for both groups we’re considering here, so the results, as shown, are probably pretty accurate.
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EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES OF THE C REQUIREMENT AND THE SPECIFIC GOALS OF C1 AND C2

In completing UCSC’s two-quarter General Education Requirement in Composition, students learn how to become effective participants in university discourse, spoken as well as written.

To this end:

1. Students learn -- when reading, writing, listening, or speaking -- to analyze rhetorical situations so as to understand that different purposes and contexts call for different strategies, different conventions, and different techniques.

2. Students learn to recognize and discuss propositions (their own as well as others’) that cannot be merely demonstrated -- that is, to analyze, evaluate, and argue matters of opinion and interpretation as well as to describe matters of fact.

3. Students learn to develop effective processes for writing in different contexts and to use a variety of strategies for discovering, developing, and analyzing data and ideas, for making sense, for revising, and for editing.

4. Students learn to produce writing that:
   - Establishes and maintains an appropriate purpose or coherent set of purposes in relation to the assignment and the audience.
   - Employs appropriate strategies of development that accomplish their purpose in relation to the assignment, its context, and its audience.
   - Uses sources’ information and ideas accurately and effectively and cites sources appropriately.
   - Communicates in accurate, appropriate, effective prose.

5. Students learn strategies for becoming accurate readers and critical analysts of all texts including their own.

6. Students learn how to collaborate with others (including their peers) in doing research, generating and evaluating ideas, and revising texts.

Composition 1, Introduction to University Discourse

As they make the transition from writing in the schools to writing in a variety of academic and professional contexts, students learn to apply rhetorical principles rather than rely on rule-driven formulas. They also experience and come to understand the connections among composing, thinking, and learning.
Students will:

1. Write at least five relatively short essays (up to 1250 words) and read a variety of texts, including a significant amount of nonfiction that employs argument and analysis.

2. Learn strategies for reading challenging texts -- that is, to understand a text’s purpose or purposes and to follow its train of thought, to begin to be aware of nuance and emphasis, and to be able to relate specific examples and statements to larger topics or claims.

3. Learn strategies for analyzing and criteria for evaluating opinions, interpretations, and arguments (propositions about things that cannot be proved) and learn the academic uses of words such as *argument*, *hypothesis*, *theory*, *assumption*, *claim*, etc.

4. Learn to analyze their processes as writers, develop strategies for enhancing those processes, and evaluate the results, all in relation to the particular demands of particular assignments. Students’ attention to process includes:
   - Learning specific strategies for invention and revision in relation to the quality of content as well as its clarity and accuracy.
   - Learning the importance of a writer’s purpose and audience and relevant conventions in relation to focus, coherence, and effectiveness.
   - Learning to take charge of their proof reading and editing in standard professional English by analyzing their weaknesses and developing a plan for eliminating error.

5. Learn oral communication skills for effective participation in discussions as well as for formal presentations.

**Composition 2, Rhetoric and Inquiry**

Students in Composition 2 build on their progress in Composition 1 by learning strategies for becoming more effective readers, writers, and speakers in the context of assignments that require independent research. They deepen their comprehension of how their writing and that of others can add to the understanding of vital issues and sustain meaningful inquiry through responsible persuasion.

Students will:

1. Write a series of at least five essays (including one of at least 1500 words) and read a variety of texts that provide occasions for analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating data and arguments.

2. Learn methods of research and approaches to using sources (i.e., the information, theories, arguments, and texts of others) that provide students with the knowledge and confidence to actively participate in the act of inquiry by composing comparative analysis, interpretation, and reasoned argument.
3. Learn specific techniques for critically analyzing sources so as to understand their purpose and context and to evaluate the credibility and relevance of their information and the persuasiveness of their evidence and reasoning.

4. Achieve solid competence and, to the extent possible, virtuosity in all facets of the writing process. This include:
   • Learning modes of inquiry and strategies for revision that strive for complexity, nuance, and depth as well as coherence and clarity.
   • Learning to develop extended, complex arguments by orienting readers, creating clear expectations and a sufficiently explicit train of thought, effectively weaving together multiple strands of inquiry, and bringing the whole to a satisfying conclusion.
   • Learning techniques for developing a prose style that moves beyond accuracy and clarity to precision, power, subtlety, and elegance.
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Preface

Between 2003 and 2005, the UCSC Writing Program undertook a multi-faceted assessment project that as one of its many goals set out to clarify the Writing Program Faculty’s standards for evaluating students’ writing at the end of Writing 1, Composition and Rhetoric (now known as Writing 2, Rhetoric and Inquiry). The project began with extensive research on theories and methodologies of assessment, continued with our refining our educational goals for Writing 1/Writing 2 and developing a rubric and protocol for evaluating the quality of students’ essays, and culminated in an ambitious pilot in 2004 in which 17 faculty members scored 54 essays randomly selected from 43 sections of Writing 1. After analyzing the pilot and the usefulness of the data it produced at Writing Program meetings as well as at a conference attended by assessment experts at UC Santa Barbara in January 2005, we revised the rubric, various aspects of the way we collected essays, and the protocol for scoring them.

In March, 2005, informed by two years of research, experience, and conversation, we asked 37 writing instructors to provide one essay written by a specific student whose name had been randomly chosen from class lists, stipulating that the essay had to refer to at least one source and had to have been assigned in the last three weeks of the quarter. Thirty instructors provided appropriate essays. Twenty-four Writing Program faculty members met and scored the essays, using the rubric included here. Each essay was read by 3-5 faculty members who did not know how it had been scored by others. Unlike the process used for scoring the Analytical Writing Placement Examination, we did not have any discussion designed to norm ourselves as readers of these essays. The point was rather to see whether the scores would reveal a consensus on the standards for evaluating writing produced by students at the end of Writing 1/ Writing 2.

During 2006 – 2007, a sub-committee of the Writing Program Faculty chaired by Jim Wilson and including Sandy Archimedes, Biff Faunce, and Carol Freeman was charged with revising a 10-year-old Writing Program document, “Standards for Passing Writing 1.” Deciding to take advantage of the work accomplished by the Assessment Project, the sub-committee looked at about 20 essays that Writing Program Faculty members in Spring, 2005, had scored the same for “overall quality . . . in relation to Writing 1’s goals” according to this scale:

- Rating of 1 – does not meet Writing 1’s minimum goals.
- Rating of 2 – demonstrates satisfactory if at times marginal proficiency.
- Rating of 3 – demonstrates clear competency.
- Rating of 4 – demonstrates sophisticated understanding and execution.

The sub-committee then selected two or three essays to represent the range and variety of essays given each of the four ratings and wrote a descriptive explanation of the consensus score. The essays and accompanying explanations were discussed at the Writing Program Fall Faculty meeting in September, 2007, and subsequently in conversations with individuals. What you have here is the revised result of those discussions.
All the essays included here represent students’ end-of-the-quarter prose without regard to process or improvement or revision. Each essay was written in response to a different assignment by a different instructor; in each case, the student did indeed produce “the sort of essay called for in the assignment,” albeit not with equal success. And, while the Writing Program faculty members who read these essays did not always agree on how to score the abilities labeled A through H on the rubric, they did agree on how to rate these essays’ “overall quality.” We offer these essays as an informative snapshot of the Writing Program’s current standards and also as materials for continuing conversation.

Carol Freeman
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EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES OF THE C REQUIREMENT AND THE
SPECIFIC GOALS OF C1 AND C2

In completing UCSC’s two-quarter General Education Requirement in
Composition, students learn how to become effective participants in university
discourse, spoken as well as written.

To this end:

1. Students learn -- when reading, writing, listening, or speaking -- to analyze rhetorical
   situations so as to understand that different purposes and contexts call for different
   strategies, different conventions, and different techniques.

2. Students learn to recognize and discuss propositions (their own as well as others”) that
   cannot be merely demonstrated -- that is, to analyze, evaluate, and argue matters of
   opinion and interpretation as well as to describe matters of fact.

3. Students learn to develop effective processes for writing in different contexts and to
   use a variety of strategies for discovering, developing, and analyzing data and ideas, for
   making sense, for revising, and for editing.

4. Students learn to produce writing that:
   • Establishes and maintains an appropriate purpose or coherent set of purposes in
     relation to the assignment and the audience.
   • Employs appropriate strategies of development that accomplish their purpose in
     relation to the assignment, its context, and its audience.
   • Uses sources’ information and ideas accurately and effectively and cites sources
     appropriately.
   • Communicates in accurate, appropriate, effective prose.

5. Students learn strategies for becoming accurate readers and critical analysts of all texts
   including their own.

6. Students learn how to collaborate with others (including their peers) in doing research,
   generating and evaluating ideas, and revising texts.

Composition 1, Introduction to University Discourse

As they make the transition from writing in the schools to writing in a variety of
academic and professional contexts, students learn to apply rhetorical principles
rather than rely on rule-driven formulas. They also experience and come to
understand the connections among composing, thinking, and learning,
Students will:

1. Write at least five relatively short essays (up to 1250 words) and read a variety of texts, including a significant amount of nonfiction that employs argument and analysis.

2. Learn strategies for reading challenging texts -- that is, to understand a text’s purpose or purposes and to follow its train of thought, to begin to be aware of nuance and emphasis, and to be able to relate specific examples and statements to larger topics or claims.

3. Learn strategies for analyzing and criteria for evaluating opinions, interpretations, and arguments (propositions about things that cannot be proved) and learn the academic uses of words such as argument, hypothesis, theory, assumption, claim, etc.

4. Learn to analyze their processes as writers, develop strategies for enhancing those processes, and evaluate the results, all in relation to the particular demands of particular assignments. Students’ attention to process includes:
   - Learning specific strategies for invention and revision in relation to the quality of content as well as its clarity and accuracy.
   - Learning the importance of a writer’s purpose and audience and relevant conventions in relation to focus, coherence, and effectiveness.
   - Learning to take charge of their proofreading and editing in standard professional English by analyzing their weaknesses and developing a plan for eliminating error.

5. Learn oral communication skills for effective participation in discussions as well as for formal presentations.

**Composition 2, Rhetoric and Inquiry**

Students in Composition 2 build on their progress in Composition 1 by learning strategies for becoming more effective readers, writers, and speakers in the context of assignments that require independent research. They deepen their comprehension of how their writing and that of others can add to the understanding of vital issues and sustain meaningful inquiry through responsible persuasion.

Students will:

1. Write a series of at least five essays (including one of at least 1500 words) and read a variety of texts that provide occasions for analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating data and arguments.

2. Learn methods of research and approaches to using sources (i.e., the information, theories, arguments, and texts of others) that provide students with the knowledge and confidence to actively participate in the act of inquiry by composing comparative analysis, interpretation, and reasoned argument.
3. Learn specific techniques for critically analyzing sources so as to understand their purpose and context and to evaluate the credibility and relevance of their information and the persuasiveness of their evidence and reasoning.

4. Achieve solid competence and, to the extent possible, virtuosity in all facets of the writing process. This include:

   • Learning modes of inquiry and strategies for revision that strive for complexity, nuance, and depth as well as coherence and clarity.
   • Learning to develop extended, complex arguments by orienting readers, creating clear expectations and a sufficiently explicit train of thought, effectively weaving together multiple strands of inquiry, and bringing the whole to a satisfying conclusion.
   • Learning techniques for developing a prose style that moves beyond accuracy and clarity to precision, power, subtlety, and elegance.
ASSESSING STUDENTS’ WRITING AT THE END OF A C2 COURSE

I. Does the writer produce the sort of essay called for in the assignment?
   Yes _____   No _____

II. Using the following ratings, evaluate the overall quality of the essay in relation to C2’s goals.
   Rating of 1 – does not meet C2’s minimum goals.
   Rating of 2 – demonstrates satisfactory if at times marginal proficiency.
   Rating of 3 – demonstrates clear competency.
   Rating of 4 – demonstrates sophisticated understanding and execution.

III. Using the above ratings, indicate the extent to which this writer demonstrates his/her ability in the areas described in A through H below.

   A. Ability to establish and maintain an appropriate purpose or coherent set of purposes in relation to the assignment and the audience. (Evaluate the essay’s form: its focus and coherence.)

   B. Ability to employ appropriate and effective strategies of development to accomplish the writer’s purpose. (Evaluate the essay’s effectiveness: its success in describing, explaining, exploring, supporting, analyzing, or arguing as necessary, using appropriate critical tools).

   C. Ability to anticipate and meet readers’ needs for context and clarity, given the demands of the assignment.

   D. Ability to edit accurately.

   E. Ability to employ an effective prose style.

   F. Ability to cite others’ information, words, and ideas appropriately.

   G. Ability to use others’ information, words, and ideas effectively.

   H. As demonstrated in a self-comment form, ability to articulate appropriate criteria and apply them in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of his/her own writing.

IV. Using the above 1 – 4 ratings, evaluate the overall quality of this essay in relation to C2’s goals.

Note: This form was inspired and informed by “Criteria for Effective Writing,” Alverno College Communication Department, 1998, and “The Critical Thinking Rubric,” Washington State University, 2000.
Essays with a Rating of 1—“Does not meet C2’s minimum goals”
Who is James Surowiecki? I believe that people who have read *The New Yorker* might know about James Surowiecki. He is an American journalist who writes for *The New Yorker* magazine. He writes regularly on the financial page of *The New Yorker*. Besides being a staff writer for *The New Yorker*, Surowiecki also write for the Wall Street Journal, Artforum, Wired, and Slate. Before joining *The New Yorker*, he wrote "The Bottom Line" column for New Yorker magazine. From 1995 to 1996, he was an editor-in-chief of Rogue magazine and a staff writer for Motley Fool. From 1997 to 2000, Surowiecki presented as a finance columnist for Slate. In 2002, Surowiecki edited an anthology "Best Business Crime Fighting of the Year" - a collection of articles provided different business news sources from various CEOs. In 2004, he published *The Wisdom of Crowds*, in which he argues that "collective intelligence shapes business, economics, societies and nations." Because of many strong experiences that Surowiecki had build up from his past works and researches, he can greatly inform readers about his points about the economic issues in only a page long article from *The New Yorker* magazine. Recently, he writes "Wages of Sin", "Standard-Bearers", and "Safe as Houses?" for *The New Yorker* magazine, and those
are the articles I had read. From all his articles that I had read, he points out a problem in this economic market. Then, he uses data, historical backgrounds, and studies to support his point of view, plus his own opinions are very effectively in making the readers to agree with.

After finishing several articles from Surowiecki, I found out that he uses a similar format to write his articles. He is effective in organizing every piece of information together and makes it clear and easy to understand for the readers. Every one of his articles that I had read is enjoyable and interesting; I felt that I had learned something from it and knew more about current economic issues. It is informative that Surowiecki provided historical background in almost every one of his articles, For example, in Sept. 25, 2006, Surowiecki wrote an article "Wage of Sin". In this article, he criticized the U.S. government's definition of gambling and its hypercritical nature. Surowiecki gives readers a little history of gambling in an ironic way. As He mentions: "Similarly, at the start of the twentieth century Progressive politicians, decrying betting as a 'source of misery and vice'[...]. But, two decades later, states desperate for revenue reopened the tracks, and found a huge audience." (68). Surowiecki used the fact of this history to satirize the U.S. government's greediness. Furthermore, Oct. 16, 2006, Surowiecki wrote an article "Standard-Bearers". In this article, he gives out new information of two new technologies- Toshiba's HDDVD player and Sony's
Blu-ray technology, which will come out soon, and which company will win the competition at the end. Surowiecki examines examples from the past that provide an outlook of what is going on in the technology market. He uses the example of both familiar and popular soda companies, Coca-Cola and Pepsi, to show that two companies can share their soda market equally. (66) This was a history from the economic market, in which Coca-cola and Pepsi both were the competitor beforehand. But now they can make a deal with each other. Surowiecki like to use historical background to support his ideas. As a result, his article helps readers who didn't have any knowledge on the topic to get a good view of what is going on.

Secondly, history might not seem like enough to let the readers agree. Therefore, Surowiecki also makes his point by presenting statistics to support his ideas. For example, in the article "Wage of Sin", he indicates the U.S. government really wins million an million dollar from the gamblers. As he mentioned "four hundred million", "five billion", and "sixteen billion" are all the revenues the government had yield. Because of the huge amount of money the U.S. government can earn from the gamblers, they legalized casino and lottery, but not online betting. In Oct. 30, 2006, Surowiecki wrote an article "Safe As Houses?" to criticize now selling a new home takes longer than used to. He points out statistics for the housing market. As The N.A.R. says that median sale prices for existing homes have risen fifty-seven per cent
since 2000, and in many markets the increase has been much bigger than that." (40). With the improvement of the houses, the median sale prices might increase not only fitly-seven percent: it might even get to a higher number. But the return to the homeowners might be reduced by forty percent as well. By the way, a new home prices were eight percent lower than before, because the seller are offering huge incentives to the buyers. But this great information is never included in the data. All the numbers and statistics Surowiecki used into his articles and makes his points to be more supportive and effective informing the readers to agree with his points.

Finally, after presenting all the history background facts and statistics, he now comes to his conclusion. Surowiecki made only one paragraph to be his conclusion for most of his articles I had read. Along with all his supportive facts, he finally concludes his points strongly by expressing his own opinion, and makes predictions on the outcome of every economic issues being discussed. In the article "Wages of Sin", Surowiecki concludes that the online bookmakers can be easily regulated and be more transparent than illegal bookies. As he points out, "Congress may think that driving bettors back underground can curb underage gambling and money laundering, but don't bet on it" (68) For this piece, Surowiecki tried to make his point that Congress could easily regulate the online betting market. However it is that true for every situation? People are smart and intelligent; they always can find a way to
operate their industry even it is illegal. In "Standard-Bearers", Surowiecki make his conclusion on: since both companies- Sony and Toshiba are backed by different major firms and advantage on different qualities, the result could go both ways. This is why consumers are felt confusion. The result is unknown. No one can win the battle. For "Safe As Houses?" Surowiecki points out that: all the data for the housing market is an illusion. It has made sellers hesitant to cut prices; ultimately there are many unsold houses left. Even people might get fooled in which investing a house is risk-free rewards. If people sell their homes with lower price and buy a new one, the money they get would not make them richer. His conclusion strongly expressing his own opinions of the economic issues, and he always make predictions what might be happening later.

Surowiecki's articles are interesting and enjoyable. As an economic major student, reading his articles gives me much more knowledge and new information about the economic world today. Unlike other verbose writers, every article he wrote was straight forward in effectively providing historical backgrounds and statistics. He is a knowledgeable, addictive, and a truly engaging economic writer.
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Essay A—James Surowiecki

The essay has a minimally satisfactory sense of purpose: by comparing three of Surowiecki’s “Financial Pages” from The New Yorker, the writer wants to show us how Surowiecki uses the same strategies in each column to achieve an interesting, persuasive economic analysis within the limits of one page. The essay’s development – while significantly constrained by the writer’s sense of what a paragraph is and by the resulting need to cram all the discussion of Surowiecki’s use of history and statistics and personal analysis into one paragraph each – might have been minimally satisfactory in explaining and supporting the writer’s points and accomplishing the essay’s overall purpose had not the essay’s language problems severely limited its ability to make clear any analytical point of any complexity, whether a summary of Surowiecki’s ideas or an explanation of the writer’s conclusions. The many editing errors – almost one per sentence – are mostly of the kind that an able English Language Learner ought to be able to fix (subject-verb agreement, verb forms, etc.). But beyond the matter of poor proof reading, the language problems contribute to simple sentences and syntax that limit what can be said – and how much of Surowiecki can be understood. Also, although Wikipedia is listed as a reference, the material in the introduction is not correctly cited or quoted. Overall, this essay does not meet Writing 2’s minimal goals for a passing essay; the rating of its overall quality is one.
Street Racing

A person entertains, and gets an adrenalin rush is when they are racing out in the middle of the night. "After that first pass, I craved the rush again. I found myself slammed against that fence -nose wide open, ear Drums pounding, being at one with the BRAPP, BRAPP while inhaling nitro" (Kerr pg.7). To these people racing is like a drug addiction, the more they do it the more they want to practice it. People also race to entertain themselves because there is no other form for them to have fun on weekends. In this paper I will present the two main views of street racing; those pro (racers) and those con (authorities).

The locations of races are sometimes in industrial area were warehouses and other business buildings are located, usually deserted of weekends. These places are ideal locations for racers because they are not disturbed. Sometimes there are certain stupid individual who think it is a good idea to start tagging on these buildings. The owners of these warehouses would later call the police to supervise these areas on weekends. Then these areas are being supervised constantly, and that is when the authorities try to interrupt the races. This leads to high speed police chases, and finding new vacant locations on weekends for the street racers. Violation of private property would be another reason for the cities around the country to try to stop street racing.

People's motives for being part of the street racing night life are respect, friends, to associate with others that have the same interests, street credit, and a reputation. The more races you win the more respect you get from others who go to the races. It is like
moving up in the army from cadet to lieutenant. At the races the participants also fonn friendships with other people. The friends people make are usually those with similar cars: those with muscle cars usually hang out with those with other muscle cars, and those with import cars hang out with those with other import cars. My friends and I like to represent for the muscle cars since we all have 5.0 Mustangs. After a while when all these people get to know each other quite well they start looking out for each other. Gaining a good reputation from racing another motivation that people seek because then word will spread and if you go to another race maybe in a different city and people have heard of you, you will be welcomed and have friends you have not ever met.

Money is another reason people go out and risk their lives racing. A race can bring a lot of money to a person if they are good racers. The bets rang from a full gas tank to pink slips. The amount waged in a bet depends on the person and their mentality about how good their cars are. The most I have waged on a race is a tank of gas and that was to a friend. We keep the bets low like who pays for the drinks for the crew. We only do this to have a good time and get on the loser's case for a little while jokingly). It is all with good intentions. Although there are a few racers who gamble on races most do it for entertainment to have a good time with their friends.

All of the performance parts for sale out in the market that are available to the public also encourage people to race. Individuals buy these parts and then go test their upgraded vehicles with other people. I know this because I am one of these people. I buy performance parts for my car and then go have fun with my friends. They are in their cars and I am in mine. People can go anywhere and find performance parts for their cars.
Information is on the internet, in car magazines, in stores that specialize in selling nothing but performance parts, and now in car maintenance stores like Kragen, and Napa auto parts which used to only offer parts to keep cars in good running condition. In fact I went to Kragen auto parts the other day and saw a nitrous oxide kit for sale, putting nitrous oxide in a car is a major upgrade. It is also illegal.

My friends and I all agree that it is safer to be at a race track than out in the street, and would rather be at a track, but in the city of Sacramento there is no track open to the public late at night where we can go and play with our toys. When a track is open to the public the cost to participate is too high or is not a convenient time for us to participate. A person I interviewed also mentioned that he wanted to gather signatures so that the city of Salinas, California would open up its little airport to the racers. This individual thinks the city and the little airport would benefit from this by charging a five dollar cover charge for maintenance and repairs. He also brought up a good point: that all the people racing would not be out in the streets endangering other people's lives as well as their own. He further explained to me that the cops could be supervising the event in case of an unwanted event (interview 2-13-03).

If word gets out that street racing is good in a certain area people from surrounding areas will go to weekly events there. The individual from Salinas mentioned to me that on few occasions he has made the three hour trip to Sacramento just to have fun at the races. Another friend that live in Sacramento told me that he has gone to the street races in San Jose (a two hour trip). The farthest I have traveled to street races was about a forty minute drive from my house in Sacramento, and I thought that was far. This
goes to show some of the extreme measures racers go through to have fun because they do not find anything better to do on weekends than endanger their lives and other's.

Even though cities like Sacramento and Salinas do not open up race tracks for street racer to go to instead of them being out in the streets they send out police officers to go and break up the gatherings of racers. The police try to put a stop to racing but it is impossible. "In Vancouver, Insp. Ken Davies says he's assigned nearly 40 officers to his Smooth operator squad, specially formed to put the brakes on street racing" (Rendon pg 2). After the police break up a gathering the street racers go and meet at another one of their racing spots were they can hang out, race, and talk until the police come again to break up the fun. It seems that authorities are wasting their time because they are not going to stop this new youth culture that has emerged recently. here is no way that they can put a stop to this because as time goes on more and more people will be attending street races through out the country (interview 2-13-03). Cities could limit the people out in the street by letting them use or build them a track were they can go were they would not be endangering people's lives who chose not to be a part of these events.

It makes sense that the authorities could have these people under supervision rather than to have them people out being a danger to themselves and others (In my opinion). " 'We have tried helicopter, unmarked cars, plainclothes officers, everything,' Bergmann says. 'we once wrote 100 citations, and we've called parents from up to 100 miles away to come get their kids. But non of this has an affect. I don't have the man power to send someone out there every night." (Lopez p2 of article). The cities try to stop
racing to protect the citizens, and properties that might get damaged. The lives of the racers is also another important fact that the city does not want to risk. As the officer mention they have called parents and that still does not stop racers.

Last year on the news a Corvette and a Lamborghini were racing in a neighborhood and the two drivers were killed when one collided into a tree and the car was totaled while the other flipped and landed upside down. The footage shown on the television was a horrible sight both cars did not look like what they were supposed to, they both looked like two big piles of crumpled metal. This was here in the Bay Area. Another similar incident in Sacramento that involved street racing also had a tragic ending was: a man was showing off for his girlfriend in a neighborhood ten minutes from my house. The man was driving a Mustang in a twenty-five mile an hour zone going about a hundred miles an hour when he lost control of his car. He suffered minor injuries and an afternoon in the hospital his girlfriend had ended up in a coma and ended up dying. Her family pressed charges against the man and he ended up in prison for manslaughter. The city of Sacramento used this incident for quite a while to try to stop people from racing in the streets. It was successful for about a month, but the racers started up again (News Report, May 2003).

One of the people I interviewed mentioned to that he thinks racing is a dangerous thing to do. He mention that once while racing he hit the side walk curb and felt that a horrible chill down his back. Nothing happened to him, but his car's front axle was damaged. He took a hit in his wallet to fix it and that caused him to stay away from racing for awhile. It seems that the only way these people stop racing is if they get in an
accident or a situation that affects them. "It was during one such early morning hat race that 33-year old Jerry Kithithwee died. Kithithwee was walking across a residential street when three cars approached at roughly 200 km/h in a 50 km/h. he was hit by one of the cars and thrown 80m by the impact. 'he was dead before he hit the ground,' says Davies" (Rendon pg 1 of article). Here is another example of why cities try to stop racer from racing. Sometimes they get reckless and into residential areas were most racers know better than to go race in these areas. All the people I know do not go race anywhere near residential areas nor were they will endanger people, property, and or get attention drawn on them.

A reason cities try to stop street racing is because it is a violation of the law. Street racers usually meet at locations that are not heavily populated out side of cities. Cops go out to these places to make sure people are not speeding and breaking the law. Drugs and other illegal substances are always present in most events that involve cars. Violation of the law is a crime and it is up to the authorities to try to put a stop to it (it is their job). "...says drivers in such situations are 'either charged with trespassing if they don't leave the plaza, or under the Highway Traffic Act if they're on the road. And if they're caught racing by or officers they're not charged with racing-- they're being charged with dangerous operation, which now is a criminal offence. It gives you a criminal record, and you lose your license if convicted" (Rendon pg2 in article). When police officers approach us when we are posting up before we leave the designated racing area we play cool we don't do anything that will get us a ticket. We are also being careful to non of us wants to get in any trouble with the law. The police know what we are doing
at a gas station at 11 at night, but can not do anything because we are not breaking any laws (interview 2-13-03).
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Essay B—Street Racing

“Street Racing” is a lively collection of information, anecdotes, and opinions, with an engaging voice, but it lacks a coherent purpose. One could say that in a sense it does “present the two main views of street racing; [sic] those pro (racer) and those con (authorities),” but these views are not described, contrasted, or orchestrated in any purposeful way. Although information is roughly divided into paragraphs, many paragraphs are developed via a stream-of-consciousness that ends up going in strange directions that sometimes contradict or are irrelevant to the paragraph’s opening assertion. The fourth paragraph, for example, begins by stating that “Money is another reason people go out and risk their lives racing. A race can bring a lot of money to a person if they are good racers.” The paragraph ends up (without explaining the contradiction) by saying, “We keep the bets low like who pays for the drinks for the crew” and “Although there are a few racers who gamble on races most do it for entertainment to have a good time with their friends.” The essay’s lack of coherence and purpose are epitomized by its lack of a conclusion. It just stops. The essay’s prose is locally clear, spirited, and generally accurate (albeit consistently missing crucial commas), but the proof reading is erratic, and the lack of focus makes the style seem more rambling and diffuse than it would appear if the same sentences were part of a systematic discussion of a point. The essay’s quotations are not linked to their surrounding prose, contextualized, or accurately cited. Overall, this essay does not meet Writing 2’s minimal goals for a passing essay; the rating of its overall quality is one.
Essays with a Rating of 2—“Demonstrates satisfactory if at times marginal proficiency”
Pig Tales Essay

In Pig Tales Marie Darrieusseq shows her perspective on contemporary French society through allegory. One of the topics she shows through the narrator's account of turning into a pig is religion. D presents many examples of religion throughout the novel. The fanatic religious protestors who chains himself to the table where the narrator is having an abortion is one example of how religion is shown in the novel. Another example is when the narrator decides to go to mass. Through these encounters the narrator has with religion D presents religion as an opportunistic institution and one that contributes to the ills of society.

After the narrator gets pregnant she decides to have an abortion. At the abortion she finds that there is a protestor who has chained himself to the operating table. With these events D presents the protestor as a symbol of how society today treats pregnancy and abortion. The protestor being chained to the operating table represents how even though our society sexualizes everything, the result of sex, pregnancy, is seen as an inconvenience and religion but at the same time religion takes the opposite stance and says that abortion is not god's way. As in the story, a pregnancy "chains" the man to the woman who he as gotten pregnant. Then to further show how relationships between men and women are in today's society the protestor D has the protestor walk the narrator back to work, but then abandon her. This is a way of showing the attitude toward relationships, sexuality and pregnancy that religion has today.

Later the same religious protestor shows up in the mental institution that the narrator finds herself in. When the patients in the mental hospital run out of food the narrator leads them to eat the bodies of the dead doctors, who have been killed by some unknown force. However,
later when the narrator is secluded in the attic, the religious fanatic protestor leads a group of other patients up to the attic to see if they can eat the narrator. Through this D shows how many people who consider themselves to be religious today only do so as long as it is convenient. She also could be saying how a lot of the religious doctrine today is not dictated by a rational moral agenda, but rather by whatever morals are politically useful to advance the church at the given time. The third time the same character comes up in the story he has acquired a lot of political power.

"Marchepiede was the oen who became Commander of the Faithful. I know, because he's the one who dealt with me afterward. Marchepiede --- no reason why I shouldn't tell you now --- was the raving lunatic from the day of my abortion, the weirdo I rescued from the asylum and all, so you can see the sort of people we have for leaders" (113).

With this D is trying to show that with the opportunistic agenda of the church they are able to achieve a lot of power in society today, but they are not necessarily doing what is best for society, as none of the public figures in the novel are.

Not only does the church try to use politics to gain power in Pig Tales, but politicians use the church to make themselves more credible with the public, much like political leaders in America do. "Now go home, my brothers, prepare yourselves spiritually for the coming Third Millennium, and pray that the spirit of the Spiral will wisely inspire our blessed leader," (108) the marabout says at a party held by Edgar. Since most of what any of the political leaders say in Pig Tales is nonsense, D is trying to show that all the talking about God and religion that political leaders do today is just as absurd as the world she creates in the novel.
The world in *Pig Tales* is absurd. D creates this world so she can comment on the absurdity of society. By creating a world where almost everything has a nightmarish quality she is able to compare aspects of that world to our own to give us perspective on just how scary our own has become. When D compares how Edgar uses religion to get people to do what he wants them to, it makes the reader think of American politicians saying that they are doing God's will, or French politicians using religion in the opposite way, to try to make society as secular as possible. One of my friend's parents went to Ohio to campaign for John Kerry in the last election and when she got back she said that the most surprising thing she found was that when she asked people why they were voting for George Bush they would respond by saying they intended on voting for Bush because God told him what to do. This kind of firm belief in the link between God and our political leaders is in much scarier than the blind willingness the narrator in *Pig Tales* shows. In some ways the society described in *Pig Tales* does not seem that different from a society that America could become very quickly.
Essay C—Pig Tales Essay

“Pig Tales Essay” follows the format of the five-paragraph essay, exhibiting both the strengths and limitations that this structure so often invites. The essay establishes a clear purpose at the outset: “to show that the novel ‘presents religion as an opportunistic institution . . . that contributes to the ills of society.’” The writer dutifully carries out this purpose in the three body paragraphs that follow, providing concrete textual examples and brief explanations as to what the examples mean, yet rarely developing the analysis beyond the barest minimum. Thus, although the second paragraph explores a scene from the novel in thoughtful detail, the third and fourth paragraphs limit themselves to one- or two-sentence observations that are not elaborated upon. Paragraph three, for example, begins by describing – at some length – an episode involving a group of people who are led by two different characters to engage in two very different actions. Although the scenario is suggestive, the interpretation that follows is limited to a single comment: “Through this D shows how many people who consider themselves to be religious today only do so as long as it is convenient.” The next sentence offers an alternative (one-sentence) interpretation (“She also could be saying . . .”), but neither point is explored further. On balance, the essay contains too much summary and quoted material in relation to its development of thought. Moreover, two of the three supporting paragraphs plunge directly into summary, following a pattern of summary-comment or summary-quotation-comment rather than beginning with insights or comments that frame the paragraph’s purpose and provide context for the reader. This simplistic approach underscores the essay’s superficial development and lack of analytical complexity. Despite these drawbacks, however, the writing is more than satisfactory on the sentence level, with only minor lapses in editing; the citations are also acceptable. Overall, this essay meets Writing 2’s minimum goals for a passing essay; the rating of its overall quality is two.
Is Our Homeland Security Program Working?

American citizens do not feel secure in their homeland anymore and they are always in constant alert. Due to this national insecurity our government created a new homeland defense agency. Until today we do not know for sure if it is worth to spend billions of dollars in a new homeland security plan that does not have a good structure and a qualified leader. William Finnegan, the author of “The talk of the Town” in the February 7th New Yorker argues that the new homeland security plan is "gawky and formless." (29) He also mentions that other observers agree with him and they see the new agency as "a dinosaur-big body, small brain" (29). It is clear that the new agency is big and very expensive, but it is not well structured. Finnegan supports his argument by saying "fifteen of the qualified people that were asked to became its intelligence chief turned down the job" (29). If fifteen qualified people had turn down the job it must be for a good reason. It seems that they do not want to be in charge of a big national security plan that does not have a clear purpose or a defined structure.

With all these negative aspects of the homeland security plan how do you think Americans will feel? Bush's administration has not done a well job in organizing this new homeland agency. A good example of this is the lack of a qualified leader. Micheal Chertoff is a good prosecutor but he does not have the necessary background to lead our homeland security agency. If we are investing billions of dollars to run this new homeland security program we should at least have a qualified leader that has the experience in dealing with homeland security programs. With this background knowledge it will make us feel secure and protected against possible future terrorist attacks. We should also take into account the funds that are cutting from other national programs that need this money to improve Americans' lives. The lack of coordination, a disqualified leader, the cut on funds from national priorities and the unattended "cyberwarfare" are only a few examples that show how the new homeland defense program is not what Americans need.
Today four years after the September 11th terrorist attacks, we continue facing constant alerts and we still fear and feel insecure to take an airplane across the nation. Therefore our government has focused the last four years in the creation of a new homeland security agency. The plan consists of protecting our nation from possible nuclear weapons, plane hijackers, chemical substances, and "cyberwarfare." But it seems that the government has not accomplished its goal to provide a safer environment for its citizens. Due to the fact that its new plan, it is not well organized and there is a lot of miss coordination between domestic intelligence agencies. Finnegan shows how miss coordination can affect our national security. He explains how the FBI and CIA did not share relevant information and they allowed the September 11th attacks to happen. One example that he uses to support his argument is showing how "two of the hijackers had been on a CIA watch list that wasn't shared in time with other agencies" and US officials were not able to stop them (29). If the two major intelligence agencies in the United States had shared information on their suspicious about the coming events, maybe they could had prevent them.

Some of the major weak points of the new homeland defense agency are the following. First Finnegan points out that the new homeland agency does not have a capable leader to lead the new program. He argues that Micheal Chertoff is a brilliant prosecutor but his "main experience on national-security issues come in the Ashcroft Justice Department, where he headed the criminal division for two tears." (30) Taking into account that Chertoff does not have the experience in working with the national security program. I will say that he is not our best bet to run this expensive program. Instead we should look for someone that has previously worked with the national homeland security program and that knows what our country needs in order to be protected against a possible terrorist attack. And not lie Bernard Kerik, ex-leader of the homeland security program that was nominated for political reasons and not for his ability to lead the program. This is not the way that it should be, because we are not giving the position to a person that is well prepared for the task.

Secondly, Finnegan argues that the administration of the new national security program it is not confident enough on the steps that are taking to improve our national security plan. According to the article "Presidential Power" on the CQ Researcher by
Ariel Bettelheim the administration shows its insecurity by "expending resources to prevent the release of information about detainees" (2). He argues that if the Justice Department's investigation would be comfortable enough it will open the department's actions to the public (2). If the Justice Department is not doing the detainees on public then it means that it is not confident enough on the actions that it is taking. Therefore we can see that these new homeland security agency needs to improve a lot if it wants Americans' citizens to feel secure in their homeland.

The author Martin Kady II agrees with Finnegan that coordination is the key point that the new homeland security agency is missing. He points out in the CQ Research article "Two years after 9/11, are we safe?" that one of the reasons on the failure of this homeland security plan is due to the "government struggle to coordinate information among independent law enforcement and intelligence agencies" (1). If the government is not able to coordinate its own plan, than who is going to be able to do it? Kady takes it a step further than Finnegan. He thinks that miss coordination makes our country more vulnerable to terrorist attacks. Kady uses the example of US "cyberwarfare" vulnerability to argue that the lack of coordination leaves out many "critical areas where we need to improve" to make us feel secure in our homeland (12). By leaving out many critical areas, such as "cyberwarfare" as Kady mentioned, our government is leaving our country vulnerable to any terrorist attacks that can be conducted through these remaining weak areas. By following these steps, we could have built on our country's weaknesses, such as national security agencies' coordination, national homeland defense, and we could also had defined our national priorities.

The authors of the article "A Skeptical Look at September 11th., from the book Science and Natural Writing agree with Finnegan's ideas since they believe that "Homeland Security Mania" is not helping our country to be secure. Chapman and Harris point out "that our government has left out many national priorities that also need our attention" (22). Some of these national priorities that they point out are: education, homicide, and influenza. Chapman and Harris believed that we should be "concern [ed] for the 15,000 Americans who die annually by homicide" and for the people that are going to die of influenza that could be "prevented if susceptible people were vaccinated" (22). But due to the new homeland security program these social programs have received
cut on their annual funds, and they cannot continue providing their services. Chapman and Harries do not believe that this trade-off is worth it, because American citizens do not seem to feel more secure than they did a year ago. I believe Finnegan will support Harris and Chapman's ideas because we are taking funds away from social programs that can help prevent many Americans' deaths in order to give more funds to programs that are not giving us visual results.

The writer of Crypto-Grams Essays on national security, Bruce Schnerien disagrees with Finnegan since Schnerien believes the lack of coordination of the new homeland security program does not affect our nation's security. In fact, he believes that this program has increased our homeland defense. Schnerie also disagrees with Chapman and Harris' ideas about our national priorities. According to his book Beyond Fear, he argues "security, when it is working, is often invisible for those being protected" (6). He believes that it is very hard to see something that is working well than to see something that it is not working at all. Schneier, however, does not show us how our security has improved in the last four years. Schneier goes on explaining how we have to pay a price in order to protect ourselves. He uses the example of the "inconvenience of carrying and using a key in exchange for some security against burglary." (7) I agree that sometimes we have to make a trade-off between the things that we want, but also we have to be aware of what are we giving up. I do not think that our national security has improved with a program that has spent four years trying to find someone that will like to be in charge of this program. On the other hand we have to be aware of what national priorities we are trading-off because we cannot forget that they are many different issues that in our society need our attention. Although our nation's security is working in an invisible way it is not a justification for neglecting other national social priorities.

The historian Maxwell, like Bruce Schnerie, disagrees with Finnegan's ideas and tells us that America was going to be vulnerable in the near future. Therefore Schnerie does not believe that lack of coordination of the new homeland security agency is affecting our homeland security. Maxwell argues in his book Terrorism that the Commission on National Security was already forecasting American's vulnerability and they also thought that our country was going to "become increasingly vulnerable to hostile attack on our homeland, and our military superiority [was] not [going to] entirely
protect us" (281). One of Maxwell's floating argument in the forecasting of US vulnerability it is that does not tell us what could we have been done in order to prevent this military vulnerability. If the Commission on National Security was already forecasting these events why did not our government do anything about it? It seems to me that our government did not take experts' advices seriously and therefore they did not do anything against a possible terrorist attack.

The author Patrick Marshall shows in his article "How vulnerable is the US to cyberwarfare?" how the United States' government is not paying enough attention to cyberwarfare. Marshall argues, "the measures taken so far are inadequate" to protect US "cybersecurity" (1). As a tool, he uses an example of a British man who "was indicted for hacking into 92 federal computers networks, including those used by the American military." (2) Through out this example we can see that cyber security has not improved by much during the last four years. One reason is the lack of interest in cyberwarfare, since some experts believe that terrorists will not use computer networking to attack the US. Instead they believe that terroist will hit Unites States' ground to cause panic among its citizens. However, Finnegan and Marshall believe that the United States is not doing everything that it can be to prepare the country for another possible terrorist attack of this kind. Finnegan compares the United States' preparation with France's preparation for the "Phony War." He points out that while France and British were neglecting some national priorities because they thought that they could not hurt them, it was what hurt them the most. Similarity the United States is ignoring "cyberwarare" to focus in other areas, but we should not forget that it could be what it can hurt us the most. Finnegann illustrates this example by telling us how "France and British did not seriously prepare, when they had the time, for the new style of blitzkrieg warfare that Hitler had introduced in Eastern Europe. By May 1940, when he invaded France, it was too late."(30) The Unites States is going through that same situation and right now it has the time to prepare its self against "cyberwarfare," but it is not taking it seriously. I hope we do not regret spending our energy on finding the new homeland security leader; instead we could have putted some energy to preparing our selves for a "cyberwarefare."

How can we expect American citizens to feel more secure if we have many areas in our homeland security that need to be improved? First we have a new plan that it is not
well coordinated and it does not even have a qualified leader to be the head our homeland security. If the leader is not capable enough to administrate the new homeland security program, then what can we expect from this program?. We cannot feel secure with a program that it is like "a dinosaur-big body, small brain" and that it is not helping us at all (29). I agree with Finnegan that coordination is the most important part of an organization and that without it there is hardly anything that can be accomplished. Our government needs to realize this situation and do something about it. They are only two options for this program in the future. It can either really protect us against possible terrorist attacks or it can cut its funds. We cannot continue going with a situation that it is harming our country’s priorities.


Essay D—Is Our Homeland Security Program Working?

Although this essay exhibits numerous sentence-level problems, its clarity of purpose and thoughtful engagement with the authors adequately compensate for its weaknesses. Through an examination and comparison of several sources, the writer of the essay argues that the new homeland security program administered by our government is not benefiting Americans. Unlike many student writers who are asked to compare and analyze a number of texts, this writer actually discusses the similarities and differences among the various authors rather than simply summarizing the material in separate chunks. Comparing Finnegan with Harris and Chapman in the seventh paragraph, for example, the writer asserts “I believe Finnegan will [sic] support Harris and Chapman’s ideas because we are taking funds away from social programs that can help prevent many Americans’ deaths in order to give more funds to programs that are not giving us visual results.” More importantly, he or she understands the material and makes some insightful observations. Additionally, the writer focuses each paragraph on a specific idea or author while at the same time tracking a coherent group of key ideas throughout the essay, creating a comprehensible essay structure and maintaining a complex line of reasoning. Matters such as the lack of a skilled program leader, the problem of faulty coordination within the program, and the question of whether the U.S. is safer now than it was at the time of the 9/11 attacks are all points that the essay pursues in support of its larger purpose. Keeping this larger purpose in mind, moreover, the writer provides specific examples that lend further weight to the essay’s claims. Rather than simply agreeing with Finnegan that the Bush administration is insecure about its stand on the treatment of detainees, for instance, the essay brings in an article by Bettelheim to further corroborate Finnegan’s point (fifth paragraph). Unfortunately, the essay’s substantial strengths are undercut by a number of editing errors, many of which are typical for English Language Learners. Problems with verb tenses (“we could have putted”), prepositions (“one of the reasons on the failure”), and general language use (“Bush’s administration has not done a well job”) are prominent—as are spelling and proofreading errors (“miss coordination”). While the editing is faulty, however, the complex analysis and general coherence place this essay in the passing category. Overall, then, this essay meets Writing 2’s minimum goals for a passing essay; the rating of its overall quality is two.
COINTELPRO In The 60's

Once World War II finally ended, America found itself in the most favorable position it could have possibly asked for. The most devastating war the world had ever seen, caused an unimaginable amount of damage across the continents of Europe and Asia. Entire cities were completely destroyed, and for years following the war, most countries in the affected regions spent a considerable amount of their time and money, simply rebuilding what they had before the fighting had begun. The United States was a completely different story. Although it was a major force during the war, it failed to have a single bomb dropped on its soil, with the exception of Pearl Harbor on the territory of Hawaii. Not having to spend any tax money rebuilding its cities, along with the large amount of currency it lent other desperate nations, caused the U.S. dollar to increase in value, thus pushing the U.S. into a time of amazing prosperity. All across the country, in many different aspects, the affects of winning World War II could be seen. For example, the GI bill allowed veterans to return home with the chance of getting a college education, a privilege that many young men never thought imaginable. However, underneath the
surface there were an abundance of serious societal issues that were waiting to erupt.

Racial segregation was still very common, and more and more African Americans found themselves getting active in reversing the situation. This was also the time of the red scare, as the world found itself being drawn into two distinct sections, communist and non-communist. This fear of communism encapsulating the world caused a large amount of powerful U.S. politicians to end up committing a large amount of completely senseless, and in some cases illegal acts. These acts can first be seen with the advent of McCarthyism. Although McCarthyism is a very broad term that involves the eradication of many different beliefs, it is most known for its attacks on alleged communists. Beginning with the actual Senator Joseph McCarthy stating he was completely positive there were numerous communists working inside the U.S. government, it did not take long for the ignorant and illegal disease of McCarthyism to spread to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, otherwise known as the FBI. COINTELPRO- Communist Party, USA, as it was referred to within the Bureau, began on August 28, 1956. ¹ It constituted a tactical break from earlier programs,² as it was primarily designed to go after the infrastructure of the issue, rather than simply the law breakers. It also showed a change of techniques used by FBI agents, as shown below.

"For the next several years, FBI activities against the Communist Party and other radical elements included wiretapping and bugging meeting

² Cunningham, "There's Something Happening Here," pg 27.
sites, sending letters and making phone calls anonymously, planting false
evidence, and engaging in evidence-gathering burglaries."  

With this advent and following success of the U.S. governments first
COINTELPRO operation, a new era was born. During the next 15 years, the FBI found
itself committing numerous acts of counterintelligence, a complete reversal of their initial
objective. The FBI was founded as an organization whose sole purpose was to be a means
of specific *intelligence* for the U.S. government. Initially used to catch fraudulent
bankers, by no means was it the FBI's job to get involved in any issue more than it
needed to be. This all changed however, as after 1956, the FBI, an organization funded
by the people of the United States, began perpetrating atrocious and sometimes even
childish acts against citizens from every walk of life in America. From placing agents
inside the Ku Klux Klan, to sending a letter to Martin Luther King Jr. trying to convince
him to commit suicide, the FBI's COINTELPRO operations were an incredibly illegal
method of trying to keep the United States completely unified, without any chance of
internal collapse. In the following research paper, the FBI's COINTELPRO operations
will be examined by specifically looking at how the White and Black power organizations
of the 1960's were affected by these actions. Not only will I present the specific
techniques used by the FBI, but I will also assess the validity and success of both
COINTELPRO operations.

---

3 Cunningham, "There's Something Happening Here," pg 25.
4 Cunningham, "There's Something Happening Here," pg 15.
White Power COINTELPRO

When looking back at the COINTELPRO operations, it is easy to simply assume that the FBI was only targeting three distinct groups: civil rights activists, political dissenters, and the new left. Although this statement is partly true, there was another group that emerged on the radar screen of the FBI. The Ku Klux Klan, and other white power organizations were early targets of the FBI, as they produced an obvious threat to the citizens of the United States. During the first 40 months of the 1960's, there were seventy-seven reported bombings that could be traced back to the Klan, and one example of kidnapping that shocked the nation. In 1964, three civil rights workers, two of which were white, were abducted by the "White Knights" of the Klan. This act was all it took, before the FBI decided to start using COINTELPRO operations against the White Hate groups of the south. Starting on September 2nd, 1964, "the White Hate COINTELPRO" systematically destroyed the main Klan organizations through careful infiltration and well placed letters.

"One very popular technique involved sending anonymous and fictitious materials to Klan members." This technique proved very useful in disrupting Klan activities, as it showed the members that their names and activities were not as covert as they thought.

---
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During this period of rebirth for the Klan, more than ever, members wanted to keep themselves out of the public eye. Being a part of the Klan in most states was not about glory, but instead it was purely about suppressing racial desegregation in the south. The FBI realized this and took full advantage. By infiltrating even the smallest of Klan "lodges", members of the COINTELPRO team would steal mailing lists, and other personal information. 8 Using these lists, FBI agents would personally write and distribute letters that would find their way into the hands of unsuspecting Klansmen. The initial letters were meant to directly target the Klansmen's fear of being found out, as they were simple postcards with quotes such as, "Klansman, trying to hid behind your sheets? You received this and someone knows who you are!" 9 Even these initial letters showed a definite decline in Klan membership.

For four years, the White Hate COINTELPRO grew, and the actual Klan diminished. Although different tactics were used to discourage Klan members from continuing with their organization, the main approach was still the common letter. The operations spared no personal feelings, as with one example, a letter was sent to the Grand Dragon's (head of the Ku Klux Klan) wife, claiming that her husband had committed acts of adultery. 10 By doing this, the FBI hoped to distract the Grand Dragon from his daily duties, and perhaps even discredit the Klan as a whole. These tactics, although childish in nature, worked very well as the Klan decreased in number from

8 Davis, "Spying on America,"
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14,000 members in 1964 to just 4,300 members in 1971. \(^{11}\) In its peak, White Hate COINTELPRO informants constituted 15% of the entire Klan population. \(^ {12} \) White Hate COINTELPRO was a complete success in the sense that it demolished the Klan, and it opened the door for other operations against different targets of the FBI.

**Black Nationalist COINTELPRO**

The second half of the 1960's represented a time of urban revolt in every part of the world. America was no exception, as almost every major city experienced a riot during this time period. It took the exceptionally violent year of 1967, for the FBI to realize they needed to take some kind of action to prevent further unrest. "By September (of 1967), racial violence had erupted in sixty-seven cities. Thirty-two people had been killed and 3,200 were injured. Property damage exceeded $100 million." \(^ {13} \) The FBI had public pressure to make some sort of change, and in August of the same year, Hoover decided that change should be a new set of COINTELPRO operations. Initially these COINTELPRO operations were put in place to monitor the inner cities in a sense. Agents working for the bureau would be placed in troublesome areas, in order to sniff out future riots. These actions by COINTELPRO agents were the most moral procedures they attempted, as it was purely reconnaissance for the protection of the people in inner city.

---
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areas. However, it did not take long for this section of COINTELPRO to take an inappropriate shift towards targeting specific parties inside these places. For five years, the FBI set its counterintelligence force against a few select black nationalist groups, in hopes of preventing a severe uprising by disenfranchised African Americans. Known as "Black Nationalist COINTELPRO", its main target was the infamous Black Panther Party of the 1960's.

The Black Panther Party arose from the streets of Oakland with a noble goal. They wanted to protect themselves and their fellow African Americans against the oppressive police officers that ruled their neighborhoods streets. Legally arming themselves with guns, and an amazing knowledge of constitutional law, these black militants struck fear in the white community. They were so intimidating in fact, that in September of 1968, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover described the Panthers as "The greatest threat to the internal security of the country." 14

With this in mind, Hoover and the FBI set out to systematically destroy the Panthers, through a distinctly original set of counterintelligence tactics. Originating in San Diego, COINTELPRO agents decided the best approach was to turn violence prone organizations against the Panthers in an effort to aggravate gang warfare that would lead

---

to possible arrests and even deaths of Panther members.\textsuperscript{15} Specifically in San Diego, agents of the bureau decided to inflame relations between the Black Panthers and the United Slaves (US) Incorporated, another black power organization.\textsuperscript{16} The two organizations were already enemies, so the FBI figured it would only take a few inflammatory actions to bring the sides to violence. In February of 1969, the San Diego field office sent the first of many cartoons, depicting a "Panther member hanging from a tree and two smiling US members looking on."\textsuperscript{17} "The Panther members that received the cartoon were outraged, as they were indeed fooled into thinking that the mailings were coming from the United Slaves."\textsuperscript{18} Similar cartoons were sent to United Slaves members, and the two organizations did respond with violence toward one another. Members from both sides were killed, and many were wounded. The violence not only caused a number of deaths for the Panthers, but it also fueled tension from within the group.

Cartoons were not the only means of causing mistrust within the Panthers, as the FBI also committed more personal attacks, as it did with the Klan. All across the country, the FBI sent letters to the wives of Black Panther leaders claiming they had been unfaithful. This technique of planting false accusations on otherwise reputable people did not cease with Black Panther members. Wealthy supporters of the Panthers were also targeted, as was the case with Hollywood actress Jean Seberg. As stated in the following\textsuperscript{15,16,17,18}

\textsuperscript{15} Wolf, "COINTELPRO"
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excerpt from a COINTELPRO memo, the FBI left nothing untouched during their reign of morally cruel actions. "Jean Seberg has been a financial supporter of the BPP and should be neutralized. Her current pregnancy by (name deleted) while still married affords an opportunity for such effort."19 The FBI took this information and had an article written about Seberg in a Sunday edition of the Los Angeles Times. The article makes numerous references to her being impregnated by a Black Panther, instead of her husband. The effect on the actress was traumatic, as immediately after the article was printed she went into labor. 20 The birth was not successful, and just three days later, the baby died. Rumors swirled everywhere, and the actress was completely devastated. Just over a year later, her husband committed suicide, thus completing the overall destruction of her life. This example shows that the FBI was especially inhuman with its use of COINTELPRO operations. Agents played the situation as if it were a game, not taking the time to realize they were dealing with actual human beings. Overall the COINTELPRO operations against the Black Panthers could be considered a success through the eyes of the FBI, as the party was neutralized. In less than five years, the BPP was almost completely under wraps, as all of the key members were either dead or in prison.

The 60's was a time of mass confusion for the United States. Important issues that were previously unimportant to the average American, were emerging from everywhere. Right in the middle of all this was the ever-controversial issue of civil rights. After
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centuries of slavery, Jim Crow laws, and other forms of oppression, African Americans were finally finding a louder and much more clear voice. A new era was on the verge of happening, and the FBI was not sure which way it was headed. It must have been a concerning fact that the middle of the decade brought about a large number of riots. Often stemming from police brutality against African Americans, there was a definite fear that these riots would lead to the attempted destruction of law and order in at least a few major cities. The rebirth of the Klan was not helping anything, as all they did was breed more hatred and violence toward not only the white man, but institutions of order as well. So with these fears in mind, the FBI decided to step in and insure the stability of the United States. By instituting counterintelligence programs such as COINTELPRO, the FBI forgot about the moral rights of its own citizens in order to protect the greater good of the country. Although the country remained stable during the 60's, with no major political overthrows or extreme systematic changes, it is still hard to consider COINTELPRO a complete success; as it is unknown what the Black Panthers or other Black Nationalist groups could have completed if the FBI had not interfered.
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Essay E—COINTELPRO In The 60’s

While “COINTELPRO In The 60’s” succeeds on many levels, it fails to use others’ ideas effectively or provide much independent analysis. Thus, for example, it establishes a coherent purpose: to examine and assess the FBI’s illegal and unethical practices against White supremacist and Black nationalist organizations of the 1960s that were deemed a threat to national security. On the sentence level, moreover, it demonstrates competent editing skills and employs an effective prose style. The essay also is adept at gathering ideas culled from various sources, integrating those ideas into a comprehensible whole, and explaining the context of the issues under discussion. Yet despite these strengths, the analysis is minimal. The writer specifically claims that he or she will “assess the validity and success of both COINTELPRO operations” but, rather than assessment, offers mostly summary and description. While the summarized material is interesting – we learn, for example, about the FBI’s tactics in creating dissension in the private lives of Ku Klux Klan and Black Panther members – the writer doesn’t venture far beyond a simple presentation of factual information. Exacerbating this problem, moreover, is a failure to adequately document the ideas of others or to distinguish between others’ ideas and the writer’s own views. On those rare occasions when an evaluative or analytical comment is made, it is unclear whether this is the surmise of the essay writer or of one of the sources. In the first paragraph of the “Black Nationalist COINTELPRO” section, for example, the sole analytical comment in the paragraph is embedded among numerous (undocumented) descriptive details about FBI activities. After outlining some of these activities, the writer states, “These actions by COINTELPRO agents were the most moral procedures they attempted, as it was purely reconnaissance for the protection of the people in inner city areas.” Although this comment might be the conclusion of the writer, it is impossible to tell because there are no indicators. The lack of adequate documentation further confuses the issue. While footnote 13 – the paragraph’s only citation—identifies the speaker of a quotation, there is no clue as to whether the entire paragraph is taken from this source or not. Overall, then, this essay meets, but does not exceed, Writing 2’s minimum goals for a passing paper; the overall rating is 2.
Essays with a Rating of 3—“Demonstrates clear competency”
The battle between comic authors, publishers and the American public has been an ongoing controversy since as early as the 1940s and has mostly remained silent to the rest of the world. This battle began almost as soon as comics entered the public eye. There are those who believe there should be a limit to what can be written or published in comic books. The limit that many speak of is known as censorship. There are others who believe by censoring comics, their freedom of speech is being trampled on. I believe that the censorship of comics is not the right answer to the controversy at hand. Recently comics have acquired a rating system, much like that of the present day movies, which I believe is sufficient and works well for all who find themselves in the midst of this comic book controversy.

As early as 1945, comics have undergone severe scrutiny, mainly because of their controversial content. In the mid 1940s, Dr. Fredric Wertham believed comics led to the delinquency of children. He thought that delinquency was on the climb during this time because the latest popular genre in comics dealt with crime (Baker). Dr. Wertham alleged that children were spending far too much time reading comics because there was a lack of parental supervision, which was due to the World War II (Bailey 64-65). Dr. Wertham believed these popular crime comics were portraying crime in an attractive light to children, thus causing them to want to reenact the crimes and stories they read about.
crime comics were not the only issue. Dr. Wertham believed “…the adventures of Batman and Robin were a homosexual fantasy involving a minor, that Superman was a poster-boy for Nazism [and] that Wonder Woman was a lesbian sadist” (McWilliams). He believed the fragile minds of children were at stake and comics would be the downfall of any child.

I believe Dr. Wertham went too far in a few of his accusations, especially those of Batman, Superman and Wonder Woman. I agree that some comics in the time of World War II, could have added to the delinquency of children because there was a lack of parental figures and role models. Children who read these comics that depicted crime, especially theft, were probably more apt to rob a convenient store than children who did not read such comics. Dr. Wertham started off on the right foot, trying to clean up the controversial media that children came into contact with. What came next, however, might have a gone a little too far.

Dr. Fredric Wertham argued that “if publishers were unwilling to clean up comic books, the time [had] come to legislate these books off the newsstands and out of the candy stores" (Bailey 65). Through many published articles and books that dealt with the correlation between child delinquency and comics, such as "The Betrayal of Childhood: Comic Books" and Seduction of the Innocent, Wertham was able to push legislation to take action (Bailey 65,67). The Senate formed a committee which conducted investigations in order to study this correlation between juvenile delinquency and comics. Three Senate hearings on comic books took place in 1954, and the result led to the formation of the Comic Code Authority (Bailey 68).

The Comic Code Authority, or CCA, made regulations on every aspect of comics, not just on content, but on dialogue, art and even titles. For example, scenes dealing with
sadism, unsavory visuals and extreme gore were prohibited (Daniels). Profanity and vulgarity and any attack of religion were also prohibited. According to the CCA, females were to be drawn realistically, with no emphasis on any physical parts of the body (Daniels). Any sexual relationships which were portrayed or even hinted at were not allowed, as well as titles that mentioned such themes (Daniels). Titles were also prohibited from containing certain words such as horror or terror (Daniels). Twenty-four out of the twenty-nine publishers of crime comics at this time went out of business. In order for a comic artist, author or publisher to survive, they either made their comics more silly and less lucrative, or simply left the business and "..joined the pornography industry to gain greater artistic freedom and better incomes" (McWilliams).

The authors and publishers at this time in history believed that Dr. Fredric Wertham and the Comic Code Authority attacked their personal freedoms and their freedom of speech. Gloria Steinem, creator of Ms. Magazine believed "...Wertham's anti-comics campaign overlooked the positive aspects of comic books," especially Wonder Woman, who many would consider "...to be such a positive role model for young women" (McWilliams). I agree with how the authors and publishers, such as Gloria Steinem, felt at this time. The Code limited everything that could be put into a comic and sold to the public. During a Senate hearing on juvenile delinquency, The EC Comics Publisher William M. Gaines testified, "once you start to censor you must censor everything...you must censor comic books, radio, television, and newspapers" (McWilliams). Yet no one made a leap to censor other forms of media and I believe that this is where the CCA and the legislation acted unfairly.

It did not matter to Wertham or the CCA if comic stories showed that crime did
not pay or that evildoers would be punished (Baker). Comics depicting any sort of crime was seen as controversial material that could manipulate the minds of juveniles, especially those that lacked parental supervision at home. The CCA and Dr. Wetham attacked comics because of all the forms of media at the time, comic books were mostly aimed at children. Children were more likely to read comic books than novels. The CCA worked well for Wertham's dream of the end of the comic book craze and thus the end to child delinquency. However, the CCA did not work well for others and therefore was fought against until its change in 1980.

Unlike the self-censoring rating systems for the movie, television, and video game industries, the Comics Code, for the longest time, made no effort to distinguish content that was appropriate for some age groups but inappropriate for others. In 1980, the CCA decided to change their policies towards the censorship of comics. No longer was certain material prohibited; all material was allowed to be written and published. This change, however, meant that comics were to be published with a rating on the cover, much like that of ratings for movies. For instance, DC Comics, publisher of Superman, has published the Vertigo line of comics, labeled "Suggested for Mature Readers." Another publisher, Marvel Comics, started printing ratings on the covers of their comics as well. For example, a comic with the rating of PSR +, means that no child under the age of 13 can purchase it. The letters PSR stand for Parental Supervision Recommended. A comic with the rating Mature Readers, means that no child under the age of 18 can purchase it. Marvel has also made an entirely new title for their adult comics. According to Marvel, "the MAX titles... look very different from the mainline Marvel books and will not carry a Marvel logo on their covers, they will not be sold in newsstands and they will not be
marketed to young readers.” Although I feel that this rating system works best for the comic industry and should eliminate all problems, there is still much controversy. The controversy now lies in the comic book shops, especially those that sell adult comic material.

I have never been into a comic book store, so before embarking on the journey of writing my paper I found the perfect opportunity to go. I visited the Central Comic Store in Salinas, California to take a look for myself what kind of comics were out on shelves today. I looked around for a while but I could not seem to find any of the adult comics, which still appear to cause quite a bit of controversy due to their content. I finally asked the clerk for some assistance. He asked that I show him my driver's license to be sure that I was over 18. Under the law, in accordance with the CCA, no comic store is to allow anyone under the age of 18 to purchase comics with the rating, Mature Readers. The clerk took me to the back corner of the store where a giant wooden cabinet housed all of the adult material. As I looked through the comics, I found many that I would consider, under my standards, disturbing and definitely not suitable for children.

The first comic I looked at was titled Hothead Paison: Homicidal Lesbian by Diane Dimassa. This comic depicts a lesbian woman killing homophobes, racists and men who abuse women. The main character also tortures her victims by cutting of their genitalia. There is much graphic violence and explicit sexual content in this comic. The second comic I looked at was titled The Wang: The Big One by Stan Yan. The plot of this comic contained pseudo-incestual lesbianism along with light-saber battles using sexual devices. I found the content of both comics alarming, especially when I thought of the children today, as well as the future children I hope to raise, reading this material. I would want my
children to grow up believing that promiscuous sexual activity is not the right path to take.

I believe if a child was to read material that shows explicit and promiscuous sexual behavior, they would become confused about how they are to act in a relationship as they become adults. More times than not, children and adolescents that are exposed to sexual content early in life, whether it be in comics or elsewhere in the media, are more likely to jump into a sexual relationship a lot sooner than their peers. There were many other comics that were mainly filled with sexual content and nudity. One simply had to look at the title to understand what the comic entailed. Some of the titles included Vivid Girls and Latex Alice.

I also found many comics that dealt with extreme violence. The Losers: Ante Up by Ande Piggie could be summed up into "guns, guile and a whole lot of guts" (Zupko). Nicola A Menzie states in her article, on the website Popmatters.com, that "it's difficult to decide whether 'The Losers' is about...revenge or justice." This statement made by Nicola A Menzie is very important because it shows that even adults can be confused about the content of some of these adult comics. Just imagine if a young child or adolescent were to read this comic. They might not be able to tell the difference whether the plot of extreme violence and rage would be considered revenge or justice. If a child was to perceive the acts of the characters in this comic as justice, then they might be more likely to act in an extremely violent way to others who they feel have wronged them. I agree with Dr. Fredric Wertham that this kind of material could lead a child into delinquency, especially because the children usually do not have the maturity level to deal with such adult and explicit content. Children who are exposed to violence or sexual content early in life, might be more likely to mimic the same behavior sooner and more
seriously than usual.

Overall I had a wonderful first visit to the Central Comic Shop because I found so much information that I had never known previously. Before leaving, I engaged in a quick interview with the clerk, who asked that his identity remain anonymous. He told me that most people that come into the comic shop these days are older men in their 30s. This agrees with a recent Gallup poll showing most comic readers, 70% to be exact, are adults far more than 18 years of age (McWilliams). The clerk believes that comics play no role in corrupting the fragile minds of children. The clerk stated that most kids these days are more interested in video games or Magic cards. I asked if many of the adult comics found their way into the hands of children and young adolescents. He told me that most of the time, even adult comics. The clerk went on to say that if a parent came in with their child and made it clear that they were purchasing an adult comic for their child, then he would still sell to them, since the one purchasing is over 18. At first I believed that selling adult comics to an adult that would then distribute them to children would be illegal. After further thought however, this scenario is just the same as a parent purchasing a rated R movie for their underage child. I believe that parents should take a closer look as to what they are handing to their children. I feel it is wrong to buy a child or adolescent an adult comic or a R rated movie, especially if there will be no supervision when they engage in the material.

Although the clerk at the Central Comic Shop in Salinas, California is getting away with basically selling adult comics to minors, there have been many crackdowns in certain regions of the U.S. All states can create regulations to restrict children's access to indecent material, if those restrictions do not burden access for adults. Some states require
that sexually indecent comics be places on-high shelves or behind counters in stores (McWilliams). A Connecticut law states that publishers of any adult comics must "...print their names and addresses in all their comics" (McWilliams). This would help any parent who finds adult comics in the hand of their children and would like to complain or give their opinion to the company. A California law makes it illegal for"...magazine distributors to require a bookstore to purchase [adult comics] as a condition for the sale or consignment of other magazines or publications" (McWilliams). This law helps comic shop owners, who do not want to sell adult comics, from being made to do so. Just because the comic shop distributes certain comics from a publisher, does not mean that they have to distribute other material they do not want to from the same publisher. This law in a way is indirectly cutting back on the adult material that is sold in stores and thus cutting back on the amount of children getting a hold of adult comics. There are also a lot people that get in trouble for disobeying the laws of their state. In El Cajun, California, a comic store owner, Timothy Parks, was arrested and convicted for selling adult comics to a 17 year old minor. In Chino Hills, California, Carlos Tortora lost his business license for selling an adult comic, "Faust," to a minor (Siano).

I believe it is important to have laws against the sale of adult material to minors. There is a reason certain comics are given the rating, Mature Readers. These comics, along with alcohol, tobacco and pornography, should not to be allowed to fall into the hands of minors. As much as children like to believe they are mature enough to handle anything, in reality most are not and most will not understand until they are adults themselves. I agree with laws that require adult material to be put on high shelves, behind counters or even in cabinets, such as it was at The Central Comic Shop. This would
prohibit minors from getting a hold of such materials that they could possibly shoplift, since they would not be allowed to purchase it anyway. Clerks would be able to keep an eye on what children were looking at since they would know exactly what parts of their store contain the adult material.

Comics have undergone much difficulty yet have come a long way since they were put into wide circulation more than three quarters of a century ago. First came Dr. Fredric Wertham and the Comic Code Authority, next came state laws and supreme court rulings, and finally the ever impressive rating system. I do believe that the censorship imposed by the Comic Code Authority inhibited the freedoms and First Amendment rights of authors and publishers at that time. This was a very unfortunate time for comics and their creators and I deeply pity those that had to endure the extreme censorship. I am glad to see that times have changed and so has the CCA and censorship. The content of comics should not be limited, but I do believe it should be rated. I believe the graphic violent and sexual nature of some comics could manipulate the minds of the youth that are not yet mature enough to handle such material. When discussing the possible delinquent problems associated with crime comics, the Supreme Court said it best when it stated, "...what is one man's amusement, teaches another's doctrine" (McWilliams). We do not want to teach the youth of the world today that explicit sex and violence is the right way to experience life. Thus we must agree together as a nation, as authors and publishers, that to rate a comic is not to censor it, but to sell it to an audience that is suitable to handle it.
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Essay F—The Censorship of the Past Versus The Rating System of the Present

“The Censorship of the Past Versus The Rating System of the Present” demonstrates competency in a number of ways. It establishes and sustains its purpose about the problematics of censoring comics and offers a relevant historical overview in support of its thesis in paragraph one that “Recently comics have acquired a rating system, much like that of the present day movies, which I believe is sufficient and works well for all who find themselves in the midst of this comic book controversy.” The transition to personal narration beginning in paragraph nine may strike readers as somewhat abrupt and elementary, even if engaging; and the student’s moral tone may not be fully persuasive: “Children who are exposed to violence or sexual content early in life might be more likely to mimic the same behavior sooner and more seriously than usual.” Nonetheless, the essay is for the most part controlled in its conceptual ambitions; and its correctio in the final paragraph is clear—perhaps pithy: “to rate a comic is not to censor it, but to sell it to an audience that is suitable to handle it.”

Most of the essay’s points exhibit a fair amount of rhetorical sophistication and syntactic variety, though paragraph two is an example of less capable stylistic execution: a 4 essay might not betray such unimpressive repetition (four infelicitous declarative sentences, such as “Dr. Wertham believed”). While some sources are omitted or incorrectly cited (e.g., Marvel, Menzie, Yan), Essay F is otherwise representative of “3” research in its range of sources and generally thoughtful integration and analysis of information and ideas (as in paragraph six).
Surfrider Foundation

What is wrong with our oceans and beaches? Every winter the beaches are closed due to bacteria, littered with trash, and unsafe to visit. Every year a new undeveloped stretch of coastline, home to many endangered animals and point of leisure to many people, is bulldozed to make way for a new hotel, golf course, or development. These coastlines then become off limits to the general public and are added to the list of beaches that will get contaminated from these developments during the winter months. With all this going on the future of our beaches looks pretty grim. Will there be any empty space left for the next generation of outdoor lovers to roam freely in? Yes, there is hope; the hope comes from people like you and me who can get involved and find solutions. People can get involved in many ways; they can write to their Congress people, they can simply pick up some trash at the beach, or they can support or join an organization. One of these organizations is the Surfrider Foundation. Surfrider has been working to solve all of these coastal problems and many more with the help and support of ordinary people. The Foundation gets involved in local, regional, and national issues through an extensive network of local chapters, all of which are tied to the parent organization. Surfrider has been able to fight for and succeed in many key issues over the years including: reducing the bacteria and pollution that is dumped onto our beaches and into our rivers, keeping open and re-opening beaches that get closed to the public, conserving undeveloped areas of our coast, and much, much, more.

The Surfrider Foundation is a grass-roots environmental organization. Surfrider was formed in the coastal community of Malibu, and since its inception in 1984 it has
been a very large force in protecting our beaches. The Surfrider Foundation is a very unique organization; it promotes protection of the beaches, ocean, and waves through an extensive nation and worldwide network of local chapters (60 chapters and 40,000 members). This enables the Foundation to focus on large issues, such as dealing with national government policies, and at the same time deal with local issues, like beach access. The Foundation is supported and run by members, volunteers, and only a few low paid employees. This makes the organization very diverse; it is made up of “surfers, swimmers, divers, body boarders, kayakers and beach enthusiasts from all walks of life” (Surfrider). Surfrider represents its members and environmental policies through the tactics of “conservation, activism, research, and education” (Surfrider). Surfrider has used these principles to come into schoolrooms and educate children, to battle the US government in the courtrooms, to monitor pollution and bacteria at beaches, and preserve our coasts and beaches. The grass roots organization style of the Surfrider Foundation has proven to be very successful.

To understand an organization like the Surfrider Foundation you must first understand the problems they face. Every winter the beaches close and you can't go in the water unless you want to seriously risk your health and well being or even be fined. Beach closures are a very complex problem; many of the sources run deep into our community's way of life. Some of the sources of pollution are easy to fix; for example, "not your dumping motor oil down storm drains and regularly sweeping streets can greatly reduce the amount of bacteria that runs off to the ocean" (State of Beach). During storms the oil and debris are deposited directly into the ocean and the effects are disastrous. Motor oil contaminates coastlines, kills fish, and disrupts the delicate near-
shore ecosystems (Surfrider). The effects of dirty streets are more complex; the increased amount of organic material and sediments draining into the ocean can dirty the water and actually change its chemical composition. This will damage the near-shore habitat and affect many species of fish, shellfish, and marine mammals (Coast Alert).

These problems can be solved. And organizations like Surfrider have introduced programs to address them. Surfrider has begun an extensive education and activism program aimed to teach people, from children to adults, about ocean problems relating to street sweeping and storm drains. Surfrider comes into communities and paints many of the stencils that you see on top of storm drains. The stencils will read "Don't dump drains to ocean/bay" (Surfrider SC). While this may not seem like a big deal, the stencils do create awareness and help to reduce dumping and pollution. If people know where their waste will end up, they are more likely to deal with it in an environmentally sound manner (Surfrider). Surfrider has also been a key organization in getting cities to adopt more effective street sweeping policies. Surfrider began this effort by conducting scientific research to prove the connection between cleaner streets and cleaner oceans and beaches. They then present their findings to city council meetings. Without an organization like Surfrider around to conduct and present their research to cities, the research would not be done (State of beach). Now many coastal cities have street sweeping programs and subsequently cleaner beaches (Surfrider). While these programs may seem small and unimportant they do produce real results.

Many sources of ocean pollution are much further reaching and more difficult to fix than simply regulating storm drains or sweeping streets. One of the major contributors to general ocean pollution and especially to beach closures is sewage discharge. In
Orange County alone two hundred and forty million gallons of sewage are discharged daily into the ocean just miles from crowded beaches. For every one hundred milliliters of this discharge there are about forty thousand live bacteria, or half a cup of live fecal bacteria (Seawifs). Subsequently Orange County experiences elevated bacteria levels and a huge amount of beach closures during the winter when these treatment plants flood. The bacteria situation in Orange County would not be as bad if all of the sewage was treated according to law. But the treatment process for the sewage is substandard (Coast Alert). In Orange County only half of the sewage will go through secondary treatment and, "The Federal Clean Water Act requires that all municipal wastewater treatment plants use primary treatment (using gravity to separate solids from liquids) and secondary treatment (using special strains of aerobic bacteria to break down the organic waste left after primary treatment) before discharging their water" (Surfrider). The Sewage Treatment system for Orange County had until recently been operating under a special waiver allowing them to be out of compliance with federal law (Surfrider). This would have unless somebody took action on the issue. In this case, it was the Surfrider Foundation.

Surfrider headed up the effort of "Getting the Orange County Sanitation District in California to agree to drop their Clean Water Action Section 301(h)waiver and stop the ocean discharge of 240 million gallons per day of partially treated sewage" (Surfrider). In order to combat the dumping of the partially treated sewage into near-shore coastal waters Surfrider took action. Their local (Orange County) chapter went on a mission to educate people about the problem. This education led many people along with Surfrider itself to contact their sanitation board members, stage protests, and become
active in fighting the renewal of the waiver. When it came time for the waiver to be
renewed it was turned down, and because of this by the year 2012 Orange County will be
in compliance with The Clean Water Act (Surfrider).

Actions like these are monumental victories; they show how a grass-roots
organization can stand up to a powerful and well established government agency.
Without organizations like Surfrider problems like this would be unknown to the general
public and would continue to damage our ecosystem.

Our beaches face many more problems than just pollution. Open stretches of
coastline are quickly disappearing across the globe, and especially in California. Places
that were once public land and open for anybody to visit are being replaced by coastal
developments of all kinds. This is evident by viewing aerial photographs of the California
coast. In the Seventies a program was set up called the California Coastal Records
Project; they flew over the coast and took pictures, which they continue to do (CCRP).
They have documented coastal erosion and development and their data is available online
(CCRP). There are many places that only twenty years ago were open space that are now
completely covered by developments (Haskell's beach, Santa Barbara). These
developments not only limit coastal access but they can erode beaches and destroy
coastal habitats as well (State of Beach). Structures that years ago were set back from
beaches and coastal bluffs are now right on the shoreline. This problem is evident right
here in Santa Cruz. Much of the city was built right along the naturally eroding coastal
bluffs. Houses that were once safe are now threatened by the encroaching waves.
Property owners naturally want to protect their investments. The main way that these
property owners protect their land is to build sea walls. These walls contribute to erosion and make beach access to the public nearly impossible.

Locally the Surfrider Foundation has opposed the building of an experimental sea wall on East Cliff Dr. near Pleasure Point. The Foundation came up with a very detailed report of past sea walls, the impact of the sea wall on the natural environment as well as to beach access, and proposed alternate plans to the wall (Surfrider SC). They presented this report to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) and local advisory boards. The local chapter of the Foundation went about fighting the wall in a very professional manner and was effective in having the sea wall go under further review by the CCC. The decision has yet to have been made about whether or not a new sea wall will be built. But none the less this is a demonstration of how through research, education, and activism potentially harmful projects can be at least held up and reviewed, if not altogether stopped.

Surfrider is not only involved in fighting pollution and protecting coastlines that already have structures on them, but they are heavily involved in protecting empty land. Coastal In California Coastal preservation is a very sensitive and controversial issue. California has a lot of coastal real estate, in many cases worth millions of dollars, and if this land is not protected developers will always try to build on it. We need some sort of protection for this land. This has been the area that the Surfrider Foundation has focused much of its resources on. In Santa Barbara County Surfrider has made a huge effort to buy up unused coastal land and preserve natural habitats. If the Foundation cannot purchase the land themselves then they get active in raising money to buy land. This effort has been very successful. They were able to help raise 3 and a half million dollars to purchase the
former Wilcox Property in Santa Barbara (Surfrider). Surfrider’s preservation efforts are also evident in their mission statement: "The Surfrider Foundation is working proactively to promote conservation and responsible coastal management that avoids creation of coastal hazards" (Surfrider). Without Surfrider many places across the globe would have more coastal developments. For example, in the town of Rincon, Puerto Rico, the local Surfrider chapter was instrumental in blocking the development of houses and a new marina (Surfrider). Surfrider got involved primarily to keep beach access but in the process the protected a stretch of coastline from development (Surfrider). Surfrider was able to block these developments by filing a lawsuit directly against the developer. The lawsuit was settled and the developer agreed to protect the land because his proposed project would have had to large-an environmental impact (Surfrider). Now this land has been set aside to be left in its natural state, and will be continue to be open to the public (Surfrider). Surfrider has been active in blocking all types of developments, from golf courses to mansions, and keeping empty land open to the public. These efforts have led to more empty spaces for people to enjoy as well as the preservation of natural habitats.

All of these efforts are still only part of Surfrider's mission and focus. They not only work to protect the ocean and the beach, but they work to protect the waves. They are one of the few organizations in the world that defends the surf and surf spots. A large portion of Surfrider's members are surfers, and surfers fight to protect surf.

Surfrider was a key player in winning one of the most unique, important, and interesting court cases for wave riders of all kinds. In the mid-eighties the Chevron Oil Company wanted to build a rock groin out into the ocean near El Segundo, CA to protect its oil interests. The Surfrider Foundation took action and fought Chevron on the grounds
that the rock groin would ruin local surf spots. Surfrider was eventually defeated. However during the mitigation process Surfrider was promised 300,000 dollars to build an artificial reef (surf spot) if the surf spots were ruined. Chevron went ahead and built the groin, and of course the surf was destroyed, but the money was delivered. The money was put towards the construction of the artificial reef in El Segundo (this reef was a total failure). Even though the reef failed the victory was huge. The significance of the decision was "(that for) the first time a government agency, department or office at any government level, recognized the significance of a breaking wave as a natural resource deserving of protection" (Surfrider). Surfrider has since been able to use this decision in many other court cases involving the protection of waves. This was perhaps Surfrider's most important victory; it was a landmark case for surfers across the country.

It is these kinds of ground breaking victories that have made Surfrider such a valuable resource. It is an example of people being able to utilize resources in order to preserve their quality of life. It is through Surfrider's unique approach to solving many of our coastlines problems that has allowed them their past successes. Their combination of fighting issues on both local and national levels has given them the power and influence that they now hold. Without an organization like this our ocean and beaches would be in much more danger than they are in now.

Even though Surfrider has been a strong organization they haven't always successful. Their opponents are often much more influential, and influence is very key in fighting legal battles. Much of the time Surfrider is fighting the Environmental Pollution Agency (EPA) or other government agencies (in clean water and bacteria issues); These agencies often have many more resources at their disposal than Surfrider. There have
been incidences where Surfrider has been completely unsuccessful, either because they simply lost, or because they chose an issue to get involved in that they didn't need to.

In Santa Barbara Surfrider is currently fighting a battle they do not need to. They are endlessly fighting a proposed plan to reinforce Goleta Beach with either a rock wall or groin. The beach protects a restaurant, more importantly the airport, and is one of the few places with easy coastal access to the public. This beach is a very important to many people and without any kind of support from a rock wall or groin the beach will be too expensive to preserve (Surfrider). There have been numerous city meetings, and many expert witnesses have testified in favor of the rock structure. This is a battle that Surfrider does not need to fight and their money would be better spent fighting other battles.

Even though Surfrider does have failures and drawbacks, the good far outweighs the bad. No organization is perfect and Surfrider has a policy of re-evaluating its goals and positions every few years to ensure they are still successful (Surfrider). It is a very difficult process to fight for the environment. Their unique goals and style of defending these goals has led Surfrider to be an overwhelmingly successful organization. Surfrider doesn't always win, but with each new member, volunteer, or concerned citizen the Foundation gets a little bit stronger. Anybody can help to become part of the solution, you can pick up a piece of trash next you're at the beach, you can write to a congress person or board member about an important issue, or you can join an organization like Surfrider. It doesn't take much to make a big difference; the change might not be immediate, but it is on the way.
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**Essay G—Surfrider Foundation**

“Surfrider Foundation” is well organized and developed, with good and often interesting information presented effectively. The final three paragraphs, for example, engage in some cogent analysis of Surfrider’s legal limitations and perhaps erroneous policy choices. The writer concedes that “a proposed plan to reinforce Goleta Beach… is a battle that Surfrider does not need to fight.” The purpose of “Surfrider Foundation” is expository rather than argumentative; in the first paragraph, the research thesis is clear, though without a critical or debate dimension that might more characteristically mark “4” level work: “The Foundation gets involved in local, regional, and national issues through an extensive network of local chapters, all of which are tied to the parent organization.”

Even more than Essay F, “Surfrider Foundation” has a flawed bibliography (sources are numbered, and not in the MLA-required style); and the in-text citations do not correctly correspond to the “Bibliography” page. However, the essay’s prose meets the standards for “3” writing: it is competently edited and consistently in control of its stylistic intentions in making the point that “Surfrider doesn’t always win, but with each new member, volunteer, or concerned citizen the Foundation gets a little bit stronger.”
Essays with a Rating of 4: “Demonstrates sophisticated understanding and execution”
William Tecumseh Sherman: The Private Politician

In a letter written to his brother John acknowledging the way politics drive the ambitions of personal prosperity, general William Tecumseh Sherman says that "Self-interest is the great motor." (Sherman, 1856) William Tecumseh Sherman is a name of great notoriety in the South because of his March to the Sea, and if self interest was Sherman's great motor, it would seem that Sherman had a lot of political reasons for his extensively destructive raid on the South. However, a troubling statement found in the research process was one by many generalized information mediums such as encyclopedias, websites, and well published historian, Stewart Sifakis, which seems to void out Sherman's quote and the way it could relate to his March to the Sea. In reference to William Tecumseh Sherman's character, Sifakis explains "He was noted for his absolute refusal to be drawn into politics." (Sifakis, 1988). My question to Sifakis and these other sources of reference targeted to a more general audience, is how could a military commander abstain from politics during the greatest homeland conflict in American history? It doesn't seem possible that Sherman, was simply leading an innovative military campaign without any thoughts or personal motives. Not only does the generalization of Sherman seem questionable, but by the way Sherman conducted himself, his campaign through the South, and the way he interacted with family in high places, Sherman shows that he was more politically active than the common belief indicates.

Most people recognize William Tecumseh Sherman as the famous general who led the "March to the Sea," a thirty day march which left the South in shambles. The March was characterized by extensive and in many cases unnecessary damage to the South, embracing the
idea of “total war,” which lay everything from military to civilian targets to waste. Even Sherman says that his company "devoured the land" and "To realize what war is one should follow our tracks." (Bower, 1005). Because of the devastation left by Sherman and his army, Southerners today resent his actions. For example, An Atlanta columnist wrote "Now he's dog food, the most disliked person hereabouts since William Tecumseh Sherman," in regards to Otis Nixon, an Atlanta Braves all-star that was suspended for drug use, which compromised the likelihood of the team making it to the championships (Henken, pg. 289-290). However, this negative and war hungry image is some what of a one-sided understanding of Sherman. If we look at his familiar roots, we can see that another aspect of Sherman is revealed that more moderate sources do not show.

The Sherman family seemed to have a recurring motif in their political careers. Declaration of Independence signer Roger Sherman, William Tecumseh Sherman's brother John Sherman, and William Tecumseh Sherman himself all seem to embrace an expanded government ideal, in which the government and the laws that make up the government are above private property (Wilner, pg 72). Based on the major political accomplishments in the lives of these men, the statement seems reasonably accurate. Because of Roger Sherman's word choice, the Declaration of Independence granted us with the "pursuit of happiness" as opposed to the "pursuit of private property," giving the government an ambiguous and advantageous interpretation of "pursuit of happiness" (Wilner, pg 72). This is important because private property is a defined entity and one of the few things in America that preserves personal freedom. Not even private property can be considered "private" if the government constantly surveys and regulates it, an idea the Shermans seem to push towards. The "pursuit of happiness" can have a variety of meaning, whether it refers to basking in the sun or loitering in front of a 7-11, yet at the
same time doesn’t give people a right to privacy. Moving on, we see that John Sherman formed both the Sherman Antitrust Law and the Sherman Silver Standard Act which both called for government regulation of private industry and finances. And based on William Tecumseh Sherman's "March to the Sea," it didn't seem like he had any regard for private property (Wilner, pg 72). Through the political actions of the Sherman's, one can see that the suppression of private property gives way to a larger and more powerful government.

Focusing on Sherman and his "March to the Sea," teamed up with his idea of a big government as a guideline, his actions fit for two reasons. First, it has been said that Sherman just wanted to end the war, which suggests that the national interest of the United States was a primary concern for Sherman (Bower). He evaluated the situation he was pitted in, saying that "tendency to anarchy was everywhere. I have seen it all over America, and our only hope is Uncle Sam." (Bower, pg 1016). Here, Sherman explains that the Civil War has brought anarchy to the country, and if the Union is dissolved, anarchy will not only give rise to chaos, but further harm the Northern and Southern governments after the war ends. On a related note, Sherman was recorded saying that "Obedience to law is the lesson that this war, under Providence, will teach the free and enlightened American citizen." (Bower, pg 1017). From here, we see that Sherman believes the ideals of American law are for the betterment of American culture, which further explains why anarchy cannot prevail over the great nation. Sherman ended the war by any means necessary, for the good of the Union. Secondly, by ravaging the South with the "March to the Sea" campaign, he was destroying the Confederate States' economy. Crops wouldn't grow and damage needed to be repaired; the already struggling Confederate States would have been economically devastated, even if they won the war. Agriculture was the powerhouse of the Southern economy, and without crops or fertile land to maintain that portion of the economy, the
South would have an incredibly difficult time rebuilding itself if they were to do it on their own. With a devastated South, the re-united government of the United States could insist on whatever they wanted in regards to rebuilding the South.

Aside from genealogical assumptions of Sherman's political ideals, Sherman's political motives can be traced from the numerous letters he wrote to his brother, John Sherman, who held a seat on the Committee of Foreign Relations and was an Ohio Senator. Not only do the letters shed light on Sherman's political opinions, but they also seem to have ambitions of persuading John Sherman into adopting William's political motives. In a letter written by William Tecumseh Sherman to John Sherman on March 20, 1856, William Tecumseh Sherman goes over a list of expectations he has of his brother. Such expectations include ways to deal with slavery, winning over California and the Pacific Coast to the Union, the Indians of the Pacific, and a national railroad. He also tells his brother that he will be watching his brother's course "with deep interest," as if he is suspicious of the way John Sherman might conduct himself (Sherman, 1856). This does not seem to represent the politically detached William Tecumseh Sherman that Stewart Sifakis portrays in his description. We see that Sherman is quite politically concerned with the state of the country. Sherman insists that John refrains from the slavery question, for he should "avoid the subject like a dirty black one." (Sherman, 1856). To further that position, Sherman warns John not to act like the following two men, Joshua Giddings and Senator William Henry Seward, two notable Republicans who gained a strong reputation as anti-slavery proponents. Joshua Giddings suggested that the Republican party should include the clause that "all men are created equal" from the Declaration of Independence as part of their platform. From this single letter, we see that Sherman tries to use his brother as a medium to exercise his own political ambitions. At this time, Sherman not only shows his middle-of-the-road view of slavery, but he
urges his brother to take his opinion into consideration.

Sherman's political ambitions are present in more than just one letter to John Sherman, but in many that comprise the series of letters between William Tecumseh Sherman and John Sherman. In the letter from March 20, 1856, not only does Sherman express his lack of faith in his brother's judgment, but he also gives him advice as to how to conduct himself. As readers, we should expect a certain amount of bias and self-interest in Sherman's words. As the introductory quote states, "Self-interest is the great motor," it should come to no surprise that Sherman had some driving motivations behind his acts. Otherwise, why else would Sherman tell his brother to carry out these suggestions? It wouldn't make sense for Sherman to suggest a resolution that he wouldn't want to live with. At the same time, it seems that Sherman fears the power and opinions that his brother possessed. Writing letters seems to be a way in which Sherman can impose his opinion and give his brother something to consider.

In another letter to John Sherman, William continues to urge his brother to take a more moderate approach to the political agenda; in this case, he specifically addresses the "dirty black" issue of slavery. "The union of states... are so important to the honor and glory of the confederacy that I would like to see your position yet more moderate," claims Sherman, about three years after the previous letter, still wants John to work towards an intact Union (Sherman, 1859). Earlier in the letter, Sherman argues that since the North is so powerful, it's acceptable to make some concessions to curtail the South from secession. This relates back to Sherman's political ideals discussed in the first letter, because he urges John to take a moderate approach the South. Slavery was a major dividing conflict in this era, but William encourages his brother to neglect the issue, for it plays a key role in the disbandment of the Union.

An interesting twist to the series of letters that William Tecumseh Sherman writes to his
brother is that Sherman himself claims that he has removed himself from politics. In a letter from July 7, 1856, Sherman makes a claim that "Since my resignation I have kept purposely aloof from all parties, whether one way or the other; being in a business where large interests are at stake, I cannot act with that decision otherwise that would suit me." (Sherman, 1856). With a statement like this, it's easy to see why Sifakis or any other source trying to formulate a broad understanding of Sherman would insist that Sherman was removed from the surrounding politics of the day. Why shouldn't we believe what Sherman writes? It's coming straight from Sherman's pen, so it's hard to deny the way Sherman may be feeling. However, in a letter dated August of 1856, just a month later, Sherman begins to discuss not only his thoughts on the political agenda, including a wagon road to California and the elements that could possibly escalate to Civil War, but how his brother should take these thoughts into consideration. Sherman persists, saying that "Unless people, both North and South, learn more moderation, we'll see sights in the way of civil war." (Sherman, 1856). Later on, Sherman says "I hope in Congress you will resolve yourself into the fighting branch and work off some of the surplus steam that is threatening to blow up the Union;" (Sherman, 1856). This is the third instance in which William Tecumseh Sherman is pressing John Sherman to take a moderate approach. It is hard to tell whether William is opposed to Southern ideals, slavery, or whatever else constitutes the majority of the Union's disturbances, but it is pretty apparent that Sherman does not want to see a war break out between the North and the South.

Another example surfaces on August 3, 1856, in which Sherman discusses his feelings about the government. He says that "There is no doubt we have a bad administration of law here, and more than a fair share of rowdies ...and if we were governed by the mere opinion of the Committee... I would prefer at once to have a Dictator." (Sherman, 1856). The Committee of
Vigilance were citizen-run justice systems created to deal with the outburst of crime during 1856. The Committee of Vigilance during 1856 disgusts Sherman, making him want to live under a dictatorship rather than a country that allows a mob of vigilante justice rule the land. He explains how he hopes President Pierce will intervene, and fears they might stir revolution. Sherman clearly voices his disgust for the current affairs, but it's somewhat unsettling as to why he's saying it to John Sherman. Why would Sherman address this to his brother instead of someone else, say his wife perhaps? It seems that Sherman is voicing himself so he can be heard, communicating with the people who can make a difference. John Sherman is in a position in which he can make a difference, so it only makes sense to talk politics with him as opposed to someone without an interest in politics. This isn't a phenomena of any kind, but it goes to show that Sherman wasn't politically withdrawn, and certainly had strong feelings to issues that he felt should be addressed. Not only do we see Sherman expressing his ideas on the politics of his time, we also see his ideas run along with a theme; the theme of expanded government idea which seems to be prevalent in his family’s political outlook. In the March 20, 1856 letter regarding slavery, Sherman wants this issue to be overlooked because it threatens the bond of the Union. Sherman never explains any moral incentives or his personal beliefs, he just wants to see the Union intact. The government he loves is falling to shambles as sectional tensions escalate, and instead of addressing the issue that's causing such turmoil, Sherman would rather see it neglected. Sherman further shows his favor for the government when he claims that the North can make some concessions to the South. Although it seems somewhat odd for Sherman to suggest that the North be more lenient to southern issues, he was suggesting it so that the Union would stay together. Sherman may have been catering to state's rights (by region at least), but his ideas were still for the benefit of the entire country. Once again, through Sherman's views of the Democratic
mob, we see that he had strong interest in big governments. In this instance, he shows us that he's against any committees that branch off from the established government, and the Committee of Vigilance is of no exception. The Committee was almost like a secession from the United States justice system, so it comes to no surprise that Sherman is against the separation. He refers to it as a mob, which implies that chaos governs the people, and that mob rule overthrew a weak government. Based on Sherman's ideologies, a strong and expanded government would have not only prevented a mob from ruling, but also may have prevented the sectional tensions that led to the Civil War.

Even in instances when the fate of the Union is not addressed, Tecumseh still shows that he favors an active and expanded government controlling the country. In the letter from August, 1856, Sherman addresses issues of transportation. Sherman wishes that John would press for a wagon road to California, because "Such a road is for the future, not the present." (Sherman, 1856). He also gives reasons as to why John should consider a wagon road as opposed to a railroad, explaining that one is financially and politically beneficial to the other. Such advantages include low costs, and with a railroad, "it would cost so much money that it will break down any administration that adopts it as a party measure." (Sherman, 1856.) This means the railroad would cost too much from an economic standpoint, which would scare any politician away from putting more funds into it. On the other hand, the wagon road would only cost a million or two dollars, and would be federally regulated, which further shows how Sherman favored a big government. With a federally funded road, a government could change it as it saw fit, and wouldn't have to argue with people from the private sector if problems arose.

Since we now see that Sherman had political motives, the question now is how did it impact the "March to the Sea" campaign? If Sherman didn't want a war to begin with, then why
did he boast that "To realize what was is one should follow our tracks?" In the letters written to his brother, Sherman never mentioned any dislike or contempt for the South; in fact, most of the time Sherman pressed for moderation, hoping that John would cater to the South's needs. It doesn't seem accurate that self-interest was the great motor of Sherman's destructive campaign. If Sherman didn't really have anything against the South, then why did he destroy it with his "March to the Sea?"

Perhaps if we take a look at the number of legends that surround the cities that he didn't destroy, we can get a better understanding of Sherman as both a politician and military commander.

There were a number of towns in the South that were spared from the wrath of Sherman; Savannah, Macon, Athens, Madison, Covington, Stilesboro, and many more were all places that Sherman spared. The reasons vary, but most of them involve some sort of negotiations with people he knew who lived in the towns. For example, it was said that Covington was spared because Sherman spent the night with an old classmate from his days at West Point. Another occurred in Augusta, in which supposedly an old girlfriend of Sherman was buried there, so out of respect, he spared the city. In the case of Savannah, it is said that the city was spared because it was too beautiful to be burned (Henken, pg 294). It seems very perplexing that these random cities of the South were spared, but if we take into account Sherman's words, it makes a little more sense. In all the legends that surround the town's survival, they all have some kind of personal relationship to Sherman. Some of these cities housed friends, relatives, classmates, and others with ties to Sherman. Out of respect, these cities were not ruined, because Sherman valued these ties with them. Sherman's personal interests in his friends' well being seemed to be the motor behind the preservation. In other cases, mayors urged Sherman to preserve the city, so diplomacy was used. Diplomacy is a political tactic used many times as a substitute for war, so it
also shows that Sherman wasn't the war monger that many general references make him out to be.

So with this in mind, maybe the towns that were destroyed simply didn't have anything that interested Sherman. Politics couldn't prevail to spare the cities that fell to the "March to the Sea."

Politics couldn't prevail to spare the cities that fell to the "March to the Sea."

Based on the descriptions general sources use, our general understanding of famous historical figures is skewed. It would be a shame too, because Sherman left about 18,000 written accounts describing his personal life, which stand around twelve feet tall when stacked on top of each other. There is an open window to the past, but many historians choose to ignore it.

Grasping the past is an incredibly difficult thing to do, but it isn't impossible. The personal accounts left by Sherman not only provide a better understanding of what was going on during the Civil War times, but give personality to a figure who is now accessible only through books.

William Tecumseh Sherman was more than just a stem general who never commanded a major Union victory; he also represents a man of private but keen political intellect. Although Sherman's political life may not have been as important as his role as a military commander, politics seemed to play an important role in Sherman's character, so it's about time his entire life is done proper justice.
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Essay H—William Tecumseh Sherman: The Private Politician

Essay H demonstrates a clear, coherent, structured response to the prompt and a sophisticated understanding of the subject. There are times when ideas or evidence could have been explored a bit more (slavery as “dirty black one”), and the use of outside sources seems limited (reintroducing the same series of letters in support of different themes). Nevertheless, the essay presents a consistent, measured argument, supported by relevant information from a variety of sources. The purpose is announced in the first paragraph. The essay will argue that the popular image of General Sherman as a man absolutely removed from politics, and thus someone motivated solely by “self interest,” is an inappropriate generalization, and it will introduce evidence that suggests the general “was more politically active than common belief indicates.” The essay begins with a counterargument and then provides a context for this position with examples from both history (Sherman’s notorious “March to the sea”) and from a more contemporary source (Atlanta baseball). Discussing in turn Sherman’s background, his family’s involvement with politics, and a series of letters he wrote to his brother, John, the essay takes the position that Sherman’s politics, specifically his belief in “the theme of expanded government,” played a much larger role than previous thought. The essay uses the first and last paragraphs to frame the writer’s position and, overall, develops its comparisons specifically and insightfully throughout.

The essay’s prose demonstrates stylistic skill, although at times the language is imprecise (“Sherman fears the power and opinions his brother possessed”) and the editing raises some concerns. It manages subordination effectively, chooses precise and usually active verbs, and employs a variety of transitional devices to highlight connections established by content (“This is important because”; “Focusing on; “Another example”).
The Real State of Technology

"Records hold great promise for understanding the long chain of causality from human want to environmental degradation and from ignorance to environmental awareness."

-Glen Asner

Many people today believe that because western technology allows us to change our environment, we are "better" than the rest of nature. Tiris sentiment is in far contrast to native populations, as indigenous Indians have shown they can exist within a balanced system, without plundering nature's resources. But because these communities lack the capacity to destroy life on such a large scale, they are unable to compete with the encroaching modern western world. Natives in particular have always developed their lifestyle and culture to maintain a balance within the environment around them, but without the use of modern science and technology. Because of their versatility and sustainability, these ways of life are in fact superior to the way the modern world functions.

In order to understand the nature of this conflict, it's important to see technology as a result of the society's way of life. Westerners may see indigenous people as ignorant or simple because of their lack of scientific thinking, but while these "simple" people may not use sophisticated technology, their tools and practices result from a sustainable lifestyle developed over centuries. Instead, western culture relies on science and technology to explain and control nature, and sustain its own massive consumption.
Science, defined in The American Heritage as "the theoretical explanation of phenomenon," when encountered with the unknown tries to fit logic to the situation so that man can understand it. Likewise technology, defined as "the application of science," employs that scientific understanding so humans can control nature and ensure their survival. Freud in his publication "The Future of an Illusion" explains how man develops both science and technology because of his own fear of nature, an attempt to control what cannot be controlled. This idea, what Tomas Hughes calls, "positive view of technology as a progressive force for controlling a hostile nature" has become the core of western development, and is manifested in the technology used today (qtd. in Stine 603).

The attitude taken by government officials and industry leaders only perpetuates this culture of rapacious consumption. The economic impetus behind technology today is evident almost everywhere. In the farming industry for example, the chain of impact stretches far beyond what one person can see. The effectiveness of huge scale production keeps the small farmers from competing with the low prices, and often the more traditional farming is abandoned simply because they cannot make a living. In its place, the use of massive machinery, chemical additives, and now genetic engineering has flourished and is now the backbone of agriculture. However these technologies are driven by the idea of production, not environmental balance, and this shows in the recent surfacing of environmental problems. In Fatal Harvest, Andrew Kimbrell states how despite the fact that chemicals and fertilizers have proven greater yields in the past, they are "wasteful, arid, vastly polluting," and because of this, "since 1950 about one-third of American cropped land has been abandoned because of problems with soil erosion"(qtd.
in Heilig, par. 8). But though these long-term effects are increasingly apparent, they are often ignored. In his article about the Hagley Museum's historical accounts of technology, Glen Asner identified numerous occasions when environmental concerns were ignored because of economic priorities. When health concerns became an issue, "The public relations departments of Sperry Gyroscope, Bethlehem Steel, Lukens Steel, and Seagrams worked actively to deflect criticism and promote a positive public image for those companies. [They] funded scientific and epidemiological studies and engaged in significant public relations efforts, more often than not, to shield industry from regulations that would entail costly investments in new technologies" (Asner 772). Often, these companies will invest resources to prove they don't need to change their policies. But if they simply diverted those efforts to researching a sustainable industry, many of the problems Americans face would never have started.

An example of this reality is the recent widespread use of genetically modified organisms (GMO's) in the United States. Companies like Du Pont and Monsanto invest millions to develop products capable of producing more in the present environment. But as usual, not enough research into the consequences of this kind of modification was performed. Rather than designing crops that harbor life, often they are made to eradicated competitors and ultimately, increase profits. A recent advancement called "Terminator Technology" accomplishes this, with the addition of numerous consequences. "A genetic alteration that causes seeds to die after a single season" prevents farmers from saving seeds for the next season, forcing them back each season to buy more (Kalm 73). But the more severe danger is that of cross-pollination. If these genetic modifications spread to
native crops via natural pollination, they have the potential to eradicate biodiversity in the environment. In this case, farmers will no longer have the choice to buy from foreign companies, as all other varieties will be extinct. More so, little research has been done to understand the effects of eating these modified foods. When research scientist Arpad Pusztai raised fears after his team conducted the only independent study on the effects of GMO's in 1998, he was censured, defamed, and ultimately fired for his concerns (Charman, par. 1). This is just an example of a clear trend of western industry priorities. Even when it comes to our own food, companies would rather make a few extra cents per corncob than address the impacts on the environment and human health. And the claimed efficiency of genetic alterations is no longer realistic. At a seed world seed conference, Dr Goodman and Dr. Carson of "North Carolina State University added to the growing evidence that genetic engineering is much more expensive and less effective than plant breeding" (qtd. in Cox 1). Rather than developing a balanced, sustainable environment, these industries propagate the use of complex machines, chemical fertilizers, and genetically engineering for their own profit.

But some of the worst effects on the environment in fact result from manufacturing industries. Almost every aspect of western life can be traced to either a massive farm, a mine, or processing plant. When looking at the environmental effects of fanning, people usually focus on the soil degradation, or the pollution to the watershed. But few consider how much steel and oil is needed to operate the machinery, and the chain of impact. In Asner's research into the records of national industries, he found "the products and by-products of manufacturing in the chemical, plastic, energy, and iron and
steel industries have contributed enormously to the degradation of air and water quality across the United States" (765). Through greenwashing and political lobbying, these companies have managed to restrict public concerns and worse, government regulations. For this reason, most of the western world is unaware of how their new car contributed to the destruction of the natural environment. Few people who oppose oil production today actually know the full process and consequences of welling and processing crude oil. For example the recent interest in alternatively powered cars works to address emissions, but it still ignores the entire production chain. Even though emissions may be improved, those generated from the production of the cars is likely to remain (or worsen with recent easing of air regulations). Ultimately the parts can be traced back to mines for the steel, and oil for the plastics. In his essay in *Technology and Culture* titled "At the Intersection of Histories: Technology and the Environment", Stine details the lack of research on the subject:

"General histories of the automobile [...] virtually ignored the mounting damage to air quality before the establishment of environmental regulations. The ecological consequences of constructing vast networks of paved streets and roads and extensive state and national highway systems to accommodate the automobile have also attracted only modest attention from historians"

(617).

What so many people fail to acknowledge is how technology and the environment are inextricably linked in all aspects of our lives. If people had an oil well and garbage dump in their backyards, would they then see the connection?
The complexity of Western industry and the consumer's distance from the source only aids this blatant over consumption. To the public, technology is marketed as a necessity of modern life, and there "remains the notion that resistance to Western technology represent[s] the backward tendencies of traditional cultures" (Asner 767). Though western technology allows for greater production, the inability to sustain itself is ultimately the downfall of this way of life. These advances may temporarily ease hardships, but in reality they only facilitate over-consumption in a society focused on an easy life. Instead of saving the extra produce to prepare for a shortage, not unlike how a bear or squirrel prepares for hibernation, westerners have ensured a life of plenty at the expense of the environment. The earth, what is commonly viewed as a resource, is rather the greater system of which all mankind is apart. But what both the public and scholars continue to ignore is that there are feasible alternatives that could sustain human life. Unlike western societies that seek to control and process nature for their profit, there are those who use what is provided to them by nature, without exploiting it.

The key distinction between western society and indigenous groups is in their view of technology and the environment. Contrary to the Freudian concept, Native Americans don't view nature as an enemy, but rather as the provider of life. By considering the earth as a spiritual and blood relation, as the mother of all, the various groups are able to thrive in harsh climates without the use of sophisticated modern technology or squandering their resources. While westerners are dissociated from their environment and the consequences of their technology, many native groups fully
integrate themselves in their environment, and are able to maintain a balanced way of life where the concepts of technology and science are nonexistent.

Throughout the Americas, ancient Indians practiced cultivating certain crops for exotic purposes, even breeding different varieties of staple products for better yields. In South America for example, medicine men are now believed to have been responsible for the persistence of pod-corn, a rare and time consuming variety that cannot survive without care. While originally people thought the variety survived because of mutations, anthropologists later realized that Andean medicine men cultivated them to treat respiratory problems (Nabhan 10). In addition, the same medicine men traveled all over the continent, eventually spreading the com all the way up to the pueblos in the Colorado plateau. The same Quichuan and Aimara people domesticated and developed virtually all varieties of potatoes from miniature, inedible wild varieties. They developed com as we know it today from wheat-like pods, and developed countless types of jalapenos and chili peppers. Likewise, the Hopi are able to grow sustaining crops in dessert conditions without the use of irrigation or other "superior" technologies, and have been for centuries. While they may not produce as much as commercial farmers do, the Hopi farmers harvest each year without plaguing the soil with problems or using excessive water from a foreign source. Rather than attempting to change the environment around them, the Hopi work within their environment, adapting to it rather than permanently changing it. They have a developed way to farm that allows them to flourish along with the rest of nature and not profit at from it destruction. Rather than viewing technology as a way to change one's environment as westerners do, "The Hopi see their rituals as a way
to maintain an intimate contact with nature that helps to keep natural forces
in harmonious balance for the sake of all life forms" (Todd 19).

Though it is rather extreme to expect all of western society to abandon its
comforts for a simple life close to the earth, there are numerous ways man can develop
his society to sustain life and preserve the environment. Asner maintains that these
industries were "Established [...] for the explicit purpose of exploiting the natural
resources," to profit rather than propagate life (763). Before westerners can change to
coexist with their environment, a change in this attitude is imperative. In order to
maintain a balanced ecosystem where other life forms can prosper, the western mind
needs to change to accept those as vital to life. Rather than looking at isolated incidents
as the scientific methods suggests, humans must view the world on a macro- scale. By
considering everything on the earth as precious, western culture can embrace the
environment and exterminate this premonition of science and technology. Only then can
man's immense creativity and intuition be applied to his way of life. By keeping the earth
as a priority, sustainable living for all mankind is not just possible but natural.


Essay I—The Real State of Technology

Like essay H, “The Real State of Technology” conveys a clear understanding of the issues (technology versus nature) and offers a thoughtful and nuanced, if at times simplistic, response to those issues (native “communities lack the capacity to destroy life on such a large scale”). The purpose of the essay is announced in the first paragraph: to argue that Native lifestyles and methods of production “are in fact superior to the way the modern world functions.” The point here is not that every reader will agree with the writer’s position, but that readers will agree that the position is stated clearly and effectively and supported with relevant evidence from a variety of sources. The essay provides background on both the development of science (“huge scale production”) and our changing attitudes about its effects, discusses the implications of these changing attitudes, and boldly suggest that technology is at odds with a natural world that is increasingly viewed as almost entirely “hostile.” Along the way the essay describes in some detail the use of propaganda by American corporations, on the one hand, to promote the pro-technology attitude, while on the other deflecting any criticism. This point is key, since part of the purpose of the essay is to argue that our attitude about technological advances has in fact exacerbated the problem. The writer states that we are so removed from nature we no longer care whether “genetically modified organisms,” for example, affect us or not. The essay then compares/contrasts this line of thought with a discussion of the “key distinctions between western society and indigenous people.” Here the essay is a little weaker, as only the final two paragraphs are used to develop this idea.

The prose of “The Real State of Technology” has less flair than that of essay H, though it does demonstrate stylistic skill. It shows the writer’s ability to choose words precisely, to use subordination effectively, to employ a variety of sentence constructions to good effect, and to draw on transitional devices that help keep the argument centered and moving forward. The few instances in which the essay’s language seems cliché or confusing (“mother of all”; “society’s way of life”) do not hinder its overall effectiveness.
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Preface

During 2011-2012, the UCSC Writing Program initiated and completed a pilot assessment project to collect and evaluate examples (near the end of the quarter) of student writing in CI sections of multiple college Core courses. The project took the Writing Program's 2007 Writing 1 (now Writing 2) assessment methodologies as its model—for example, modifying that assessment's rubric and protocol for evaluating first-quarter student essays; and scoring essays randomly selected from various Core sections—with certain understood limitations and differences from that 2007 enterprise: most but not all of the ten college Core courses were represented; more essays were solicited from ELWR-unsatisfied sections than from ELWR-satisfied sections (since only Writing Program instructors participated in passing along student essays or in scoring the essays); and essays from C2 or 80B sections of Core were solicited but not ultimately considered, primarily because those essays were more ambitiously developed and all involved major research—rhetorically more suitable for a subsequent Writing 2/Core 80B assessment.

In fall 2011, 24 Writing Program faculty were asked to submit one or two essays that had been randomly selected by pilot project chair, James Wilson: one essay if from an ELWR-unsatisfied section, of which there were sixteen—including six stretch Core; and two essays if from an ELWR-satisfied section (of which there were four) or from an 80B section (of which there were also four). In winter 2012, fifteen Writing Program faculty members (not all of whom had participated in submitting an essay from their sections of Core) gathered for 90 minutes and holistically scored the 24 essays; each essay received a score from random and changing groups of six faculty members who did not know how others were scoring the essays. As with the 2007 assessment project, faculty members had no discussion to norm themselves as readers of these essays. The point was to determine if the scores would reveal a consensus on the standards for evaluating writing produced by students in different colleges with distinct Core curricula.

In spring 2012, a committee of the Writing Program faculty (Sarah-Hope Parmeter, Amy Weaver, Mark Baker, Sandy Archimedes, Annalisa Rava, and Chair James Wilson) met twice to consider 10-12 essays and eventually select and annotate eight that Writing Program faculty members in winter had scored the same or nearly the same according to this scale:

Rating of 1—does not meet CI's minimum goals
Rating of 2—demonstrates satisfactory if at times marginal proficiency
Rating of 3—demonstrates clear competency
Rating of 4—demonstrates sophisticated understanding and execution

A primary challenge of the committee was to accurately annotate essays (especially those scored as 2 or 3) from significantly different Core courses. All C1 courses follow similar objectives: students practice "writing in a variety of academic and professional contexts" and 'learn to apply rhetorical principles"; yet reading assignments from college to college range from experimental fiction to dense scientific prose, and therefore writing assignments can differ greatly. Since neither readers of the essays nor the committee members themselves were privy to the assignments (or individual instructor-led discussions, analytic contexts, or organizational expectations), scoring and annotating—i.e., the pilot assessment project itself—could reach only partial conclusions. Indeed, five of the twenty-four essays received scores from 1 to 4, and four of those five received each of the four possible scores (from among six different faculty members!). Those four essays were discussed at length in the Writing Program Fall Faculty meeting in September 2012 with the aim to sharpen the program's norming principles and to generate subsequent conversations about first-quarter student writing among the Core faculty and Provosts at the ten UCSC colleges.

All of the essays included in this document represent students' end-of-the-quarter prose without regard to process or improvement or revision. As noted above, students wrote their essays in response to particular assignments by different instructors. While the fifteen Writing Program faculty members who rated these essays in winter 2012 did not always agree on how to interpret the abilities labeled A through G on the rubric, and in some cases clearly disagreed as to certain essays' "overall quality," the committee charged with selecting and annotating eight essays believe that this pilot assessment project offers a useful draft of the Writing Program's current standards and a document to help guide an evolving conversation around first-year student writing and also around the pedagogy of first-quarter Core courses.

James Wilson
Fall 2012
EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES OF THE C REQUIREMENT AND THE SPECIFIC GOALS OF CI AND C2

In completing UCSC's two-quarter General Education Requirement in Composition, students learn how to become effective participants in university discourse, spoken as well as written.

To this end:

1. Students learn -- when reading, writing, listening, or speaking -- to analyze rhetorical situations so as to understand that different purposes and contexts call for different strategies, different conventions, and different techniques.

2. Students learn to recognize and discuss propositions (their own as well as others') that cannot be merely demonstrated -- that is, to analyze, evaluate, and argue matters of opinion and interpretation as well as to describe matters of fact.

3. Students learn to develop effective processes for writing in different contexts and to use a variety of strategies for discovering, developing, and analyzing data and ideas, for making sense, for revising, and for editing.

4. Students learn to produce writing that:
   - Establishes and maintains an appropriate purpose or coherent set of purposes in relation to the assignment and the audience.
   - Employs appropriate strategies of development that accomplish their purpose in relation to the assignment, its context, and its audience.
   - Uses sources' information and ideas accurately and effectively and cites sources appropriately.
   - Communicates in accurate, appropriate, effective prose.

5. Students learn strategies for becoming accurate readers and critical analysts of all texts including their own.

6. Students learn how to collaborate with others (including their peers) in doing research, generating and evaluating ideas, and revising texts.
Composition 1, Introduction to University Discourse

As they make the transition from writing in the schools to writing in a variety of academic and professional contexts, students learn to apply rhetorical principles rather than rely on rule-driven formulas. They also experience and come to understand the connections among composing, thinking, and learning.

Students will:

1. Write at least five relatively short essays (up to 1250 words) and read a variety of texts, including a significant amount of nonfiction that employs argument and analysis.

2. Learn strategies for reading challenging texts -- that is, to understand a text's purpose or purposes and to follow its train of thought, to begin to be aware of nuance and emphasis, and to be able to relate specific examples and statements to larger topics or claims.

3. Learn strategies for analyzing and criteria for evaluating opinions, interpretations, and arguments (propositions about things that cannot be proved) and learn the academic uses of words such as *argument, hypothesis, theory, assumption, claim,* etc.

4. Learn to analyze their processes as writers, develop strategies for enhancing those processes, and evaluate the results, all in relation to the particular demands of particular assignments. Students' attention to process includes:

   - Learning specific strategies for invention and revision in relation to the quality of content as well as its clarity and accuracy.
   - Learning the importance of a writer's purpose and audience and relevant conventions in relation to focus, coherence, and effectiveness.
   - Learning to take charge of their proof reading and editing in standard professional English by analyzing their weaknesses and developing a plan for eliminating error.

5. Learn oral communication skills for effective participation in discussions as well as for formal presentations.
Composition 2, Rhetoric and Inquiry

Students in Composition 2 build on their progress in Composition 1 by learning strategies for becoming more effective readers, writers, and speakers in the context of assignments that require independent research. They deepen their comprehension of how their writing and that of others can add to the understanding of vital issues and sustain meaningful inquiry through responsible persuasion.

Students will:

1. Write a series of at least five essays (including one of at least 1500 words) and read a variety of texts that provide occasions for analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating data and arguments.

2. Learn methods of research and approaches to using sources (i.e., the information, theories, arguments, and texts of others) that provide students with the knowledge and confidence to actively participate in the act of inquiry by composing comparative analysis, interpretation, and reasoned argument.

3. Learn specific techniques for critically analyzing sources so as to understand their purpose and context and to evaluate the credibility and relevance of their information and the persuasiveness of their evidence and reasoning.

4. Achieve solid competence and, to the extent possible, virtuosity in all facets of the writing process. This include:
   - Learning modes of inquiry and strategies for revision that strive for complexity, nuance, and depth as well as coherence and clarity.
   - Learning to develop extended, complex arguments by orienting readers, creating clear expectations and a sufficiently explicit train of thought, effectively weaving together multiple strands of inquiry, and bringing the whole to a satisfying conclusion.
   - Learning techniques for developing a prose style that moves beyond accuracy and clarity to precision, power, subtlety, and elegance.
ASSESSING STUDENTS' WRITING AT THE END OF A C1 COURSE

Does the writer produce the sort of essay called for in the assignment?  Yes  No

Using the following ratings, evaluate the overall quality of the essay in relation to CI's goals.

Rating of 1 - does not meet CI's minimum goals.
Rating of 2 - demonstrates satisfactory if at time marginal proficiency.
Rating of 3 - demonstrates clear competency.
Rating of 4 - demonstrates sophisticated understanding and execution.

III. Using the above ratings, indicate the extent to which this writer demonstrates his/her ability in the areas described in A through G below.

A. Ability to establish and maintain an appropriate purpose or coherent set of purposes in relation to the assignment and the audience. (Evaluate the essay's form: its focus and coherence.)

B. Ability to employ appropriate and effective strategies of development to accomplish the essay's purpose. (Evaluate the essay's effectiveness: its success in describing, explaining, exploring, supporting, analyzing, or arguing as necessary, using relevant critical tools.)

C. Ability to edit accurately.

D. Ability to employ an effective prose style.

E. Ability to understand a text's (or author's) rhetorical purpose.

F. Ability to relate specific examples and ideas to larger to pic: chaiims.

G. As demonstrated in a self-comment form, ability to assess the strengths and weaknesses of his/her own writing.

IV. Using the above 1-4 ratings, evaluate the overall quality of this essay in relation to CI's goals.

Note: This form was inspired and informed by "Criteria for Effective Writing," Alverno College Communication Department, 1998, and "The Critical Thinking Rubric," Washington State University, 2000. It was then applied to assessment of C2 courses at UCSC, and revised for a pilot assessment of student writing in CI/Core at UCSC.
Essay with a Rating of 1 – “Does not meet C1’s minimum goals”
A View Through Out Americas History

It was once said, that America was the land of hope, prosperity, freedom, and equal opportunity, but is this really true? From the 1800s to the present we have presence various forms of discriminatory acts against the minority groups. This minority groups have been put down but most of all their dignity was step over and over again. Giving us the simple explanation to cover this horrible act it was said that these groups belong in a "different race, ethnicity or gender", but they are human too don't they deserve the same rights? The most recent groups under constant discrimination included the undocumented immigrants.

The beginning of this great battle against social injustice aroused from the beginning of the 1620s, partly because during this time the first immigrants came to America to follow their dreams. Every immigrant group that has come to America has gone through bad situate and they were discriminated for that. Undocumented immigrants are people who came to America to follow their dreams of having the American life. Many undocumented immigrants have been attacked in hate crimes overall for being foreigners. The majority have the lowest paying jobs, some people believe that they came to take away the jobs of the people of California. This is not true because the majority of undocumented immigrants are working in the fields. States like Arizona, Alabama, and others are making it harder for undocumented immigrants by making unjust laws mat make them flee to another state. Some examples of this are the states Arizona, Alabama, Georgia because after passing some harsh anti-immigrant laws made the immigrants flee to another state with fear of if they stayed in this states they might get deported. "Farmers in states like Alabama that have passed strong anti-illegal immigration laws are fighting back, saying they are losing labor and that US workers are unwilling to take up farm work". This has
effected their economy because with out the labor their crops are dying.

Do to the injustice and violation of human rights people are getting courage to standup and to speak not only for them but also for the good of other immigrants even at the cost of getting deported. Undocumented immigrants, lack basic human rights that have been taken from them. Simon, a student who decided to speak in "Papers" as a way to stand up for this injustice. To sum her speech she gives us this great quote, "I don't want to do this anymore... How long can a person live without basic human rights?" (Galisky, A. (Director). (2009). Papers) Students are taking a stand to this injustice and doing this they are showing the rest of the world that in order to change something we all have to unite as one.

Martin Luther King announced in one of his famous speech, "An individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and who willingly accepts the penalty of imprisonment in order to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the highest respect for the law" (Letter to Birmingham jail) An example of how students are standing for this injustice is the movie Papers; because it shows us how undocumented students feel, and how in their life there is a lot of fear of getting deported but they know that in order to win something one has to make sacrifices. This has a lot in common with the Freedom Riders, a group of students who put their "lives at risk" when they started defending the rights of the African americans. (Nelson, S. (Producer and Director). (2011). Freedom Riders) Jorge a student activist who appeared in the movie stated "Being part of this cause, fighting for it, being part activist for it, makes me part of something... You feel like you are making a small change, you are just making your community better!" (Galisky, A. (Director). (2009). Papers) He understands that every small contribution for changes like this can make the
world a better place because it might end all the discrimination against the undocumented population.

Life as an undocumented immigrant in California can be really challenging which is what keeps the undocumented immigrants in shadows. Being and undocumented immigrant one has to blend into society, in doing this one loses their sense of identity of who they really are. This is what Jose Antonio Vargas show us in, "My Life as an Undocumented Immigrant” where he describes "But I am still an undocumented immigrant And that means living a different kind of reality. It means going about my day in fear of being found out It means rarely trusting people, even those closest to me with who I really am."(Vargas, 2011,260)

Many other people live in fear just like Vargas, and have lost a sense of who they are and from where they came and their lives became a constant set of lies to cover their true identity. This can become a constant fear that becomes hard to live with.He was really devoted to the USA system that he figured his devotion would soon help him become an american but he soon notice it wasn't helping at all, "After so many years trying to be part of the system, of focusing all my energy on my professional life, I learned that no amount of professional success would solve my problem or ease the sense of loss and displacement I felt."(Vargas, 2011,267) In this quote he explains that he does not want to keep living this fake life he has continued to live for some years now, and he is ready to fight against this injustice just like the students who are committed to change the world. They want to give the immigrants their voice so that they will not stay in shadows like they have bad to because of the fear they have of getting deported back to their native countries.

In conclusion, we all have our opinions on what should and should not happen to illegal
immigrants. But we never stop to think about other People, and we should start to. 
Though there are different paths to solve this, the best way would be to pass a reform to allow certain people to become legal citizens. It should include students because a lot of them want to have a career, and people who came to work here in the USA so that they can provided for their families. This would have a positive impact because many young students will be able to attend college and feel secure that they will finish school and when they do they will have a better chance of getting a job. In addition it should include people who have payed their taxes. This would also allow the undocumented immigrants to feel more secure and it would give them the human rights they deserve. Society might change their view about undocumented immigrants once they see that most of them are hard working people.
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Essay 0200 ("A View Through Out Americas History"): Score 1

Beginning with its title (absence of apostrophe) and first sentence (misuse of comma), essay 0200 betrays an insufficient grasp of mechanics; by the second sentence ("we have presence various forms..."), any vestige of an effective prose style has been lost. In the first paragraph alone, readers struggle through ESL errors (third sentence: "This minority groups"; "their dignity was step over") and punctuation problems (fourth sentence: "they are human too don't they deserve the same rights?"). Essay 0200 does not meet CI's minimum goals in terms of basic language proficiency.

Essay 0200 falls short in other areas as well. The writer attempts to establish a purpose and give some context for making a claim that undocumented immigrants deserve rights—but that claim is not clearly articulated at the outset of the essay, and it remains somewhat simplistic and vague: what kinds of rights should undocumented immigrants be granted, under what circumstances, and why?

Elsewhere in the essay, the writer does make relevant points; readers can generally follow the logic and understand the rhetorical purpose of most paragraphs. Even though paragraph two, for example, demonstrates serious misuse of vocabulary ("aroused" and "situate"), the historical background and contemporary context demonstrate a marginal proficiency that gestures towards passing work. The same might be said of subsequent paragraphs where the writer attempts to relate specific examples and ideas to larger topics or claims.

However, the issue of rights is not sustained in the essay; body paragraphs about the challenges of being an undocumented immigrant lack development and cohesion; ideas towards solutions are addressed only in the conclusion. Moreover, the writer's prose displays several gaps in logic: the historical and the contemporary are too abruptly correlated: what distinguishes the newest waves of undocumented immigrants, and how is field work irrelevant to the claim that undocumented immigrants do not take away jobs from citizens?

In some minimal respects the essay achieves focus and coherence. Nonetheless, the overall quality of essay 0200—with its often ineffective use of outside sources, many unattributed and insufficiently integrated quotes, inaccurate phrasing, punctuation infelicities, and persistent grammar errors that often interfere with the writer's intended analysis—falls short of CI's goals of competence by the end of the quarter.
Essays with a Rating of 2: "Demonstrates satisfactory if at times marginal proficiency"
America's Education:  
Equal for some but not for you

In the United States there are many ideologies concerning education. But what is education? Is it the same for all? American society would like to believe that their education system is equal for all and that its goal of producing a well informed society is possible. * Reality is far from these perceptions; American Education is certainly not equal for all. Issues including but not limited to race, socio-economic status, and the social stratification of society all lend to the inequality and injustice found in the American Public Education System. These issues and the injustices that follow them have a large impact on minority groups and their ability to assimilation into society. *

Publicizing the flaws of the education system has been a topic that many authors have begun to write about Some, like Keith Osajima, in his article "Internalized Oppression and the Culture of Silence", and Paulo Freire, in the excerpt "Pedagogy of the Oppressed", focus on the oppression of students of minority backgrounds in the "banking system" of education that they are provided and how this oppression effect their daily lives and futures. While others, like Jonathan Kozal, in his article "Still Separated, Still Unequal", focus on the racial and socio- economic factors that influence the levels and quality of education that student receive. All authors focus on the inequality and injustices that the students of
America face throughout their years of preschool elementary, high school, and college schooling and the ultimate effects on their future lives.

The American Public Education System, as Paulo Freire describes it, is a banking system, which the teachers and students have minimal to no personal connections rather share a relationship of depositor and receptacles. This type of teaching is harmful for both the student and teacher for several reasons. The most potent being the oppression and dehumanization of the student, and according to Freire "the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing...the teacher is the Subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere objects" (Freire 73). The students are taught to not think for themselves but rather that which they are told; they are discouraged from acting analytically, creatively, or independently. Teachers present themselves are necessary to the students by "considering their (students) ignorance absolute" (Freire 72). The oppression that students feel in school follow them to the outside society and create more and more internalized problems to face.

In the majority of cases regarding the United States the banking system of education is usually found in low-income minority communities, where the students being oppressed are of Latino, African American, and Asian American decent These students have been found to be the most troubled in society, for as Keith Osajima explains, they
have to deal with the dynamics of oppression they face as students of a racial minority
groups. Similar to Freire, Osajima feels the "most devastating effects of oppression is that it
dehumanizes the oppressed people; that under the objective conditions of oppression
people lose their ability to see themselves as individual human beings" (Osajima 153). With
no way to release or get away from the oppression of society, these minority groups begin
to internalize it, creating an even larger problem which affects them tremendously.
Internalizing the problem turns students of minority to consider the reasons for the
oppression to be absolute and unchangeable. This is what Osajima means by, "Oppressed
people come to believe that they are the source of their problems lies, not in the relations
within society, but in themselves, in their own inadequacies and inabilities."(153) It is this
thought process that inhibits these students from trying to change their position in society
and try to advance in their career paths and lives. This internalized oppression is spread
from generation to generation making it more and more difficult to try to change.

The inequalities and injustices of the school system do not stop at just race but are
deeply rooted in the socio-economic gap within American society. Schooling in
low-income communities vs. higher income communities is very evident of the quality gap.
For Jonathan Kozal, these inequalities can be seen in the all levels of education. From early
learning programs and pre-schooling to high schools of Los Angeles County, in specific,
Fremont High School and Beverly Hills High School. Kozal presents the idea of the inequality of education starting at an early age, through the availability and quality of early learning programs for children. He states:

The governmentally administered diminishment in value of the children of the poor begins even before the age of five or six, when they begin formal education in the public schools. It starts during their infant and toddler years, when hundreds of thousands of children of the poor in much of the United States are locked out of opportunity for preschool education for no reason but the accident of birth and budgetary choices of the government, while children of the privileged are often given veritable feasts of rich development early education.

(Kozal 645)

Early education programs for low-income students are very important because they help to train and prepare children for what to expect in the next years of education. Many of the programs help to ease the transition from home to school for students and help to teach the minimal social skills needed to participate in class. While high income parents have the ability to send their children to what are sometimes referred to as "baby Ivies" where kids are taught far more and show far more improvement in learning along with demonstrating success in later years.
The inequality that children of color experience in their education does not stop but intensifies with time. Kozal does not just stop at the educational gap of pre-schooling but follows students to their high school education. In particular, the students of Fremont and Beverly Hills High School, and begin to analysis the social inequalities that have formed. From sanitary conditions to the availability of certain classes, the differences between these two schools are disturbing to acknowledge. In Fremont High School students complain about the unsafe sanitary conditions, one student stated, "Long lines of girls are waiting to use the bathroom which are generally unclean and lack basic supplies including toilet paper" (653). These conditions are not suitable learning conditions and students shouldn't have to think about the next opportunity they may get to relieve themselves without the consequences of missing class or breaking rules. But the injustices are not only in the sanitary conditions but also in the available levels of education. Students at Fremont talk about "being programmed into Sewing Class... or Life Skills a very basic course 'retarded class',"(645). Versus the expanded variety offered at Beverly Hills High School where students are given the ability to choose between, "...residential architecture, the designing of commercial structure, broadcast journalism, advanced computer graphics, and a sophisticated course in furniture design, carving and sculpture" (654). The different classes that are available to students are important because that is one of the few ways that
students broaden their learning horizons and begin to find interest in new things that they may continue on in the future. But many of the classes available are not vocational and keyed to low-paying levels of employment, which do not help oppressed students improve their situations through education.

The problems of the American Public Schooling System are strongly rooted in the inequalities of race in its society. Understanding this concept is important when trying to understand the problems that students of minority backgrounds have to deal with and the inability and struggle they face when trying to improve their situation. Kozal goes into depth with the concept that, "As racial isolation deepens and the inequalities of education finance remain unabated and take on new and more innovative forms, the principals of many inner-city schools are making choices that few principals in public schools that serve white children in the mainstream of the nation ever need to contemplate" (647). The need to make these types of decisions is supported by the case studies presented and my personal experience with a public inner city high school. The quality of education in America is far from equal, but rather is favored more to both whites and higher income citizens. This concept of a well-informed equal society seems impossible to achieve when the United States teaches their citizens that they are far from equal and that opportunities are available to you based on your race, social class, and socio-economic status.
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Essay 1300 ("America's Education: Equal for some but not for you"): Score 2

Essay 1300 exhibits several strengths in terms of the writer's overall sense of purpose, interest in exploring complex and challenging ideas, and engagement with sources and examples. The writer describes Freire's concept of the "banking" approach to education in acceptable detail and, later, describes the lack of early learning programs in lower-income schools with similar attention to specifics. At the same time, however, the writer doesn't fully explain the logical connections between these two types of injustice in relation to each other and to race and socio-economic status, the two major lenses through which the essay examines its topic. Moreover, the analytic center of gravity shifts when the essay locates its examination of internalized oppression within the logic of the "banking system" discussion rather than the larger framework of race and class.

In addition to offering a compromised analysis, the essay evidences frequent errors at the sentence level. Problems with structure and faulty predication intrude ("Publicizing the flaws of the education system has been a topic that many authors have begun to write about"), as do errors in grammar and sentence boundary (subject-verb agreement, comma splices, fragments, etc.). While the writer can be praised for thoughtfully considering weighty issues and supplying substantive support for the essay's claims, the essay does not display the kind of analytical and syntactical control required for more than a "satisfactory" assessment. Overall, this writer meets the minimum goals for a passing C1 essay; its overall quality merits a score of 2.
Male dominance has played a major role in the way many cultures are formed. Many families base their kinship on the idea of patriarchy, a tradition that has been long established. This idea is inherited from family to family, and continues to serve as a basis for many.

The idea of patriarchy has been a long established custom that has served many families. According to Allan Johnson, patriarchy revolves around the idea that the society or family is "male- dominated, male-identified and male-centered." Society wise, it is clearly portrayed that males have the advantage in many areas. They are known to fulfill higher positions such as administering large companies, being elected into government positions and running religious ceremonies. The idea of the survival of this idea is based specifically on the ones who are affected positively by this, also known as the male community. They continue this practice by reelecting "their kind" into the positions where it has been long established to be fulfilled by males.

Not only does the idea of patriarchy affect society as a whole, but also individual cultures. The Latino culture, for example, clearly portrays the idea of male dominance within the families. This culture is based on the idea that males have the last word to every decision. Males are stereotyped into being the main figure of the family who are the primary providers in the financial sense as well as disciplinary.

Although patriarchy is not as strict in Latino families as it once used to, it continues to prevail in many situations. Corina Olmos, autor of the essay "Mujer Malinche", clearly illustrates
to what extent patriarchy affects the contemporary Latino family. Her experience of
subconsciously disrespecting the older males of the family at dinner by sitting down before any
of them clearly depicts how even women stay true to this tradition. The women of the family
began to call her out for sitting down at the kitchen table before the oldest male, even though
Olmos' intention was not to be served first, but to take a break from sitting down. It is these
situations and experiences that contribute to the survival of patriarchy. Even though we are living
in a contemporary era, many families continue to practice patriarchy, giving utmost respect to
the male figure of the family.

My experience was not nearly as harsh as Olmos', however. My family no longer lives
up the idea of a strict sense of male dominance in the house. I cannot say that patriarchy no
longer exists in my family, but I can say that it is not practiced as strictly as other families. My
dad is the primary contributor financially, but my mother also works and she also contributes to
the household. It may not be as much as my dad who holds a full time job, but it is undoubtedly
helpful. When it comes to decision making, both my mother and my father discuss it, but
ultimately my dad is the one who has the final say. When I ask my mother for permission to do
something, she always tells me to call my dad and see what he says. She tells me that she is fine
with whatever he says. In a sense, I feel like my mom gives up her power or making decisions
when she says this, because it seems like she is afraid to make a decision without my dad being
in accordance with her. I do not understand this since there has been many instances where my
dad has made decisions without my mom's opinion. Although they were not decisions that
affected the
family to a large extent, it is still clear that my dad can do what he would like without consulting my mom first. I am not saying that it is a bad thing for the most part, since I can sometimes benefit from this, but I am not sure I am completely in agreement with this. Although my family may not serve as a first hand example of a strict patriarchal family, my family can portray a slight image of it.

I am happy to say that we are not like many other Latino families that male dominance is clearly the basis of their family. Yes, my family has strict rules, but nothing compared to what many other families follow. I am not saying that my family is disrespectful or we do not know how to behave ourselves since we are not faithful to the idea of patriarchy, because we are not. I am happy with how I was raised. Many other families have stricter rules that revolve around the male figure. For example, many families live in fear of the head of the household, given the fact that they live in a "macho" home. Macho is not always bad, but for someone who has known families with this type of home, I can say that I am happy my dad is no where near the personality they are. Many macho figures are rude and dominating, prohibiting the rest of the family members, specifically the females, from doing everyday things. Many feel that if they discontinue the way they run their family, they will lose control of the home and their families will be doomed. I can honestly say that this is not always the case. Like I said before, I live in a home where even though patriarchy is not as strong as other families, there is still a sense of male dominance. Last time I checked, my family was not doomed for not following stricter guides of male dominance in our home.

Patriarchy may seem like something that is not a big deal, but in fact it is. It can either
ruin or benefit whoever is exposed to it, depending on how far the idea of patriarchy is
practiced. Male dominance has seem to be the only way families and society ran about, but
perhaps it is time to change the norms around to a more lenient society and incorporate female
influence into the household as well as society overall.
Essay 0600 ("Manuscript"): Score 2

The writer of essay 0600 is clearly committed to the topic and to developing an authorial voice; to this end, the writer includes several rich narrative examples from personal experience. Moreover, the narrative portions of the essay clearly relate to the writer's central claim, stated in the third paragraph: "Males [in the Latino culture] are stereotyped into being the main figure of the family who are the primary providers in the financial sense as well as disciplinary." Yes, although the writer attempts to ground the essay in a theoretical overview of Allan Johnson's "Patriarchy" and foregrounds the discussion with some brief textual references, as a whole the essay does not engage sufficiently with the text.

This essay shows that when many first-year writers are provided the opportunity to engage in the genre of narration they can achieve a level of clarity, continuity, and occasion complexity—while direct textual analysis remains marginal at best While the personal examples here are relevant, the connections to the text are not realized or evolved; the writer's end result is a superficial consideration of patriarchy. Additionally, the non-narrative portion of the essay (a three-paragraph introduction and a single paragraph on Johnson's text) is syntactically simplistic and occasionally choppy or disconnected.

Essay 0600 can be considered satisfactory because it follows through with its central focus, contains scant but just enough textual analysis, and exhibits sufficient control over language and editing. (Also, it could have responded adequately to the assignment, an assessment point made in the Introduction to this pilot study.). Despite this essay's obvious limitations, it very marginally meets C1’s minimum goals for a passing essay: a score of 2.
The Multiple-Voiced Paper, Round 2: King and Machiavelli

Martin Luther King, Jr. and Machiavelli both exhibit their knowledge of what it entails to be a leader and of the struggles one will face in both their works, "The Prince" by Machiavelli, and "Letter from Birmingham Jail" by King. According to Machiavelli, in order to maintain a peaceful society, a leader must be stern and impose stern laws so that the society does not turn into chaos for, "it is more compassionate to impose harsh punishments on a few than, out of excessive compassion, to allow disorder to spread, which leads to murders or looting" (p.51). But what happens when there is no compassion at all? After reading, "Letter from Birmingham Jail", it is apparent that the authority figures in the segregation era, do exactly the opposite of what Machiavelli considers a good ruler should do because of their enforcement of unjust laws and their lack of compassion towards the African American community by continuing to treat them as inferior beings.

For King and other African Americans during this era of segregation, they were shown no compassion. Being the, "victims of a broken promise" (p. 152) after negotiations for peace, King passionately emphasizes that after centuries of abuse and mistreatment, African Americans as a people can no longer be told to, "Wait"! How can they be expected to wait any longer after being let down so many times? King very effectively appeals to the reader's emotions by vividly describing the specific abuses that he has witnessed. "But when you have seen mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick and even kill your black brothers and sisters...then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait" (p. 154). By forcing the reader to visualize the cruelty
that the African Americans had to endure, one can see why riots and looting occurred. The
oppressed can no longer take the oppression and so action has to be taken. The inability of the
authority figures during this time to set strict yet compassionate laws were, in fact, the very
reasons why there was such tension between whites and blacks.

As Machiavelli points out, there needs to be strict yet compassionate laws imposed on a
people. There must be a balance between the two because going too extreme in either direction
is not helpful in ensuring a peaceful society. In King's situation, the extreme was past strict all the
way to unfair. A ruler should strive to be both feared and loved, in the mind of Machiavelli. But
when only one is possible, it is better to be feared. Being feared, however, does not imply that
one must be hated. The authority figures during the segregation era were undoubtedly invoking
hate among the African American community. This hatred started at a young age when children
are not allowed to partake in activities that white children are allowed to partake in. After King
distressingly explains to his daughter that Funtown is closed to colored children, he sees, "tears
welling in her eyes...and ominous clouds of inferiority beginning to form in her little mental sky,
and see her beginning to distort her personality by developing an unconscious bitterness towards
white people" (p. 154). Growing up and constantly living with mistreatment inevitably causes
hatred towards white people as a whole. This situation demonstrates how going to one extreme,
in this case unfairness, leads to hatred. To show an example of an effective leader, Machiavelli
describes army commander, Hannibal, and his ability to avoid being hated. In both times of
success and failure, Hannibal's army always remained admirable of him because he was, in fact,
harsh and cruel. The army did not go against him in fear of the punishment that they would
receive, but they also wouldn't want go against him because he was keeping order and peace. If Hannibal had treated his army unfairly, as African Americans were treated, then the army would have most likely revolted against their leader, as African Americans did.

Hatred leads to a disorderly society, but, "excessive compassion" (p. 51) does this as well. If a ruler is too compassionate then the people are more likely to do harm because, "love attaches men to ties of obligation, which, since we are wicked, they break whenever their interests are at stake" (p. 52). If a man is fearful of the punishment that he could receive, then he is more likely to remain loyal to their leader, if remaining loyal does not mean injustices are being afflicted upon him.

If a law does not have the best interest for the people and, is therefore, unjust, then the possibility of a disloyal people is much higher. In the words of King, "Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust" (p. 155). Just and unjust are clearly defined for us and it is apparent that the laws African Americans were forced to abide by were not just. Not being able to vote and, consequently, not being able to express their opinion, or personality, is an example of an unjust law. And since these laws were unjust, King declares, "I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. One not only has a legal but a moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. I would agree with St. Augustine that, 'an unjust law is no law at all" (p. 154). Since the segregation laws clearly, "degrade human personality" (p. 155), King advocates disobeying unjust laws, but by doing so, "openly, lovingly, and with a willingness to accept penalty" (p. 155). The people enduring unjust laws by unjust leaders must go against the rules and accept
the punishments in order to promote a better future. The complexities of reasoning from both Machiavelli and King are difficult keep track of. But the most difficult part is the actual struggle of going against the authorities. Fighting for what one believes in is no easy task. When there are definite lines dividing one side from the other, unrest is clearly going to unfold. Unfairness and discrimination lead people to riot, loot, etc. Even though King's philosophy was to avoid violence at all costs, he as a single man could not control the actions of a massive group. The leaders of the nations are the ones who have an obligation to bring peace by administering laws that are fair to all people. When this necessary task is not performed, societal outbreaks will unquestionably occur.
Essay 0700 ("The Multiple-Voiced Paper, Round 2: King and Machiavelli"): Score 2

In essay 0700, the writer is working towards developing a substantive and engaging consideration of two complex texts, Martin Luther King Jr.'s *Letter from Birmingham Jail*, and Machiavelli's *The Prince*. The essay considers these two texts to support its central claim that law enforcement authorities during the Jim Crow era of segregation did not strike a balance between strictness and compassion, as Machiavelli advises.

While the essay explores the texts attentively and moves from topic to topic in an orderly fashion, some of the logical connections are hazy or problematic. For instance, the writer presents Hannibal, Machiavelli's army commander, as an example of an "effective leader" who, although "harsh and cruel," was able to "avoid being hated"; at the same time, the writer makes the point that Hannibal did not treat his army "unfairly." The writer doesn't explain how Hannibal can be cruel and fair simultaneously; nor does the writer parse the distinctions between the two concepts.

Other passages demonstrate the writer's lack of control, such as the paragraph that recommends that a leader avoid "excessive compassion," an idea that seems to undercut the next paragraph's concern about just and unjust laws. Machiavelli's view of what is just and unjust differs from King's (e.g., for King a just law promotes human dignity), but the writer is unable to work through the differences in a nuanced manner.

Additionally, the essay contains a fair number of editing errors, ranging from lack of proofreading to problems with sentence structure ("Hannibal's army always remained admirable of him") or missing signal phrases (or other forms of author identification) with quotations.

On balance, then, this essay is purposeful and uses texts in a marginally proficient way; thus, it meets the C1 minimum goals for a passing essay with an overall rating of 2.
 Essays with a Rating of 3: "Demonstrates clear competency"
Patients Not Criminals

Reduce the Harm

For over 50 years ago the War on Drugs has been measured by the ability to implement and enforce a 'zero tolerance' level. But is this really a war or, rather, an intertwinement of social and health problems? In attempting to maintain order, governments, such the American, rely on extremes such punitive prohibition and incarceration to send a 'tough on drugs' message, that usually ignores the health and welfare of its citizens. Throughout this 'drug war' most addicts have been confused for criminals because of the violent and corrupt system usually associated with the demand for drugs, however, these addicts are not criminals. They are patients: their addiction is an illness and cry for help. In his lecture professor Craig Reinarman stresses how harsh punishments such as prohibition and incarceration do not treat addicts but rather lead to corrupt 'underground' systems. Instead governments should try to enforce harm reduction policies, in order to regulate drug use while protecting the health of its users.

An addiction to drugs is essentially an illness. A disease can be described as "any departure from health presenting marked symptoms; malady, illness; disorder"(Webster Dictionary 2002). An addiction to drugs is primarily responsible for many psychological problems including depression and in some cases acts of violence. A drug addict can also develop serious physical ailments including heart attacks, strokes, organ failure, and death due to an over dose. Thus highlighting how a drug addiction is a disease that takes away a person's full mental capacity. In the "Report of the Global Commission on Drug Policy” the commissioners describe drug dependence as a "complex health condition that has a mixture
of causes—social, psychological and physical for example: harsh living conditions or a history of personal trauma or emotional problems. For these very reasons a person whose lifestyle is dependent on drugs should not be treated as a criminal, but as a patient pleading for help. Recently the American government has turned to extremes to try and regulate drug use, but are these extremes really working?

The government has responded to the drug war with extremes and harsh law enforcement against those involved in drug production, distribution, and use; usually advocating that all addicts are criminals. The government has spent thousands in arresting and incarcerating drug users. In his lecture, professor Craig Reinarman highlights how "America locks up 100,000 more persons just for drug offenses than the entire European Union does for all offenses, even though the EU has 100 million more citizens than the US (Reinarman 2011)". These statistics suggests that there are other methods of treating addicts, other than incarceration. The EU probably has as many or even more drug users than the US suggesting that America is more centralized in incarcerating its drug users, rather, than helping them recover and continue treatment Even by simply referring to this conflict as a 'drug war' the US is demonstrating its extremist ideal on drugs. This extreme incarceration method has proved to be unsuccessful in regulating drug use especially since drug addicts are not given ongoing treatment after their jail sentence. With no ongoing treatment available and drugs easily obtained how can we expect our prisons' population to achieve and gain sobriety? Most addicts have the tendency of once being released simply returning to the same circumstances and behaviors,
creating a never ending cycle. A person's addiction to drugs is not treated with punishment or harsh consequences it is simply restricted. It is a mistake to assume that all drug addicts are "mules", those who engage in the drug trade primarily for money to maintain their drug dependency. There has also been a tendency to associate drug use with minorities. In a professor Reinarman's lecture he argues that the percentage of white drug users is greater than minority drug user, however, the percentage of minorities incarcerated for drug use is far greater than the percentage of whites. This suggests that the methods for incarcerating drug addicts are not only ineffective, but certainly bias and corrupt (2011). This 'tough on drug' mentality has just filled prisons with some that are not even criminals in addition recent studies have shown that the price of incarcerating an addict cost ten times more than an actual treatment does.

Punitive prohibition is the other extreme the American government has enforced in order to attempt to regulate or put an end to this 'drug war'. This other extreme also does not work because of its tendency to lead to more violence and creation of corruptness. In the "Report of the Global Commission on Drug Policy" the commissioners argue that" existing evidence suggests that drug related violence and high homicide rates are likely a natural consequences of drug prohibition and that the increasing sophisticated and well-resourced methods of disrupting drug distribution networks may unintentionally increase violence"(2011 pg15). This extreme regulation leads to a corrupt 'underground' system were the government essentially has no control. As mirrored in the 1920's when the 13* Amendment prohibited the sale, manufacture, and transportation of any 'intoxicating liquor'. The prohibition of alcohol led to a corrupt underground system controlled by
bootleggers; just as the prohibition of drugs has led to the rise of drug cartels and gang violence. In the article "A Lucrative War" Ben Ehrenreich argues how prohibition has instead increased violence not only in the US, but has also caused mayhem in places like Mexico. He claims that the bloodshed in places such as Mexico "is the result of heightened competition between drug cartels for control of profitable smuggling routes, and of the military battling it out with the bad guys" (2010 pg2). Ehrenreich suggests that, prohibition does not seem to regulate, the manufacture and transportation of drugs, but rather causes violent uprisings amongst the cartels themselves as well as the cartels and the military(2010). Essentially nothing is being controlled; prohibition is simply causing tensions that lead to violent chaos.

Instead of turning to the extreme\textsuperscript{3}, such as incarceration and prohibition, governments should try to implement 'harm reduction policies'. The article "Global Commission on Drug Policy" the commissioners best define this policy as " an approach that includes syringe access and treatment using the proven medication methadone or buprenorphine to minimize the risk of drug overdose deaths and the transmission of HIV and other blood borne infections" (2011 pg5). These methods essentially accept mat a drug free world does not exists and attempt to reduce the harm that can be caused by drug use. These policies focus on creating "good Samaritan laws", acts that tend to others who are injured or ill. In his lecture to college nine Professor Reinarman focuses on how these policies highlight that an addiction to drugs is a health issue rather than a legal issue. He provides examples of how governments in countries, such as the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, have implemented policies and
programs that treat and protect drug user's health. For example governments provide needles for drug injections, in order to prevent the spread of diseases such as HIV or AIDS, which are caused from the sharing of needles. In some cases governments may even provide centers, where an addict can consume the drug, in order to prevent over dose and harm (2011). These polices understand that the complete prohibition of drug is an impossible task so therefore attempt to reduce the harm and focus the safety and health of the citizens.

Harm reduction policies are efficient because they tend to lead to fewer arrests while focusing on drug use as a public health issue by providing treatment The article "Global Commission on the Drug Policy" provides studies that show how countries, such the EU and Switzerland, "that implemented harm reduction and public health strategies early on have experienced consistently low rates of HIV transmission among people who inject drugs. Similarly, countries that responded to increasing HIV prevalence among drug users by introducing harm reduction programs have been successful in containing and reversing the further spread of HIV. On the other hand, many countries that have relied on repression and deterrence as a response to increasing rates of drug related HIV transmission are experiencing the highest rates of HIV among drug using population" (2011 pg6). This shows how harm reduction policies accept that the government cannot prevent drug use, so rather attempt to reduce the harms that can be caused. These policies respect the rights of individuals while regulating drug use and
trafficking. Harm reduction policies have proved to be a more effective and humane approach to the 'drug war' because of the treatment available. For example the article "Report on the Global Commission on Drug Policy" exploits a case study in Switzerland, during the 1980's when severe drug problems developed in the country. Switzerland implemented new policies and programs such as heroin substitution programs that relied more on the public health than crimination. The study concluded that "heroin substitution targeted hard-core problematic users- assuming that 3000 addict represented 10 percent to 15 percent of Switzerland's heroin users that may account for 30 percent to 60 percent of the demand for heroin on the illegal market Heavily engaged on both drug dealing and other crime forms, they also served a link between wholesalers and users. As the hard-core users found steady, legal means for their addiction, their illicit drug use was reduced as well as their need to deal heroin and engage in other criminal activities" (pg7).

This study suggests that by providing centers the government is essentially getting more control over the demand and consuming of drugs. These policies not only reduce the demand and consumption of the drug, but in theory also reduce criminal activity/ Since drug-uses is known to cause violent behavior. Thus, Harm-reduction is more effective in regulating drug use because it provides an ongoing treatment for drug addicts and gives the government control over the substance.

Although harm reduction policies can appear to be an appeasement to a drug war tantrum, they essentially lead to less incarcerations and end the violence caused by prohibition;
while acknowledging that drug addicts are not criminal but rather patients pleading for help.
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Essay 0100 ("Patience Not Criminals Reduce the Harm"): Score 3

Throughout essay 0100 the reader never doubts the writer's competence. The essay's purpose is clear, and the development underlying the purpose is logical (moving from defining addiction as a disease to exploring the different responses that disease and criminal behavior merit to proposing specific, more effective governmental responses to addiction).

The writer makes use not just of text-based sources, but of lectures as well, demonstrating an ability to purposefully synthesize different types of sources. Though the formatting of longer quotations is somewhat awkward (e.g., imprecise signal phrases), and the reporting of facts could be more sophisticated, movement from the writer's voice to source material is generally unproblematic.

The writer's occasional proof reading errors ("rely on extremes such [as] punitive..." in paragraph 1, for example) never obscure meaning. While the sentences are sometimes a bit ornate or not clearly controlled, these characteristics appear to reflect the writer's attempts to experiment with style and to develop a reasonable academic theme.
Looking Past Ourselves

America is self absorbed. Corporations, politicians, and the consumer each care only for themselves. Each part of our society does things in ways that grant them the most ease and profit. When these irresponsible actions have consequences, someone or something else must suffer the pain and damage.

Many companies that produce our food do not put thought or care into ensuring the quality of their products. The meat industry's cattle raising conditions show the truth of companies not protecting the health of consumers. A government health official, quoted in Fast Food Nation by Eric Schlosser, compared the modem feedlot to a crowded European city in the Middle Ages. "The cattle now packed into feedlots get little exercise and live amid pools of manure... Feedlots have become an extremely efficient mechanism for 'recirculating the manure' (175-176). By packing the cattle close together, farms can save money by using less land. But at me same time, the farms also create unsanitary living spaces. Farms not only keep cattle in miserable conditions, they feed the livestock things far from what they were evolved to eat. "Current FDA regulations allow dead pigs and dead horses to be rendered into cattle feed, along with dead poultry... cattle blood is still put into the feed given to American cattle... The waste products from poultry plants, including the sawdust and old newspapers used as litter, are also being fed to cattle... about 3 million pounds of chicken manure were fed to cattle in 1994" (176). To produce massive
amounts of cheap beef, farmers fit as many cattle together as possible. The farmers feed the
cattle cheap food so the animals will grow faster. Schlosser explains that "the rise in grain
prices has encouraged the feeding of less expensive materials to cattle, especially
substances with ahig protein content that accelerate growth" (176). Corporations put
cattle in such disgusting situations in order to make as much profit as they can. The beef
produced this way is not only unappetizing to think about, but potentially dangerous.

The conditions cattle are raised in make the contamination of beef very likely,
Schlosser writes, saying that the "recent changes in how cattle are raised, slaughtered, and
processed have created an ideal means for the [E. coli 0157:h7] pathogen to spread"
(175). The modern production of ground beef raises contamination risks further, by
centralizing to large slaughterhouses and processing large amounts of meat in one place "a
single animal infected with E. Coli 0157:H7 can contaminate 32,000 pounds of that ground
beef (177). The massive feedlots and protein filled diet make for an efficient cattle raising
process. The cost effective beef production process also increases danger for the people in
an efficient manner. The meat industry puts consumers at risk, and has "repeatedly denied
that problems exist... sought to avoid any responsibility for outbreaks of food poisoning,
and worked hard to shift the costs of food safety efforts onto the general public" (177).
The costs of cheap beef are in our health and safety as consumers. Companies refuse to
take responsibility for making people sick, and even refuse to take responsibility for
producing unsafe meat.

Consumers are not the only ones to be put at risk through companies' irresponsibility, though. Schlosser, in "The Chain Never Stops," says that according to findings from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, workers in the meatpacking industry have the nation's most dangerous job (188). However, workers who get injured on the job often are not compensated enough or at all, Schlosser continues, saying that the meatpacking companies have a vested interest in compensating workers as little as possible, because the more money they spend on injured workers, the less they keep as profits. Supervisors and foremen often discourage workers from reporting injuries or seeking first aid in order to get more annual bonuses. Companies usually do not deny workers with clear and visible injuries, but when injuries are less obvious or workers seem uncooperative, companies often block every attempt to seek benefits (193). Schlosser writes of the companies' intentions, "From a purely financial point of view, the company has a strong incentive to delay every payment in order to encourage a less-expensive settlement. Getting someone to quit is even more profitable - an injured worker who walks away from the job is no longer eligible for any benefits" (193). Companies treat workers as expendable, and try to get rid of them once they can no longer be used. But, many of these injured workers are left unable to work again, and must rely on welfare and unemployment to survive. Schlosser quotes Kevin Glasheen, a Texas attorney willing to battle IBP, saying, "By failing to pay the
medical bills of injured workers... large meatpackers are routinely imposing their business costs on the rest of society" (195). The meatpacking corporations treat the workers irresponsibly, ignoring worker injuries to save money. The companies' selfish actions in refusing workers compensation force the government and people to pay instead.

While the government supposedly exists for the people and to protect them, it does not always act in our best interest. The government should guarantee our safety, including guaranteeing that corporations do not sell us unsafe products. However, Schlosser writes in *Fast Food Nation:*

The nation's leading agribusiness firms have resolutely opposed any further regulation of their food safety practices. For years the large meatpacking companies have managed to avoid the sort of liability routinely imposed on the manufacturers of most consumer products. Today the U.S. government can demand the nationwide recall of defective softball bats, sneakers, stuffed animals, and foam-rubber toy cows. But it cannot order a meatpacking company to remove contaminated, potentially lethal ground beef from fast food kitchens and supermarket shelves. The unusual power of the large meatpacking firms has been sustained by their close ties and sizable donations to Republican members of Congress. (173)

The congressmen who received donations from the meatpacking firms helped the firms
continue make as much money as they could, instead of protecting consumers from
dangerous products. By preventing legislation that would punish the firms for their
wrongdoing from being passed, Republicans in Congress failed to enact not only legislation
to provide the USDA with the authority to demand meat recalls and impose civil fines on
meatpackers, but similar legislation introduced from 1996 to 1999 (182). Because the
Republicans care more about securing financial support than securing the safety of the
people, the meatpacking industry could operate with fewer restrictions, resulting in
contaminated meat being sold to and eaten by people. In their refusal to protect the people
by regulating the meat industry, the policymakers showed unwillingness to act in the
interests of the people.

The government has also not acted in the interest of the people in terms of U.S.
agriculture. J.P. Reganold, in an article titled "Transforming U.S. Agriculture," writes that
people commonly criticize subsidies for distorting market incentives and making our food
system too dependent on a select few grain crops used mainly to feed animals and make
highly processed food, while having negative effects on the environment and human health
(261). The government interferes with the agricultural economy without benefiting the
country as a whole. Michael Pollan, in The Omnivore's Dilemma, writes that corn subsidies
have driven the price of corn down, "impoverishing farmers, degrading the land, polluting
the water, and bleeding the federal treasury" (208). By not properly regulating the
agricultural industry, the government has created a detrimental economy to the environment and people.

Consumers are not only victims. By participating in the chain, consumers are supposed to be informed and responsible buyers. By buying a company's product, a consumer is essentially supporting that company's business practices. Consumers are also wasteful. Judith Selby Lang explains in "World's Oceans Face Problem of Plastic Pollution" about our attitude towards waste that we buy a bunch of disposable things that we have no problems throwing away. But when we toss it away, the trash does not just disappear, and the trash does not break down for a long amount of time. Lang says that "everything ends up somewhere." However, consumers only focus on their immediate involvement in the world. Their wastefulness comes from the perception that there are no consequences for just tossing something into the trash. The consumer does not feel the consequence, but the garbage ends up somewhere else as someone else's problem. This problem is fueled by consumers who only want to satisfy their own wants in a culture of excess. For example, Stan Cox writes in the article "Dress for Excess," that according to the Environmental Protection Agency, the average American throws away 68 pounds of clothing and other fabric every year. Compared to other countries, America buys textiles at a rate twice that of Spain, four times that of China, and seven times that of India (Cox). American consumers do not buy or discard their goods responsibly.
The people at each stage involved in production think they should only be responsible for themselves and what happens there. Unfortunately, when those easiest to exploit are made to suffer for our lack of compassion, we create a world where our economic systems destroy communities and environments.
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Essay 1400 ("Looking Past Ourselves"): Score 3

Essay 1400 represents a very solid 3. Though not necessarily sophisticated, the writing throughout is clearly competent: the reader recognizes that the writer has a purpose concerning food and corporations, has examined texts in an appropriate manner, and has grammatical and syntactical control of sentences.

The essay is at its strongest when marshaling evidence from readings (paragraphs 2-7). The writer comfortably moves between original prose and citations. The essay is somewhat weaker in analyzing the evidence (paragraphs 1 and 8). The writer is drawing appropriate inferences from the material presented, but these could be made more complex and precise in the hands of a more expert writer.

The essay is effectively edited, highly accurate on the sentence level, and reflects an understanding of the conventions of academic English.
Finding A Voice Through Oppression

Coming from an underprivileged community, I have experienced an educational system that does not have the resources to create professionals. As I went to a public school, it was not too great, pre-fabricated lessons and standardized testing eliminated my individual thoughts. While I compared my school to others, I only then noticed that my school was holding back. I knew somebody that was enrolled in a private school, same age, same grade, different lessons. Only then I realized that unless I wanted to feel behind all my life, I had to take the initiative and learn on my own. Society's low expectations of the students in my community planted the idea that we would not amount to much. I had to become the change I wanted to see in my society.

Similar to my experience, James Baldwin's "A Talk to Teachers" tells about the oppression that underprivileged student minorities faced as they entered a lacking educational system. Giving insight to history as it was taking place, this 1963 essay focuses on the educational, mental, physical, and emotional oppression that African American students faced in Harlem, New York, in the midst of the Civil Rights Movements. Baldwin's advice to teachers is to help underprivileged minorities break the bonds of their oppressed history and give them a fair chance to equal education. It is the obligation of these students to find their voice and use education to break free from their oppression so that they do not fall into society's low expectations. Society didn't expect much from them.
Most of these children were expected to become janitors, maids, and fill the low paying jobs in the community. Not having a positive influence and resources to become a professional, these students often conformed and became what society expected them to be. Although change in society begins with the educators devotion and influence, ultimately it is the child's responsibility to recognize their societal oppression and initiate the change they want to see.

Baldwin gives the teachers advice on how to help a student become empowered to find a voice and make a change in society. If a teacher challenges what society expects, they would be able to influence a student by showing how breaking tradition might be the only way to make a change. It is important that Baldwin is telling this specific group of teachers because they have the power to influence the young minds of the students. Because these teachers serve as the oppressors and limit the knowledge the students receive, they need to fix the damaging situation that the students are in. As stated in the text:

If, for example, one managed to change the curriculum in all the schools so that Negroes learned more about themselves and their real contributions to this culture, you would be liberating not only Negroes, you'd be liberating white people who know nothing about their own history, (page 683)

This quote is saying that educators can challenge society's expectations by teaching other
history for a change. Not only will African American students benefit, but white people will by receiving insight to part of their own history. This will teach students about their past and from there they will see the need to have a voice, the need to escape their ancestors oppressive history and change their future. Understanding their history will strengthen their voice and gain a valuable education by change society's expectations. Baldwin's advice to teachers is beneficial not only to them, but also to the students because they have to take the initiative and retain this information.

Students in Harlem in comparison to the rich white school, faced opposing realities. Baldwin explains that in Harlem, the school system was ineffective and oppressive. The educators that they received relayed little to no encouragement and served as the main oppressors to these students. Baldwin explains how these students were in an educational system that makes them "[run] the risk of being schizophrenic" (page 679). This comment on schizophrenia is depicting the harsh reality that the Harlem students faced every day. The American educational system told these students to become professionals, but they did not provide the resources to help these students achieve their goals, once they went home, they realized that they were not able to become a professional even if they wanted to. The act of telling a student one thing and them going home to another contributes to the thought of them becoming schizophrenic because it is telling them two things at once. Because, in society, these students were not seen to go to college, they did not have a voice and were
not able to fight for a change of history. In opposition to the Harlem students was the academic life of the rich, white, students across town. These students had everything: determination, positive influence, and goals they could reach. The life that these students lived in comparison to the Harlem students was completely superior. Because they went to a school that could provide them with the resources to be a professional, it was easier for them to follow society's expectations. The differing education between these students would have inspired a student minority to use his or her voice to get ahead and stray from society's low expectations.

Like the Harlem students, Gloria Anzaldua faced oppression by society and a lacking American school system. Anzaldua's "How to Tame a Wild Tongue" tells about the struggles she faced with oppression because of her culture and language. She understands the cause of her internal oppression, she states "as long as I have to accommodate the English speakers rather than having them accommodate me, my tongue will be illegitimate" (page 50). The start of her thought of an illegitimate and inferior language was in school. She was punished by her teachers because she spoke a different language in class. Being punished for something as natural as speaking a different language shows how the educators were being the oppressors. This made her consider her language to have less value than others. Although she feels inferior to those who don't understand her language, she challenged society by breaking the traditional
writing style and writing in two languages. By using Spanish phrases in her writing, she is making those who don't understand feel like she did while she was oppressed in school. Even though she stands up for herself by writing in two languages, it is the confidence and the voice she has that begins to create change in society. This connects to Baldwin's text because he comments on the change that could happen in society if the Harlem students had a voice, they would have the power to express their thoughts without feeling inferior to anyone else. By gaining to confidence to use their voice, they would be able to escape from the expectations that society has from them. It is up to the students to want to make a change, just like Anzaldúa.

Anzaldúa took the initiative to break free from her oppression by receiving an education. Like her, the Harlem students have the obligation to make their own path and escape from oppressive history on their own. Baldwin says how a teacher is the one who starts the change, but it is also up to the student to take advantage of the education they receive. As stated in the text, "it is your responsibility to change society if you think of yourself as an educated person " (page 685). This quote is telling how if a person finds themselves with information, they are responsible to share the knowledge and educate the rest of the community. The Harlem students aren't receiving the positive influence they need from educators, but once one student finds the courage to use their voice, it is up to them to inform others. Even though teachers are the ones who start the change, the students need to
find the courage to strengthen their voice and speak up. Furthermore, a child must recognize that the only way out of an oppressive history is through a valuable education.

With the obligation these students have, society's views of the Harlem students would alter and education would have served as freedom from oppression. Like Baldwin says:

The purpose of education... is to create in a person the ability to look at the world for himself, to make his own decisions, to say to himself is this black or is this white, to decide for himself whether there is a God in heaven or not. To ask questions of the universe, and then learn to live with those questions, is the way he achieves his own identity, (page 678)

The ability for a student to freely question anything is a symbol that individual thoughts exist in their minds. Education is supposed to liberate, not oppress. The advice given to teachers and the future information from teacher to student will serve as a tool to escape oppressive history and unfair societal judges.

The need for a student to find a voice among a society that excludes uneducated people is crucial because otherwise they will live among the oppression their whole lives. The importance of the advice that was given by Baldwin is that it will directly benefit the students. The advice to challenge norms and help oppressed students exceed low expectations is crucial to society because "if this country does not find a way to use that energy, it will be destroyed by that energy" (Baldwin page 686). A student should find their
voice and use it before they conform into what society expects from them.
Essay 0400 ("Finding a Voice Through Oppression"): Score 3

Essay 0400 demonstrates competence, even if it is not as compelling as essays 0100 or 1400. Though the introductory paragraph's focus on self slightly misdirects the reader (since the rest of the essay takes a larger perspective), it is not unrelated to the essay's ultimate purpose. The writer initially stumbles in weaving together personal experience and textual analysis; by the end, however, the writer has more skillfully layered voice with argument.

Essay 0400 appropriately and effectively utilizes two sources (Baldwin and Anzaldua), drawing parallels between them and tying them to the writer's own ideas (if not experiences, as the introduction suggests). Editing problems are relatively rare and usually minor, such as imprecise use of apostrophes. While occasional weaknesses of phrasing appear (e.g., "a lacking educational system" in paragraph 2; "Understanding their history... will gain a valuable education" in paragraph 3), meaning is not obscured; the reader can generally follow the writer's reasoning.

Overall, while essay 0400 does not "demonstrate sophisticated understanding and execution" required of a 4 score, for the most part it rises above the "satisfactory if at times marginal proficiency" of a score of 2; specific examples are explained in the context of the writer's larger topic, including the claim in the final paragraph that everyone must "help oppressed students exceed low [social] expectations."
Essay with a Rating of 4: "Demonstrates sophisticated understanding and execution"
Don Manuel as a Christ like Figure: Goodness above all else

Unamuno's novella depicts the atheistic Priest Don Manuel as a Christ-like figure, showing how one can live a good Christian life without a predisposed disposition to believe in God and eternal life. He shows, through the example of Don Manuel, that a lack of faith, or inability to believe, does not eliminate the possibility of goodness in that person. And furthermore, it shows that deception is not sinful, but rather is deemed good or sinful based on the deceiver's motives. Through Don Manuel's good works and façade of faith, he becomes more Christ-like than most Christians, as demonstrated by the villagers who blindly accept their faith spoon-fed by tradition and habit. It is arguable that because this text appears within an Existentialist anthology that it's intent is to emphasize goodness as defined solely by actions and good works; but it is Don Manuel's motives that make him good, and Christ-like. His lack of faith does not equate to hypocrisy but rather renders his motives pure because he does not expect anything in return; in his mind there is no heaven or eternity waiting for him. He embodies Christ's ideals because he is pure at heart; to only note Don Manuel's actions is to miss a key part of Christ's teachings.

Manuel's doubt plagues him and in his attempt to escape from his self-inflicted torment, he is constantly doing good works. He dedicated his life to "salvaging wrecked marriages, forcing unruly children to submit to their parents, or reconciling parents to their children, and, above all, he consoled the embittered and weary in spirit and helped everyone to die well" (Unamuno 260). He became caregiver, protector, mentor, teacher, companion, fellow worker, as well as a spiritual and ethical father of the village all in an attempt to distract himself from his thoughts. He repeatedly spoke against idleness and fled
from solitude. Jesus emphasized the importance of loving your community more than yourself as well as compassion towards others, qualities which Don Manuel takes on fully. During the Sermon on the Mount Jesus said: "Give to everyone who begs from you, and do not refuse anyone who wants to borrow from you" (Matthew 5.42). Manuel gives to everyone in need in his village, ensuring that all have clothes and firewood.

Jesus also said that you should not hide your goodness, but rather "let it shine before others, so that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father in heaven" (Matthew 5.16). These values epitomize Don Manuel. He gives himself entirely to his community believing that he is "meant to live for [his] village, and die for it too" (Unamuno 267). He extinguishes any dissention that sprouts in his village. When a young woman returns to the village, unmarried, with a son, Manuel convinces her old sweetheart to marry her, thus avoiding any division amongst the villagers. He understands the value of unity within the community just as Jesus understood the danger of the divisions within the Jews of his time. Jesus united his people with his life, death and resurrection; Manuel united his people with the example of his life. The people turned to the lake for healing and "Don Manuel undertook to fulfill the same function as the lake, to serve as a pool of healing, to treat his people and even, if possible, to cure them" (Unamuno 260). He gives himself to the village, suffering with his doubt in silence so that the villagers may live, and die, content. Manuel is motivated by a desire to protect his people, which is pure because he does not believe. If he believed, like the villagers do, he would not have that motivation. If he believed and still sought to protect his people it would not be with the same passion, and selfless desire because he would be offering his people joy, and not attempting to shield
them from torment. The drive to protect those you love from pain is far more powerful than the desire to make them happy.

Don Manuel's recognition of the importance of faith in eternal life for his people, and his consequent crusade to shield them from his perceived truth that there is no afterlife, makes him Christ-like. Because he realizes the gravity of their need for faith by contrasting it with his forlornness - which is a result of his inability to believe - he sacrifices himself for his people to protect them from his fate. He knew that he must uphold his facade of faith for their sake, and so "The imperturbable happiness of Don Manuel was merely the temporal, earthly form of an infinite, eternal sadness which the priest concealed from the eyes and ears of the world with heroic saintliness" (Unamuno 266). This is his most Christ-like attribute; his self-sacrifice out of love for his people. Unamuno draws a distinct connection between God's love for man, and Manuel's love for his people. The narrators' exclamation of: "How he loved his people!" alludes to the Gospel's message that God sent his Son to die for mankind out of love (Unamuno 259).

This unwavering love that Manuel has for his village drives him, and causes him to takes on the role of Christ for his village. He acted as their guide out of sin, and their protector from that which he knew they could not handle. Just as Jesus took up his cross at the will of his Father, Don Manuel took up his cross for the sake of the people. Manuel has lost the ability to believe which he possessed as a child, and so has lost his life, for a life without meaning is not life. This loss makes him worthy of Christ because Jesus said: "whoever does not take up the cross and follow me is not worthy of me. Those who find their life will lose it. and those who lose their life for my sake will find it" i Maxthew
10.38-39). Manuel adheres to Christ's teachings but cannot find it within himself to believe in an afterlife. Because he acts without faith, his motives are not tainted by a sense of obligatory self-interest that leads many Christians to do 'good works' such as donate to charity or do volunteer work. His motives are pure because they spring from his desire to bring peace, contentment and joy to his people; he seeks to show them how to live in harmony with each other and how to be good, since he knows that while they will not listen to his words, they cannot ignore his actions. It is not reasonable to argue that his motives are selfish because - though he does seek distraction from his mind - he does so through selfless acts, and by sacrificing his happiness.

The accusation that Don Manuel is a deceiving hypocrite is unjust because he never contradicts himself or professes to believe that which he doubts. He shields the people from his torment out of love for them, and because he knew they would not understand. He does not say that he believes in the Devil, the God of the Church, or an after life. It cannot be said that Manuel speaks against his beliefs when he leads the church in prayer because, as the narrator attests: "As we reached the section "I believe in the resurrection of the flesh and eternal life," Don Manuel's voice was submerged, drowned in the voice of the populace as in a lake. In truth, he was silent" (Unamuno 263). That last sentence is proof that Manuel never claimed to believe in eternal life. As for a belief in God, Manuel believes in God, only his belief does not consist of an omniscient, guiding being that directs men to Heaven or Hell after death, but rather God exists in man, and in the world. When Angela questions him about the existence of Hell he tells her to "Believe in Heaven, the Heaven we can see" which is the good and beautit within the people and nature surrounding each of us
(Unamuno 270). When Angela and Lazaro's mother is dying, believing she is on her way to Heaven. Manuel tells her that she is "not going anywhere" (Unamuno 273). She persists that she is "going to see God" and he responds without compromising his belief: "God, my daughter, is all around us, and you will see Him from here, right from here. And all of us see in Him, and He in all of us" (Unamuno 273). For Manuel, "God" is love; this is a sentiment reflected by Jesus' apostle John who says: "God is love" (1 John 4.8). Manuel does not deceive his people. He teaches them to live, and die, well, just as Jesus taught his people.

Don Manuel is an iconic example of goodness as defined by selfless acts spurred by pure motives. The philosophy of Jesus is apparent throughout Manuel's character through his existentialism. All who claim to be Christian should examine themselves and excavate any selfish assumptions that an act is detachable from its motives; for they will not be judged solely on what they have accomplished, but by their intentions, thoughts and motivations behind each act; "for the LORD does not see as mortals see; they look on the outward appearance, but the LORD looks on the heart" (1 Samuel 16.7). Those who claim to be atheist should also examine themselves and ensure that their actions are good and their motives are pure. For "to have done good, to have feigned good, even in dreams, is something which is not lost" despite religious inclinations, beliefs, or the state of reality, whatever it may be (Unamuno 285). The importance of life is to be good; faith and theology are unnecessary, so long as the intent is pure and the action is for the good of all.
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Essay 1700a ("Don Manuel as a Christ like Figure: Goodness above all else"): Score 4

While not flawless in its analytic purpose or execution, essay 1700a demonstrates a strong understanding of the material—two texts: the unnamed Unamuno novella, and the Gospel of Matthew. Despite occasional over-writing (e.g., "predisposed disposition" in the first sentence), the writer also displays some ambitious phrasing: "He became caregiver, protector, mentor, teacher, companion, fellow worker, as well as a spiritual and ethical father of the village all in an attempt to distract himself from his thoughts" (page 2, lines 2-3). Even more impressive, the writer offers a nuanced consideration of complex concepts—such as the "value of unity" in the second paragraph on page 2— and an overarching exploration of Unamuno's existentialism and the tensions between Don Manuel's motivations and actions.

The writer formulates and sustains a clear purpose, or a set of related purposes: to draw parallels between Christ and Don Manuel (note the skillful use of the semi-colon on page 2: "Jesus united his people with his life, death, and resurrection; Manuel united his people with the example of his life"); and to argue with precise reasoning that goodness is gauged by intentions as well as actions—doing good in the absence of faith and belief in the afterlife as compared to obligation and self-interest in being charitable.

In brief, throughout the essay the writer employs an effective prose style (e.g., dashes setting off non-restrictive relative clauses on page 3), edits accurately, and exhibits fine analytic control in relating specific examples to larger themes. The writer very thoughtfully develops the essay's ideas: not only through offering several independent links between Unamuno's novella and the New Testament, but also by addressing interpretive counterpoint ("The accusation that Don Manuel is a deceiving hypocrite": page 4)—a very mature rhetorical move that serves to deepen the intellectual claim of the paragraph (and the essay itself) that Don Manuel teaches people "to live, and die, well, just as Jesus taught his people" (page 5). Essay 1700a demonstrates overall sophistication for a first-quarter (C1) student at the university.
EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES OF WRITING 20/21/23

Writing 20, 21, and 23 are taken by students who have been assessed or self-described as needing additional work on their writing after Core and before moving on to C2. Like all writing courses, Writing 20, 21, and 23 address both reading and writing and approach each of these on multiple levels. While the topics addressed in Writing 20, 21, and 23 will overlap with those in C2, these topics will generally be addressed in Writing 20, 21, and 23 with more explicit scaffolding and with more detailed articulation of the distinct strategies and skills that can be applied at any stage of the composing process.

Writing 20, 21, and 23 affirm and supplement the goals of C1/C2, and to this end:

1. Students in Writing 20, 21, and 23 learn—when reading, writing, listening, or speaking—to analyze rhetorical situations so as to understand their different purposes and contexts and to respond to these with appropriate strategies.

2. Students in Writing 20, 21, and 23 learn to recognize, evaluate, and discuss matters of opinion and interpretation (their own and others’).

3. Students in Writing 20, 21, and 23 learn to develop different effective processes for writing in different contexts, particularly those used within the academic community, and to use a variety of strategies for discovering, developing, analyzing, and defending ideas, for making sense, for revising, and for editing.

4. Students in Writing 20, 21, and 23 learn to produce writing that
   • establishes and maintains an appropriate purpose in relation to the assignment and the audience.
   • employs appropriate strategies of development in relation to the assignment, its context, and its audience.
   • uses sources’ information and ideas accurately and effectively and cites sources appropriately.
   • communicates in accurate, appropriate, effective prose.

5. Students in Writing 20, 21, and 23 learn strategies for becoming more accurate readers and critical analysts of all texts, including their own.

6. Students in Writing 20, 21, and 23 learn how to collaborate with others in generating and evaluating ideas and revising texts.
Writing 20, The Nature of Written Discourse
As they move from Core and prepare for C2, students experience facilitated entry into communities of scholarly communication. This entry emphasizes the importance of context, helping students build a repertoire of skills that will allow them to recognize, evaluate, and participate in conversations in a range of disciplines.

Catalogue Description: Explores the dynamics of written language: its relationship to speech, thought, and culture; its uses in different personal, academic, professional, and public contexts; its abuse in jargon and propaganda. Course work includes extensive practice in different kinds of writing.

Students in Writing 20 will:

1. Do close reading of a variety of texts, generally of article length.

2. Develop and practice reading strategies that allow them both to process texts in their most literal sense, but also in terms of their implications, assumptions, and underlying purposes.

3. Develop recursive, inductive reasoning skills that can be applied to their reading and writing and that allow development of a nuanced stance, rather than simple agreement/disagreement.

4. Make explicit use of the often recursive and sometimes intuitive processes of composing and revising.

5. Recognize and begin to make use of a variety of the conventions of academic writing.

6. Write frequently both in and out of class producing not only essays, but other works that allow them to use writing to generate ideas, assess their own understanding of challenging concepts, and to experiment with a variety of rhetorical stances and approaches.

7. Learn to distinguish between topic, stance and purpose.

8. Develop individual strategies for identifying and correcting problems with their own prose.

9. Begin developing a vocabulary that allows discussion of writing and revising (their own and others’) on multiple levels.

10. Hone and present their ideas in writing in a way that allows for increasing complexity and precision of these ideas.
Writing 21, Meaning and Style: the Sentence in Context
Students continue the work begun in Core and Writing 20 with an increasing emphasis on those aspects of academic English that are least accessible to those from multi-lingual backgrounds.

Catalogue Description: Explores, via cross-cultural readings, the nature, uses, and abuses of language. Course work includes extensive writing, both take-home and in-class. Emphasis on revising for power of expression and for variety and accuracy at the sentence level.

Students in Writing 21 will:

1. Refine strategies for reading texts of different lengths.

2. Learn to interact with texts in ways that acknowledge implicit, as well as explicit, ideas, claims, and purposes.

3. Use writing and discussion to contextualize their own ideas within and alongside the ideas of other writers.

4. Continue to develop effective personal writing processes that can be adjusted to meet multiple rhetorical situations.

5. Continue to experiment with and control the conventions of academic writing.

6. Explore the interplay between purpose and audience and begin to understand how this can inform their decisions as writers.

7. Further develop individual strategies for identifying and correcting problems with their own prose.

8. Continue to master methods of evaluation of and response to written texts that move beyond simple agreement/disagreement.

9. Expand their personal and academic vocabulary in order to explore texts and express ideas more richly and precisely.
Writing 23, Grammar and Rhetoric: Language and Writing

Catalogue Description: Builds on writing skills gained in previous writing courses; focuses on effective language use in academic writing. Students reinforce their written English proficiency by reading, studying, practicing, and writing structures and patterns of written English.

Students in Writing 23 will:
1. Interact critically with a variety of academic texts through both discussion and writing.

2. Develop written responses to texts employing information beyond that contained within the texts themselves.

3. Write in ways that reflect an ability to use the conventions of academic discourse to develop and defend their own ideas.

4. Broaden the range of rhetorical strategies they are comfortable employing in the process of developing their own ideas in writing.

5. Write frequently both in and out of class in response to readings and ideas from a range of disciplines.

6. Continue to develop individual strategies for identifying and correcting problems with their own prose.

7. Use writing to explore, evaluate, and—when appropriate—reconcile a variety of stances on a single topic.

8. Continue to develop a rich, precise vocabulary that reflects an understanding of the norms of academic discourse within specific disciplines.
Grading Subcommittee Progress Report, 2011-2012

Committee Members:

Sandy Archimedes, Chair
Toby Loeffler
Brij Lunine
Ellen Newberry
Amy Weaver

The Committee’s task: The Committee explored the benefits and drawbacks of putting letter grades on individual papers in Writing 2. We also discussed the possibility of the Writing Program having a non-uniform policy that would allow for instructors to either grade or not grade papers, according to their own preferences.

General procedure: The Committee’s procedure breaks down into three main elements: (1) We reviewed the literature on grading and not grading papers, especially focusing on more recent material; (2) we conducted a survey of “a” equivalency faculty in the Writing Program; and (3) we outlined future goals. These items are discussed in more detail below.

Key talking points in the literature: In general we discovered that although a few sources contained material that was partially or implicitly supportive of some form of grading, there was almost nothing in recent years that made an overt argument in favor of doing so; clearly, the pedagogical center of gravity has shifted from one grounded in a quantitative type of assessment to one based on holistic principles enacted within a portfolio system. (Some analysts have described this split as being between “summative” and “formative” approaches; see Huot, “Toward a New Discourse of Assessment for the College Writing Classroom,” 167). However, the issue is a bit more complicated than would initially appear from these findings, because the question addressed in the literature is not simply whether to grade or not to grade, but rather how to assess writing in a way that enables students to become better writers and that coaxes their best work out of them. Couched in these terms, there is then quite a wide variety of approaches to assessment, some of them closer to the quantitative (or summative) model and others further away from it. Thus, Peter Elbow (“Grading Student Writing: Making It Simpler, Fairer, Clearer”) discusses ways to use minimal grading (credit/no credit, no pass/pass/high pass, scores of 1/2/3, and so on) not only on “low stakes” writing, but also on “high stakes” writing such as essays. Additionally, he explores ways to give grades or a grading-like system more meaning by using grids or specific criteria. At the other end of the spectrum (and in much higher numbers) are those who shy away from quantitative measurements and develop their assessment entirely through written feedback, conferences, and open-ended assignments designed to encourage exploration and inquiry. Some of these instructors see assessment more as a partnership between teacher and student rather than a one-way process (see especially Yancey, “Teacher’s Stories: Notes toward a Portfolio Pedagogy”). Others suggest eliminating the question of merit completely and basing final course grades on quantity (all the work is credit/no credit and students gets points based on the amount of passing work they complete; see especially Adkison and Tchudi, “Grading on Merit and Achievement: Where Quality Meets Quantity”). Taken as a whole, what is striking about arguments on both ends of the spectrum is that the summative/formative distinction doesn’t always hold fast. For a list of the main readings we consulted, see the attached document, “Grading Committee Reading List.”

The survey: The survey was envisioned as a means to start a conversation, not as any kind of final pronouncement. Out of 23 potential respondents (we sent the survey only to those with the “a” equivalency) we received 18 responses (including responses from 3 of the 5 grading committee members). This represents about half of the instructors working within the Writing Program (both “a”
and non-“a” faculty). The survey posed three questions: (1) Do you think that the Writing Program needs a uniform grading policy? (2) Would you like to have the OPTION to give grades on essays in Writing 2? (3) How do you think that either grading or not grading essays would affect your pedagogy or your students’ learning experience? For the first question, a majority (8 respondents, including one with qualifications) answered “yes,” they would like a uniform policy, while a significant minority (5, including one with qualifications) answered “no.” For the second question, a majority (9 respondents) answered “no,” they would not like the option to give grades, while a significant minority (6 respondents) answered “yes”. Not surprisingly, the most interesting and complex comments came in response to the third question. Highlights from these comments are outlined below:

- **Instructors who were against grading** made some of these comments:
  - Grading does not motivate students.
  - If students see a grade, they don’t read the comments (several similar survey responses).
  - Grading makes students afraid to experiment and take risks.
  - It’s not fair to struggling students to grade them on work they do early in the quarter, before they have progressed.
  - Grading turns the students into passive, not active learners.
  - One instructor sees his/her role as that of writing coach, not judge.

- **Instructors who gave reasons in favor of grading** mentioned some of the following ideas:
  - Grading does motivate students (two similar survey responses).
  - Not grading is unfair to students; it produces anxiety.
  - Students come from a culture of grading, so they have trouble adapting to a different system.
  - Grading could possibly help instructors manage their workload.

- **Instructors who were open to experimenting with grading** made some of the following comments:
  - There’s not a big conflict between grading/not grading because the instructor can continue to use grades along with a portfolio system, extensive feedback, etc.
  - One instructor requires students to respond directly to his/her feedback, so grading would not change the students’ response to the instructor’s comments.
  - Some instructors are curious; they want to know whether and how grades could work with a portfolio or revision-promoting pedagogy.

For a complete transcription of the survey comments, see the separate document entitled “Grading Survey Comments.”

**Future goals:** To collect feedback from all instructors in the Writing Program, the Committee proposes that we allot an hour or more to discussing the topic of grading in an upcoming meeting, preferably early in the fall quarter. As background to the issue, we would send out a list of suggested readings in advance of the meeting. We have already sent out two articles, one by Peter Elbow and one by Brian Huot, via email to all Writing Program faculty. If there is interest in an experiment, we would suggest that a pilot program be performed in the spring quarter. In such a program, a few Writing 2 instructors could use letter grades on papers, perhaps in conjunction with a portfolio system. At the end of the quarter, students in these courses could fill out a survey or questionnaire in which they would respond to questions about their attitudes on grading (or whether they would automatically choose instructors who used grading, if offered a choice). As a control survey, students in the non-grading sections could be asked questions on their feelings about not receiving grades on papers, especially in comparison to their feelings at the start of the quarter (this suggestion came from Phil Longo).

**Supporting documents:** Attached to this report are three documents that provide more context for the topics discussed here: (1) “Grading Survey Comments” (a copy of the comment portion of the grading
survey); (2) “Grading Committee Reading List” (a list of readings that we found especially relevant); and (3) “CCCC Writing Assessment Bibliography” (a list of readings on writing assessment from CCCC).

Overall, we realize that there is much interest in this issue and that much more discussion in the program needs to take place.
Library Committee Draft Report
September 2012

The Writing Program’s Library Committee began its work during the 2010-11 school year, its membership including Robin King, Annalisa Rava, Veronica Flanagan, Robin Somers, Mark Baker. Our initial (and ongoing) projects evolved from the three pillars central to the Committee’s charge:

1. Develop a survey for Writing Program faculty to relay to the library our needs, concerns, thoughts regarding library instruction;

2. Further the Writing Program’s internal annotated bibliography of library materials (books, journals) relevant to the work on Writing Program faculty;

3. Work with reference librarians to design a 2-part workshop series whereby Writing Program faculty could gain greater insight into library databases, advanced searching methods, keyword searching.

During the 2010-11 school year the Committee met a handful of times with Reference and Instructional Librarian Annette Marines as well as on its own without Annette. The Committee wrote initial survey questions for Writing Program faculty to collect thinking about library workshops; after consultation with librarians, we all decided the nature of the first survey would not serve librarians well. At this time given pending changes to library service and library instruction, we are rewriting the survey so as to collect the most useful information from Writing Program faculty that can be used by librarians and the Writing Program alike.

The Committee continues its work in building and revising the annotated bibliography--this will be made available spring quarter 2013.

Our big project for this year (finally) given the conclusion of the Writing Program’s SOE search will be one or two meetings/workshops with librarians (Annette Marines or another instructional librarian). We hope to cover two prime issues this winter/spring during the workshop:

1. Training for faculty. Though there has been debate as to what topics and areas would be most useful for Writing Program faculty, the plan is to offer a 70 minute workshop and discussion over library databases, advanced searching methods, assisting students to refine their topics.
2. Library instruction. As the UCSC Library wrestles with its own series of budget cuts, the library will be revising its method of delivering instruction to first year students. The Committee will work with a liaison from the library this year to impart this information to our colleagues, and to plan a session whereby faculty can plan for the changes and how these changes will affect our curriculum.

The Committee will have one general meeting so that its members can bring other issues, ideas, suggestions to the table regarding other Writing Program and Library matters.
The C2 paper committee completed its second year of work in 2011-12. Our objectives and a report on the work we accomplished during the year follow below.

Committee members: Elizabeth Abrams; Maggie Amis; Derede Arthur; Joy Hagen; Lindsay Knisely; Stephen Sweat. Chair: Roxi Power Hamilton

Goals:

- **Generate ideas and versions of what constitutes an “essay.”**
  Published C2 objectives indicate that C2 courses assign five essays. While there are a series of expectations about what our students must be taught (e.g., about persuasion, argument, use of sources, etc.), with the exception of the proviso that at least one of those essays must reach a minimum of 1500 words, there are no stated requirements about the form or length of the essays: individual instructors may make their own decisions about how to meet these goals. Discuss guidelines for accomplishing our C2 objectives while retaining the individualized and autonomous character that is the strength of our program. Questions we discussed in meetings over the past two years: what is an essay? What do we currently assign, and why? What sorts of options do we have for essay assignments?

- **Create a means to share our C2 pedagogy.**
  1. **Establish a Pedagogy discussion series** (“brown bag lunches”) for faculty to present assignments and pedagogical strategies (1-2 per term). A separate committee has been established to coordinate the series in 2012-13.
  2. **Collaborate with creators of the Writing Program electronic archive** to (a) create a sharable repository of C2 assignments to broaden our pedagogical repertoire; and (b) archive transcripts and sound links from talks given at our pedagogy colloquia (2011-2012).
  3. **Create and distribute a C2 workload survey.** Following the model of the Writing Program’s committee on grading, solicit anonymous comments on workload concerns. The focus should be proactive rather than reactive: factors such as class size, student preparedness, ELL status, and required numbers of essays are either fixed or otherwise beyond our control. The survey should focus on sharing/inventing strategies we all use to address these and other challenges including the strains that the rising cost of education and pay cuts puts on students and teachers alike. Summarize and analyze results in a document we post on the Archive. Lead discussion about results in a program-wide meeting (2014).

Accomplishments:

- **Creation of a "survey of writing assignments” (see addendum 1)** based on a brief questionnaire we sent to our Writing Program colleagues: “please list all formal essay assignments and describe each in no more than 1-2 sentences.” (Roxi sent the survey and gathered responses; Derede summarized results in a list that reflects the responses.) The list includes a number of distinct essay genres and some assignments that trail lingering questions. The latter include critical reading
journals (several colleagues would like these to count as one essay, but this brings us back to the question of “what is an essay?” and whether quality--more formal considerations--prevail over quantities of informal writing, no matter how impressively written?); and assignments with multiple drafts (when is a draft a separate essay?). We concluded that an essay, to be one of the minimum required five, must be a discrete intellectual exercise: i.e. two versions of the same essay must involve revisions sufficient to meet that criterion. We agree that assignments such as a detailed annotated bibliography count as an essay. (See for example the sort that Jim Wilson assigns in which students are required to critically analyze the legitimacy of each of their sources in convincing prose.)

What we do with this list is the subject of future discussions. For example, how do we accomplish our twin objectives of teaching “rhetoric” and “inquiry” in each assignment? For now, we will post on the WP electronic archive.

• Establishment of a pedagogy colloquium series. In the spring of 2011, we held the first “brown bag lunch” in which faculty presented some aspect of their C2 pedagogy. In the 2011-12 academic year we assisted presenters in organizing and advertising their colloquia. Last year’s colloquia include:
  1. “Using student writing groups effectively,” Lindsay Knisely, Ingrid Moody
  2. “What is an essay? Effective assignments for C2”
     a. Carol Freeman: “What is an essay? A history of the C2 objectives”
     b. James Wilson: “Assigning the annotated bibliography”
     c. Elizabeth Abrams: “Annotating our assignments for the archive”
  4. “Resource Archive tea and discussion,” Joy Hagen
  5. “Research in Writing 2: An overview,” Brij Lunine, Terry Terhaar

See addendum 2 for more detailed descriptions of each of the pedagogy colloquia hosted during 2012-13.

Looking forward:
• Future pedagogy colloquia: in 2012-13, we plan to present winter term colloquia on “Allotropes of the Academic Essay” (Stephen Sweat, Robin Somers, Amy Weaver, and Roxi Power Hamilton) as well as a round-table discussion, “Effective pedagogy/Efficient workload.”

• Many topics for future colloquia were generated during the 2012 fall retreat. These could be spread over this year and next. They include the following: Strategies for teaching ELL students (most popular topic); Student collaboration; Reading challenging texts; Grammar pedagogy; Writing that instructors don’t respond to; Guiding students in academic success; Presenting Rothman award essays and assignments; Creative writing in composition; Library instruction; Assigning shorter papers; Student-centered classes. They also include reprisals of popular colloquia that many had to miss: Digital feedback; Using group conferences for feedback; Teaching research. Note the request that presenters model how we do things in class rather than just summarize or describe.
There were 28 respondents to the survey, which was sent to all regular writing program faculty. Responding to student writing and meeting with students were overwhelmingly the most time-consuming tasks reported, with all of the responding faculty ranking these as their top task and spending from seven to over 20 hours per week on feedback for students. In keeping with our program’s pedagogical goals, other instructional tasks such as corresponding with students outrank more procedural tasks like Writing Program business. The instructional objectives we prioritize are teaching: critical reading, revising/writing process, argument, audience, generating paper ideas, and research strategies (see Figure 1). In ELWR-unsatisfied core course sections and in Writing 20, responding to student writing, teaching critical reading and grammar, and administering the course all increased in workload, as indicated by responding faculty.

The flip side of our prioritized teaching goals is that some of our other teaching goals suffer due to workload constraints (see Figure 2). Responding faculty identified oral communication skills, research skills, grammar and editing skills, and attention to style as suffering in our classes due to workload constraints. The survey results are organized in an Excel spreadsheet, with summaries of each question’s responses, graphs to help visualize the response data, and the results from each respondent (responses are anonymous and have been randomized).

Figure 1. Instructional Time
Figure 2. Instructional Goals Constrained by Workload Demands
Writing Program Workload Survey: summaries and sample comments from colleagues

Question #4: If you noticed discrepancies between what you are able to teach and what you’d like to teach, comment here. What skills or objectives would you like to spend more time teaching? What do you worry your students are being shortchanged on due to workload constraints?

Predominant themes: Core and W2 courses are objective-impacted. This has not always been the case. When we had smaller class sizes and a student population with fewer ELL demands, the objectives were achievable. However, with increased class sizes (from 17-25) and increased ELL issues (more personal attention to individuated students and more mixed pedagogical strategies to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse competencies), we are having difficulty meeting those original objectives. Moreover, we cannot overlook the hidden-curriculum within our courses, which focuses on teaching study skills and the adjustment to a residential college experience (to name a few). So the explicit course objectives become unmanageable when compounded with (1) increased class sizes, (2) increased student need, and (3) tacit/implicit course objectives. The result is that objectives get ignored and student education suffers (not to mention the quality of instructors' lives).

Helpful quotations that illuminate the results:
- (Most comments in survey responded to ELL issues and lack of University preparedness)
- “I am untrained [in ELL] and whatever I do is out of desperation.”
- “I spend a lot of time training my students how to be college students—time management, study skills, how to take notes, study for exams… They are desperate for this information and feel betrayed by their high school teachers for not teaching them and resentful of the U. for expecting them to arrive with these skills. Are all Core instructors experiencing this? Should provosts include preparation for college materials?”
- “I’m falling into the habit of thinking of myself as a triage nurse…no teacher who cares about her students should be forced to make these kinds of triage decisions.”
- “I struggle most with trying to balance the demands of this job with my personal life, and trying not to feel overworked and underpaid, or burnt out. The needs of our students are so great, and our work can often times feel very overwhelming, esp. since we are among very few faculty who interact with and develop relationships with our students on such an intimate and individual level. Because of this, I think students want and expect more from us…It’s very difficult to draw boundaries in this job and protect my personal time…”
- “The loss of library instruction greatly increases workload while our mandate remains the same with respect to teaching research; research instruction really suffers; we need a C3.”
- “In C2 the need for a separate C3 course is clear.”
- “I would like to be able to spend more time on every aspect of my job, but I feel overwhelmed so much of the time that I have a hard time juggling the demands.”
- “So much time needed to work on basic writing skills not enough time for critical analysis of texts. I.e., teaching students to write and teaching texts at same time is a problem…in Core.”
- “Wish we could make Writ 22 mandatory for all ELWR-unsat Core students.”
- “Due to the volume of expectations to be met, I sacrifice depth of instruction for breadth.”

#5: Feel free to discuss your feelings about any workload issues, as you experience them. What are the long and short-term effects of these issues upon your students and quality of life?

Predominant themes: As a group, our quality of life is suffering, but we (1) are afraid to change our practices (because of reviews), (2) are philosophically opposed to deindividuating writing instruction, or (3) are at a loss how to change. All three of these impediments seem to speak to
increasing isolation and a lack of community. With more community, perhaps we would have more courage to change our practices (pilot groups trying out group conferencing or grading matrices), rethink our pedagogical philosophies in relation to our changing circumstances, and procure more ideas about how we can change, i.e. work together to change the culture of the Writing Program to address these new working conditions.

Helpful comments that illuminate the results:
- “For workload to be taken seriously by the university, for me it would mean limiting the number of hours faculty are supposed to work based on the percentage of time we are paid to work. If each class is 30% time, then we should limit our time to 30% of 40 hours a week = 12 hours/per class, and guidelines should be given by the U as to how we should maintain that standard and not exceed those hours (i.e. spending no more than 15 minutes grading a student paper, grade only 50% of all homework assignments, etc.)
- “My main workload issue is the number of papers to read and mark. Students needs good, detailed, timely feedback, and the pressure to prepare that feedback well and in a timely enough fashion puts stress on me at home…”
- “…multiple intensive conferences with students are absolutely necessary to getting the students through the basic requirements…yet I have never been as stressed in my life. I often miss dinner with my family… I would take on more work to pay the bills…as our salaries have gone down (UCOP diverting pay to cover retirement), but I do not have time…”
- “If I felt more secure that the merit reviews would take into account these real shifts in our workload, I wouldn’t stress so much every 3 years in this climate of job insecurity. Many feel this way but don’t speak up in official contexts,…”
- “I want to preface my feelings of being overwhelmed with a genuine show of love to the WP faculty themselves who I know are doing the best we can…I am dumbstruck at the suddenness of this demographic change and its implications on our workload. The very first step is to have an honest, safe program-wide conversation (with enough time for that conversation.”
- “I would not be able to do this work if I did not use writing groups. They are the reason I am still here teaching…”
- “I am appalled by how we are treated as disposable indentured servants by the university. Full time for lecturers (8 courses, poorly paid) compared to full-time for a tenured faculty member (3-4 courses/yr, w/120k + paid attendance at global conferences is disgraceful.”
- “Unlike previous years, I now spend 4 days’ a week at school morning until evening meeting with students, and the more time I spend with them, the more they want;…”
- “I work 7 days/week but still feel behind…My partner would love it if I got a different job.”
- “Meetings with my colleagues have become nothing more than time lost when I could be reading essays that pile up on my desk inexorably. Additional requirements, such as organizing tutorials, meeting with tutors, and in the fall, reading exams, only contribute to the sense that, rather than lively intellectual and humanistic, teaching writing at UCSC is often more like physical labor or a factory job….dreary and physically/intellectually unsustainable.”
- “Quality of life: sacrifice of sleep, weekends, etc.; each quarter feels like a real grind…I don’t do as much committee work or independent scholarship as I would with a more manageable workload…”
- “Whereas workload in most disciplines tends to decrease over time as one develops a repertoire of lectures, the workload in writing classes increases…”
- “No matter how much I prepare my courses, the quality of my instruction declines over the quarter because my energy and attention is increasingly transferred to providing student feedback. When all is said and done, students will not recall the feedback they received from me. What they will remember is their learning experiences in my course, and I often sacrifice this…to provide more feedback. One fewer paper in a C1 or C2 course might go a long way toward improving the quality of writing instruction.”
#6: What instructional practices do you use to manage your workload? Examples include writing groups, grading matrices, in-class assignments, handouts to streamline your teaching of writing and reading, conferencing, scaffolded writing assignments, etc.

Predominant themes: Many people in our program are identifying ways to 1) address common student areas of need, and 2) address those in a more collective fashion, using the students themselves to do so.

Summary of some of the instructional practices, roughly in the order of most common practices first:

- Writing groups; Grading matrices and rubrics; Scaffolded writing assignments so that formal essays build on informal responses; Conferencing, both individual and group, sometimes instead of feedback on rough drafts; Assigning ungraded writing (early drafts, self-reflective writing like journaling and free-writing, reading responses, some revisions, etc.); Peer editing in class or in peer response groups; Handouts for lessons, assignments, and prompts; Assigning two or more shorter essays of the five required papers; Small group work in class, using handouts, discussion questions, or projectors to share ideas; Student research presentations in C2 classes; Using sample essays in class for group discussion and analysis; Reading quizzes, sometimes self-corrected; Modifying or eliminating final portfolio assignments; Using eCommons to post assignments and materials and manage student writing groups; Asking students to bold and/or annotate revisions so that these are very clear when the instructor is reviewing them; Digital feedback, including voice dictation programs and editing capabilities

Helpful quotations that illuminate the results:

- “I…plan to scaffold my assignments more carefully—to tie in more ‘pre-writing’ assignments that will help students develop their papers, so that I can simply check to see if they did the assignment and if it helped with their papers. If students do them well, they should have an easier time with writing their papers, so hopefully it will keep them motivated to do well on these seemingly ‘busy-work’ oriented homework assignments.”
- “Student presentations in C2 so that students are able to share the results of their research.
- “In Writing 2, I do not comment on students’ initial drafts; they meet in peer response groups twice for each essay, focusing on issues related to global revision in the first session and sentence-level revision in the second....”
- “I have a couple of uniform revision assignments that I find are good to assign almost out of the gate with only cursory reading of the students’ papers (to glean examples or some tailoring). For example, reverse outline, breaking the paper into standard argument format, writing new conclusions, reading backwards, etc. I then can read the revisions incorporating the substantial changes (instead of mild editing) and save myself some otherwise in-depth commenting.”
- “I…have students complete writing groups OUTSIDE of class....
- “Get students into small groups, give them a transparency and a marking pen, have them write out their responses to an assignment, and then share those responses with the class by way of an overhead projector.”
- “I teach Trimble and start with a paper assignment that focuses on “voice” and “dramatizing their ideas” so that their writing is reader-focused (or at least they know it should be) and “interesting” to readers so that I don’t have to segment the writing lessons into false genres.....”
- “I…use model papers in class to teach several lessons at once.”
- “I have adopted two shorter papers of the six I assign so that the bulk of my time is spent responding to the other 4. I plan to include more short papers and modify my own internal voice that says I must comment on everything. As Paul Skenazy once said, it’s useful to just assign writing whether or not you comment on it.”

For further faculty discussion and participation: We’d like to use this information to assemble a compendium of best practices in a variety of ways that would be useful to you, such as:

- A pedagogy colloquium where all participants bring ideas and materials to share with the group in the form of handouts, assignments, matrices, and/or strategies, so that we all leave with
a collection of helpful tools.
• An online archive of materials (handouts, assignments, matrices, and/or strategies), which has already been started by Joy. Please submit your teaching tools and materials to joyhagen@ucsc.edu!
• A workshop, perhaps at our September retreat, where faculty are invited to bring and briefly present tactics and materials (handouts, assignments, matrices, and/or strategies) that represent their particular teaching strengths and gifts.

#7: What support or resources could best help you maintain excellence while better managing workload?

Predominant themes: “PEOPLE POWER.” All the suggestions focus on maximizing the people around us (more WAs, sharing techniques, colloquia, limited class sizes, social events, ratcheting down C2 expectations). Several others focus on mobilizing resources (Prop. 30 funds and future HSI funding) for more ELL sections, faculty, and training of existing faculty. Increased pay.

Some comments that illuminate the responses:
• “Bringing down class size, second only to increasing pay…the only REAL ways to manage workload from an institutional standpoint…from an internal standpoint—more assistants, ELL training, sharing among colleagues, etc.
• “MORE TUTORING FOR CORE STUDENTS! I can’t believe all that funding was cut!”
• “A Writing assistant to check off/return minor assignments” [MANY colleagues want more tutors and assistants. How can we have writing assistants with no more independent studies?]  
• “Sample assignments from variety of disciplines; more materials, access, and archives; better on-line document sharing; electronic exercises, etc. though cost-prohibitive; standard publisher if not handbook; sharing of our internal resources—handouts, instructions, etc.;”
• “Sharing of expectations with high school teachers and finding out what practices high school teachers are using; more out of class peer mentorship by writing tutors; more classes outside of the current requirements…”
• “Actively strive for more ELL specialists and sections; distribution of federal funds generated by HSI status in future + Prop 30 funds.”
• “A C3 course to focus on research--“More realistic admissions criteria (out of our control but necessary discussion w/the U.)--“A ratcheting-down of the C2 expectations (revise evaluation form) unless more resources are available”
• Pedagogy colloquia on the following: Streamlining comments; Digital grading; Better student-centered workshops so our comment time is reduced; Discuss how intensive revisions can be full assignments in themselves; Good short assignments that teach sub-skills without so much commentary required;
• “Replace some of our faculty meetings or portions of them with pedagogical discussions/colloquia which cannot be stacked on the already onerous teaching and meeting load.”

Outside the survey: Contextualizing class size—a comparison among UC writing programs
Berkeley (14); UCLA (22); Davis (25); Riverside (23); Merced (20); UCSD (15*); Irvine (23 in WRIT 2 equivalent and 20 in WRIT 20 equivalents). Note: UCSD is broken into colleges like UCSC and each college has a writing intensive theme course, much like we do. The three colleges I spoke to (there are six total) all capped their classes at 15.
# Workload Survey

## Task Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AnswerOptions</th>
<th>Responding to student writing</th>
<th>Preparing for class</th>
<th>Corresponding with students</th>
<th>Meeting with students</th>
<th>Fulfilling Writing Program or College responsibilities</th>
<th>Record keeping, administering, and managing courses</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ResponseCount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Most Time</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Least Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Estimated hours per class per week (Average)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AnswerOptions</th>
<th>More than 20 hrs</th>
<th>15-20 hrs</th>
<th>10-15 hrs</th>
<th>7-10 hrs</th>
<th>5-7 hrs</th>
<th>2-5 hrs</th>
<th>0-2 hrs</th>
<th>ResponseCount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Most Time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Least Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify) 0 28
Writing Program Faculty Bylaws
September 17, 2010

PREAMBLE

The Writing Program is an independent academic unit of the University of California, Santa Cruz, Division of Humanities. Its mission is to foster a culture of writing at UCSC and research on the teaching of writing. The program administers or co-administers the lower-division campus composition requirements and UC’s Entry Level Writing Requirement. The Writing Program’s responsibilities include

1) providing effective, innovative, intellectually challenging instruction for students who come to UCSC without having satisfied UC’s Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR), with special attention to the needs of traditionally underrepresented students and those who are English language learners;

2) offering outstanding lower-division composition courses designed to stand at the theoretical and practical center of students’ general education, with a sufficient number of sections so that all entering students can satisfy the campus composition requirements during their first two years at UCSC;

3) providing mentoring and instruction in the theory and practice of teaching composition to graduate students who wish to become expert teachers of writing;

4) providing mentoring and instruction in the theory and practice of tutoring writing to outstanding undergraduate students who wish to serve as writing assistants;

5) providing the campus an outstanding professional writing faculty capable of advising on and participating in writing instruction at all levels, and to provide to members of that faculty the collegiality, personal satisfaction, and opportunity for professional development that will enable them to pursue their goals as teachers, researchers, writers, and concerned, knowledgeable, integrated members of this academic community.

ARTICLE I. ORGANIZATION AND APPOINTMENT OF THE PROGRAM FACULTY

All instructors with year-long appointments at UCSC of which greater than fifty percent is located in the Writing Program are members of the faculty of the Writing Program. Faculty appointments are recommended by the Chair and approved by the Dean of Humanities. Writing Program faculty members teach the program’s courses and have a substantive interest in the program's development and governance. The faculty is governed, as appropriate, by the regulations of the Academic Senate and the Memorandum of Understanding of the Non-Senate Instructional Unit.

The Chair provides the principal governance of the Writing Program, assisted by (1) the remaining Senate faculty; (2) the campus Coordinator of the Entry Level Writing Requirement, appointed by the Chair; and (3) three standing committees: (a) the Writing Program Personnel Committee, whose members are appointed according to the Writing
Program’s Personnel Procedures (see Appendix A); (b) the Council of College Writing Coordinators, whose members, including the Convener, are appointed by the Chair; and (c) the Course Offerings Committee.

The Chair of the Writing Program is selected according to procedures detailed in “Procedures for Selecting a New Chair of the Writing Program (Appendix B) and is then appointed by the Dean of Humanities to serve for a term of three years with possible renewal. The Chair reports to the Dean of Humanities; the Chair also reports to the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VP/DUE).

ARTICLE II. OFFICERS

Chair

The duties of the Chair include

1) providing leadership in defining the vision and mission of the Writing Program;
2) supervising regular curricular offerings; proposing new or intermittently offered courses; in conjunction with the VP/DUE’s office, coordinating with the colleges to ensure a Core Course curriculum that meets Composition General Education requirements; assessing faculty leave and course relief requests; working with the ELWR Coordinator and office staff on ELWR-related issues;
3) chairing the Writing Program Personnel Committee and directing all personnel actions including academic recruitments and reviews and the selection and scheduling of Graduate Student Instructors;
4) participating in recruitment and selection of staff;
5) managing the academic budget, discretionary funds from grants, gifts, and revenue-sharing programs;
6) developing and administering programs for student awards;
7) working to develop writing-related curricular and extracurricular activities and opportunities that enhance the mission of the Writing Program and the experience of students;
8) working in conjunction with the UC Office of the President and with campus advising, admissions, and registrar to disseminate consistent advising information.

ELWR Coordinator

The ELWR Coordinator oversees the instructional program for students who matriculate at UCSC without having satisfied the Entry Level Writing Requirement. The duties of the ELWR Coordinator include

1) providing leadership in designing and developing appropriate curricular and co-curricular support for ELWR-unsatisfied students, including those who are English language learners, members of underrepresented minorities, and students whose
family educational or economic background qualify them as members of the Educational Opportunity Program;

2) coordinating and overseeing Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) administrations and ELWR portfolio reviews, training exam and portfolio readers, gathering and submitting results to the Registrar and ensuring their distribution to the colleges;

3) maintaining student records on AWPE and portfolio review results; monitoring student progress toward satisfaction of the ELWR and working with the Writing Program Chair, the Registrar, the Coordinator of Academic Advising, and college advising services to ensure that ELWR-unsatisfied students enroll in appropriate courses;

4) placing enrollment holds on students who fail to satisfy the ELWR by the end of four quarters of enrollment, and lifting them upon receiving evidence of students’ having satisfied the requirement;

5) analyzing data as needed for predicting course enrollments and other uses by the Chair and the VP/DUE;

6) working with College Writing Coordinators to orient new and returning faculty to the ELWR and the AWPE and to the expectations of college Core Courses designed to help students write at the college level and satisfy the ELWR.

ARTICLE III. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY

Writing Program Personnel Committee

The Writing Program Personnel Committee consists of all faculty who are members of the Academic Senate and a mix of Continuing and pre-six Lecturers elected annually by the faculty via procedures established in the “Writing Program Procedures for Evaluating and Reappointing Instructors” (Appendix A). This committee considers all non-Senate faculty reviews and personnel actions and submits recommendations to the Humanities Division Committee on Academic Personnel and to the Humanities Dean.

Council of College Writing Coordinators

The Council of College Writing Coordinators consists of one or two Writing Program faculty members from each college appointed by the Chair to serve as liaisons between the colleges and the Writing Program and to advise the Chair, the ELWR Coordinator, and the Director of Learning Support Services on (1) procedures for the recruitment, hiring, training, supervision, and review of undergraduate Writing Assistants; (2) procedures for orienting, training, and mentoring college Core and Writing Program faculty vis-à-vis the pedagogical and administrative expectations of the C1 requirement; (3) procedures for reporting Analytical Writing Placement Exam and portfolio review data; (4) curricular issues related to the Entry Level Writing Requirement. The Council is chaired by a Convener appointed by the Chair.
Course Offerings Committee

The Course Offerings Committee consists of a minimum of three Writing Program faculty members. Membership is voluntary; the Committee Chair is appointed by the Writing Program Chair. The committee examines course offerings in light of student needs (e.g., the variety of inquiries or “topics” explored in Writing 2 classes), campus needs (what students need to know in order to be ready for writing in upper-division discipline-specific courses), and trends in the field and practices in similar programs at other university campuses both within and beyond the University of California. The Course Offerings Committee reports on its findings and makes curricular and co-curricular recommendations to the Writing Program faculty.

Ad Hoc Committees

The Chair annually appoints Writing Program faculty to serve on various ad hoc committees of pedagogical relevance.

ARTICLE IV. MEETINGS

The Chair, in consultation with the Writing Program Personnel Committee faculty, shall call such regular and special meetings of the Personnel Committee as are deemed necessary and desirable. There shall be at least one regular meeting per quarter.

The Chair shall also be responsible for scheduling at least one meeting per quarter with Writing Program faculty. The Chair shall circulate draft minutes within four weeks of such meetings. Minutes shall be approved at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

ARTICLE V. QUORUM

Meetings of the Writing Program faculty shall be announced by the Chair seven days or more in advance via web posting and e-mail or regular mail. Fifty-one percent of the faculty members shall constitute a quorum of a meeting. Minutes of previous meetings shall be approved by a simple majority.

ARTICLE VI. AMENDMENTS

These bylaws may be amended as necessary when and if approved in a mail ballot by a two-thirds majority of the Writing Program faculty.
Appendix A

Writing Program Procedures
for Evaluating and Reappointing Writing Instructors
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I. All instructors with year-long appointments predominantly located in the Writing Program are eligible to vote in the election of members of the Writing Program Personnel Committee, and to stand for election for the Personnel Committee provided they have year-long appointments predominantly in the Writing Program during the year in which they would serve.

The Personnel Committee of the Writing Program, which is responsible for most reviews of writing instructors, reports its recommendations for reappointment, and, if appropriate, a merit increase in salary, to the Dean of Humanities. The Personnel Committee consists of:

(A) the Chair of the Writing Program;
(B) all members of the Writing Program faculty who are Lecturers with Security of Employment;
(C) three to four members at large elected each year by members of the Writing Program from among those writing faculty with more than six quarters of experience with the Writing Program, at least one of these having served six or more years and at least one fewer than six years, if personnel makes this feasible.

II. At intervals designated in section III below, the Personnel Committee will review writing instructors who are Non-Senate Faculty and who are eligible for reappointment or merit increase, including those eligible for a review to determine an initial Continuing Appointment. The Committee’s evaluation of the pre-six writing instructor’s performance shall address the instructor’s “competence in the field, ability in teaching, academic responsibility and other assigned duties that may include University co-curricular and community service” (MOU, Article 7a, Section C4[a3]). The Committee’s evaluation of an instructor to determine an Initial Continuing Appointment shall address the instructor’s “demonstrated excellence in the field and in teaching, academic responsibility, and other assigned duties which may include University co-curricular and community service” (MOU, Article 7b, Section D).

The Chair will assign two members of the Personnel Committee to review the instructor’s file, visit one or more class sessions, and report back to the Personnel Committee. Recommendations made to the Dean of Humanities concerning reappointment shall reflect the decision of the committee as a whole (votes shall be reported), as shall recommendations for merit increases for Continuing Appointments, and salary increases greater than the standard increases recommended in the MOU.

Subcommittees reviewing faculty for an Initial Continuing Appointment shall be chaired by a Lecturer with Security of Employment; the second member may be
another Lecturer with Security of Employment or an instructor with a Continuing Appointment. Should the membership of the Personnel Committee in a given year contain fewer such faculty than are needed for timely review of instructors up for an initial Continuing Appointment, the Chair shall appoint subcommittee members from among the Writing Program instructors with Continuing Appointments.

A writing instructor’s file will include the following materials, all submitted by the instructor except where noted below:

(A) all relevant student evaluations for Writing Program classes, submitted by the Writing Program;
(B) all relevant student evaluations for Writing Program-funded sections of college Core classes;
(C) course descriptions, materials, and syllabi;
(D) a letter from the writing instructor to the committee that helps demonstrate his/her teaching practices and currency in the field:
   • In an instructor’s first review, the letter should include a description of the instructor’s approach to commenting on student work;
   • In an instructor’s third-year review, review for initial Continuing Appointment, and subsequent reviews, the letter should describe the instructor’s teaching goals, innovations, or new projects, and contain whatever information and explanations the writing instructor would like the committee to have as it conducts its evaluation;
(E) the instructor's narrative evaluations of the students in one class;
(F) current biobibliography;
(G) when required by campus procedure or deemed necessary by the Personnel Committee, letters solicited by the Writing Program from individuals such as former and current students and course assistants, fellow teachers, college provosts, and others conversant with the instructor’s work;
(H) material relevant to the evaluation of assigned duties other than course work.

A writing instructor may include letters solicited from anyone familiar with some aspect of his/her work, and will be given the opportunity to provide the names of people who may not be able to review his or her work objectively. The instructor may also include materials (e.g., writing or research) relevant to his/her work in the Writing Program and/or demonstrating currency in the field, and may include descriptions of service insofar as such descriptions affect or reflect on the instructor’s work for the Writing Program. Such materials are not required for reappointment.

In addition to the file, the Personnel Committee shall consider:

(I) a report on the class visit(s);
(J) the writing instructor's performance of any assigned administrative or committee or college responsibilities.
In alternate merit reviews starting with the first after the initial Continuing Appointment (i.e., in the second year after the initial Continuing Appointment), instructors may submit a short file, with item (G) optional.

III. The Committee's reviews will take place:

(A) In the second or third quarter of a lecturer’s teaching for the Writing Program. As a result of this review, the Committee may recommend reappointment.

(B) In the seventh, eighth, or ninth quarter (the third year) of teaching for the Writing Program. The Committee may recommend reappointment. A two-step salary increase is automatic in the tenth quarter of teaching. A recommendation for a larger, exceptional, salary increase may accompany a recommendation for reappointment, with proper justification.

(C) In the academic year during which the lecturer’s eighteenth quarter of teaching for the Writing Program falls, provided that a determination of instructional need has been made. Need must be assessed no later than one calendar year prior to the lecturer’s eighteenth quarter of service in the Writing Program. A determination of excellence and approval of a Continuing Appointment will be accompanied by the larger of a two-step merit increase or an increase up to the minimum salary for a Continuing Appointment.

(D) In the second year following the initial Continuing Appointment and every three years thereafter. If the standard of excellence continues to be met, the Committee will recommend an appropriate merit increase of at least two steps. Merits may be accelerated, if justified; merit reviews may be deferred, at the request of the instructor, for up to one year. If the Committee finds cause to recommend against a Continuing Appointment, notice and appeal procedures in the Non-Senate Instructional Unit contract will apply.

Any reappointment of a lecturer in the first six years that does not fall within one of the review occasions detailed above will be determined by decision of the Writing Program Chair.

IV. When a writing instructor with SOE is to be considered for a merit increase or promotion, Academic Senate members of the Personnel Committee will constitute the ad hoc committee if the SOE Lecturers number at least four. Senior SOE Lecturers delegate authority for their reviews to SOE Lecturers, in accordance with APM By-Law 55. If SOE Lecturers in the Writing Program number fewer than four, the following procedure shall govern the creation of a separate By-Law 55 faculty review committee: The SOE Lecturers shall suggest to the Dean of Humanities names of By-Law 55 faculty to serve on a review committee. The Dean shall request service by these By-Law 55 faculty, and prepare a letter to CAP and the Campus Provost/EVC recommending the establishment of a review committee, who then approve the committee.
Appendix B

Procedures for Selecting a New Chair of the Writing Program

I. Selection of a New Chair

A. The Chair of the Writing Program will be chosen from among the Program's Lecturers with Security of Employment. At the end of a chair's term of service, the Program's SOE's will caucus and, by consensus, recommend a successor. Subsequently, the rest of the Writing Program Faculty will be asked to confirm the SOE's recommendation by anonymous ballot. (For the purpose of this process, the Writing Program Faculty is defined as all lecturers who hold Writing Program appointments except for those appointed from a temporary pool.) If the candidate receives confirmation by at least two-thirds of the voting faculty, the candidate's name will be forwarded to the Dean of Humanities for approval.

B. If the SOE's propose a chair by consensus but that person either is not confirmed by the faculty or is not approved by the Dean, the SOE's will reconvene and propose a new candidate or resubmit the previous recommendation. If this recommendation is confirmed by the rest of the faculty, the candidate's name will be forwarded to the Dean of Humanities for approval. If this recommendation is not confirmed, an explanation of the disagreement and the results of the votes will be forwarded to the Dean for resolution.

C. If the Lecturers SOE cannot achieve consensus on recommending a new chair, the Program's entire faculty, in this instance including Lecturers SOE, will be asked to vote for one of the competing recommendations. An explanation of the disagreement and the results of this vote will be forwarded to the Dean of Humanities for resolution.

II. Term of Service

A newly appointed chair of the Writing Program will under normal circumstances serve a three-year term, with possible yearly extensions up to 5 years. At the end of 5 years, the full selection process must be repeated. The sitting Chair may be returned to the position as a result of this process.
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The Writing Program at the University of California, Santa Cruz, seeks applicants with expertise in composition and rhetoric and significant experience working with multilingual students to fill up to two permanent, full-time leadership positions as Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE). UCSC’s Writing Program has a moderately sized faculty, and is interested in a teacher-administrator with faculty development experience whose expertise in applied linguistics/multilingualism, program assessment, or both will help us develop our programs for incoming UCSC students. The successful candidate will teach a range of writing courses and share administrative responsibilities with other Writing Program faculty, and will take a leadership role in grant writing, program assessment and faculty and course development, especially involving courses designed to effectively support the success of English language learners: thus collaborative work with other campus units engaged in related enterprises is important.

The holder of this position will be expected to teach the equivalent of six quarter courses for the Writing Program; to participate in Writing Program business such as placement and advising, program and personnel reviews, and discussions of pedagogy and policy; to contribute to campus wide work relating to undergraduate education; and at some point to serve a term as program chair, which carries course release.

The Writing Program offers a lower-division writing curriculum that includes interdisciplinary residential college Core courses, entry-level writing courses that integrate instruction for English language learners, and “1B”-level composition courses. Faculty also train and supervise undergraduate writing assistants, and graduate students from a number of fields preparing to teach classes in the program.

The Writing Program is an independent unit within the Humanities Division, which also includes the Departments of American Studies, Feminist Studies, History, History of Consciousness, Linguistics, Literature, Philosophy, and the Program in Languages. The Division has a strong tradition of collaborative and interdisciplinary work, and encourages applications from qualified candidates eager to extend their activities across departmental and disciplinary boundaries.

The campus is especially interested in candidates who can contribute to the diversity and excellence of the academic community through their scholarship, teaching, and service, and it particularly values those who can play leadership roles in pursuing the goal of increasing diversity within the campus community.

RANK: Lecturer with Security of Employment.

The Lecturer SOE rank is a full-time, permanent position with the rights and responsibilities of membership in the Academic Senate; “Security of Employment” is analogous to tenure. Though Lecturer SOE is primarily a teaching position with no set expectations for research and publication, holders are expected to be conversant with scholarship in the theory and practice of composition and rhetoric; and faculty development leaves are possible. Criteria for advancement include teaching, professional achievement and activity, and University and public service.

SALARY: Commensurate with qualifications and experience.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS: Doctoral degree or equivalent in a relevant discipline. A minimum of six years of successful university-level teaching. Demonstrated excellence in teaching college composition and rhetoric, including teaching writing to multilingual, second language, heritage, and/or generation 1.5 students. Demonstrated engagement with the pedagogy of writing and rhetorical theory. Evidence of skill at working with students and colleagues from diverse social and cultural backgrounds.

Continued
PREFERRED QUALIFICATIONS: Experience in program leadership and administration. Preferred candidates will have the ability to help Writing Program faculty develop and teach our programs for multilingual writers, and will therefore have a background in one or more of the following: applied linguistics, with a focus on bilingualism or multilingualism; program assessment; faculty development.

POSITION AVAILABLE: July 1, 2012, with academic year commencing Fall 2012 (subject to final budgetary approval).

TO APPLY: Please send (1) a detailed letter of application describing how your teaching, training, and administrative experience prepare you for this position; (2) a curriculum vitae; (3) three current letters of recommendation*, sent directly to the address below, dated September 2009 or later; and (4) sample syllabi, including syllabus and writing assignments for a composition course for first-year students akin to Writing 2 (for course descriptions and other information, see the Writing Program website at http://writing.ucsc.edu). Applicants are invited to submit a statement addressing their contributions to diversity through their teaching and/or service. Other pertinent materials may also be sent. For more information about the position, please contact Writing Program Manager Pamela Edwards (pedwards@ucsc.edu). Please send application materials via U.S. mail*** to:

LSOE Search Committee
c/o Pamela Edwards, Manager
Writing Program
MS: Kresge College
University of California
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064

Please refer to Position #618-12 in all correspondence

***Please do not submit applications electronically***

*All letters will be treated as confidential documents; please direct your letter-writers to UCSC’s confidentiality statement at http://apo.ucsc.edu/academic_policies_and_procedures/cappm/confstm.htm

CLOSING DATE: The position will remain open until filled. In order to be considered at the initial screening, the complete application must be postmarked by October 11, 2011.

UC Santa Cruz faculty make significant contributions to the body of research that has earned the University of California the ranking as the foremost public higher education institution in the world. In the process, our faculty demonstrate that cutting-edge research, excellent teaching and outstanding service are mutually supportive.

The University of California, Santa Cruz is an Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Employer, committed to excellence through diversity. We strive to establish a climate that welcomes, celebrates, and promotes respect for the contributions of all students and employees.

Inquiries regarding the University’s equal employment opportunity policies may be directed to: Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at the University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064; (831) 459-3676. Under Federal law, the University of California may employ only individuals who are legally able to work in the United States as established by providing documents as specified in the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. Certain UCSC positions funded by federal contracts or sub-contracts require the selected candidate to pass an E-Verify check. More information is available here or from the Academic Personnel Office at (831) 459-5579.

If you need assistance due to a disability please contact the Academic Personnel Office at 499 Clark Kerr Hall (831) 459-5579. This position description is available in alternate formats, which may be requested from Academic Personnel at (831) 459-5579.
INTRODUCTION

UCSC is at a critical moment with regard to its Writing Program. A wave of impending retirements of key writing faculty coincides with the campus's own period of self-reflective planning for the next five to ten years, including its examinations of the writing-intensive (W) requirement (Committee on Educational Policy docket, 2005-06) and funding for the Writing Program (Committee on Planning and Budget report, spring 2005). As soon as possible, the campus needs to make a careful decision about the kind of writing program it wants and how that program should be funded and configured. Can a first-rate education emerge from a campus whose resource commitments for writing concentrate on first-year composition -the current model for the Writing Program? Or should the campus reinvest in an upper-division writing curriculum, the model that prevailed until 2002? Models for both approaches are available at the University of California: UC Irvine, UC Riverside, and UC Berkeley focus on first-year composition; UC Santa Barbara, UC Davis, and UC Los Angeles provide the full range of classes. Certainly the programs at several top universities-among them Harvard, Princeton, and Duke-suggest that it is possible to provide superb undergraduate education via a first-year writing program, provided that a campus also supports upper-division writing courses in the disciplines with appropriate rewards for and mentoring of the faculty teaching them. (Each of those institutions either requires writing-intensive courses in the disciplines or puts significant resources into writing instruction in gateway courses, such as sophomore-level seminars, in the majors.) At the same time, that model leaves unrealized opportunities that the campus may want to pursue.

Whatever approach the campus takes, UCSC's Writing Program represents an important resource in furthering campus aims for diversity and interdisciplinarity. At present, that resource is underutilized. Some key modifications would have wide impact on efforts to enhance the excellence of a UCSC undergraduate education.

UCSC aims to be a world-class institution. What, then, is the place of the Writing Program at UCSC?

BACKGROUND

Until 2002, UCSC's Writing Program was a full-service program. It provided a full curriculum of lower-division classes and two minors (Journalism, and Communication and Rhetoric). It offered instruction to students at all levels and provided a number of writing-intensive courses that helped supply the campus with the W-course seats required for students to satisfy General Education requirements. It also provided tutoring to students in first-year writing classes and many in writing-intensive courses in other units; consultations with faculty across the disciplines; and active outreach efforts to a diverse population of teachers and their K-12 students whom UCSC hoped to attract. It is now a first-year writing program, its three remaining courses for upper-division and graduate students designed to prepare those students for tutoring or teaching those in first-year writing classes. Outreach efforts are now strictly voluntary, and Writing in the
Disciplines (WID) is located in a single instructor with one course equivalency. Tutoring is now available almost exclusively to ELWR students and-for most students-for a fee. (A proposal to restore tutoring for the least well-prepared writers via student fees is currently under consideration.) And class sizes for writing courses have increased well beyond the upper limits recommended by several national organizations.

Despite these changes, Writing Program faculty have remained characteristically engaged, participating, for instance, in the creation and adoption of an assessment instrument designed to gauge the effectiveness and stability of the main first-year composition course, and maintaining, despite increased workload and decreased opportunities to participate more broadly in the education of undergraduates, their well-documented excellence as teachers and active citizens of the campus community. The one significant positive curricular change since 2002 has been the campus adoption of the new, two-part composition requirement, CI/C2, launched in fall 2005, which promises to enhance the delivery of writing instruction to first-year students, especially those somewhat stronger writers who, under the old C requirement, would have arrived on campus having exempted the requirement entirely.

The profound, rapid shift in campus priorities and investment in the writing curriculum for undergraduates occurred within the period covered by the last ten-year plan. This shift took place in a climate of budget cuts to the UC system, the UCSC campus, and the Humanities Division— that more closely resembled an ongoing siege than a period of careful reflection. The changes made to the Writing Program were thus largely reactive, not the result of comprehensive planning for campus needs. We are now in year five of the period covered by the last ten-year document, and in a good position for thoughtful planning. This new document emerges from a more stable notion of the campus profile in the next decade. It thus more accurately addresses both the Writing Program's needs in order to fulfill its mission and the resources the Writing Program can offer to UCSC as a whole as the campus engages in the process of comprehensive and realistic academic planning.

The 2001 Ten-Year Plan
In their 2001 ten-year planning documents, the Writing Program and the Humanities Division agreed that the mission of the Writing Program was "to provide a curriculum of writing courses for undergraduate students, especially freshmen." At the behest of the Dean of Humanities, the Writing Program developed a proposal to become a Department of Rhetoric and Communication that the division substantially adopted in its Ten-Year Plan. This new department was to have a curriculum anchored in first-year writing courses for students across the campus, as well as majors, minors, and graduate programs emerging out of the existing minors in Journalism and Rhetoric and Communication. Recruitment priorities grew out of these plans, and out of the expectation of a growing lower- and upper-division undergraduate population.

This plan collapsed almost immediately—in large part, ironically, because of decisions made by the dean who had recommended its major propositions. Budget cuts in the Humanities Division, a change from enrollment-driven funding by the central administration to a fixed budget provided by the Division, and the projected flattening out of the campus's expected lower-division enrollment profoundly affected the Writing Program. These budgetary exigencies, among others, led to programmatic decisions by the Division: the defunding of the minors and consequent suspension of all the Writing Program's upper-division courses except those meant to support lower-division system-wide and campus requirements. As a result, after years of praise in external reviews for its pedagogical excellence and imaginative use of limited funds, the UCSC Writing Program is no longer a full-service program.
The Commensurable Funding Policy
The "Commensurable Funding Policy," subsequently implemented by the Dean of Humanities, newly limited both the Writing Program's funding and its ability to serve the campus as a whole. It has two main provisions: (1) a fixed budget of Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) funds, set at twelve FTE ($620,400); together with the salaries for the four Lecturers with Security of Employment, these funds are meant to cover the cost of mounting all Writing Program classes; and (2) a set of rules on faculty course buyouts whereby units outside the Writing Program must return to the Division the full per-course salary of any Writing Program faculty member it wishes to employ; in turn, the Division provides $3000 to the Writing Program toward the replacement cost of the course.

The effect of these changes on the Writing Program, its faculty and students, was immediate and considerable. The effect on the campus as a whole has been slower to be felt, but is now emerging.

For the program, the shift from enrollment-driven funding for writing requirements to a fixed block of funds-a shift initiated by the campus's decentralization of open provisions to the divisions-carried with it an immediate increase in the size of writing classes to among the largest in the UC system (and larger than those at any of our comparison institutions), and has meant that incremental changes to other variables such as size of incoming freshman class, percentage of students who require additional courses to clear the ELWR, and size of lecturers' merit increases, directly limit the program's ability to mount the required curriculum of classes for undergraduates without applying to the Humanities Division for further funding. The consequences, as a recent Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) report on the status of Writing Program funding asserts, include considerable challenges to the Writing Program's ability to plan effectively, severe limits on its ability to remain flexible in response to incremental shifts in enrollment, and over-dependence on last-minute hiring from the pool of temporary lecturers-effects that have consequences, of course, for students. (See appendix.)

For members of the program and the campus as a whole, the impact of the buyout provisions has been equally profound and has effectively prevented the Writing Program from using its most valuable resource, an experienced, superb faculty, to serve the campus. The cost of paying the per-course salary of Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) and highly experienced non-Senate faculty (NSF), for instance, deters other units from drawing on the expertise of these educators. And the cost of making up the difference between the $3000 returned for the replacement class and the $5000-$7000 to mount it prevents the Writing Program from releasing them. In total, then, the tax on such course buyouts collected by the division means that their cost far exceeds the standard buyout of $6200 per course.

Under this provision, among other losses, a Writing Program faculty member who was the founding director of the campus's well-regarded Central California Writing Project had to step down after twenty-seven years; another faculty member, a long-time college Faculty Fellow and former provost, was prevented from coordinating and helping design the college's freshman Core class; and numerous opportunities for cooperation and collaboration with other departments across campus were stillborn. Isolating instructors in first-year writing ultimately detracts from the program's ability to serve the campus well. Access to upper-division students and cross-disciplinary experiences students makes faculty into better teachers of freshmen.
Teaching first-year writing courses is the primary mission of all Writing Program faculty, and a responsibility that the faculty respect and embrace. But the campus ignores a most valuable resource for interdisciplinary and interdivisional education when it leashes the faculty in a program meant to serve the campus as a whole.

CPB, in its report on the funding of the Writing Program (2005), recommends that both provisions of the Commensurable Funding Policy be adjusted or removed. On the subject of funding, CPB suggests that "recognition of the mismatch between the needs of the Humanities Division and the needs of the Writing Program lend weight to the idea that a strict enrollment-based funding model might be a good safeguard against potential conflicts in the future" (9). Enrollment-based funding, CPB elsewhere suggests, would significantly ease planning and increase flexibility for curricular planning as well (8). Should the program return to enrollment-driven funding, however, it will be important to calibrate the formula to account for an evidently increasing population of English language learners.

On the matter of course buyouts, the report again recommends a more flexible approach:

The Writing Program has a long history of innovative and highly successful collaborations with other units. For example, senior members of the Writing Program have co-taught W courses in the disciplines and have worked with graduate students in various departments. Now, however, the funding model imposes restrictions so that SOE lecturers cannot [teach] in other units without risking bankruptcy for either the host units or the Writing Program. Under a chancellor who has made inter-disciplinarity and inter-divisional inter-disciplinarity one of her explicit goals, it seems unnecessarily restrictive to have a funding policy that essentially keeps the Writing Program's most experienced instructors on a short leash. CPB urges the administration to re-consider the funding model and to make it more flexible. (9)

The Writing Program endorses these recommendations for both LSOEs and non-Senate faculty.

THE WRITING PROGRAM THROUGH 2010-11
With the suspension of the upper-division curriculum, the Writing Program, and the campus, lost a comprehensive and carefully designed series of courses and an opportunity for students at all levels to solidify their writing skills and develop them further in disciplinary and professional contexts. The program also faces the retirements of some of its most experienced and longstanding faculty. Though it retains a roster of superb faculty, responsibility for two major campus writing requirements, and a well-tested lower-division curriculum, the Writing Program is at a critical point in its planning for the future.

Current Responsibilities
In cooperation with the colleges, the Writing Program is responsible for the majority of the lower-division writing curriculum. At UCSC, the University of California Entry-Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) must be satisfied by the end of the fourth quarter of enrollment. Failure to satisfy the ELWR by the end of the fourth quarter means students are barred from further enrollment. Annually, about 35-40% of incoming freshmen at UCSC are liable for the ELWR; about 20% of that number are still liable for it after their first quarter. The Writing Program provides twenty-four courses in the fall and, usually, enough courses-twenty for students entering in fall 2005-during the second, third, and fourth quarters of enrollment to help most students clear the ELWR so they are not barred from further enrollment at the university. The colleges provide enough additional fall courses (twenty-eight in fall 2004) to meet the ELWR
needs of incoming freshmen. Writing Program faculty teach a number of these college-funded sections.

Campus writing requirements also include the C1 and C2 (first-year composition) and W (writing-intensive) General Education requirements. The colleges provide the majority of the C1 curriculum via fall Core courses. The Writing Program provides the majority of the C2 curriculum via Writing 2. About 80% of incoming freshmen take at least one Writing Program class to complete the C2. Writing Program faculty also teach several of the fall C2 sections of Core offered by the colleges. Aside from two or three courses offered during the summer session, the Writing Program no longer offers any classes that satisfy the campus W requirement.

In addition to courses designed for lower-division students seeking to satisfy UC and UCSC requirements, the Writing Program offers three upper-division and graduate-level courses: a grammar course for aspiring teachers, a theory and practice course for writing tutors, and a theory and practice course for graduate students interested in teaching writing.

Resources
Described this way, the Writing Program's mission and scope look limited: to address UCSC's need to meet minimum system-wide and campus requirements for writing competence among students, to provide training for graduate students and advanced undergraduates interested in participating in that mission, and to provide teaching opportunities for graduate students.

From the point of view of UCSC's objectives for itself, however, the Writing Program should correctly be viewed as a resource in furthering campus aims for diversity, interdisciplinarity, and academic excellence, and an essential partner in efforts to promote retention and speed time to degree among undergraduates. The Writing Program serves the entire campus community via the lower-division writing requirements. Through its close and often repeated contact with students held for the ELWR and UCSC's growing population of English language learners (e.g., ESL students and children of immigrants), the program is on the leading edge of the campus's efforts to retain a diverse student population and preparing such students to succeed in the university.

The lower-division requirements are only part of what the Writing Program could provide the campus, especially in light of two considerable challenges UCSC faces in its next five years of growth: an increasing number of transfer students from community colleges needing to manage the transition to university-level writing; and a decreasing number of appropriate W courses for students who need them in order to graduate. The Writing Program is well prepared to help ease both, via its experienced faculty and roster of pre-existing courses. The campus could make efficient use of the resources the program has at hand by lifting the most restrictive provisions of the Humanities Division's Commensurable Funding Policy for programs, and thus enabling the Writing Program's faculty to teach and consult for the benefit of the campus.

• **Transfer students:** Writing Program faculty are the campus experts on the transition to university-level writing. Undergraduate population growth through 2010-11 is expected to emerge mainly from the population of students transferring from California community colleges. Students transferring to the University of California need more academic support than can be provided via Student Affairs. If the campus plans adequately to support the influx of transfer students, Writing Program faculty should be called upon to work with the departments absorbing these students directly into their
upper divisions and to provide services (consultation, classes) to them so that these students can succeed in their chosen majors.

- **Writing-intensive courses:** The Writing Program's upper-division curriculum, currently on ice, contains a dozen W courses. With the brewing crisis in the number of appropriate W courses available to students who need them to graduate, the campus should consider offering these courses, a number of which could easily be retrofitted for use by other divisions or offered as cross-divisional courses if the faculty could be released to teach them. Writing 103 and 104, for instance-Rhetoric of the Natural Sciences, and Writing in the Arts-would help assuage the W crisis in the Natural Sciences and the Arts while simultaneously easing the pressure on Humanities W courses affected by the large numbers of students from other divisions seeking writing-intensive courses without restrictive pre-requisites.

Whether the campus opts for a first-year or an expanded writing program, the program's main resources, its faculty and courses, should be considered as the campus plans its future. Thus, though this academic plan lays out the minimum requirements for sustaining the Writing Program's mission while retaining its intellectual integrity and strength, it also offers both divisional and campus administrations recommendations for a more efficient and effective use of the resources held by the Writing Program to promote campus goals.

**The Next Five Years**

To sustain the mission of continuing to provide excellent writing instruction to undergraduates, the Writing Program must retain the four hard-funded lines for Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE), slightly recast the curriculum for students who still need to satisfy the ELWR after their first quarter, and continue to work with other departments on campus to understand the expectations for writing in the disciplines and anticipate them, as much as possible, in first-year composition classes. The Writing Program must also continue to work closely with the residential colleges on clearly articulating the move from the CI composition classes most students take in their first quarter to the C2 courses most will take in the Writing Program by the time they enroll in their seventh quarter.

**ELWR curriculum:** Students who don't satisfy the ELWR after their first quarter at UCSC have three more quarters to satisfy it before being barred from further enrollment. The ELWR sequence (after fall Core classes) comprises Writing 20 in winter, Writing 21 in spring, and two three-unit "add-on" classes in fall for ELL freshmen (Writing 22A) and fourth-quarter students (Writing 228). In all but Writing 22A, students attempt to satisfy the ELWR by submitting portfolios of their writing for careful review by writing faculty.

Figures documented by the Writing Program ELWR coordinator strongly suggest that this curriculum needs adjustment, especially for English language learners. There has been a swift and steep upward trend in the number of students at risk of being barred from further enrollment for not satisfying the ELWR, from fourteen in 2001 to forty-two in 2005, many of whom are ELL students. And there is an as-yet undocumented number of students who legitimately satisfied the ELWR but who need more than one quarter to clear the C2 requirement (by passing Writing 2) and are likely struggling in their writing in other courses as well. A proposal currently being developed by the Committee on Preparatory Education calls for the following changes to the ELWR sequence:
• Require Writing 20, currently an elective course, of students who do not satisfy the ELWR in the first quarter. Whether or not it were formalized as a requirement, capturing more ELWR-unsatisfied students by means of this change would increase the number of Writing 20s offered annually. (Estimating from figures for Winter 2006 it would likely mean offering four or five more sections at twenty-two students apiece). On the other hand, it would likely reduce the number of sections of Writing 21 needed to two (from the usual three), as students who currently take two quarters to satisfy the ELWR would accomplish that sooner. Satisfying the ELWR sooner would mean quicker passage into C2 courses, particularly important now that the C2 must be satisfied by the time the seventh quarter begins.

• Offer three-unit Writing 22 language workshops to ELL students in winter (and possibly spring) as add-ons to their five-unit ELWR classes. Two sections in winter would likely suffice, and one-if any-in the spring. Adding language support workshops to courses that focus mainly on the work of writing purposeful, well-structured, and well-supported essays should help ELL students satisfy the ELWR sooner and-both for those who satisfy sooner and those who don't give them more practice in writing their own prose, a skill they will need in all their future classes. Frontloading language support early on in their UCSC educations will help these students satisfy the ELWR earlier and diminish the risk that they'd need to repeat Writing 2 to satisfy the C2 requirement.

• Replace the two three-unit Writing 22B workshops for fourth-quarter students ELWR students with a five-unit class, Writing 23, that focuses on all aspects of writing, with special attention to rhetorical grammar. Students who require four quarters to satisfy the ELWR generally need more than a grammar and language workshop. This course would better prepare students with serious writing challenges to succeed in subsequent classes.

This arrangement would require a net increase of three to four new five-unit classes, two new three-unit classes, and the conversion of one course from three to five units. Calculated at the median cost per Writing Program class, plus benefits, these additions would add up to about $35,000-$43,000. (Less benefits, which are not charged to the Writing Program's budget, the cost to the Writing Program would be about $28,000-$34,000.) The cost of these changes would rise if a proposal to cap ELWR classes system-wide at 20 students, offered by UCEP and the Academic Council, is approved. The cost of these changes will be partially offset by fewer repeaters in C2, and thus fewer Writing 2 classes-perhaps one or two fewer classes.

As important, the cost of the changes would likely be offset by effects on diversity, by helping the students we admit succeed at UCSC. The program's role in this effort is especially significant in light of its status as the only academic unit on campus providing direct support to the campus's growing population of English language learners (e.g., ESL and "Generation 1.5" students). In its ELWR-related courses, the program probably reaches more EOP students and English language learners (ELL) than any other unit on campus, and thus has close and often repeated contact with a significant proportion of the campus's population of economically disadvantaged students, students from under-resourced high schools, and students of color: the students who provide much of the campus's claim to diversity, and to whom the campus has as much obligation as to any others. Academic fragility makes some of these students retention risks, and their ability to succeed as writers undoubtedly affects their ability to move through the curricula required for majors and general education. A more robust ELWR curriculum, frontloaded at the beginning of their academic careers, will not only promote diversity and speed time to degree but also encourage academic success.
Overlap with other departments: As this document has established, the Writing Program should provide rich ground for deliberate, inventive overlap with other units in terms both of courses (e.g., its W courses) and faculty expertise it could offer.

Writing Program faculty have historically been in great demand on the campus for their superb teaching and their expertise in an array of academic disciplines. Several non-Senate faculty, for instance, have or have had long-time associations with Environmental Science, Anthropology, and other departments, helping build writing effectively into disciplinary curricula, mentoring graduate students through their own writing, and so on. And faculty can also help other departments understand what they do well pedagogically and what they need to do better, as several Writing Program faculty did in conducting a study with affiliates of the Natural Science Division to understand the importance of writing for science students.

Other kinds of potential overlap, possibly deeper and more deliberate, are just now becoming visible. The Writing Program's long-standing professional interest in literacy and K-12 education, evident in the outreach work of a number of the faculty, overlaps with courses and professional expertise in Education. And the program's proposal for a richer set of offerings for ELWR and ELL students and proposed recruitment in Applied Linguistics could bear fruit in collaborations with the Linguistics Department-shared courses, perhaps, or more opportunities for graduate students to teach ELL students in Writing Program classes.

There are, of course significant potential bars to such collaborations. Chief among them is the funding of the Writing Program. Given limited existing and projected resources and many competing demands for them, the division has little incentive to invest in the growth of a program whose courses serve more students outside the division than in it.

Graduate student support: Among the serious unmet needs on this campus is the academic support of graduate students. The Division has worked to the limits of its resources to provide fellowships and teaching assistantships for graduate students in its departments. However, several important kinds of support have eroded in the last ten years, and must be addressed.

The most pressing of these are the language proficiency challenges faced by international graduate students (and by their own students, in turn). There is no systematic English language support for international graduate students at UCSC, and has been none since the retirement of two lecturers involved in such efforts for the Division of Physical and Biological Sciences. The Writing Program's courses for undergraduate English language learners typically have few if any seats available to graduate students. However, should the ELWR curriculum be expanded as proposed here, additional sections of Writing 22 language workshops funded by the Graduate Division could be taught by writing faculty. This would assist them in immediate, concrete ways.

Graduate students' writing also needs support. Graduate students often falter as they shift from undergraduate to graduate work or from graduate coursework to independent dissertation production. This phenomenon is a common dilemma faced by writers at all levels: when the context, the audience, the standards of evidence and the terms of discourse change, writers often find themselves uncertain and inarticulate. Interventions by experienced writing faculty still remain productive in Anthropology, where a writing faculty member continues to work with the entering class. Lost to a previous round of budget cuts in 1995-1996 were the two course equivalencies Writing Program faculty had to work individually and in small writing groups with
History of Consciousness and Literature students. While faculty in these departments are expert in the subjects their students pursue, experienced writing instructors can sometimes see immediately what forces are complicating the argumentative strategies or prose styles of a graduate student writer. Furthermore, graduate students are famously in awe of their faculty and will sometimes be more willing to seek help from an instructor not in a position to evaluate them. The acknowledgements pages of articles and dissertations completed by students in those years testify to the real usefulness of this service. Its restoration might increase productivity and reduce time to degree; were the Division to see it as cost-effective, the Writing Program would be pleased to provide it.

Finally, the Writing Program has always aspired to be a full partner in the training of graduate students to teach, and has long provided a seminar in teaching writing to those interested in teaching first-year composition at UCSC- Writing 203. (Another course, occasionally offered as a workshop, helps teaching assistants effectively teach writing in disciplinary contexts.) Such courses, though, are a possibility only for those who are interested enough in teaching writing to make time for the coursework and the supervised teaching experience we offer. (A certificate program in the teaching of writing might make the additional work more attractive to graduate students.) A more structured relationship between the Writing Program and departments in the Humanities and across campus might make this opportunity more widely available. For instance, under the UC/UC-AFT non-Senate faculty workload proposal currently under review, which calls specifically for a share of the Writing Program courses to be taught by graduate students, these students would assume responsibility for about fifteen Writing 2 courses annually, under the close mentorship of a Writing Program faculty member.

Fundraising: Though the Writing Program has not typically been invited to participate in fundraising efforts for itself or for the division, members are enthusiastic about the prospect. Indeed, the program has much to offer the division in its development aims, as its work coincides with the watchwords of the current administration (diversity, interdisciplinarity) as well as with some of its pressing concerns (retention, time to degree). In addition, faculty interests and achievements are wide-ranging and interesting, and frequently occupy the intersection between the work of the academy and the interests of the public. In recent years, for instance, Writing Program faculty have founded inter-arts magazines, created an on-campus, student-run social justice conference, helped develop James Burke's "Knowledge Web," and produced an intelligent and effective course assessment instrument (of public interest in the era of state-mandated assessments in the schools). Several have been honored with major teaching awards. These achievements are worth touting, and could well attract donor interest in the program and division.

Writing-related operations such as the Central California Writing Project (CCWP) would benefit from development assistance, which would, in turn, benefit the campus. The Writing Project gives the division an immediate outreach opportunity and a way to increase the academic preparation of diverse students by providing professional development opportunities for K-14 teachers, occasions that enhance the teaching of writing, reading and literature. Writing Program faculty active in the Writing Project have been invited to participate in ICAS (the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates), to advise high school teachers in Merced when they were attempting to prepare their middle-school students to become UC-eligible by the time UC Merced opened, to consult with legislative bodies, to recommend pedagogies for transfer-level writing courses to community college teachers, and so on, a list prohibitively long for this occasion. That is, the Central California Writing Project enables the campus to engage with and transform language-arts education in the state. Until the spring of 2002, when the
Commensurable Funding Policy limited the relationship Writing Program faculty could have with the CCWP, writing faculty had considerable success bringing in grant money for the Writing Project. It is time to reconsider this possibility.

It is also time to reconsider journalism as an occasion for fund-raising. The furor surrounding the suspension of the Journalism minor should be sufficiently in the past to enable the Writing Program and the Division's Development Office to plan fund-raising efforts for courses, internships, outreach, and summer institutes. Doing so would re-engage a significant population of alumni who will otherwise continue to be alienated from the campus in the wake of the decision to defund and suspend the minor. Some of these alumni are themselves now professional journalists whose public recognition and articulate writing advertises for the program and whose support of the program, itself, should be a valuable asset to the campus. And current students-engaged, articulate, thoughtful, diverse-on air and in print would be an excellent advertisement for the Humanities and for the teaching of rhetoric, understood in its broadest context. Finally, development in this area would allow the Humanities to claim its place in any discussion of a graduate program in Public Media.

Some ideas that are worth revisiting in this context include both past achievements and other campus resources that could be tapped. Members of the Writing Program faculty conducted a very successful summer institute for high school teachers of journalism (sponsored by the Central California Writing Project) and for five years did considerable outreach with diverse students in the San Francisco Bay Area and in Merced to attract them to campus. Such efforts further outreach and diversity aims and could serve as occasions for fundraising. As for tapping campus resources, Student Media, an Academic Affairs unit, is very well grounded, providing space, equipment and staff advising for broadcast and print media students, including the many dozens of students putting out literary magazines. Student Media could provide the necessary campus match for grant proposals and donor outreach.

**Staffing:** The Writing Program is staffed by a 100% time program manager and a 75% time (over 10 months) program assistant. The program assistant's percent time has recently been returned to the current level, a considerable relief to the program manager and chair; it had dropped to 50% time over ten months with the separation of a previous assistant.

The restoration of the 75% position has improved the program's ability to accomplish its administrative and bureaucratic work in timely fashion. The current staffing level, though much improved, is not sufficient to cover all the work that needs doing; despite the increase in staff time, almost all of the substantial clerical and bureaucratic duties associated with administering the ELWR are still completed by the ELWR coordinator, an academic appointee. The ELWR coordinator has booked rooms for exams, tracked and contacted every student on campus who hasn't satisfied the ELWR by the end of their second quarter, filed and photocopied, entered changes on students' records. Though essential work, this is poor use of faculty time.

With the recruitment of an LSOE to serve as campus ELWR coordinator, current staffing levels must be reconsidered. Increasing the staff assistant's time to at least 100% over ten months would more appropriately distribute the clerical and bureaucratic work of the program, which is swelled by the program's responsibility for two campus requirements, ELWR and C2.

**Hiring priorities:** Of the four LSOEs currently at work in the Writing Program, one is retiring at the end of 2005-06; one is expected to retire at the end of 2006-07; and one, with over thirty years of service to UCSC, will certainly consider retiring by the end of the period covered by this...
document. In addition, of the non-Senate faculty (NSF), one of the program's premier specialists in composition theory retired in 2004; the campus ELWR coordinator will no longer serve in that capacity after 2006-07; and a number of the program's other highly experienced NSF are nearing retirement age. The Writing Program will need to conduct a national search in 2006-07 for two LSOEs in order to provide intellectual leadership, maintain pedagogical continuity, and insure that administrative responsibilities are appropriately covered and fairly distributed. Barring unforeseen increases in freshman enrollments, subsequent recruitments will depend upon faculty retirements (both LSOE and NSF), the possibility of shared hires with other departments, and the vision the campus has for the role of the Writing Program.

Though the program managed well with two LSOEs until 2000-buttressed by the administrative roles of non-Senate faculty-the campus's considerable growth in recent years makes the current arrangement of four LSOEs the minimum for effective leadership and administration. In a program largely staffed by non-Senate faculty whose full-time workload is currently set at eight courses per year, it may be tempting to consider trading the hard FTE represented in an LSOE position (full time set at six courses and two releases for service) at retirement for more TAS funds, which would represent more courses covered. The loss to the program and the campus, however, would be much greater than the gain in courses covered (perhaps two to four courses per year, depending on NSF salary). As Academic Senate members, LSOEs serve on campus committees critical to the mission of the program and the campus. In recent years, they have served on the Committee on Committees, and committees on Educational Policy, Planning and Budget, Teaching, and Preparatory Education; they have served as campus representatives to system-wide committees and projects; and they have served on search committees for campus administrators. In such efforts, they represent the Writing Program to faculty colleagues and administrators within and beyond the campus. Fewer than four LSOEs would trim the Writing Program's collegial contact with the rest of the campus. Fewer than four would also mean that the chairmanship would rotate between only two faculty members (the ELWR coordinator's duties would prohibit simultaneously chairing the program), and that personnel actions would regularly require outside faculty for completion.

Literature in composition pedagogy has, in the past decade or more, become increasingly divided between theory and practice, a divide often reified in the distinction between rhetoric (theory) and composition (practice). Unsurprisingly, this divide appears commonly in publication, with leading journals (College Composition and Communication, College English) favoring theory and smaller journals (California English, Teaching English in the Two-Year College) more often providing rationales for pedagogical techniques. UCSC's Writing Program has since its inception managed to occupy a position between the extremes, drawing on current theory to maintain pedagogical excellence. Via the program's next hires, we intend to maintain a program identity in which rhetoric and composition are thoroughly intertwined.

The following are replacement hires, which the Writing Program has included in its last three planning documents. All should be expert teachers and specialists in composition pedagogy. Their other specializations define their importance to the Writing Program and the campus.

In 2006-07:

- **An LSOE with expertise in applied linguistics and ESL to serve as campus ELWR coordinator.** The ELWR coordinator coordinates an operation that serves 35-40% of the annual incoming class of freshmen. The coordinator serves as a liaison between Writing Program, registrar, college advising, and Learning Support Services. Because UCSC does not have a separate track for English language learners (ELL), the ELWR
coordinator also oversees the tracking of ELL students and teaches courses that serve that growing population. Currently the ELWR coordinator is a non-Senate faculty member. An administrator of such considerable importance to the campus should be a member of the Academic Senate, which would enable full voting membership in Senate committees and a service component built into the appointment.

- **An LSOE with expertise in K-12 education; secondary specialization in disciplinary or professional writing.** The priority in this hire is to sustain the work the Writing Program has done at the intersection of university composition courses and K-12 education, work that transformed the teaching of writing in the primary and secondary schools served by the Central California Writing Project and helped shape the teaching of writing at UCSC. A relationship with the public schools enables Writing Program faculty to understand the context from which their students have recently emerged, a context that makes possible more focused, nuanced teaching. LSOE status for this position would promote collaboration with the Education Program, as well as enabling a faculty member with real expertise to sit on key system-wide Senate committees concerned with preparation and intersegmental cooperation. A secondary specialization in disciplinary/professional writing would be desirable, especially if the campus opts to draw more systematically on the Writing Program’s resources for assisting with upper-division writing. An interest in science writing seems particularly important given the investment of campus resources in science initiatives.

**In 2009-10 (projected):**
- **An LSOE with expertise in the history, theory, and practice of rhetoric.** Though all program faculty are expected to remain current in the field, the Writing Program must have at least one specialist in rhetorical theory and composition pedagogy with Academic Senate status, someone who can speak from the history of the field that defines our work. One of the program’s two main specialists in this area retired in 2004; the other will likely retire within the next five years.

A few words about the study of rhetoric: In the beginning, there were only rhetoric and philosophy. Out of them grew literature, politics, linguistics, psychology, anthropology, sociology, and so on. Rhetoric is thus the original interdisciplinary study because it existed before the disciplines split off. After Aristotle, we see rhetoric as the art of discovering the best means of persuasion in any situation whatsoever. It is the field of inquiry that concerns itself with analyzing the nature of human discourse in all areas of knowledge and is particularly concerned with how humans try to persuade each other to make free choices. A specialist in this area will have much to provide the campus, and will be an invaluable asset in the professional development faculty in the Writing Program.

**CONCLUSION**

In 2002, immediately following the last effort at academic planning, the campus appeared to have made its decision about the role of the Writing Program at UCSC, and stood by without protest as the strongest and most financially efficient writing program in the UC system was stripped of its upper division and its longstanding role as a source for outreach efforts. But several years have passed, and the campus has had an opportunity to reflect on the real costs of those cuts. An excellent undergraduate education requires a greater investment than that required to meet the minimal requirements for competence. Whether the campus opts for a first-year writing program or for a return to a full-service program, an investment in students' writing
beyond the first year is essential to a first-rate education. It would be a thrifty and efficient choice for the campus to make use of Writing Program resources to reach that goal.

Minimum recommendations for a first-year Writing Program:
- Retain hard-funded FFE (four LSOEs) so that leadership will be assured and key elements of the Writing Program's mission anchored.
- Return to some version of a funding formula so funding will stabilize.
- Enhance the ELWR curriculum to move students through the ELWR earlier, with better editing skills, in order to prepare students more effectively to satisfy the C2 requirement and the writing expectations within their majors.
- Remove strictures of the commensurable funding formula so the resources of the Writing Program will be available to the campus.
- Work with the VP/DUE, CEP, the Coordinator of Writing in the Disciplines and Divisional Deans to make sure that provision for W courses in departments is adequate.
- Welcome initiatives from campus and system-wide units for improvements in programs for diverse students in their first four quarters.
- Continue to engage graduate students in the teaching of first-year composition through the system of mentoring which now exists or through the Workload Proposal, if it is accepted.
- Invite other departments to propose courses in professional or scholarly writing for students who want to (or should) develop their skills in these areas.

Minimum requirements for a full-service Writing Program:
- Retain hard-funded FTE (four LSOEs) so that leadership will be assured and so that key elements of the Writing Program's mission will be anchored.
- Return to some version of a funding formula so funding will stabilize.
- Enhance the ELWR curriculum to move students through the ELWR earlier, with better editing skills, in order to prepare students more effectively to satisfy the C2 requirement and the writing expectations within their majors.
- Remove strictures of the commensurable funding formula so the resources of the Writing Program will be available to the campus.
- Work with the VP/DUE, CEP, the Coordinator of Writing in the Disciplines and Divisional Deans to engage writing faculty in the provision of W courses, through co-taught or other collaborative courses and through courses housed in the Writing Program.
- Welcome initiatives from campus and system-wide units for improvements in programs for diverse students, including courses for transfer students, housed in the Writing Program (now in suspension).
- Continue to engage graduate students in the teaching of first-year composition through the system of mentoring which now exists or through the Workload Proposal, if it is accepted. In addition, restore services to international graduate students as well as to graduate student writers in the Humanities.
- Reinstate courses in professional and scholarly writing housed in the Writing Program (now suspended).
A Proposal to Stretch the College Nine Core Course  
Helen Shapiro, Provost, College Nine and College Ten  
Submitted to CEP, April 2010

1. Rationale

In fall, 2009, we instituted a pilot “stretch” course in College Ten. Based on previous November ELWR-exam results and instructor feedback, we concluded that it was not feasible for many of our students to satisfy all of the core requirements in one quarter. Therefore, we required all students entering College Ten with a score of 5 or below on the AWPE exam to enroll in a two-quarter core course.

The course was very successful. All but one of the 27 stretch students passed ELWR this winter. This is a better pass rate than that of College Ten students who did not pass ELWR in the fall and took Writing 20 in the winter. (It is important to keep in mind that these non-stretch students also entered UCSC with a 6 on the AWPE exam.) In their evaluations, many students wrote that they initially had negative feelings about being assigned to stretch, but most came to see its value. (We hope to address this by inviting former stretch students to the first day of class.) Both course instructors were extremely positive about the course.

2. Student Selection

Our data indicate that entering students with AWPE scores of 4 or below have a very slim chance of satisfying ELWR in November. Students entering with a 5 have a slightly better, but still mediocre, chance of passing. Therefore, they would have to take an additional writing course (Writing 20) in the winter, anyway.

Last fall, we offered two sections of stretch in College Ten and required all students with an AWPE score of 5 or less to take it. We found that a few of the students who scored a 5 could have succeeded in a regular ELWR-required core course. Therefore, in 2010, we plan to require all students with a 4 or less to take stretch, but our instructors will review the exams and/or request a diagnostic writing sample of students with a 5. We plan to do the same for College Nine.

3. Instructors:

We have two experienced instructors who could teach this class. Sandy Archimedes has been College Nine’s CWC for a number of years and is helping to draft this proposal. She currently teaches ELWR-required courses for us, as well as Writing 2 courses in the WP. Toby Loeffler is affiliated with the WP and taught for College Nine for the first time last fall. He is an experienced writing instructor who teaches other courses in the WP. The assumption is that they would teach the same students in both quarters.
4. Funding for the Additional Winter Courses:

For College Ten in 2009, we had originally planned for the College to fund one section and the Writing Program to fund the other. Given that the WP would have had to provide at least one section of Writing 20 for these students in the absence of this stretch course, this was simply a transfer of resources. We were fortunate that a funder agreed to pay for both of these courses in 2009 and has made a verbal commitment to fund four winter stretch courses (two for each college) in 2011. If the funding does not come through, we expect the WP to fund one of the College Nine winter stretch sections.

5. Assessment:

As we did for College Ten, we will solicit student and instructor evaluations and look at the ELWR pass rates.
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Senate Lecturers With Security of Employment
Elizabeth Abrams http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Abrams.pdf
Heather Shearer http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Shearer.pdf

Unit 18 Continuing Lecturers
Margaret Amis http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Amis.pdf
Sondra Archimedes http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Archimedes.pdf
Jeffrey Arnett http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Arnett.pdf
Farnaz Fatemi http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Fatemi.pdf
B.K. Faunce http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Faunce.pdf
Roxanne Hamilton http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Hamilton.pdf
Robin King http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.King.pdf
Brij Lunine http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Lunine.pdf
Patrick McKercher http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Mckercher.pdf
Ellen Newberry http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Newberry.pdf
Sarah-Hope Parmeter http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Parmeter.pdf
Annalisa Rava http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Rava.pdf
Amy Weaver http://writing.ucsc.edu/pdfs/FV.Weaver.pdf
Writing Program Chairs

1997-98: Carol Freeman
1998-99: Carol Freeman
1999-00: Carol Freeman
2000-01: Carol Freeman
2001-02: Roz Spafford
2002-03: Roz Spafford
2003-04: Rox Spafford
2004-05: Elizabeth Abrams
2005-06: Elizabeth Abrams
2006-07: Elizabeth Abrams
2007-08: Elizabeth Abrams
2008-09: Elizabeth Abrams
2009-10: Elizabeth Abrams
2010-11: James Wilson
2011-12: James Wilson
2012-13: James Wilson
Equivalency Chart for Writing Lecturers

Writing instructors will receive 1/6th course equivalency for assuming each of the following assigned responsibilities:

(a) Miscellaneous routine Writing Program business, including proctoring and reading placement exams and serving on committees that consider appeals; advising students about writing requirements and courses; helping with quarterly pre-enrollment; serving on search committees; writing recommendations for students; attending campus and systemwide meetings and conferences; and completing requests for information, data, opinions, etc. (In the past stipends have partially covered this expense.)

(b) Supervision of Writing 10 tutorials associated with core course sections for students who have not satisfied Subject A and with Writing 20.

(c) Any combination of three independent studies/senior thesis committees/student publications.

(d) Supervision of a college writing center or other group of tutors hired by the Writing Program. (In the past stipends have partially covered this expense.)

(e) Membership on the Writing Program's Personnel Committee.

(f) Service on campus-wide committees and task forces.

(g) Supervision of two graduate student TA apprentices who are teaching Writing 1 for the first time.
## WRITING PROGRAM - 3 WEEK ENROLLMENT DATA

### ALL COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Program</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 022</td>
<td>Written Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>25 25 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>23 25 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>23 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>22 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>21 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>20 23 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>19 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>18 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>23 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>22 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>21 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>20 23 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>19 23 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>18 23 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>17 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>16 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>15 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>14 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>13 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>12 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>11 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>10 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>9 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>8 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>7 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>6 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>5 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>4 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>3 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>2 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley-Polk, Amy</td>
<td>1 24 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIT 021</th>
<th>The Sentence in Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>24 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>23 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>22 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>21 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>20 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>19 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>18 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>17 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>16 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>15 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>14 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>13 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>12 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>11 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>10 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>9 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>8 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>7 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>6 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>5 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>4 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>3 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>2 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>1 23 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIT 022A</th>
<th>Grammar &amp; Editing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>25 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>23 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>21 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>19 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>17 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>15 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>13 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>11 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>9 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>7 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>5 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>3 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>1 25 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIT 022</th>
<th>Written Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>25 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>23 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>21 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>19 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>17 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>15 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>13 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>11 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>9 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>7 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>5 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>3 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>1 25 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIT 021</th>
<th>The Sentence in Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>24 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>23 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>22 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>21 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>20 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>19 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>18 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>17 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>16 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>15 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>14 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>13 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>12 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>11 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>10 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>9 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>8 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>7 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>6 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>5 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>4 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>3 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>2 23 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Sarah-Hope</td>
<td>1 23 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIT 022A</th>
<th>Grammar &amp; Editing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>25 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>23 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>21 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>19 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>17 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>15 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>13 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>11 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>9 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>7 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>5 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>3 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James A</td>
<td>1 25 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>2009-10 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 099F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 198F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>2009-10 Total</th>
<th>2010-11 Total</th>
<th>2011-12 Total</th>
<th>2012-13 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO:  Georges Van Den Abbeele  
Dean of Humanities, UCSC

FROM:  The External Review Committee for the Writing Program  
Susan McLeod, UC Santa Barbara (Chair) 
Rise Axelrod, UC Riverside 
Marjorie Roemer, Rhode Island College

DATE:  June 20, 2007

SUBJECT:  External Review Report

From May 1 to May 3, 2007, the External Review Committee visited the UCSC campus and spent time with many of the different constituencies that make up the larger university community. We are very grateful to those who so carefully planned and arranged our visit and for the thoughtfulness and generosity of those who met with us. In particular, we would like to thank Norma Ray for all her help.

In our conversations with very disparate groups, we were struck by the convergence of a deep commitment to the ideals and traditions of the university with a thoughtful and flexible approach to the challenges that changing demographics and new realities pose. The challenges facing the Writing Program seem to focus on four salient issues: an increase in populations requiring more introductory support for writing and the resources needed to provide those services, a desire to sustain the intellectual excellence of the freshman composition course across the ten colleges with their independent missions and separate administrative structures, a need to rebuild programs, particularly for the W requirement, after severe budget cuts have gutted those initiatives, and finally a changing faculty as retirements take their toll on the leadership of the Program. The attached report addresses the specific questions we were given to consider.
1. Academic Staff

Quality  The External Review Committee finds that the quality of the academic staff in the Writing Program is superb; the faculty have maintained a very high quality of instruction, and have soldiered on in the face of the cuts to the Program, which we understand were budget-driven. These faculty are a seriously underutilized resource for the campus. Faculty morale\(^1\) is remarkably high, given the situation; we were greatly impressed with their professionalism, their collegiality, and the collaborative way they work, especially with regard to establishing outcomes for their curricula and establishing agreed-upon standards for student work.

The last external review of the UCSC Writing Program, conducted in 1999, stated that it was “the most distinctive and outstanding program in the UC system” and ranked “with the very best Writing Programs in the United States” (2). Unfortunately, that is no longer the case, in part because the academic staff is so underutilized. The Writing Program has gone from a full-service one (providing courses at both the entry-level and upper division and consulting with faculty across the disciplines to develop “W” classes) to a program that focuses on entry-level instruction, a change that has reduced the Program to a model that was out of date 25 years ago. This is especially unfortunate in the light of UCSC’s “uncommon commitment to undergraduate education.”

The best programs across the country have gone to the model that UCSC used to have: guided practice in writing for students throughout their college careers, gradually moving from an introduction to academic writing to very focused writing in the disciplines. Various longitudinal research studies show the wisdom of this approach. Writing is not a closed skill, like learning to ride a bicycle; it is an open skill, more like learning to play an instrument, always open to improvement and refinement. Further, there is no Platonic form of “good writing,” as recent research in writing in the disciplines has shown: writing in the sciences is very different from writing in the humanities. Students become “good writers” in a disciplinary context, as they learn what constitutes data and how to shape arguments in specific areas of study; writing across the curriculum programs were established so that students could receive guided practice in disciplinary writing, rather than learning (or not learning) by trial and error. We understand that the Academic Senate has recently reaffirmed faculty commitment to the “W” general education requirement; the expertise of the Writing Program faculty will be wasted unless they are part of the effort to make the “W” requirement a meaningful one.

Budget MOU and Workload  We hope that the new budget MOU, along with the proposed workload policy, will enable the Program to regain some lost ground; we fully endorse both proposals.

Future Directions  There are also some interesting opportunities ahead as some of the present permanent faculty retire. How to craft the positions for new Senate faculty will be an issue that

\(^1\) We are not able to comment on the morale of graduate student instructors, since none of them came to the meeting scheduled with us.
the Program, together with the administration, should think through carefully. On the one hand, there are arguments to be made for hiring ladder faculty, as other UC campuses (Davis, Irvine, Riverside, San Diego, and Santa Barbara) have done. Research faculty not only raise the national profile of a program, they also bring expertise in areas that can be applied immediately to the program and its pedagogy. Further, the present job market for faculty with expertise in rhetoric and composition is a seller’s market; new PhDs routinely receive multiple offers, and senior faculty have to be actively recruited. In such a market, LSOE positions are less desirable than ladder positions; further the LSOE designation is not understood outside the UC system, being often mistaken for a temporary lectureship. On the other hand, the present mix of LSOE and NSF seems to be working very well, and Program faculty expressed strong reservations about bringing in ladder faculty, since they sensed that this might disrupt the collegiality and collaboration that is clearly a hallmark of the program. The Review Committee sees this collegiality as an important value, one that we would not want to see compromised.

What we recommend, therefore, is a series of discussions involving the Writing Program, the administration, and faculty from other writing programs to help shape a plan for the future of the UCSC Writing Program. (UC Davis, for example, invited a series of composition experts from across the country to consult with faculty and give invited talks before hiring a Senate faculty member to direct the UCD Writing Program.) At the national level, the trend is toward separate writing programs becoming departments and developing a writing major. Is this the direction that the UCSC Writing Program should go? Or should the Program maintain its distinct identity as a key part of the liberal arts ethos of UCSC? The answers to these questions will help determine what sorts of Senate hires should be made in the next few years.

One staffing issue that drew our attention was the fact that in some colleges, the Writing Lecturer who serves as coordinator for the ELWR is drawn from a pool of temporary hires. To assure continuity in the instruction and evaluation of ELWR students, the college coordinators should have continuing positions as members of the Writing Program faculty and work closely with the other college coordinators.

Recommendations (Academic Staff):

1.1 The External Review Committee strongly endorses the proposed budget MOU and the proposed workload policy. Taken together, the two proposals should remove some of the conditions that have forced the program to focus only on lower-division courses and enable them to engage in outreach activities, especially for the “W” classes.

1.2 In order to think through the sorts of Senate faculty hires that will be made in the next few years, the Writing Program should be involved in a planning process that would involve discussions with the administration and with national composition experts in order to determine what the best direction is for the Writing Program, given the distinct mission of UCSC.

---

2 For example, UC Irvine advertised in 2005-06 to replace its LSOE director of composition, an advertisement that occasioned negative comments on the listserv of the Council of Writing Program Administrators because the LSOE designation was taken to be an adjunct position. The search failed, and was successful the following year after it was advertised at the Associate Professor level.
1.3 The University should consider making all College Writing Coordinators members of the Writing Program faculty.

2. Curriculum

*Transparency* The recent changes in the campus general education requirements and consequent curricular changes in the core writing program seem to us to be an improvement, a move toward ensuring that entering students take core courses that, whatever the topic, have the same outcomes in mind in terms of developing academic reading and writing skills.

While we did not have the opportunity to ask students about how well they understood the general education and writing requirements now in force, it may be worthwhile to note that three of us – full professors in English and Directors of Writing Programs ourselves, two of us from other UC campuses – had some difficulty in mastering the terminology, as well as in trying to figure out how the ELWR was fulfilled. The Writing 1 and Writing 2 and C1 and C2 designations pose a complication that seems unnecessary, especially given the fact that the latter is also termed a “W” course. Perhaps some of the confusion stems from the fact that the curriculum is in a transitional stage, but if we found it difficult to puzzle out, we assume students have similar difficulties. The requirements themselves seem sensible and entirely in line with writing curricula nationally; UCSC might consider simplifying the designations to make them more readily grasped by students.

*Relationship between Writing Program and College Core Curriculum* In each of the meetings that we attended over two days, the strength of the college system and the commitment to its multiple distinctive identities was evident, yet the challenge of administering a campus requirement across so many different structures was also evident. Our back to back meetings with college provosts and with NSF staff highlighted some of the strains that can emerge when the required college writing course is also the introductory course that socializes the students not just to the university but to the mission of the particular college. Clearly there is some anxiety about who is in charge of the Core courses, and clearly the ways of sharing this responsibility differ markedly from college to college. Indeed, the one group we did not meet was the teachers of the Core courses who are not part of the Writing Program. We understand that in some colleges the Writing Coordinator is closely involved with the hiring of such teachers, while in others this does not happen. Because of the recent reaffirmation that writing is a central concern of the Core, it would seem that a candidate’s expertise in teaching writing should be a factor in the hiring process. In order to help regularize the process, it would be helpful if there were a protocol for newly-appointed provosts to follow when making these hires, one that might involve consultation with the College Writing Coordinator. We understand that there is a high turnover with regard to these particular teachers. It would be helpful in terms of providing continuity for the curriculum if the Writing Program were to offer a joint appointment—that is, the person hired would teach the Core in the Fall Quarter and teach Writing Program courses Winter and Spring.

*Assessment* The External Review team also understands that an Assessment Project is underway to determine passing standards for C2. We recommend that a writing assessment specialist be invited to campus to consult on assessment procedures that would be most appropriate to UCSC’s particular concerns.

*ELWR and ESL* Although the Writing Program is responding as well as it can under the circumstances to changes in the student population, the ELWR is at the center of what the
Program’s self-study report describes as a “a perfect storm of inadequate funding.” Shifts in funding policies and changes in demographics have combined to put severe pressure on resources. The budget for ELWR-related courses takes up more and more of the available funds. Where something like 80% of incoming students used to pass the ELWR requirement on entrance, now closer to 66% do so. And the students who do not pass now often require more instruction and more time to meet the requirement. The accommodations being made for ELWR students seem appropriate and intelligent, but they depend on a skilled teaching force. With the coming retirement of 3 of the 4 faculty members with special training in linguistics, the program is going to need more support. While the search for a new ELWR and ELL coordinator with LSOE is certainly going to be one step in the right direction, it seems that even more support for this program will be needed. Here is one place where the Writing Program and the individual colleges must have more carefully delineated strategies for collaboration. Teachers of the ELWR sections need special training. They also need to be able to rely on the effective use of tutors in these classrooms. The tutorial program seems a particularly successful part of the ELWR program, and it is to be hoped that the current system of fee-for-service can be abandoned and a return to assured tutoring services for all ELWR students can be re-instated.

One of the highlights of our visit was the meeting with the undergraduate tutors. They are a wonderful advertisement for the university; we wish we could have captured on videotape their energy, enthusiasm and thoughtfulness. Our meeting with them certainly underscored the power of undergraduate tutors to serve as intermediaries with beginning students. All the tutors agreed about their sense of being helpful to other students and what it means to play that role (“Their accomplishments are yours.” “Best job I ever had.” “It was really, really valuable.”) They also agreed about the great benefits of working closely with Writing Program faculty and how much the actual tutoring had offered them as students. (“It helped me to find a direction.” “I see now that I want to be a teacher.” “I realized how much harder I should work myself.”) The investment in this tutoring has to be money well spent. It is a little that gains a lot.

In 1999 the External Review Committee commented extensively on the singular success of this campus in “helping ESL students satisfy campus writing requirements without assigning those students to the sorts of segregated and stigmatized courses that ESL students on other UC campuses tend to resent and avoid.” The efficacy of this design still holds, but the success is now partially compromised by the increasing class size, the need for faculty development for those teachers of ELWR sections who don’t have formal background in applied linguistics or ELL specifically, and the cut-backs on tutorial support.

Recommendations (Curriculum):

2.1 Consider how to designate the general education writing requirements in ways that are more transparent.

2.2 Some thought should be given to a hiring protocol for all Colleges that would discuss the desired qualifications of and the process for hiring non-Writing Program teachers of the Core courses. More continuity of academic staff would result if these appointments were made jointly and in consultation with the Writing Program.

2.3 More support needs to be given to the program for work with ESL students and those who do not speak English at home.

2.4 Funding for tutorial services should be restored.
3. Administration

Staff Support It is clear that the one administrative staff person assigned to the Writing Program is overwhelmed by the sheer amount of work required for what is a fairly complicated program. She is continually being diverted from doing her own work because she is often the only one in the office to respond to questions and advise students. Faculty have had to take on staff functions as well, an obvious misuse of resources. Staff and faculty morale inevitably suffers. The External Review team urges that special consideration be taken and that the formula for staff allotments be modified to allow the hiring of a second full-time staff person as well as work study support as needed. The External Review Committee understands that a second full-time staff position has been approved, and when this is filled the situation should improve. A full-time staff of two persons seems a minimum for the program.

One of the issues for the Writing Program in terms of staffing, resources, and equipment is that it is not a department, and therefore does not fit the usual mold for administrative decision-making (for example, it has no majors, but does a lot of advising). Some thought should be given as to how to estimate the needs of the Program outside of the usual funding formulas. Further, because the Writing Program faculty are committed to the College structure of USCS, they have not joined other units in the humanities who have moved their offices into one building, a move that some faculty see as a move away from the focus on the Colleges and toward departments. In some of the Colleges faculty teaching the core courses have support services, but in some they do not have support services or their own offices; it seems only reasonable that all Colleges should provide support and office space for those teaching the core.

Administration of the ELWR The Committee was concerned by the amount of time and energy devoted to administering the ELWR. If the present search for an ELWR Coordinator is successful, that person should be able to take over some of the work involved with that requirement. Still, the number of students at UCSC who have not met the ELWR has been increasing steadily, according to statistics we were given, with an accompanying rise in the administrative work involved in advising, placing, and testing these students. The way that UCSC has chosen to deal with the ELWR—separating the course from the exam—is wise, in that the course itself is not remedial and student motivation is therefore not an issue. However, we were concerned that using the entry-level placement exam at the end of the course as what is in effect an exit exam may not be appropriate. Further, research shows that a timed writing examination discriminates against students whose first language is not English, an increasing group of students in all of California. The Writing Program has dealt with this issue by allowing appeals and portfolios for students who do not pass the exam; while this is in line with assessment practices nationally (because portfolios are a more authentic assessment of the range of student writing abilities), it does add to the administrative workload. It may be that modifications of the present testing and placement system are needed; there is an extensive ongoing national conversation about writing assessment that the Writing Program might join, both to learn from and to instruct others. Inviting a writing assessment expert to campus would be one step in that direction.

Governance The present quality of Program governance seems excellent; it is an exceptionally collaborative and consultative unit, distributing administrative responsibilities and sharing the workload among NSF and Senate faculty. Such a model ensures that all faculty, regardless of status or level of employment (full- or part-time) are invested in the Program. The present budget situation has meant that the Director has assumed rather more administrative duties than
her released time would allow; the new budget MOU, if approved, should allow the Program to return to a more distributed model.

Administrative Coordination of W Courses One area of administration that the university as a whole might want to consider has to do with the W courses. Since the Academic Senate has just reaffirmed faculty commitment to the writing-intensive courses, the program may want to follow the lead of UC Irvine and hire one person to coordinate these courses into a true WAC program rather than a collection of courses. Given the state of the market at present, this would need to be a senior Senate faculty position.

Recommendations (Administration):

3.1 A second staff-support person should be hired immediately. The possibility of hiring work-study students for additional support (reception, answering the phone) should be explored.

3.2 Thought should be given as to an appropriate funding formula for Writing Program resources, since it does not fit the mold for most other units in the university.

3.3 Each College should provide support services and offices for faculty who are teaching the core course in that College.

3.4 The Writing Program should consider inviting an expert in Writing Assessment to campus to discuss ways that the present handling of the ELWR might be streamlined without sacrificing the quality of the present system.

3.5 The Writing Program should consider hiring a Coordinator for W classes, in order to revitalize the WAC program at UCSC.

4. Future Goals

Faculty Development While the budget cuts that led to significant curtailments in the Writing Program have certainly taken their toll, there is little question that the energy and commitment of the Writing Program faculty has remained undiminished. A vibrant sense of community characterizes their work together and their own self-study document. The External Review Team attended an after-dinner reading by several faculty members that demonstrated this energy, connection, and playful enjoyment of writing as a community-building activity.

One of the concomitant results of their commitment is the degree to which the Writing Program faculty focus their professional development efforts on immediate, local, or pedagogically related issues. Whether it’s research on UCWRITE or Cross-Age Writing Partnerships, or service on the Santa Cruz County/City Schools Advisory Board, the faculty here involve themselves in the issues that are immediate to their several community affiliations. They are active public intellectuals. This feels like one of the significant strengths of the non-hierarchical academic structure of their program and the shared authority that it has fostered. Noteworthy, too, is the breadth and diversity of the faculty’s training. Poets, psychohistorians, film studies experts, compositionists, linguists, Victorianists, communications specialists, fiction writers, hip-hop analysts, computer technology specialists, videographers – the faculty possesses broad and varied resources for collaboration with other departments and programs.
Given the traditions and the strengths of this pattern of development, it is complicated to imagine what a next move should be. As was noted earlier, ladder faculty positions and a director for the WAC programs would offer certain kinds of status and strength to the program. It would seem wise, however, even if such appointments were made, for those new faculty to build on the shared energy and resourcefulness that the Writing Program now demonstrates in committing itself to a first-class program for beginning students and to a sensitive system for supporting ELWR unsatisfied students while immediately bringing them into the discourse community provided by the Core programs. Additionally, the focus of the Writing Program’s own professional development agenda on local issues, UCSC-related research, is an important part of the tradition here. The commitment to this kind of intellectual work has promoted a particularly self-reflective practice that seems to have gained the Program the deserved respect of other faculty members across the campus.

It is, however, the co-curricular work that seems most sadly to have suffered in the recent budget reallocations. The CPB report on the funding of the Writing Program (2005) remarks on the long history of innovative and highly successful collaborations between the Writing Program and other units, specifically the work on co-teaching W courses. As the campus recommits to the W courses, whose necessity we have already addressed, it seems important that such work be conceived, not as the province of one ladder faculty appointed to superintend such a project, but as a shared venture that builds on the strengths of the existing Writing Program faculty and their relationships with faculty in other units. The Writing Program is in a position to provide support for the upper-division writing requirement if present budget restraints are lifted by resuming their collaboration with colleagues across the disciplines.

Placement of the Writing Program We were asked to comment on the placement of the Writing Program in the Humanities Division. This is a thorny issue for all institutions where the writing program is not part of an English department. On the one hand, a separate program in fact serves all students, not just those in the Humanities; this fact would suggest that such a program should be funded centrally. On the other hand, writing has historically been located in the Humanities, and most writing teachers have degrees in humanities-related areas. The question really comes down to budget: who should fund a campus-wide program? In some institutions the writing program is funded by an undergraduate dean or vice-provost who oversees all of general education; in others, the allocation for the writing program is made centrally and passed down to the dean. These decisions are site-specific, often determined more by history than by logic. Where the program is located is less important, in our judgment, than how it is funded. The proposed budget MOU would go a long way toward alleviating some of the difficulties the Program has had in the recent past.

Unsolved Problems Rereading the External Review Report of 1999, one is struck by how many of the issues noted then still remain unresolved: 1) the loss of the upper division writing initiatives; 2) a funding formula that has curtailed Writing Program involvement in that upper division work (and that has now threatened many of the exemplary outreach efforts of this university); 3) the need for more Senate appointments; 4) the need for more staff support. While it seems that the new MOU and the recommitment to the W courses will speak to some of these issues, it is to be hoped that another eight years will not find these same issues worsening.

5. Other

Graduate Student Instructors Although the meeting with graduate students did not materialize, our discussions with the faculty lead us to believe that they have integrated this new group of
teachers into the Program very well; certainly the curriculum for TA training is an excellent one, in line with national standards for such courses. The funding basis for graduate student instructors clearly should not be through a decrease in the existing budget for Writing Program faculty. Moreover, graduate instructors should not be thought of as replacing the professional staff of highly experienced writing instructors. Instead, graduate students should be given the opportunity to extend their graduate training through the teaching of writing in their disciplines.

Loss of Journalism Minor  The External Review team understands that the former journalism minor was popular and highly successful. Restoration of the minor would be beneficial to the campus.
Writing Program Response to the External Review Committee Report
October 2007

The report of External Review Committee (ERC) members Rise Axelrod, Marjorie Roemer, and Susan McLeod (chair) affirmed many of the choices that the Writing Program has historically made and confirmed as logical and forward-thinking the efforts the program has made to respond to UCSC’s changing demographic and the Writing Program’s changing budgetary circumstances. We are delighted that the ERC sees as strengths what we also see as strengths—a splendid faculty; excellent teaching, lower-division curriculum, and self-governance; and, overall, an effective approach to resolving challenges we see developing in undergraduate students’ writing education. We are thoroughly pleased that the ERC endorses solutions that the Writing Program itself has helped craft, such as the non-Senate faculty Workload Proposal (2005), recent changes to the entry-level writing curriculum, and the re-engineering of the composition requirement into the two-part C1/C2 requirement. And we are gratified that the areas of concern we identified in our Self-Study—among them the underutilization, since the last External Review, of Writing Program faculty in instructional and co-curricular efforts that affect the whole campus (notably the writing-intensive [W] requirement); the challenges facing the program with the imminent retirement of so many of its longstanding faculty; and the promising but incompletely defined relationship between the Writing Program and the colleges in administering the C1/C2 curriculum—have been confirmed by the ERC as worth prompt, close attention. We return to several of these in the next sections of this document.

The ERC report also identifies areas of concern that have since been resolved or are on their way to resolution. These include the following:

- Recommendation 1.2: At the behest of Dean Van Den Abbeele, a task force is now following the ERC’s advice to consult with other campuses on the advantages and disadvantages of filling recently vacated Senate positions with ladder faculty or Lecturers SOE;

- Recommendation 1.3: College Writing Coordinators with more tenuous relationships to the Writing Program have been regularized as Writing Program faculty via bestowal of the “a” equivalency, a one-sixth course equivalency provided to compensate them for participating in regular Program business, and as many courses as we can assign to them annually;

- Recommendation 2.3: The Writing Program has recently hired a specialist in TESOL to strengthen faculty expertise in working with English language learners;

- Recommendation 2.4: Fully-funded tutoring for all ELWR-unsatisfied students has been restored, at least on a trial basis, through a combination of funding provided by VP/DUE Ladusaw and student fees;
• Recommendation 3.1: The Writing Program’s staffing deficit should soon be ameliorated now that the Humanities Division has authorized, conditional upon the Program’s meeting certain conditions, a second 100% staff position.

Though some of these changes were already in progress at the time of the campus visit, nevertheless they represent significant steps forward. Other recommendations are also en route to resolution but are as yet incomplete (e.g., Recommendation 1.1, which endorses the proposed budget MOU and workload policy); still others, which we support, are outside the power of the Writing Program to resolve alone (e.g., Recommendation 3.2, which calls for an “appropriate funding formula for Writing Program resources, since it does not fit the mold for most other units in the university”; and Recommendation 3.3, which calls on the colleges to provide support services for faculty teaching college Core courses).

In the balance of this document, we highlight several key points made by the report and, at the end, respond to or clarify a few others.

**The role of the Writing Program at UCSC**

In the introduction to its report, the External Review Committee identifies what it sees as the Writing Program’s four main challenges:

- an increase in populations requiring more introductory support for writing and the resources needed to provide those services, a desire to sustain the intellectual excellence of the freshman composition course across the ten colleges with their independent missions and separate administrative structures, a need to rebuild programs, particularly for the W requirement, after severe budget cuts have gutted these initiatives, and finally a changing faculty as retirements take their toll on the leadership of the Program. (1)

These points succinctly sum up key challenges. As we noted in our Self-Study and other planning documents, and as the External Review Committee report clearly suggests, together these are effectively campus rather than solely Writing Program concerns: they address issues that affect the education of students across all four years of college.

Though it is a thread that runs through the entire document, the ERC report addresses the campus-level challenge most directly in its first section on “academic staff.” There it indicates that the budget cuts imposed on the Writing Program, and its consequent focus on “entry-level instruction,” have “reduced the Program to a model that was out of date 25 years ago”—an ironic change given that “the best programs across the country have gone to the model that UCSC used to have.” This model involved writing instruction for students at all levels of their academic development (2).

The report’s overall approach, with its emphasis on finding ways to support the W requirement by making use of the “underutilized” Writing Program faculty, supports a return to this integrated model of writing instruction. Under such an integrated model, the main challenges facing the Writing Program, neatly summed up in the four listed
above, would be part of a continuum in which the adequacy of resources for entry-level writers would be considered in tandem with the adequacy of resources and consistency of programs for more advanced writers both within the colleges and across the majors. This is a vision the ERC report articulates in its first recommendation, which “strongly endorses the proposed budget MOU and the proposed workload policy” in order to “remove some of the conditions that have forced the program to focus only on lower-division courses and enable them to engage in outreach activities, especially for the ‘W’ classes” (3).

We hope that the campus considers seriously the External Review Committee’s intention. Although the individual questions posed to the Committee and answered in their report tend to atomize the central question of the role of the Writing Program, the report’s first and most fundamental recommendation concerns a pair of policy changes that, together, may enable the Writing Program once again to serve the campus as a whole—by further developing the entry-level curriculum, working together with the colleges and the departments to strengthen their writing curricula, and hiring faculty members whose work portfolios include responsibility for such programs.

**The relationship between the Writing Program and the college Core curricula**

In its section on “curriculum,” the ERC report devotes a significant paragraph to the joint administration of the college Core classes by the Writing Program and the colleges. The Writing Program’s commitment to the college Core courses is deep and long-standing, and, through the individual College Writing Coordinators, its involvement in the administration of Core courses long pre-dates the new C1 and C2 requirements. But as the report puts it, “there is some anxiety about who is in charge of the Core courses and clearly the ways of sharing this responsibility differ markedly from college to college” (4). At some colleges, for instance, College Writing Coordinators participate in the hiring of Core instructors; at other colleges, they do not.

The anxiety is no doubt exacerbated by the distribution of responsibility for the requirements. The Writing Program is responsible for the majority of C2 classes but the colleges also run one or two C2 classes apiece each fall which they staff. The Writing Program is responsible for C1 students who are ELWR-unsatisfied, but staffs fewer than half (only 24) of the C1 classes for ELWR-unsatisfied students offered each fall through the Core classes. The remaining ELWR sections of Core classes are staffed by the colleges, which are also responsible for staffing all C1 classes for ELWR-satisfied students. In short, although all C2 classes are responsible for meeting the educational objectives for C2 classes, and likewise all C1 classes are responsible for meeting C1 course objectives, because hiring and oversight for these classes is independently conducted by the Writing Program and the colleges, it is likely that some differences surface in the hiring, training, and reviewing of faculty, meeting the expectations of the curriculum, and so on, especially as shifts take place in the leadership at the colleges and the Writing Program.

The ERC report recommends a two-part solution: first, a “protocol for newly appointed provosts to follow when making these hires, one that might involve consultation with the
College Writing Coordinator” (4); and second, maintaining continuity between the colleges and the Writing Program by having fall Core faculty teach winter and spring Writing Program classes, a practice we already follow to the extent possible. These are fine recommendations that emerge from existing, though not universal, practices.

Perhaps in advance of these recommendations, we suggest another: a committee made up of representatives from the Writing Program, the colleges, and the Committee on Educational Policy and charged with examining the C1/C2 curricula and with recommending protocols for hiring, mentoring, professional development, and evaluation of C1/C2 faculty in order to facilitate curricular and instructional consistency across many units. The Writing Program and the college provosts have a history of excellent collaboration on projects such as these, including the development of the educational expectations for C1 and C2 courses. With the new requirements now in their third year, now would be a good time to review what we have accomplished together and to see where we might further improve the new model.

Clarifications
Here we have two corrections and a few points of clarification or divergence from the report’s recommendations:

(1) In its comments on the “ELWR and ESL” curriculum, the report mentions a drop in incoming students’ ELWR satisfaction rates from 80% to 66% percent “on entrance” (5). The figures are correct but misapplied. On entrance, in fact, roughly 50% of incoming students are ELWR-satisfied. After the September administration of the Analytical Writing Placement Exam, roughly 60-65% of incoming students annually are ELWR-satisfied. Of the remainder, we have in the last several years seen a drop in the ELWR satisfaction rates at the end of a quarter of UCSC instruction from a historically quite consistent 80% (actually 78%) to 66%.

(2) In its discussion of the transparency of the terminology associated with the composition requirements, the ERC report declares that “The Writing 1 and Writing 2 and C1 and C2 designations pose a complication that seems unnecessary, especially given the fact that the latter is also termed a ‘W’ course” (4). Here we have a factual correction: C2 classes cannot also satisfy the W requirement. There are three General Education requirements having to do with writing—C1, C2, and W—and no course satisfies more than one of them.

This statement also raises a slight divergence of opinion: we believe that the nomenclature problem is self-correcting. We acknowledge that the terminology may initially befuddle, but we have not noticed any noteworthy confusion among students, who are accustomed to distinguishing between GE codes and numbered course names. While it is true that each quarter a very small number of students who should enroll in Writing 2 mistakenly enroll in Writing 1 and then quickly correct their enrollments (because of enrollment safeguards the reverse almost never happens), with the imminent graduation of nearly all of the remaining students who must take Writing 1 to satisfy the
old composition requirement, we are very close to retiring the Writing 1 course name, and we believe that should clear up any remaining confusion.

(3) In its discussion of the “administrative coordination of courses,” the ERC report sensibly suggests that a single individual be hired to coordinate the writing-intensive courses “into a true WAC [Writing Across the Curriculum] program rather than a collection of courses,” and recommends that the Writing Program consider making this hire as a “senior Senate faculty position” (7). The Committee makes this recommendation in the belief that such a recruitment would help reestablish the Writing Program’s involvement in writing pedagogy beyond the lower division, an aim we certainly endorse.

We believe such a hire would benefit the campus, and that the suggestion is in keeping with the expanded role the Writing Program could helpfully take vis-à-vis writing pedagogy on the campus as a whole. However, we believe that dedicating a Writing Program recruitment to a campus WAC Coordinator at this point would put the cart before the horse. The Writing Program now has a curriculum devoted during the regular academic year almost exclusively to the lower-division writing GEs; it currently has no official relationship with the writing-intensive requirement. (In a separate administrative role, the chair of the Writing Program consults with the Committee on Educational Policy about W course proposals, but this responsibility is not part of the Writing Program’s regular business.) While we would support a Senate-level position for a WAC Coordinator, and would welcome such a role for a Writing Program faculty member, before dedicating one of our open lines, or even an additional line, to such a position, we would expect the campus first to solidify an appropriate infrastructure for the W requirement (a project we know CEP is currently engaged in) and next to establish a defined role for the Writing Program vis-à-vis that requirement.

(4) The ERC report calls for consultation with national experts on several subjects: on hiring ladder vs. Lecturer SOE faculty for open Senate-level positions (3); on determining the best methods for assessing program efficacy (4, 5); and on determining the best methods for assessing students’ abilities to advance from ELWR-unsatisfied to ELWR-satisfied classes (6, 7). In response to the first recommendation, Dean Van Den Abbeele has already convened a task force of Senate faculty (two Writing Program LSOEs and one ladder faculty member apiece from Linguistics and Literature) charged with investigating Writing Program hiring practices at other UC campuses. This committee will report directly to the dean—the report is due at the end of October—and the dean will then decide. This process should be helpful in articulating the course the Writing Program takes for future hiring.

On the other two recommendations, we respectfully disagree with the need to bring in national experts. We are interested and ready to participate in wider scholarly discussion on best practices in assessment. In fact we have already done so. That said, the Writing Program’s assessment practices are well in keeping with national recommendations on the subject; indeed, the ERC report acknowledges that our portfolio system for ELWR placement meets national expectations (6). Also, though we do indeed employ the
Analytical Writing Placement Exam again at the end of the fall quarter, we do so not as an exit exam but as a placement exam. It is separate from the work students do in their classes and does not affect the course outcomes, a benefit to our students and to campus retention of at-risk students.1 Retaking the test is integral to the way that we manage the ELWR at UCSC; indeed, this practice has been singled out for praise by prior review committees for its efficiency and effectiveness.

We also demur on the subject of consulting with national experts on program assessment, a recommendation that the ERC report makes without explaining (4). In preparing our program-wide Writing 1/2 assessment project, for instance, a committee of Writing Program faculty led by our most senior members spent several years researching, planning, piloting, and fine-tuning an assessment protocol—a protocol that received the approval of a recognized national expert on the subject (Leslie Perelman, MIT) when faculty members presented the approach at a national conference. We are confident that our protocol is sound. We have already found it to be an effective and productive tool for self-study. Indeed it has already yielded data that we have used to update our teaching materials and improve the consistency of our teaching.

**Conclusion**

The Writing Program has found the review process illuminating and helpful, as much for the opportunity to examine our own recent history and practices as for the chance to confer intently with practicing professionals from other campuses about what we do and what we could, or possibly should, do. The review has inspired quite a few valuable conversations among ourselves and with our colleagues both on and off campus. We look forward to the next stages of the discussion.

---

1 Our practice differs from that of UC campuses that do not make this distinction between course and ELWR outcomes. As a result, UCSC students, especially those who are English language learners, progress in good standing toward their degrees and on developing their writing skills rather than repeatedly failing courses, and jeopardizing both their academic standing and their retention, because of their need for extended instruction in Entry Level Writing.
November 7, 2007

ALISON GALLOWAY  
VICE PROVOST ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

RE: Writing Program External Review Response

Dear Alison,

I am pleased to present the Writing Program's response to their recent external review. In general, I am pleased with the review, which struck me as forthright and constructive in its evaluations, queries and suggestions. I do note that, while a number of highly specific recommendations are made by the reviewers, many of the larger questions that affect the future development of the program are largely tabled, or recommended for "further discussions." The first sentence of the second paragraph on p. 2 is emblematic: "What we recommend, therefore, is a series of discussions involving the Writing Program, the administration, and faculty from other writing programs to help shape a plan for the future of the UCSC Writing Program." I will return to this general "recommendation" after addressing some of the more particular issues raised in the report.

In terms of the specific recommendations as the Writing Program response details, many of them have already been addressed. I have convened a small committee to explore the advantages and disadvantages of hiring ladder faculty to fill vacated LSOE positions. I am hopeful to get a response in the next several days that will allow me to make a decision on this potential change. But again, the review report does not specifically recommend an outcome, merely that this possibility be explored, citing as they do the contradictory evidence, on the one hand, that LSOE positions are not understood outside the UC system and fail to garner applications from top candidates, thus leading to failed searches (as happened just last year in the search for an LSOE to coordinate ELWR instruction): and on the other, that LSOEs are better suited to maintaining "the collegiality and collaboration" of the program's existing instructional corps.

Other recommendations that are already being implemented include the hiring of a second full-time staff person (search currently in progress); the hiring of an NSF TESOL specialist (done); funding for tutorial assistance to help students satisfy the ELWR requirement (restored under an agreement with VP/DUE's office); "regularization" of College Writing Coordinators as members of the Writing program faculty; and progress towards an MOU to stabilize the program budget. A set of recommendations addresses the need to establish better coordination between college core courses and writing courses. The WP appears in general agreement with these recommendations, but the College Provosts will have to be part of this discussion as well.

The reviewers expressed some confusion about the current campus designation of courses that fulfill the ELWR requirement, viz. Cl and C2, Writing 1 and Writing 2. I will admit to having had to take quite some time myself when I came here to understand this terminology, though I will take some comfort in the WP's claim that "the nomenclature problem is self-correcting," that they have "not noticed any noteworthy confusion among students," and that the Writing 1
course name will in any event soon be "retired" with the impending graduation of those students who came in under the old requirement.

The reviewers also recommend the hiring of a "senior Senate faculty member" to serve as administrative coordinator for the "W" requirement with the aim of converting the W offerings into "a true WAC [Writing Across the Curriculum] program rather than a collection of courses." In my view, such a recommendation must first await the current CEP-driven reconsideration of ways to deliver the W requirement. There also appears no specific reason or justification for that person being a member of the Writing Program faculty per se. On the other hand, the reviewers' weighing in on this campus discussion also speaks to an implicit, if undeveloped, concern with the scope of the Writing Program and, in particular, with its involvement in writing instruction beyond the lower-division level.

Such an expansion of the WP is, of course, wholly contingent on the availability of greater resources. The current MOU discussions between the offices of the CP/EVC and the Dean of Humanities seek to provide a stable funding envelope to assure the program's current primary mission of delivering ELWR instruction. While the MOU will not preclude further growth and program expansion, its function is more directly concerned with precluding any further erosion. Specifically, the MOU is limited to clarifying funding and resource allocations insofar as they support the scope and nature of the Writing Program's curriculum for the satisfaction of the ELWR (a UC requirement) and UCSC campus writing requirements. Although the MOU will be an agreement between the Division and central administration, it does not presume that increased costs associated with university and campus writing requirements will be entirely covered by the center. Nor does the MOU presume to address the administrative organization of the program, its constitution of faculty, the appropriate use of GSIs, or other curricular issues such as the establishment of minors, majors, and the like. These later questions are in fact to be reserved to the Division under the terms foreseen in the MOU and thus contingent upon future divisional resources and planning.

And perhaps this is where we are returned to the larger questions about the WP's scope and role on the UCSC campus, questions which remain largely unanswered by the reviewers and for which they recommend further "consultation with national experts." For example, on p. 2, we read: "the Writing Program should be involved in a planning process that would involve discussions with the administration and with national composition experts in order to determine what the best direction is for the Writing Program, given the distinct mission of UCSC." The WP's response to such suggestions strikes me as unduly defensive, dismissing such consultations with national experts (on assessing student progress, on program effectiveness, on the relative merits of ladder faculty vs. LSOEs, etc.) as unnecessary. If the reviewers' recommendations to consult national experts on a variety of big program issues mean a passive acceptance of outside advice, then the WP's response would be justified. On the other hand, the reviewers seem to be suggesting something else (after all, they are already "national experts" on the issues they cite), namely an ongoing set of dialogues internal to the campus but also making judicious use of external campus resources that puts the mission and scope of the Writing Program at the center of campus-wide concerns with our much vaunted "uncommon commitment to undergraduate education." Indeed, if the WP wants to participate more broadly in the delivery of writing instruction at all levels of the curriculum, then the establishment of such an ongoing forum of discussion would seem to be a strong prerequisite. Indeed, one could imagine such a set of conversations, visits, conferences, seminars and the like as modeling best practices and inventing
new ways of addressing old problems on a scale as to put our efforts here at UCSC in the very forefront of national discussions around issues of writing and general education. One could well imagine white papers, teaching manuals, textbooks and even instructional videos as potential outcomes. In this way, what at first blush might appear to be a reluctance by the reviewers to make pronouncements on the bigger issues affecting the WP, in point of fact turns out to be the very mechanism by which to reassert and reinforce the centrality of the WP's concerns.

My hope, then, is that this external review process, rather than being brought to speedy and inconsequential closure, should be the beginning of a fully vetted campus conversation on the many issues surrounding that most basic of basic skills.

Yours,

Georges Van Den Abbeele
Dean. Humanities Division

cc. VPAA Galloway
    VPDUE
    Ladusaw
    Assistant
    Dean
    Caloss
    Principal
    Analyst
    Moses
    Analyst
    Ray
    Academic Senate
January 18, 2008

VPAA Alison Galloway
Chancellor’s Office

RE: Writing Program External Review

Dear Alison:

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has reviewed all the materials submitted to date for the 2006-07 External Review of the Writing Program. The report of the External Review Committee (ERC) praises the high quality of the writing faculty and of the instruction as delivered, but the overall assessment characterizes the program as one at risk from budget-driven cuts. The ERC concludes that both the pedagogical scope of the program, now narrowed to a focus on entry-level instruction rather than the broad ranging approach of writing-across-the-disciplines, and the consequent “underutilization” of the academic staff threaten the overall health of a program that was just a short time ago regarded as “the most distinctive and outstanding program in the UC system” (1999 External Review Report). This is especially critical given the current campus focus on reforming and strengthening the “W” requirement.

The CPB perspective focuses on the status of the Writing Program in relation to the delivery of “W” courses and the coordination of the freshman composition courses across the ten colleges. We conclude that the current situation of a reduced academic mission for the program is attributable to budgetary rather than pedagogical reasons. During the round of budget cuts in the late 90s, for example, funding was cut for the campus coordinator of writing-across-the-disciplines, one of the more successful initiatives within the Writing Program. Subsequent budget decisions made by the dean in the early 2003 eliminated upper division curriculum such as the Journalism minor. Compounding the erosion of these cuts, now that freshman enrollments have grown, it is not clear that resources have kept pace. The ERC Report notes that both the demand for and nature of the courses have changed, as students require more remedial instruction at the entry level. The result appears to be a sweeping unintended negative consequence of “gutting” (the word used in the ERC Report) the program in delivering and coordinating the “W” requirement as well as the upper-division curriculum.

- CPB urges that the cuts to the budget be restored, within an ongoing budgetary analysis of the needs of fulfilling the newly invigorated “W” requirement.

CPB echoes the conclusion of the ERC Report that the problems with the Writing Program are organizational and budgetary rather than intellectual and pedagogical. The key questions about program administration, leadership and future hiring (tenure-track versus Lecturer SOE) that are raised in the Report would also be best approached from this perspective.
• The Report advises, and CPB concurs, that the future direction of faculty hiring for the program be formally explored by members of the campus community with participation by an outside expert, as has been done successfully at other UC campuses.
• We recommend that the administration accelerate discussions, initiated by the MOU and Senate reform of the “W” requirement, of the best campus venue for the Writing Program.

Among the solutions proposed, the one that has been most frequently put forward is the possibility of moving Writing out of the Humanities Division and placing it under central leadership, perhaps of the VPDUE (who is currently negotiating the MOU with the Humanities Dean). We endorse taking further steps in this process, assessing the budgetary implications of the loss of FTE and enrollments to the Humanities Division as well as the benefits to the campus as a whole.

The excellence of the Writing Program and its incontrovertible contributions to the quality of undergraduate education at UCSC require that the campus provide the necessary support to maintain its health. That the costs here are both essential and relatively modest make their restoration all the more imperative.

Susan Gillman, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

CC: Dean Van Den Abbeele
    Chair Abrams
    Analyst Moses
    Committee on Educational Policy
    Graduate Council
January 24, 2008

Alison Galloway  
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs  

Re: CEP’s Response to the Writing Program External Review  

Dear VPAA Galloway:  

CEP is pleased to see that once again an external review committee (ERC) gives high praise to our Writing Program faculty. The latest ERC is “greatly impressed with their professionalism, their collegiality, and the collaborative way they work, especially with regard to establishing outcomes for their curricula and establishing agreed-upon standards for student work.” They are described as “active public intellectuals”, deeply engaged and reflective in their approach to their mission.  

At the same time, the fundamental message of the review is that our Writing Program faculty “are a seriously underutilized resource for the campus.” The ERC writes:

> The Writing Program has gone from a full-service one (providing courses at both the entry-level and upper division and consulting with faculty across the disciplines to develop “W” classes) to a program that focuses on entry-level instruction, a change that has reduced the Program to a model that was out of date 25 years ago.

We take it to be understood that this curtailment of the Writing Program was never the desire of its faculty but was imposed by a series of decisions on the part of the campus administration.  

Some of the ERC’s recommendations have been or are being addressed in some way. For example, administrative staff have been hired; there is more funding for writing tutors; the Dean of Humanities has been engaging faculty on the question of the future direction of Writing Program hires; and the Memorandum of Understanding to stabilize funding continues to be negotiated.  

In this response we focus on four issues: 1) the Memorandum of Understanding; 2) writing in the disciplines; 3) writing and the college core courses; and 4) the future of WP hires.  

**The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)**  

We understand the goals of the MOU to be i) stabilize funding of freshman writing courses in a way that is tied to campus enrollment; ii) broaden the use of graduate student instructors in freshman writing; iii) free up funding for Writing Program faculty to reinvigorate curricular offerings beyond freshman writing.  

We take the desirability of (i) to be self-evident. As for (ii), the obvious concerns have to do with maintaining consistent high quality instruction and reliably obtaining and retaining graduate student instructors. The Writing Program knows how to train graduate students; the question is how to attract and hold onto (for a while) excellent candidate GSIs. This probably cannot happen without the active support of Humanities departments with graduate programs, and these programs will naturally have their own curricular interests most at heart. We wonder whether Dean Van Den Abbeele can find concrete ways to encourage departments to send graduate students to the Writing Program in a regular way. One idea is to establish some kind of certificate program in writing instruction; graduate students who completed the...
training and taught some number of writing courses would receive the certificate.\footnote{This was an idea entertained by the Humanities Division Task Force on the Utilization of Graduate Instructors in the Language and Writing Programs.} Financial incentives to departments are also conceivable.

It is clear that the Writing Program and the task force mentioned in footnote 1 take (iii) to be a crucial goal of the MOU negotiations. We find the Dean’s comments in this regard to be much less encouraging: “While the MOU will not preclude further growth and program expansion, its function is more directly concerned with precluding any further erosion.” We would like clarification of this issue at the closure meeting. In particular, CEP strongly supports a funding arrangement that is consistent with the Writing Program faculty’s target full time workload goal of 6 courses and two equivalencies per year. We see this as a fundamental prerequisite to a certain amount of Writing Program growth and reinvention that is in fact desperately needed by this campus; see for instance the following section.

\textit{Writing in the disciplines}

Some time this year CEP and CPB will jointly submit a proposal calling for the establishment of a Writing in the Disciplines requirement. (CEP is currently working with individual departments.) We envision a change in regulations that would make it a responsibility of departments to articulate their discipline-specific communication objectives for their majors and to see that these objectives are met. Such a change will be possible only given new funding commitments on the part of the administration. The proposal is likely to call for some or all of the following.

- Support for TAs and other instructors.
- Re-establishment of a peer tutoring program for Writing in the Disciplines.
- Increased and active involvement of Writing Program faculty in Writing in the Disciplines, through consultations with faculty and teaching assistants, TA training, training of peer tutors, etc.
- Dedication of some or all of a Senate-level FTE to Writing in the Disciplines.

Regarding the last item, both the Writing Program and the Dean of Humanities observe that dedicating a position to Writing in the Disciplines before the Senate has established a basis and a culture for it would be “putting the cart before the horse”. We see the point, but it is equally true that persuading your faculty to build a big cart is hard to do without their knowing there will be a horse (so to speak) to pull it. Perhaps the biggest obstacle to progress is the faculty’s sense that they will have a burden imposed on them with no support; in such a context, a commitment on the part of the administration, even if contingent on things like changes in regulation, could be a big help.

\textit{Writing and the college core courses}

In spite of progress made with the move to C1 and C2, integration of writing and core has some way to go. Everyone seems to agree that 10 weeks is too little time to meet objectives in both writing and the substance of college core curricula. This fact, combined with the yearly struggle to find qualified instructors and the bewildering way that responsibility for staffing courses is divided up between the Writing Program and the colleges, virtually guarantees that there will be issues of quality and consistency in meeting educational objectives especially in core courses.

In addition we understand that the college Provosts may be coming to their own conclusion that the current arrangements for meeting the different needs of non-ELWR satisfied, ELWR satisfied, and C2-ready students is no longer functioning well.
Meanwhile, CEP has been entertaining ways in which general education reform could interact with the college curricula.

We think the Writing Program is right that it is time to form a committee drawing on Provosts and members of the Writing Program and CEP to re-examine the C1/C2 curricula and how it is delivered.

The future of Writing Program hires

Dean Van Den Abbeele has been actively exploring the question whether future Senate-level hires in the Writing Program should be Lecturers with Security of Employment, following past practice, or ladder-rank faculty. CEP has little it can add to the report of the recent task force on this issue. However, CEP members expressed the opinion that if ladder-rank faculty are brought in this be done with great attention to the factors, such as a focus on research and effects on faculty authority and morale, that could every easily distract the Writing Program from its teaching mission.

The ERC expresses the worry that in a “seller’s market” it would be hard to attract excellent candidates to an LSOE position, because such a position is easily mistaken for a temporary one. We wonder whether this problem can’t be mitigated by means of a well-worded job description.

To conclude, CEP strongly agrees with Dean Van Den Abbeele that this review process should lead to continued serious discussion of these and related issues, and one hopes, to a positive resolution of many of them.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

cc: Dean Van Den Abbeele
    Dept Chair Abrams
    CPB Chair Gillman
    GC Chair Miller
    Principal Analyst Moses
Dear Alison,

Graduate Council has reviewed the External Review Committee report and the responses of the Writing Program, Humanities Dean Van Den Abbeele, and CPB. Although graduate affairs are a relatively limited part of the Writing Program’s overall purview and, accordingly, only marginally touched upon in the review process, there are a few points on which we would like to comment.

First, we were disappointed that, for reasons unstated, the program did not succeed in having the ERC committee meet with graduate student instructors teaching for the program. This would have been an important source of information about the experience of graduate students as writing teachers and would have provided feedback about the effectiveness of the training/mentoring, relations between graduate student and lecturer instructors in writing, and workload for graduate teachers. Nor was the issue of graduate student instructor experience given more than cursory treatment in the Program’s self-study. We are thus requesting that the Writing Program (WP) solicit graduate student feedback and provide this information to Graduate Council. We are especially interested to know:

- Graduate students’ views of the effectiveness and usefulness of the pedagogical preparation in Writing 203.
- Graduate students’ views of the overall effectiveness and time commitment associated with training and mentorship of graduate writing instructors.
- Graduate views of workload as writing instructors, including the required mentorship of first and second-time instructors.

Second, although it was not mentioned in the responses of the WP, the Dean, or CPB, we understand that the issues raised in the self-study and its workload appendix about the funding of graduate instructors have been resolved by the establishment of Writing-specific supplementary GSIs allocated by the Humanities Division for WP graduate-led sections. It is our understanding that these GSIs are supplementary to the WP’s open allocation and that their availability to Writing (and Languages) does not affect the total available TA allocation for other academic units in Humanities.
This issue of the system of funding graduate instructors out of the open allocation to the Program was raised in the context of the MOU proposal to create equivalencies for lecturers out of funds that would otherwise have been used to pay 15 graduate instructors. It is the understanding of Graduate Council that the graduate instructors now no longer represent a debit against the Program’s open allocation for instruction, nor, since the funds are specifically designated for graduates, can the GSIs be “reallocated” as proposed. We would be interested in the closure meeting to hear this issue explicitly addressed and whether our interpretation of these developments in the funding of graduate instruction is correct.

Finally, we wish to underscore the positive role that the Writing Program plays—and could play in the future—in training and mentoring graduate students, both as WP instructors and as TAs/GSIs in the disciplines. Graduate Council welcomes suggestions on ways in which the WP’s role in providing graduate students with pedagogically and professionally useful training in writing-based instruction could be strengthened.

cc: CPB Chair
    CEP Chair
    Humanities Dean Van Den Abbeele
    Writing Program Chair Abrams
    Graduate Dean Sloan
Dear David:

The Writing Program external review was conducted May 1-3, 2007, and the subsequent closure meeting was convened February 4, 2008. Closure meeting participants were Program Chair Elizabeth Abrams, Humanities Division Dean Georges Van Den Abbeele, Committee on Educational Policy representative Loisa Nygaard, Graduate Council representative Tyrus Miller, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Bill Ladusaw, Principal Analyst Betsy Moses, and myself. The representatives from the Committee on Planning and Budget, and the Vice Provost and Graduate Dean, were not available. Academic Senate comments were available prior to the closure meeting.

Critical Issues

The external review committee assessment is consistent with past reviews; Writing Program faculty and pedagogy are commended for professionalism, collegiality, and quality. This is strong evidence of faculty proficiency and good morale, despite both resource reductions resulting in loss of upper division programs and Academic Senate changes to the "W" requirement. The Program's current focus is on entry-level instruction, a model considered outdated by professionals in the field. Many explicit recommendations have already been implemented, and ongoing campus discussions are continuing regarding the program's future and how its extensive expertise can best serve the campus.

Program Stabilization

The program's organizational location within the Humanities Division complicates resource issues given the inevitable funding priority conflict with Humanities departments. Program expansion or enhancements must be weighed with their impact on Humanities' academic planning. To increase transparency and stabilize support for essential campuswide instruction, the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education and the Dean of Humanities are developing a MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) articulating a funding envelope. This proposed MOU will define a resource commitment to the lower division writing instruction required for an annual frosh enrollment target of 3,700. It is not a document defining an academic strategy, but a first step towards addressing campus enrollment management and stabilizing essential instruction linked to frosh enrollment. The program's mission beyond the first year is not addressed; however, establishing an MOU creates a mechanism to supplement resources systematically. The MOU is now being 'costed-out' by Planning and Budget before it can become final. It will include clear benchmarks while retaining program flexibility to achieve benchmarks and more effective management.
Colleges have traditionally partnered with the Writing Program to deliver lower division writing instruction, which is a component of the required college core courses. The reviewers observed core course hiring and management is inconsistent across the colleges, and propose increased consultation and integration with writing. Graduate Council Chair Miller, also serving as Cowell College Co-Provost, notes the provosts are now considering other possibilities and share some concern about course quality. Offering core courses that introduce first year students to the college themes and identity is essential. How they can best connect to writing instruction is under consideration. Chair Abrams states the writing faculty members welcome an opportunity to work more rationally with the colleges. If the provosts propose alternatives to the current arrangement delivering writing instruction, they can be considered within a final MOU. Colleges are seeing increased student demand for basic skills from native and non-native speakers, more support will help address undergraduate retention.

**Organization and Hiring**

The Writing Program holds 16 faculty FTE, larger than several Humanities departments. Leadership is provided by SOE positions. Retirements among the SOE faculty have reduced these positions from four to two. Recruitment for a SOE resulted in hiring at the Lecturer level, and discussion between the Program and Dean is ongoing regarding the advantages and disadvantages of targeting this level. Senate faculty provide program leadership and consistency through downturns, and enable interface with graduate programs and graduate students. Different UC campuses use various titles. LSOE is most familiar at UCSC but may be problematic when describing to potential candidates. Recruiting focused on expertise in writing in the disciplines is needed for credibility and effective future program development.

**Writing in the Disciplines**

The Academic Senate anticipates proposing a Writing in the Disciplines requirement and subsequent regulations change that would make it a departmental responsibility to articulate discipline-specific communication objectives for their majors and to see that these objectives are met. The Writing Program role in this is to be determined; however, the Senate proposal is likely to call for increased support such as TAs, peer tutoring, and active writing faculty assistance. The expectation is that department faculty can benefit from writing faculty expertise both in pedagogy and in defining and measuring student educational objectives. Encouraging departments to assume primary responsibility without raising unrealistic expectations for extensive new support funding is the challenge.

Chair Abrams suggests various strategies possible for success. Writing pedagogy is the program's priority; the program's faculty could teach graduate students to recognize quality writing within the disciplines, teach TAs, and help faculty plan syllabi. Freeing up a Writing Lecturer's time to work closely with CEP and the departments is one possibility. Offering a certificate to graduate students completing specialized writing pedagogy training would support instruction and improve graduate student job placement prospects. Writing involvement in Writing in the Disciplines is traditionally a supportive role; program faculty members are not looking to change that.

Increasing the visibility of the Writing Program to department faculty might be furthered by association with the Center on Teaching Excellence. Marketing all campus teaching support
resources to the growing numbers of department faculty and graduate students through one umbrella venue may be most expedient. Campus program growth in several communications based fields such as Social Documentation, Digital Arts/New Media, and potentially Creative Writing indicates growth areas for writing support.

**Graduate Issues**

Graduate student teaching for the program was not sufficiently addressed in the external review documents. Divisional funding is now allocated to the Writing Program for GSI support. This support funding relieves the program's budget and supports graduate students. Issues of workload, integration with graduate programs, and graduate student views will be addressed before the next review.

**Summary**

The Writing Program's consistent evidence of quality faculty and programs is a mark of campus distinction. Rapid enrollment growth and budget constraints have seriously limited program capacity to provide more than basic lower division instruction. Senate proposed changes in Writing in the Discipline may affect the program's future role. External reviewers suggest additional consultation to identify the program's future direction, given the distinct mission of UCSC. The program is already responding through collaboration with the college provosts, Dean, and VPDUE, in an ongoing conversation. Closure participants concur this is an on-campus dialogue that is well underway; additional external expertise is not necessary.

I am asking Dean Van Den Abbeele to provide responses to the following mid-cycle review update questions no later than February 28, 2010. The next program review will be scheduled on a six-year cycle for 2012/13. Per review guidelines, the program's review cycle may be extended to eight years and this will be determined after receipt of the update report.

Attest,

Alison Galloway  
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

cc:  Chair Abrams  
Chancellor Blumenthal  
CPB Chair Gillman  
VPDUE Ladusaw  
Graduate Council Chair Miller  
Principal Analyst Moses  
CEP Chair Padgett  
Vice Provost and DGS Sloan  
Dean Van Den Abbeele  
Academic Senate  
Office
Writing Program
2006-07 External Review
Mid-Cycle Update Questions

Please submit a response to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs no later than February 28, 2010, with copies to the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost and Graduate Dean, and Academic Senate office.

Stabilization

• What is the current status of the MOU between the Division of Humanities and CP/EVC office? If it is finalized, please append.
• What is the current understanding between the Dean and Program about future expectations for faculty hiring in numbers, area, and level?
• Describe the present arrangements with the colleges regarding teaching in the core courses, has consistency increased across the colleges?

Writing in the Disciplines

• Has there been progress made in campus efforts to increase Writing in the Disciplines and, if so, what is the role of the Writing Program?
• What is the status of the undergraduate tutor program?
• Have connections been established with the CTE to market Writing Program expertise?

Graduate Issues

• Please solicit and report graduate student feedback regarding:
  > Graduate students' views of the effectiveness and usefulness of the pedagogical preparation in Writing 203;
  > Graduate students' views of the overall effectiveness and time commitment associated with training and mentorship of graduate writing instructors; and
  > Graduate views of workload as writing instructors, including the required mentorship of first- and second-time instructors.
The Writing Program has been asked to respond to several questions following up on our last External Review. We interleave our responses below.

**Stabilization**

*What is the current status of the MOU between the Division of Humanities and the office of the CP/EVC? If it is finalized, please append.*

It appears that an MOU is imminent, though this question would be best posed to the Dean of Humanities and the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education. As Writing Program chair, I have periodically been informed about their consultations but have not been formally included in the decision-making process.

*What is the current understanding between the Dean and Program about future expectations for faculty hiring in numbers, area, and level?*

No conversation has recently taken place between the Dean and the Program about hiring. Recent conversations about staffing have had to do with losses. In 2008-09, the Writing Program lost one Senate-level line (of four) previously assigned to a Lecturer SOE. We anticipate losing another at the end of June 2010 with the retirement of Senior LSOE Carol Freeman. We are also facing the loss of all or most of the ten pre-six lecturers we hired to minimum 50% time positions in the Writing Program in spring 2008 for lack of funding (they were hired with the expectation of an annual frosh enrollment of 3700, which has since dropped to 3200 for the near future and perhaps as low as 3000 thereafter), and are not yet assured of being able to retain all of the Program’s continuing faculty, let alone faculty currently in the midst of their initial continuing reviews. While I have some hope that these appointments, at least, will be sorted out, much remains uncertain.

This level of uncertainty is a consequence of two main elements:

1. The Humanities Division, like the rest of the campus, is in a period of retrenchment, not growth, and is currently deciding upon priorities for replacement and retention within the Division. These decisions may hinge, in part, on reductions in the size of the Writing Program’s non Senate faculty.

2. The Writing Program does not yet have an MOU that would fence off funding for required classes—at least at a certain agreed-upon minimum—from the funding required by the Division to conduct the rest of its business. Ensuring a minimum acceptable level of professional staffing for the Writing Program is a first step in developing a clear understanding about staffing in the future.
Describe the present arrangements with the colleges regarding teaching in the Core courses: has consistency increased across the colleges?

The Writing Program coordinates most closely with the colleges in the teaching of C1 classes to ELWR-unsatisfied students. Consistency is best achieved via a stable, experienced teaching staff, clearly communicated goals and expectations, and appropriate means of measuring results.

(1) Staffing: The Writing Program has historically funded 24 Core course classes for frosh who enter UCSC not yet having satisfied the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). This number of classes was built into our funding some decades ago, when it corresponded to the number of sections of Core for ELWR-unsatisfied students (at about 18 students per class) that the campus required. In the years since, the number of classes for ELWR-unsatisfied students has grown considerably, but the number of classes we fund has not grown correspondingly: these days the Writing Program pays for half or fewer of the classes required for ELWR-unsatisfied Core students. That said, Writing Program faculty and Writing Program pool lecturers do teach college-funded classes for ELWR-unsatisfied students at a number of the colleges, and thus, though funding half or fewer of these required classes, the Program has directly or indirectly provided staffing for closer to two-thirds of them. This sort of arrangement contributes to consistency, as do stable lecturer pools at the colleges. Until 2009-10, however, when VP/DUE Ladusaw provided $26,000 for four additional Core classes to be funded by the Writing Program, we paid for no classes for ELWR-unsatisfied students at Colleges Nine and Ten, and only two Writing Program faculty, funded by Colleges Nine and Ten, had regular appointments at these two colleges, which experienced a great deal of annual turnover. The additional funding enabled the Writing Program to pay for four classes at Colleges Nine and Ten, one apiece for four expert teachers whose appointments we expected would help stabilize the staffing there.

Because of the funding uncertainties described above, these staffing arrangements are less certain going forward. Our current curriculum plan accounts for 24 Writing Program-funded Core classes, distributed as usual across the eight older colleges. However, the classes are assigned only to continuing faculty—those whom we have a reasonable expectation of retaining based on our current understanding of our funding for 2010-11. Because we have no certainty of funding for Writing 2 classes in winter and spring for pre-six faculty, and because our current knowledge of our funding prevents us from assigning any Core courses to them at all, we expect the colleges will begin to lose the Writing Program pre-six faculty who help provide consistency across the ELWR-unsatisfied sections of Core.

(2) Communication and oversight: The Writing Program retains its system of College Writing Coordinators (CWCs) who relay information and communicate expectations between the Writing Program, the campus ELWR coordinator, the
colleges, and Learning Support Services. CWCs typically mentor less experienced teachers in need of guidance and help lead them through the intricacies of the ELWR calendar and the responsibilities it confers upon those who teach classes for ELWR-unsatisfied students. Since Fall 2007, the VP/DUE’s office has compensated all college-funded teachers of ELWR-unsatisfied students for attending an ELWR training session, which helps the colleges and the Writing Program to know that all instructors have received the same information about the expectations of the job. (The Writing Program separately compensates faculty it funds.) Instructors also receive training materials conceived by the Writing Program and Learning Support Services (LSS) and physically produced by LSS. These materials have grown increasingly more detailed and thorough to guide less experienced instructors through the ELWR calendar and the teaching expectations that calendar imposes.

(3) **Assessment:** The Writing Program monitors annual pass rates for ELWR-unsatisfied students, broken down by college. We do not break these results down by instructor (some colleges place the most challenged students in the classrooms of the most experienced teachers, which affects results), and we review only those classes and instructors whom we fund—the colleges review those they fund. Having 11 different units separately reviewing faculty teaching courses that have the same educational objectives surely affects consistency, but we do not have a concrete way of knowing or assessing the effect. On the subject of consistency between colleges, that too is challenging to measure: different colleges attract different student populations, and thus typically have a wide spread in performance at the end of November, when students take the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) for the second time. Two colleges have instituted innovative programs in 2009-10. College Ten, whose annual late fall AWPE pass rate is among the lowest at UCSC, introduced a “stretch” (two-quarter) Core class for the students whose performances on the AWPE prior to the beginning of Core was weakest, and who were thus most likely to need an extra quarter of writing instruction. Writing Program instructors are teaching both classes (though one of these teachers has very little seniority, and is thus a retention risk in today’s climate), and College Nine is expected to launch a stretch Core next year. The experiment is being monitored and, if successful, should be a model for instruction of ELWR-unsatisfied students at UCSC. And College Eight introduced an eight-unit fall Core class (a “jumbo” Core made up of a 5-unit writing class and a 3-unit plenary) designed in part to enable students in fall quarter to concentrate more closely on their writing. (The terms “stretch” and “jumbo” come from Gregory Glau’s examination of such classes at Arizona State University.) Finally, LSS has conducted some careful analyses of the correlations between ethnicity and pass rate that cut across the colleges.

**Writing in the Disciplines**

*Has there been progress made in campus efforts to increase Writing in the Disciplines and, if so, what is the role of the Writing Program?*
What we hope will be significant progress toward quality has been made via the passage of the recent General Education reform, and with it the new Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement. Among other improvements on the old model (the Writing-Intensive requirement), the DC is an upper-division requirement that all students, including IGETC-satisfied transfers, must take at UCSC. Thus more students than before will be taking a post-C2 writing-oriented class at UCSC, and all will be doing so in the second half of their UCSC careers. It is unclear whether this initiative will spur other “increases in Writing in the Disciplines,” especially given budget cuts likely to increase class sizes even in the upper division and to decrease the availability of TA support. Under these circumstances, outside of required DC classes, it is possible that instructors will cut back on writing assignments for workload reasons.

The Writing Program has no mandated role at all in the DC requirement. As Program chair, I consulted closely with CEP’s former chair, Jaye Padgett, on the proposed new DC requirement, as did my colleague Carol Freeman. This year, Carol Freeman is also working closely with CEP on the DC and consulting with VP/DUE Ladusaw; she is working as an expert consultant in writing, though, not as a representative of the Writing Program. The Writing Program has had considerable past experience in training TAs working with writing in many disciplines and training tutors for discipline-specific writing-intensive courses, and is eager to help serve the campus again in these and other ways, including, as needed, teaching or co-teaching within the disciplines.

*What is the status of the undergraduate tutor program?*

Writing tutoring for ELWR-unsatisfied students has been restored, free of fee, via collaboration of the Writing Program and LSS with VP/DUE Ladusaw. Students in Core receive group tutoring; ELWR-unsatisfied students in subsequent quarters receive individual tutoring. Fall group tutor funding was arranged by the VP/DUE; supplementary fall individual tutoring comes from the Writing Program via registration fee funds we receive; individual tutoring funding for winter and spring students is supplied by LSS. The Writing Program continues to offer tutor training classes for qualified undergraduates interested in tutoring ELWR-unsatisfied students. The first, Writing 169, is required of all new fall tutors; the second, Writing 159, is required of new tutors of students who remain ELWR-unsatisfied in their second, third, or fourth quarter of enrollment. In 2008 we retooled Writing 169 as a 3-unit class in response to student evaluations and as a means of efficiently reducing class size (e.g., three sections of 30 instead of two of 45). Writing 159 is routinely over-enrolled.

*Have connections been established with the Center for Teaching Excellence to market Writing Program expertise?*

During the tenure of former CTE director Ruth Harris-Barnett, the Writing Program and CTE co-sponsored a series of workshops on writing-related topics of interest to
UCSC faculty. Since her departure, and with no full-time CTE director, no such efforts have been made.

**Graduate issues**
The Writing Program was asked to solicit and report on graduate student feedback on the following questions:

- Graduate students’ views on the effectiveness and usefulness of the pedagogical training in Writing 203;
- Graduate students’ views of the overall effectiveness of, and time commitment associated with, the training and mentorship of graduate student instructors; and
- Graduate students’ views of their workload as writing instructors, including the required mentorship of first- and second-time instructors.

To meet these expectations, the Writing Program conducted an electronic survey of all the former Humanities 203 and Writing 203 graduate students for whom we could find email addresses—70 out of 103 enrolled between spring 1998 and spring 2009. (Sixty-eight of the 70 invitations to respond were sent to those enrolled between 2002-2009.) We received 22 responses, a return rate of about one-third. We attach the survey questions and two versions of the results—one that disaggregates individual responses, and one that aggregates them into a summary report.

On the whole, responses are very favorable. Although they indicate some areas to work on—e.g., it is clear that first-time teachers of Writing 2 find the workload challenging, and also that mentoring experiences vary—the survey shows that the considerably majority of those who responded found the training extremely valuable. We expect VPAA Galloway will be particularly interested in the final qualitative question, about the usefulness of Writing 203 in preparing students to teach elsewhere, and the enthusiastic final comments of a number of the respondents, most of whom focused on that point. Of the 18 who responded to the question, 15 were unequivocal: Writing 203 made them better teachers of whatever they happened to be teaching.
About the Writing Program

The Writing Program offers courses designed to help students become more competent and confident writers of prose. These courses approach writing as one of the most important ways we have of making discoveries about ourselves and the world around us and of communicating these insights to others. The courses offered through this program teach skills of grammar and organization and strategies of invention, composition, revision, and editing.

Together with the colleges, the Writing Program administers the writing components (C1, C2) of the campus general education requirements; administers the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) (formerly known as Subject A); and advises students about ways to fulfill these requirements.

Writing Program instructors in each college participate in the college’s core course and counsel its students about their writing. Each year, the Writing Program offers Writing 2 (a lower-division course that satisfies the C2 requirement); the Writing 20, 21, 22, 23 series to help meet the needs of students who have not passed ELWR, including students with multilingual backgrounds; and Writing 169 and Writing 203, which offer instruction in the theory and practice of teaching writing for peer tutors and graduate students, respectively.

The Writing Program also offers each year several specialized lower- and upper-division courses, as well as several writing-intensive (W) courses during the summer session. Courses in creative writing are offered through the Literature Department.

Please note, the Writing Program no longer offers minors.
Program Description

The campuswide Writing Program offers courses designed to help students become more competent and confident writers of prose. The courses offered through this program teach skills of grammar and organization and strategies of invention, composition, revision, and editing. These courses approach writing as one of the most important ways we have of making discoveries about ourselves and the world around us and of communicating these insights to others.

Together with the colleges, the Writing Program administers the writing components (C1, C2) of the campus general education requirements; administers the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR), formerly known as Subject A; and advises students about ways to fulfill these requirements.

Writing Program instructors in each college participate in the college’s core course and counsel its students about their writing. The Writing Program offers Writing 2 (a lower-division course that satisfies the C2 requirement); the Writing 20, 21, 22, 23 series to help meet the needs of students who have not passed ELWR, including students with complex linguistics backgrounds; and instruction in the theory and practice of teaching writing for peer tutors and graduate students.

Each year, the Writing Program also offers several specialized lower- and upper-division courses, as well as writing-intensive courses during the summer session.

Courses in creative writing are offered through the Literature Department.

Revised: 8/31/12
The Writing Program is a faculty FTE holding course sponsoring unit, not an academic department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>00-01</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>Title 12-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spafford, Roz</td>
<td>Journalism/media criticism/fiction/poetry</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Sr. Lecturer w/SOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothman, Don</td>
<td>Literacy education/democracy/UC/K-12 partnerships</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Lecturer w/SOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman, Carol</td>
<td>History/theory/practice of rhetoric</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Lecturer w/SOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrams, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Composition/rhetoric/writing across curriculum</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Lecturer w/SOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James</td>
<td>Modern European literary, artistic, intellectual, and political movements (especially of France, Italy, and Spain);</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Lecturer w/SOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearer, Heather</td>
<td>not in catalog 10/12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer w/SOE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| <40  | 1  | 33%
| 40-49| 1  | 33%
| 50-59| 1  | 33%
| ≥60  | 0  | 0% |

### Rank Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer w/SOE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Lecturer w/SOE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: UCSC Faculty Roster - http://planning.ucsc.edu/irps/facrosters.asp
Senate Rank Payroll Faculty Courseload and Enrollment History
(Excludes Instruction Offered by Non-Senate Rank Faculty)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses Taught per Senate Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Total Enrollments Taught Per Senate Faculty FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>99-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>99-00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Writing Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Senate Payroll Faculty FTE - full-time equivalent ladder rank and SUE faculty appointed to the department, adjusted for leaves, sabbaticals, Department Chair and/or Academic Senate service.

Courses - includes all regularly scheduled, credited courses offered by department Senate faculty.

Enrollments - enrollments associated with those courses taught by Senate faculty, including independent study enrollments.
Final grades given in Writing 2 are comprehensive. They account for all aspects of a student's work over the quarter -- the conceptual work of reading, thinking, and writing; the cooperative work of participating in a writing community; and the procedural work of completing reading and writing assignments, meeting deadlines, and attending class, writing group meetings, and conferences.

Writing Program faculty members will determine a student's final grade by considering all of his or her work at the quarter's end. During the quarter, students will receive written assessment and advice concerning what their work has accomplished and how it can be improved rather than letter grades on individual assignments.

Note: The final grade of D in Writing 2 grants credit towards graduation, but it does not satisfy the Rhetoric and Inquiry (C2) General Education Requirement. Students who receive the grade of either D or F must repeat Writing 2 to satisfy the C2 requirement.

A (or P)
The grade of A is appropriately given to students whose preparation for and execution of all course assignments (for example, reading, in-class discussions, presentations, group projects, informal writing, essay drafts, and revisions, etc.) have been consistently thorough and thoughtful. In addition, by the end of the quarter students who earn an A are consistently producing essays that are ambitiously and thoughtfully conceived, conscious of the demands of a particular assignment, purposeful and controlled, effectively developed, and effectively edited.

B (or P)
The grade of "B" is appropriately given to students who have satisfactorily completed all class assignments, although some of these efforts may have been more successful than others. By the end of the quarter, students who earn a B are consistently producing essays that are clearly competent in that they meet the demands of assignments, are controlled by an appropriate purpose, are sufficiently developed, and are accurately edited. A "B" performance may well reveal areas of strength that are not sustained throughout.

C (or P)
The grade of C is appropriately given to students who have fulfilled course requirements although, in some instances, minimally so. By the end of the quarter, students who have earned a C have provided sufficient evidence that they can produce focused, purposeful writing that satisfies the demands of an assignment, is adequately developed, and is carefully edited.
although, in some instances, achieving that standard depended on multiple revisions.

**D or (NP)**
The grade of D is appropriately given to students whose work has been unsatisfactory in some significant way: they have not completed all the course requirements and/or their essays have not yet achieved the level of competency described in the Writing Program's standard for passing work in Writing 2. Students receiving a D must repeat Writing 2 to satisfy the C2 requirement.

**F or (NP)**
The grade of F is appropriate for students whose work in Writing 2 is so incomplete or so careless that it does not represent a reasonable effort to meet the requirements of the course.
Addendum 1: C2 Paper and curriculum committee report, 2011-12:
Survey of assignment strategies for teaching rhetoric and inquiry

**Longer/more formal (very often, instructors expect multiple substantially altered/expanded drafts):**

- Critical/analytical reviews of/responses to a single author or text (of course, a wide variety of options exist for this: some ask students to focus on how the writer structures or articulates his/her argument; others invite students specifically to interrogate the author’s evidence, assumptions, language, etc.)

- Textual or rhetorical analyses of literature, art, advertising material, etc. Some versions ask students to rewrite the text they are interrogating, and then to analyze what that experience (and that different product) reveals about how the article shapes meaning.

- Comparative or contextual analyses – looking at one things in terms of another (applying a theory to a piece of art, analyzing the views of one author/text to another, etc)

- Critical essays asking students to respond to multiple texts/authors (analyzing a particular problem, situation, etc.)

- Research-backed argumentative or expository essays

- Satirical essays attacking counterarguments of previous argument essay

- Formal proposals (backed by research) calling for a specific person or organization to institute some change

- Obituary essays – using journalistic techniques (interviews, artifacts the subject has produced, documented sources if available, etc.) writing a formal essay-style obituary of a classmate, a famous person, etc.

- Extended annotated bibliographies with critical annotations

- White papers

- Op-ed pieces or letters to the editor – typically intended to produce “forceful, spirited writing”

- Position papers with sources

- Extended literature reviews or book review essays

- “Common ground” essays

- “Philosophical lab reports”
• **Formal oral presentations** (could this be considered an oral “essay”?)

• **Projects**: web sites, pamphlets or handbooks on a subject of interest (for a particular audience), videos, multi-faceted advertising portfolios

**Shorter/Less formal (often precursors to or building blocks for more formal essays)**

• **Analytical reader responses**: “free responses, roadmaps, guided questions or analyses of a short passage,” email-list conversations with classmates about particular texts/topics

• **Critical reading journals** kept on every reading

• **source-reviews** (short critical analyses of possible sources)

• **research proposals/prospectuses/abstracts**

• **reflective essays** -- often first/last thing in course, on the definition of some abstract quality (the topic of the course) or on some version of “my journey thus far as a writer”; later in course, on how my views of my own writing (or of that topic) have developed this term, etc. Some instructors ask for the student’s response to/difficulties with/successes concerning the research process required for a particular essay.

• various assignments to help students with library research and building a strong, accurate bibliography
Addendum 2: C2 Paper and Curriculum committee report
Pedagogy colloquia, 2011-12 (detailed descriptions)

1. Using student writing groups effectively
Lindsay Knisely and Ingrid Moody
Wednesday, October 12, noon, Oakes Mural Room

In this brown bag lunch, we will discuss the most effective ways to use peer editing groups and instructor-led workshop groups to improve our students' writing. We will provide handouts, including peer editing worksheets that we have used successfully in class, as well as instructor-led workshop group comment sheets and guidelines for both students and instructors. Come join in the discussion and share strategies for getting the most out of writing groups.

2. What is an essay? Effective assignments for C2
Carol Freeman, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Abrams
Tuesday, October 25, 2:30, Cowell Senior Commons

What is an essay and what are examples of assignments--creative and traditional--that might fulfill our C2 educational objectives? Carol Freeman will return with her historical perspective on these issues. Jim Wilson will present his annotated bibliography assignment that resulted in a Rothman award-winning student essay. Elizabeth Abrams will briefly discuss the value of annotated assignments we could contribute to our archive.

3. Digital Feedback
Thurs. Nov. 17, 4 pm
Oakes Mural Room
Patrick McKercher and Phillip Longo

In this brown bag "tea," we will explore how digital tools might help give more effective and efficient feedback to students.

Can digital tools like Google Docs, audio feedback, MS Word, eCommons, etc. help us handle the paper flow while also giving students more constructive feedback? What are the benefits and limitations of these tools for us and our students?

We will share our experience experimenting with these tools and hope others will bring their own experiences. Technophobes and skeptics are encouraged to attend.

4. Resource Archive Tea and Discussion
Joy Hagen, Thursday, May 10, 4:15
College 8, Room 301
Wouldn’t it be great to have that writing group rubric from Ingrid? Or the peer review tasks from Sara-Hope and Dan Scripture? Electronically? In a shared site where you could search for them (and find them)? Between us, we have resources as good or better than any OWL, and we want to be able to share.

Please join us for a discussion of how we can efficiently archive and share resources. We will discuss options for an ongoing system, create archive categories or folders, and archive some materials. Bring your resources! If you have materials that can be archived, whatever the format—hard copies, electronic versions, outdated or updated—bring them and we will use this meeting to start our archive. Imagine if we each bring two of our favorite resources. Right? If you can’t come on the 10th, but you can send some resources, please do! Also, there will be tea.

5. Research in Writing 2: An Overview.
Brij Lunine will discuss the various approaches to teaching inquiry in Writing 2, from the C2 goals/requirements to what we actually do in our classes, briefly assessing the potential pros and cons of each.

Terry Terhaar will talk about "Shattering student assumptions about research essays, or why I take 10 weeks to teach the research essay."
Students hold a number of flawed assumptions about the research essay, including:

1) they should "dump" everything they know about their topic into their essay, making it into what I call a "brain dump" essay,
2) they couldn't possibly do "real" research because they're students(!),
3) they should know their thesis first and then "find stuff" to support their ideas,
4) they should never present evidence against their thesis because it would make the essay less convincing,
5) they should never do anything creative ... or fun ... or intriguing because research essays are, by definition, dull and boring and academic!

Come find out how and why I work to shatter these assumptions.
Proposal for an On-Going Program to Support the Disciplinary Communications General Education Requirement

I. Divisional Coordinators/Consultants (6 course equivalencies)
Three Divisional Coordinator/Consultants (one for the Divisions of Humanities and Arts; one for the Divisions of Physical and Biological Sciences and Engineering; and one for the Division of Social Sciences) will each receive two full course equivalencies to:

- Consult with departments to help them meet the goals of the Disciplinary Communications Requirement, offering workshops, developing resources (including online guides), and working with individual instructors on planning, teaching, and assessing DC courses;
- Provide training and trouble-shooting for graduate students working in DC courses;
- Assist DC instructors in making requests for undergraduate Writing Assistants and train, supervise, and evaluate these Writing Assistants. WA’s will be recruited by faculty members from among their best students and assigned to specific DC courses;
- Keep records, monitor use of tutor funds, and participate in program assessment.

Coordinator/Consultants will be Writing Program lecturers (Unit 18 members or SOE’s), who are expert teachers of writing and familiar with the academic genres and domains of knowledge represented by the divisions they are supporting. They will report to the Program Director.

Notes:
There are many arguments for drawing Coordinator/Consultants from among the Writing Program faculty, beginning with the observation made in the Writing Program’s last external review that UCSC should take greater advantage of the Writing Program’s expertise and excellence and the fact that freshman composition programs must fight provincialism to remain effective. If more elaboration is needed, I can provide it.

C/C’s may consult with faculty on all the usual topics relating to integrating instruction in writing with course content, but especially on ways to help instructors:

- better understand and more clearly articulate their goals and criteria for writing in their courses;
- transfer more teaching of writing from comments on individual papers to course design, the construction of assignments (including revision), use of models, etc.;
- devise plans for using Writing Assistants effectively;
- develop strategies for increasing the possibility that students will use what they learn in one course to write better in the next;
- enable students to take more self-reflective responsibility for setting goals and assessing their own progress;
- take advantage of assessment.

The collective experience of WAC/WID programs here and elsewhere reveals that one of the most effective ways to initiate useful relationships between course instructors and
WAC/WID consultants is to require instructors to make formal proposals in order to be assigned Writing Assistants.

TA training may take a number of different forms, for example: pre-quarter workshops for departments; meetings with the TA’s of one course or with the TA’s of a cluster of courses; a resurrection of Writing 202 (3-credit Writing and Learning seminar); a reinstatement of some version of the once-popular 5-session workshop for TA’s that provided them with a certificate rather than credit.

II. Program Leadership (1 course equivalency)
A Program Director (most likely one of the three Divisional Coordinator/Consultants) will receive one full course equivalency to provide overall leadership, coordination, and budgetary oversight and to collate data into a yearly report. The Program Director will report to the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education.

Note:
In their report on “The State of WAC/WID in 2010,” (College Composition and Communication, February 2010), Thaiss and Porter state that their findings “reinforce the idea that programs are more sustainable” when they report to administrators whose campus-wide purviews reflect the campus-wide mission of the programs (559).

III. Undergraduate Writing Assistants
Undergraduate Writing Assistants will be assigned to work with students in DC courses when instructors of DC courses have submitted a request and an acceptable plan explaining how they will be used.

• Department faculties and Divisional Coordinator/Consultants will work together to recruit students who are strong writers and, when possible, have taken the DC courses with which they would work.

• When Coordinator/Consultants have determined a student is eligible to be a Writing Assistant, that student will enroll in a two-credit experiential training course taught by the Divisional Coordinator/Consultant. This course will begin with an intensive workshop at or right before a quarter’s start, to be followed by a tutoring assignment and weekly meetings throughout the quarter. This course will satisfy the Service Learning General Education Requirement.

• In subsequent quarters, Coordinator/Consultants, in consultation with DC course instructors, will assign Writing Assistants to DC courses. They will be paid per hour as tutors.

Initially, it would be reasonable to plan to provide 40 hours of tutoring per every 60 students enrolled in a DC course. (This is not a formula for allocating WA’s to particular courses but rather an estimate of overall demand.) If there are 3000 seats in DC courses,
this implies 2000 hours of tutoring. 2000 hours times $13/hour = $26,000. One would expect this figure to grow as DC instructors develop models for integrating Writing Assistants into their courses.

The cost of training, supervising, and assessing these Writing Assistants will be covered by the Coordinator/Consultants’ equivalencies, but staff support will be necessary:

- The Writing Program Office will need to provide basic services to the Program Director and Coordinator/Consultants probably comparable to the support currently provided to College Writing Coordinators and the ELWR tutor program.
- Academic Divisions or Learning Support Services or some other unit will need to be remunerated for processing tutor hiring and payroll.

**Notes:**
On other campuses, when undergraduate writing tutors work directly with individual instructors in courses that satisfy disciplinary writing requirements, the tutors (aka Writing Fellows, Writing Assistants) are most commonly hired, trained, and supervised by units that cooperate with but are funded separately from Learning Centers or Writing Centers. On many campuses, tutoring programs on this model are regarded as – or are a part of – honors programs.

The Program Director and Divisional Coordinator/Consultants will coordinate their work with College Writing Coordinators, who oversee ELWR tutors, and with Learning Support Services, which currently provides tutors for writing-intensive courses in some departments. Inevitably and fortunately, these three programs will share a number of undergraduate tutors, which, we discovered in the past, makes it easier to recruit and retain excellent tutors. During the years of the Writing Assistance Program’s existence, College Writing Coordinators recruited core course tutors with an eye to their majors and potential for working as Writing Assistants in writing-intensive disciplinary courses. Also, in their initial training quarter, Writing Assistants could be assigned to do drop-in tutoring in the Academic Resource Center.

The 2-credit training course for Writing Assistants would efficiently combine the different roles of a concentrated workshop and on-going mentoring while a Writing Assistant is actually tutoring. The Service Learning credit will replace pay for a defined number of hours of tutoring during a Writing Assistant’s first quarter of training and work.

Very few of the DC proposals submitted to CEP by departments made any mention of undergraduate writing assistants. Because it is difficult to predict how fast – and to what extent – DC faculty members will incorporate Writing Assistants in their courses, it is difficult to estimate resource requirements. Moreover, the deployment of Writing Assistants to DC courses will be complicated by the diffuse nature of some departments’ Disciplinary Communications plans (for example, when the DC is spread over three courses or when a very large number of courses – or labs -- satisfy part of the
requirement). In some instances, Writing Assistants may need to be assigned to a cluster of courses rather than to individual courses.

IV. Instruction for students with significant grammar and editing problems (one lecturer course equivalency plus TA’s?)

Students with persistent challenges in using Standard Professional English would enroll concurrently with their DC course in a one-credit Writing Program course (possibly modeled on Writing 22 B) that would deal only with issues of grammar, usage, and style, using students’ writing in their DC course as the text to be worked on. A Writing Program lecturer would receive one course equivalency for one year to design this course and subsequently to supervise sections taught, perhaps, by graduate students.

• Students could enroll in this course by choice or be required to enroll in it in by a DC instructor, possibly on the basis of an initial assignment written at the very beginning of the quarter or on the basis of a recommendation from the instructor of a previous DC course.

• Sections of this course would need to be available throughout the year and probably would be most effective if segregated by division.

Note:
This course’s structure and mode of delivery need to be determined through research and experimental pilots. The goal is to provide more effective, systematic language instruction that depends less on students’ individual initiative and motivation than is usually the case in ad hoc tutoring sessions.

V. Co-Teaching

When expedient and feasible, it can be a good investment of resources (one course equivalency) to have a Divisional Coordinator/Consultant co-teach for one quarter with a department’s faculty to implement a new DC course (see, for example, Environmental Studies and Computer Engineering).

Selected References:

“Undergraduate Writing Fellows/Peer Tutors” and “Handbook for Faculty Mentors to Writing Fellows.” George Mason University: Writing across the Curriculum. http://wac.gmu/program/initiatives/writing_fellows/

Miscellaneous memos, reports, and studies written between 1984 - 1999 by UCSC Writing Program faculty members concerning Writing-Intensive Courses, the Writing Across the Curriculum Program, and the Learning Assistance Program in Writing.

Written by Carol Freeman, with advice and ideas from Virginia Draper, Holly Gritsch de Cordova, Jaye Padgett, John Tamkun, and the College Writing Coordinators, especially Mark Baker, Dan Scripture, and Amy Weaver (April, 2010).
Writing Program Committee on Teaching Writing in Core (Stretch) 2011-2012
January 2012

Committee members: Robin King, Erica Halk, Lindsay Knisely, Annalisa Rava, Susan Gorsky (chair)

Purpose: To assess teaching C1 Goal #2:

“Learn strategies for reading challenging texts – that is, to understand a text’s purpose or purposes and to follow its train of thought, to begin to be aware of nuance and emphasis, and to be able to relate specific examples and statements to larger topics or claims.”

Because students in 80A, 80C/D, Writing 20, and even Writing 2 lack skills in reading and in using text, we studied the following:

1) Strategies for helping students develop skills in reading and understanding challenging texts.
2) Strategies for helping students understand the purpose of using texts in their writing.
3) Creating assignments that guide students in incorporating texts in their writing.
4) Assessing the success of 1, 2, and 3.

Plan:

a) Fall 2011: We examined our assignments and prompts to discover how we currently guide students (#1-3) and began to assess students' progress in these areas.
b) Winter 2012: We will continue to assess results in 80D and W2, add to and complete our report, which we hope will provide material for interested instructors to continue to explore the issues.

Report:

I. Strategies for helping students develop skills in reading and understanding challenging texts:

Most students are not prepared to read, understand, and analyze the kinds of texts assigned in Core, so we all structure a series of assignments that guide students to these goals. Scaffolding is key, especially for the 80C students. Students need guidance to figure out the author’s main idea (thesis, claim, purpose) and separate the main points from the supporting evidence before they can begin to engage with the argument of the text or draw connections among texts. The progression might include:

- Annotation
- Nutshell paraphrasing (See Appendix 1)
- Analytical outlines for articles (Appendix 2)
- TIPS+ (Appendix 3)
- Summary and response (present the text accurately and fairly before agreeing, disagreeing, etc.).
- Summary and analysis (Appendix 4)
- Dialectical journals.
- Connecting texts (explore how texts “speak” to each other).
- Reading quizzes (which also serve as assessment) can occur at any time

II. Strategies for helping students understand the purpose of using texts in their writing.

As students see how successful texts use evidence to develop and support their ideas, we also guide them to use texts in their writing. Many of the strategies in “I” are designed to help students develop material for their own papers, especially:

- Summary and response
- Summary and analysis
- Dialectical journals
- Connecting texts

See also “Assignments” below.

III. Assignments that guide students in incorporating texts in their writing. (Samples follow report).

Appendix 5 (Susan’s Paper Prompts 1-3): These are designed to move from personal experience through basic comprehension of a text to a focused essay using textual support.
Appendix 6 (Halk Paper 2): This is a simple paper in the sense that students need to use the texts to support agreement/disagreement with what others have said. Along these lines, students are mainly summarizing, paraphrasing, and offering direct quotes.

Appendix 7 (Halk Paper 3): This is a much more challenging assignment in that students must use a concept from one text to make sense of/analyze another text. The goal here is for students to take what they have learned a step further and play around with what it means to bring texts in conversation with one another.

Appendix 8 (Rava Essay 2): This is an early assignment that helps students solidify their understanding of textual explanations of ethical terms and concepts that will be foundational for the rest of the course; later, other more difficult texts will refer to these ethical ideas, explicitly or implicitly, in discussing key issues, and students will be asked to apply these terms to their own views about these issues. The assignment sets up a vocabulary that they will encounter as well as use for the rest of the quarter. In this assignment, students are asked to do some personal narrative, but to apply the terms and the authors’ explanations of them to their own experience. Paraphrasing and quoting from texts is required.

Appendix 9 (Rava Essay 3): In this assignment students begin to apply the ethical concepts from the previous assignment to broader issues. They also look at claims made by authors and begin to determine what makes a claim convincing.

Appendix 10 (Rava Essay 4): This is probably the most challenging essay of the quarter – the texts are difficult, and the task requires explanation and refutation of an author’s viewpoint. The texts offer opposing views on a number of aspects of the issue, so students have a way of supporting their refutation with textual references. This task demands that students differentiate between when an author is explaining an opposing viewpoint and when an author is voicing his own.
IV. **Assessing** the success of I, II, and III.

We assess student success in many ways: class discussion, written homework, quizzes or reading checks, use of texts in papers. Here are some preliminary notes on our findings:

a) Reading checks / quizzes: (Susan’s 80C). A 'mock' quiz given in the first full week showed students that they needed to read more carefully and annotate more thoughtfully. A quiz on 11/22 showed that most students could understand the text far better: one student failed but the rest averaged 5+ out of 6 possible points.

b) Rubrics: Using rubrics for formal papers like the one excerpted below allows us to guide the students to understand the expectations of academic writing and to assess their progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content (critical thinking, logic, accuracy, depth, engagement with texts)</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates not only strong comprehension but also fresh and insightful engagement with text(s) and ideas, characterized by analysis and synthesis that is creative, ambitious, risk-taking, and memorable.</td>
<td>Demonstrates clear comprehension and thoughtful engagement with text(s) and ideas, characterized by detailed and thought-provoking analysis.</td>
<td>Demonstrates basic understanding and engagement with text(s) and ideas, characterized by analysis which takes the reader beyond summary.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a lack of understanding of text(s) and ideas, and/or the absence of adequate analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Collating results from our comments on papers or portfolios:

Example 1: Susan's portfolio comments in fall demonstrate the range of students' current abilities in this area:

**WEAK:** There are still problems either with your comprehension of the texts or your use of them in your papers.

You need to read more thoughtfully and annotate more thoroughly... and write papers with greater depth and use of textual analysis.

**MIDDLING:** You are beginning to synthesize material, using more textual evidence and integrating it purposefully...

**STRONG:** You clearly understand the texts and have begun to make meaningful connections among readings and ideas. You are ready to challenge yourself to dig more deeply into the texts and ideas and to take risks in thinking about the material...
APPENDIX 1: NUTSHELL PARAPHRASING

DEFINITION
To paraphrase means to put another’s writing in your own words and in your own sentence style and structure. When paraphrasing, you are representing the gist (main idea, main purpose, main point) of a small selection of text, usually no longer than a couple paragraphs, in a clear, succinct way. In doing so, you remain objective, sticking to the author’s intended meaning.

NOTE: You may hear others refer to paraphrasing as a form of summarizing.

PURPOSE
We often paraphrase text while reading for the following reasons:

- To keep track of the author’s main points
- To use our own wording to better understand and remember what the author says
- To check our comprehension while reading (i.e. if we are unable to put a passage into our own words, this may be a signal that we need to rethink it in order to understand it)

We often use paraphrases in our writing for the following reasons:

- To offer our reader an overview of a paragraph
- To offer our reader the gist of an example which is exceptionally long
- To articulate main ideas in a succinct and clear way
- To re-word an author’s claim or definition which is exceptionally confusing, and which we suspect our reader will need some help with
- To set our reader up for a quote and/or establish background/context

STEPS/GUIDELINES
To paraphrase a passage, do the following:

- Read the original passage as many times as is needed to understand its full meaning.
- As you read, take notes, using your own words. Use phrases if re-writing the passage in full sentences is cumbersome.
- A useful trick is to put the original aside (turn upside down) so that you are not influenced by the exact wording of the author.
- Check your version against the original source by rereading the original to be sure you’ve included all the main ideas from the source.
- If you find a phrase worth quoting in your own writing, use quotation marks in the paraphrase to identify the words you’ve borrowed, and note the page number.
- NOTE: When you use a paraphrase in your writing, you do not need to use quotation marks, but you do need to cite where the information is coming from using the appropriate citation format – MLA, APA, Chicago.

APPENDIX 2: Outline Format for Analysis of Articles (in APA format)

Use this format when preparing an analysis of, and response to, an article. Type up your outline and response.

Title __________________________
Author & Year __________________________

(Always paraphrase from the text)

I. Topic/Subject (What is the focus of the piece? This can be written as a phrase.)
II. Audience (Who is the author(s) writing to? Who would be interested in this text?)
III. Purpose (What seems to have inspired the author to write the piece? What is s/he writing in response to? What is his or her main goal(s): to inform, entertain, persuade, reflect, question, challenge, critique, compare and contrast, examine, etc.)
IV. Author's Thesis/Controlling Idea/Main Message (Write this as a complete sentence, using a verb which accurately reflects the purpose of the piece: has argued, asserted, shown, contended, maintained, claimed, made a case for, reported, reasoned, found, realized discovered, determined, noticed, ascertained, discerned, disputed, challenged, examined, defined, defended, etc.)
V. Supporting Points
   a. Supporting point
   b. Supporting point
   c. Supporting point
   d. Supporting point
   e. Supporting point
   f. Etc......

Critical Response: Write a paragraph in which you reflect on how you reacted to the author’s controlling idea, supporting points, and even writing style and tone. In the response, answer any of the following questions (pick a couple; don’t answer all of them), offering direct textual support when appropriate:

- What do you think of the author’s perspective or argument? Do you agree, disagree, or possibly agree and disagree? Why?
- Do you think the author did an effective job supporting his or her controlling idea? Why or why not?
- What do you think of the author’s main ideas? Which do you agree with? Which do you disagree with? And, which do you have mixed feelings about? Why?
- What do you think about the author’s writing style and tone? Why?
- What was most interesting or surprising about this article? Why?
- What was most troubling or upsetting about this article? Why?
- What was most confusing or frustrating about this article? Why?
- What is the larger social significance of this piece? Does it relate to any other cultural or political events and debates? If so, which ones and how does it relate?
- What connections can you make between this article and any others which we have read? Explain the connection.
- What did this article remind you of in your own life? Could you relate to it in any way? Be specific.
- Are you left with any questions after reading this article? What are they?
Title: “Still Separate, Still Unequal: America’s Educational Apartheid”

Author: Jonathan Kozol (2007)

Topic: Inequality in American schools

Audience: People involved in academia -- students, faculty, and those who make important decisions about pedagogy and policy -- and people unaware of the state of our public schools

Purpose: Kozol (2007) has written in response to the idea that our schools allow for all students to receive the same quality of education. He critiques this assumption, aiming to inform and persuade his readers so as to catalyze social change.

Thesis (Controlling Idea/Main Message): Kozol (2007) has argued that American public schools are no less segregated by race and class than they used to be; the unjust inequalities of our educational system are in fact still a problem. He has posited that educations offered by poorly-funded schools (usually inner-city schools predominantly populated by students of color) are so inadequate that they further intensify social divisions between middle and upper-class whites and lower-class minorities.

Supporting Points

a. Educational inequality begins at a very young age (pre-school years). Poor kids are behind educationally from the outset, which is problematic because they are held to the same standards as those who attend private schools (pp. 645-646).

b. Schools attended predominately by poor students of color are expected to reform their practices so as to even out educational inequalities. Teachers in these schools are expected to use militaristic methods to instruct and control students (pp. 649-650).

c. The utilitarian, drill-based “Skinnerian curriculum” implemented in inner-city schools turns students and teachers into robots. Students are not expected to be critical thinkers, but rather, well-behaved workers. Teachers are expected to enforce rules and offer feedback based on pre-determined “categories of proficiency” (pp. 650-651).

d. While many teachers who are required to teach in a Skinnerian style do not approve of such methods, they do not have any other options if they wish to continue working with these students (p. 652).

e. Not only are many inner-city schools poorly staffed, they are also poorly maintained (e.g. functioning bathrooms) (pp. 653-654).

f. Many high school students in these schools seem to be aware of their plight and are frustrated and angered by the fact that they have limited resources and are at times steered away from their dreams because classes aren’t available (pp. 654-655).

g. Those not involved with inner-city public schools have little to no awareness of what is happening in these institutions (p. 655).

h. Many inner-city schools are run like businesses with principals referred to as CEOs and teachers referred to as classroom managers (p. 656).

i. While attempts at reform in inner-city schools (e.g. No Child Left Behind) seem to work towards helping inner-city students achieve academic success, they in fact actually make them fall farther behind. They are being taught to take tests, not think critically or autonomously (pp. 656-657).

Critical Response
After reading “Still Separate, Still Unequal: America’s Educational Apartheid,” I am extremely disturbed by how little we seem to value education in our society. Why is it that race and class determine one’s educational resources? Shouldn’t receiving a decent education be a basic human right? What I was most struck by was how teachers in inner-city schools are expected to teach. For example, Kozol (2007) has observed that students in one school were “graded…on the way they march[ed] along the corridors” (p. 651). While I agree that there is value to encouraging students to be well-behaved and orderly, I cannot find any value to making “marching” such a high stakes activity. One could describe this type of practice as militaristic, but I find it much more disturbing than that. It seems as if these students are not just being turned into workers, but rather, zombies: they are not encouraged to think for themselves or engage in any sort of original and individual reflection. I think that Kozol’s (2007) use of “apartheid” in the title is especially powerful, for these students truly are being discriminated against based on who society thinks they should become and what role they should play in society. I think I am so appalled by the mistreatment of inner-city school kids because I have come from a fairly privileged background and have been given better opportunities simply based on my economic standing rather than any natural qualities which make me more deserving of such resources. I not only agree with Kozol (2007) that something needs to be done to affect change, but I also think something needs to be done to change the mindset of our society which makes such social divisions “normal.”
TIPS+: ESSAY ORGANIZATION & COMPREHENSION

Title: __________________________________________________________

Author: _________________________________________________________

T: What is the topic of this article? What is the author writing about?

I: What is the main idea (controlling idea) of this piece? What is the author telling us about the topic?

P: What points does the author make to support his/her main idea? Be sure to list the main points, not the examples or evidence. In addition, you may choose to cite some of the examples, quotes, or facts the author presents to make the main idea and the individual points seem reasonable.

•
•
•
•
•

S: Write a brief summary of this piece. What are the most important parts of this piece? What is the author's controlling idea, and what supporting points does he or she include to develop that idea?

+: Respond to whichever of these questions seems most relevant to you: What is your reaction to this piece? Why do you think you had this reaction? What was most interesting or surprising to you about this article?
APPENDIX 4: SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The “Guidelines” below are from:


GUIDELINES FOR WRITING A SUMMARY:

In the first sentence, mention the title of the text, the name of the author, and the author’s thesis.

Maintain a neutral tone; be objective

Use the third person point of view and the present tense: Taylor argues...

Keep your focus on the text. Don’t state the author’s ideas as if they were your own.

Put all or most of your summary in your own words: if you borrow a phrase or a sentence from the text, put it in quotation marks and give the page number in parentheses.

Limit yourself to presenting the text’s key points.

Be concise; make every word count.

GUIDELINES FOR ANALYZING A (WRITTEN) TEXT:

What is the author’s thesis or central idea? Who is the audience?

What questions does the author address (implicitly or explicitly)?

How does the author structure the text? What are the key parts and how do they relate to one another and to the thesis?

What strategies has the author used to generate interest in the argument and to persuade readers of its merit?

What evidence does the author use to support the thesis? How persuasive is the evidence?

Does the author anticipate objections and counter opposing views?

Does the author fall prey to any faulty reasoning?
Appendix 5: Essays 1-3 (80C, Gorsky)

Essay 1: Education ~ A Personal Journey

The Assignment: Write a 2-3 page essay exploring your educational experiences, focusing on what made it possible for you to attend UCSC and discussing how typical your experiences might be. Your paper needs to have a clear central purpose which is developed and supported through specific evidence. Due: September 27.

Process:
1. To start, think about these questions, then answer them informally (free-write):
   • Why are you at UCSC?
   • How did you get here?
   • What factors helped you?
   • What obstacles did you have to overcome?
   • What are your goals while at UCSC?
   • Based on your knowledge and observations and on the video First to Worst, were your educational experiences typical of students in America and/or in California?

2. Find a purpose for your essay: what do your answers have in common? Define that purpose in a few sentences. This statement belongs in your introduction.

3. Take notes about specific evidence to develop and support your purpose, then prepare a rough draft. When possible, use evidence from First to Worst as well as your own experience.

4. Reread, revise, and edit the draft before you submit it.

5. Guidelines for written work: See SR, “Writing” (4-5) for guidelines, including formatting, submitting, sharing, and saving assignments. This essay can help you prepare your first major paper, Essay 3.

Essay 2: Critical Reading ~ Summary and Response

The Assignment: Write a brief (2-3 page) essay that demonstrates your comprehension of and response to the reading by one of these authors: Kozol, Sacks, Walker, or Wilson. You may structure the essay as you choose, so long as you respond to the entire prompt.

Due: October 6.

Process:
1. Choose your favorite text and review any written homework and class notes about it.
2. If you haven’t already completed TIPS+ for the text, do so (SR 13). If you have, revise the “S” (Summary) to be sure it is complete, accurate, and well-written.
3. Brainstorm or cluster to determine your response, addressing all of the following: the main (controlling) idea, supporting points, evidence (examples, quotes, facts…), conclusions.
4. Return to your TIPS+ and expand the “+” by describing and analyzing your reaction to the piece. Brainstorm about specific evidence you can use to develop and support your response.
5. Find and define a purpose for your essay. That statement belongs in your introduction.
6. Reread, revise, and edit the draft before you submit it.
7. Review the written work (SR, p. 12, “Writing”). This short essay can help you with Essay 3.
ESSAY 3: Education and Social Justice

The Assignment: Write a 3-4 page essay that addresses one of the issues of education and social justice that we have been studying by looking closely at selected texts. In the drafts, you must include and analyze material from Kozol or Sacks to develop and support your claims. You may also use any of our other readings, First to Worst, and/or your own experiences. In the final revision (due 11/1), you must discuss at least two readings from weeks 1-3.

Due Dates:
Draft for writing assistant meeting: Week 3, depending on tutoring schedule.
Draft for Peer Review: October 18.
Revised draft to instructor: October 20.
Final revision to instructor: November 1 (be sure to discuss at least two texts).

Option 1: In “Still Separate, Still Unequal,” Jonathan Kozol claimed that “As racial isolation deepens and the inequalities of education finance remain unabated and take on new and more innovative forms, the principals of many inner-city schools are making choices that few principals in public schools that serve white children in the mainstream of the nation ever need to contemplate” (para 10). Do you agree or disagree with this claim? Why or why not?

Option 2: In “Public Schools, Private Privilege,” Peter Sacks asserted that “our public school system” is not the “great equalizer, able to overcome social and economic disparities.” Instead, he said that the school system “may in fact reproduce and justify existing inequalities” (para 1). Do you agree or disagree with this claim? Why or why not?

Option 3: In ‘The Great Divergence,” Part 9, Timothy Noah argued that a “failure by elementary and secondary schools to provide education relevant to the economy’s growing demands” has contributed to America’s increasing “income inequality.” Thus, our educational system seems to be failing those who most need a good public education. Discuss the challenges facing public education, exploring who is most impacted by these challenges, and consider the justice of the current situation.

Process:
• Review the texts, your written work, and class activities to find ideas. You may wish to free-write about the options until you find one you wish to explore. Review Anne Lamott on “a shitty first draft” since that is your first goal (SR 19).
• Reread Essays 1 and 2, your TIPS+ and DJs: you may find ideas, examples, even a thesis or whole paragraphs that you can revise for this essay.
• Define your purpose in a few sentences, including in your introduction.
• Gather your evidence. Think of your audience as your classmates: your readers know the texts but they haven’t thought about your topic. You need to help them understand your response to the text and persuade them through appropriate analysis and evidence.
• Follow the usual guidelines for written work and watch the deadlines carefully.
• October 20 essay: Coversheet. When you submit the paper to the instructor, attach the completed “Coversheet for Essays” (SR 22).
• November 1 Revision: After you receive the essay with comments, you will need to revise it. Remember that you must make significant use of at least two written texts in the final version. Review “Revision” and “The Revision Process” (SR 26-27) and submit a complete “Revision Packet” (SR 27). Save all your written work.
Task
Using at least two texts read or viewed for class, write a 3-5 page paper in which you examine the following:
   a) Why is our educational system seen by many as failing and unjust? That is, why is educational equality a social justice issue?
   b) Given what you have read, viewed, and/or experienced and witnessed in your own life, do you agree that our system is in need of change? Why or why not?

Criteria for Success

- Assert an arguable assertion (thesis) early on in your paper. Your thesis should be a well-focused, direct response to the task. Because this is a short paper, you will not be able to address all points covered in class. Instead, choose one reason as to why many see our system as unjust and then respond to this one reason. We will discuss what constitutes a well-focused thesis in class.
- Each body paragraph should have a clear purpose, focusing on just one supporting point.
- Each body paragraph should include specific and detailed support. That is, ground your claims in concrete evidence. In doing so, utilize direct quotes, paraphrases, and summaries. You may also offer descriptions of lived experiences and observations – these should be detailed.
- As mentioned in the task, you must utilize at least two texts (articles read and the films viewed). However, the two texts should not be two films – use at least one essay/article.
- While you may indeed use personal experiences and observations to support your claims, the majority of the paper must include text-based analysis. In using text, you must do so in a significant manner: including just one or two quotes in passing in the entire paper is not enough.
- Cite all information taken from another source. Use APA formatting to do so.
- Offer an engaging title which prepares your reader for the specific focus and purpose of your essay. Feel free to be creative! Remember, the title is what your reader encounters first.
- Revise and proofread carefully!
- Your paper should be written in a standard 12 pt. font and be double-spaced.
- In the top left-hand corner of your paper include your name, my name, the course title, and the date.
- Staple all pages together in the upper-left-hand corner. Staple your cover letter to the front of your paper. See “Cover Letter Guidelines” on eCommons.

Suggestions

- In thinking about why many view our educational system as unjust and whether or not you agree with this perspective, look back at Paper 1 in which you defined “injustice” and “social justice.” You may find it useful to explore how your definitions parallel and/or challenge what we have examined in class thus far.
- Additionally, you may find it generative to consider the following questions:
  a) Is education a privilege or a right? Is it a basic human right? Why or why not?
  b) What is the purpose of public education in America? Does our current system fulfill this purpose? Why or why not?
  c) Who is benefitted/hurt by our educational system? How and why?
  d) What causes the inequalities in our school system? Can they realistically be changed? Why or why not?
- Clearly, this is a complex issue, so do not feel restricted to either fully agreeing or disagreeing with the idea that our system needs to be changed (question “b”). If you are conflicted (you both agree and disagree), assert this perspective in your thesis and then explore it in your body paragraphs.

Steps & Due Dates
Shitty First Draft:
Rough Draft:
Final Portfolio:
APPENDIX 7: PAPER 3: ANALYZING INJUSTICE (HALK, 80C)

Task
In a 3-6 page paper, analyze one of the texts from List A. To do so, complete the following:
1. Assert and support an argument about how your chosen text demonstrates the cause(s) and/or effect(s) of injustice and why it is illustrative of a social justice issue. That is, what is the injustice highlighted in the text and why does it matter?
2. Frame the analysis of your chosen text with at least one of the concepts we have discussed in class (concepts defined in the List B Texts). Use the term (or a set of closely-related terms) to help you articulate why/how the experiences highlighted in your chosen text are issues of social justice. In other words, you’ll use a text from List B to help you explain and make sense of a text in List A (e.g. use “cultural imperialism” to help you explain what the men in “Paper Tigers” experience).

List A Texts: To be analyzed (choose one)
- Taking Back the Schools
- Freedom Riders
- “My Life as an Undocumented Immigrant”
- Papers
- “No Evictions! We Won’t Move!: The Struggle to save the I-Hotel”
- “And This Will Conclude our Transmission from the I-Hotel”
- “Omar”
- “American Girl”
- “C.P. Ellis”
- “Asian Americans: Myth of the Model Minority”
- “Paper Tigers”

List B Texts & Concepts: To be used as analytical frameworks
- “The Social Construction of Difference” (social construction, the Other, privilege, oppression)
- “Five Faces of Oppression” (oppression as structural, social group, exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, to be marked and invisible, double consciousness, systemic violence)
- “The Cycle of Socialization”
- “Prejudice and Discrimination” (prejudice, discrimination, institutionalized discrimination, segregation, stereotypes, scapegoating, the –isms, the utilitarian function, the protective function, the value-expressive function, the cognitive function, “authoritarian personality” v. “democratic personality,” projection, competition and exploitation)

Criteria for Success
- In the introduction, prepare your reader for the purpose of the essay. To do so, address both elements of the task, establishing an overview of your List A Text (i.e. its focus and the author’s thesis/main idea/purpose) AND a link between the concept(s) from your List B Text(s). For example, if you write on “Paper Tigers” and you have chosen to analyze it using the concept of “cultural imperialism,” use the introduction to establish how “cultural imperialism” relates to the narratives of the men in “Paper Tigers.”
- Your thesis should be a well-focused, direct response to the task. Your thesis for this paper will be more complex than your thesis for Paper 2. Instead of summing up what others have said and agreeing/disagreeing with them, you will be offering an interpretation of your chosen text,
which will be your understanding of how what you have read is reflective of social justice theory.

- Because the concept(s) you utilize from your List B Text will function as a framework for analyzing your List A Text, you will need to do the following:
  a) Define the concept(s) BEFORE applying it/them to your List A Text.
  b) Go beyond discussing it/them in general, vague ways. That is, you'll need to apply the concept(s) DIRECTLY to SPECIFIC examples from your List A Text.
  c) Do not assume that your reader will automatically understand your application. You need to THOROUGHLY explain how your concept(s) fit with these specific examples.

- Each body paragraph should include the PIE elements. That is, each body paragraph should have a clear POINT, specific and detailed INFORMATION, and thorough EXPLANATION.
- Cite all information taken from another source. Use APA formatting to do so.
- Offer an engaging title which prepares your reader for the specific focus and purpose of your essay. Feel free to be creative! Remember, the title is what your reader encounters first: it is part of your introduction.
- Revise and proofread carefully!
- Your paper should be written in a standard 12 pt. font and be double-spaced.
- In the top left-hand corner of your paper include your name, my name, the course title, and the date.
- Staple all pages together in the upper-left-hand corner. Staple your cover letter to the front of your paper. See “Cover Letter Guidelines” on eCommons.

Suggestions
- To determine which text you’d like to analyze, review your class notes and your analytical outlines. Based on what you have written in these outlines, which of these texts were you most interested in? Which of these texts did you feel comfortable picking apart and which left the greatest impression on you?
- Use the feedback you received from me on Paper 2 to help you construct this paper. For instance, if I asked you to be much more specific and detailed in your support, this is a clue that you will want to focus on offering specific, detailed support in this paper.
- Make an appointment to meet with me to discuss drafting this paper if you’d like help. Do so ASAP instead of waiting until the last minute.

Steps & Due Dates
Skeletal Outline:
Rough Draft:
Final:
Appendix 8: Annalisa Rava, Essay #2, Making an Ethical Choice

In the words of the Markkula Center’s document, “We all have an image of our better selves – of how we are when we act ethically or are ‘at our best’” (p. 13). We make choices all the time, in a variety of situations, that affect ourselves and others. If you are acting ethically, you should be able to justify your decisions using one or more of the ethical standards. Think about a time when you have been called upon to make an ethical choice, when there was something wrong personally, interpersonally, or socially. Consider the facts, as well as who was affected by the decision, and reflect on the choice you made and whether it led to an ethical course of action.

Assignment:
Write an essay that explores this ethical situation carefully and thoughtfully, and explain why you chose the course of action that you did, and why you believe it was the right thing to do (or, in retrospect, was not).

Before you begin, use the “Framework for Ethical Decision Making” on p. 15-16 to do some pre-writing and help you organize your thoughts. Evaluate possible courses of action, and use the vocabulary and the concepts from our readings to think through your ethical approach in this situation. In your essay, make specific reference to some of the sources of ethical standards on p. 14. If different ethical standards would lead to different courses of action in your case, explain why you think yours was the right—or the wrong—choice.

While part of your essay will be narrative, describing the ethical dilemma, you also need several pages of thoughtful analysis that will lead you to a meaningful conclusion about ethics. Go beyond just naming the ethical standard(s) that would lead to a right action in this particular case, and think about how they could or should apply to decision making in general. Rather than just applying the different ethical standards to your situation, use your discussion of various ethical approaches to say something purposeful about ethical decision making. For example, you might end up rejecting the utilitarian approach because it conflicts with the compassion approach. Or, your concern about justice for all may supersed the value you place on the rights of the individual. You may conclude that you are an ethical egoist, or a moral absolutist. You might discover that you prefer character-oriented ethics to act-oriented ethics. There are many possible points you can make about ethics, either yours specifically, or ethics in general, as a result of analyzing your particular dilemma.

You may not have thought formally about your ethical perspective before; even so, the purpose of this assignment is to get you started thinking about your own ethical views. Often, we realize what we believe by examining what we have done. Thinking through your notion of right and wrong and how you formulated your decision in this situation will help you begin to apply the language from the readings to your ethical views in a more specific way, and prepare you to consider the broader ethical issues in emerging technologies.

Requirements:
◆ Make sure to refer to define specific ethical standards as they relate to your decision. Explain clearly how they apply to the decision that you made.
◆ Quote directly from Lawrence Hinman’s “Introduction: A Pluralistic Approach to Moral Theory” at least once, meaningfully.
  ➢ When quoting directly from texts: refer to the name of the article, the author’s full name, and then place the exact words from the texts in quotation marks, followed by the page number in parenthesis.
  ➢ If you are borrowing information or ideas specific to an author, but not quoting verbatim (indirect rather than direct quoting), document the reference by placing the author’s last name and the page number in parentheses after it.
  ➢ Provide a works cited page, listing any text you cited in your essay.
◆ Give your essay a title that makes me want to read it, and that is relevant to your essay’s content.
◆ Your essay should be about 4 pages, double-spaced, using a 12-point academic font (such as Times or Times New Roman.
◆ Put your name, my name, the course and section, and the due date, all double-spaced in the upper left-hand corner of the page. Place your last name and the page number on the right hand corner of each page.
◆ Include a brief cover letter in which you 1) explain to your reader your purpose in writing about your decision: what point about ethics and ethical standards are you trying to make? 2) what did you struggle with in writing this essay?
◆ Due: Thursday, 10/6 (in a folder)
In her article “Your Genes Aren’t Covered for That,” Susannah Baruch points out that “Millions of us could benefit from the information genetic testing reveals” (75), but she also acknowledges that people have legitimate concerns about having this information and how it will be used. The medical benefits may be outweighed by psychological anxiety as well as privacy and discrimination concerns.

Imagine that you have been offered the opportunity to have your whole genome sequenced and interpreted at no cost to you (current costs for sequencing and interpretation start at $10,000). The analysis of your genome would give you comprehensive information (to the extent that current knowledge allows) about your vulnerabilities to inherited diseases and behaviors, as well as about the risks of passing these onto your offspring. It could provide a diagnosis for a disease you are already experiencing symptoms of. You’d also have information that pertained to your family members, both ancestral and current.

Would you accept or decline this opportunity and why? What factors contribute to your decision and what kinds of adversity are you concerned you might face after receiving the information? Write a 4-5 page essay explaining your position. Discuss the issues that you considered in weighing the benefits and drawbacks of having your genome sequenced and analyzed and where relevant, apply the ethical concepts we have been discussing to your decision.

In order to defend your decision, you will have to consider the compelling reasons for making the alternative decision as well, so the reader knows what your decision is being weighed against.

You must quote meaningfully from both James Watson’s “Genome Ethics” and from Susannah Baruch’s “Your Genes Aren’t Covered for That.” You may quote from other class texts in addition, if relevant.

Requirements:
- Your essay should be 4-5 pages long, double-spaced, using 12-point academic font.
- You must quote accurately, appropriately, and meaningfully at least twice from the above texts. We will have talked about integrating and citing sources, so you’ll be expected to be developing your quoting skills and mechanics.
- Include a Works Cited page, on which you list alphabetically by authors’ last names the sources that you cited in your essay.
- Give your essay an engaging title.
- Put your name, my name, the course and section, and the due date in the upper left-hand corner of the first page (double-spaced, just like your essay is). Place your last name and the page number on the right hand corner of each page after the first.
- Bring 3 copies of your well-thought out drafts to class on Thursday 10/13 for peer workshop.
- Your revised essay will be due on 10/18.

Suggested Process:
- Consider all the pros and cons of the decisions. Look specifically at Watson’s claims and think about how convincing you find them. Also consider Baruch’s objections and explanations of risks to see if you think they outweigh some of Watson’s advocacy. The viewpoints of authors should be addressed in your essay.
- Check our readings for information, details, ethical principles, and case studies that might help you make your decision.
- Map your ideas on paper.
- Decide what position you’d take and why.
- Think about if you need to qualify your decision (if this, then that – under these conditions, I would).
- Consider your decision in the broader view – should everyone make the same decision you do?
- State your decision early and then explain your reasons.
- Explain what you didn’t choose and why as well as what you did choose. An argument is more convincing if you can weigh alternatives.
- Provide concrete examples and details to illustrate your point (from your own experiences as well as from the texts).
- Write as if your audience is not familiar with our readings and you have to explain issues and terms.
Cover Letter Instructions for Essay #3
All Essays MUST be turned in with a Cover Letter

Type your answers to the following questions in a well-written, self-reflective, and proofread cover letter that you turn in with your essay. Your essay should come to me in a folder with the cover letter on top, the draft you are turning in to me next, and then the drafts that you brought to peer review. Please place your name and email address on your folder, along with any other personal identifying designs that you wish. Make sure that you have proofread your essay carefully before turning it in, or I will not read it. Please don’t include anything else in your folder.

1) What is the main idea of your essay?

2) What do you think you did well in this essay?

3) What are you still dissatisfied with in this essay? What would you change if you had more time to continue to revise?

4) What new strategies, advice, or suggestions that you’ve gotten (from this class, from Writing and Revising, from essay feedback, from your writing tutor, or from peers) did use to help you draft, write, and revise this essay?

5) How is this draft different from the draft that you brought to your writing group? Be specific!

6) Do you have any particular concerns that you want me to address when I read and respond to your essay?
APPENDIX 10: Annalisa Rava, ESSAY #4
Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research
and the Ethical Issues of Therapeutic and Reproductive Cloning

Write an essay in which you answer the following question: Under what conditions, if any, is human embryonic stem cell research ethically acceptable?

Think about the questions you will need to consider in developing your position. What is the value of regenerative medicine? What is the moral value of a blastocyst in relation to the potential utilitarian good of regenerative medicine? Which embryos, if any, should be used for research? Are you concerned that therapeutic cloning will open the door to reproductive cloning? If you approve of SCNT, do you have any ethical concerns about getting eggs for the process? You won’t have to discuss every single issue related to human ESCR – use your well-qualified thesis to limit your discussion so that you only develop points relevant to it. Brainstorm, freewrite, and diagram your ideas to figure out your position and narrow down the scope of your argument.

Depending on what your thesis is, you will have to address and refute different authors’ arguments. You might have to defend yourself against Sandel’s accusations of hypocrisy, or you may have to find away around Kass’s moral blunder concern. You might want to use or criticize McGee/Caplan’s argument that the embryo’s potential is preserved rather than destroyed by hESCR. Make a list of the points that you would have to make and the authors you would have to contend with to support your thesis. Use other authors to help you formulate your refutation.

Your essay should incorporate the ethical approaches we’ve been discussing this quarter.

You must quote from meaningfully from three of the following five authors’ texts: Sandel, Kass, Wilmut/Highfield, McGee/Caplan, Hayry. You can quote from other class texts in addition if you choose.

Your essay should be 4-5 pages long, with a title, a works cited, academic font, appropriate formatting, page numbers, etc. Use the cover letter questions from essay #3 for this essay as well (including the question about Writing and Revising).

Your essay should have a clear position, well-supported with examples, analysis, and textual evidence. You should be able to address and refute views that differ from yours. Your quotes should be led into appropriately, fitted into your prose grammatically, documented and punctuated correctly. Quotes MUST be used accurately: use of quotes should demonstrate an understanding of “what it does” in the text, not just “what it says.” Show that you understand authors’ views, and represent them faithfully.

Make sure to explain and refute at least one viewpoint that disagrees with yours. Consider mapping texts, as we’ve done class, to diagram which authors agree/disagree on which points. This will help you see who you need to argue against as well as which author you can use to help you do so.

Arrange to meet with your peer group and conduct a peer review session, to which you must bring 3 copies of a well-conceived draft as well as several questions for your readers. The peer review session should be completed by the night of Tuesday, 11/1, so that writers have enough time to use suggestions for revision. Your revised essay will be due in class on Thursday, 11/3, in a folder, with a cover letter, and the drafts and peer-review sheets. Note: I read your early draft as well as your peer-review sheets. I will notice if you have not addressed your readers concerns and macro-revised accordingly. I will also notice if you told the writer that aspects of the essay were well-done when there were obvious problems that you should have noticed. Take peer review seriously, as your feedback on peer writing is part of your performance for the class.
Grading Committee Reading List

- Bauman, Marcy. “What Grades Do for Us, and How to Do without Them” (see Tchudi).
- Bloom, Lynn Z. "Why I (Used to) Hate to Give Grades." College Composition and Communication 48.3 (1997).
- Collegiate Learning Assessment; http://collegiatelearningassessment.org/ (note: CLA developed a standardized test given to college students that received a lot of attention; see especially Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses, by Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa. University of Chicago Press, 2011).
- Elbow, Peter. “Grading Student Writing: Making It Simpler, Fairer, Clearer” (sent via email).
- Holaday, Lynn. “Writing Students Need Coaches, Not Judges” (see Tchudi).
- Huot, Brian. “Toward a New Discourse of Assessment for the College Writing Classroom” (sent via email).
- Tchudi, Stephen. Alternatives to Grading Student Writing. NCTE, 1997 (http://wac.colostate.edu/books/tchudi/).
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. “Teachers’ Stories: Notes toward a Portfolio Pedagogy” (see Tchudi).
Comments from the Survey on Grading Papers (June 2012)

1. Grading won't affect what I do but (I disagree with Elbow that it creates more work) but it may affect my students' reactions, their clarity about and understanding of requirements (beyond what is provided by the rubric), and their clarity about their progress. Since I require students to respond directly to my comments in their (mandatory) revisions, I do not think grades will reduce their ability to learn or improve.

2. Grades come to define the class and the students' sense of writing as a process. If we look at writing as having multiple steps, how do we assign a grade. And in the end of the quarter, when we have this set of grades, won't those limit the way we can look at the student's work as a whole? A student who has improved tremendously but is still struggling is doomed. Writing is a combination of so many steps and so many elements--grades I think limit us in the way we can evaluate a student's progress. Even my students who resist not getting a grade on each paper usually come to appreciate the process--they say it frees them as writers to experiment without fear. If I stick a letter or a number on a paper they will stop looking at my comments as carefully. I saw this in other schools where I had to give grades. Though I can see the temptation and understand the desire to give grades, I think I would become a weaker reader of their papers and they will lose that sense of process.

3. Grades on papers is anti-ethical to my pedagogy and undermine my efforts to get students to pay attention to the written feedback.

4. I haven't read the essays - maybe I should wait to respond until i have more time to do so. But my initial thoughts are that it is increasingly difficult to maintain an ideological position about writing as process with endless feedback from the instructor. The result of not giving students grades is that they study for their chem final instead of writing and revising, because they get grades in those classes, and grades are what matter. If we gave them grades on things, then they would value the work more. I hate to say it and I really don't want to give grades, but I also hate spending an hour giving meaningful feedback on a shitty draft, only to later find out that the student, by his own admission, put no time or effort into it because he had a midterm for which he was receiving a concrete grade. Grade drafts, and then grade the revision as well. Initially it would be hard, but in the long run, I think it would make students more accountable. I think it would force us to make grading criteria more transparent -- I think grading criteria should be more uniform across sections as well.

5. I feel strongly that my role/relationship as a coach for my students' writing skill is hampered by switching to an evaluator/judging role. When portfolio assessment and its goals are explained well, students are more likely to continue working on individual skills across multiple papers if they feel credit will be granted in portfolio assessment. Further, grades distract students from the learning outcomes (skills) by focusing them instead on the object-- the individual assignment or paper. Such an assignment-centric focus keeps students from seeing how their writing instruction translates to the real world, or at least their broader academic world.

6. seems kinda complicated and tough to get an assured outcome?

7. While I currently do not assign grades on individual essays, I would like the freedom to do so. At times, I feel that my students would respond more seriously to grades than they do to my comments. A grade, while it is a blunt instrument, provides a simple, easily deciphered indication of success. Considering that many of our students come from high schools that focus on testing and are enrolled in majors in which this is the norm, I don't think that it is always fair
to demand that they learn an entirely new system, no matter how beneficial we might believe it to be. In this sense, students might find grades more, not less, informative than extensive comments. Similarly, a grade, particularly a lower grade, offers me the opportunity to speak to my students more frankly than I might be able to, or willing to, in written comments.

8. I only had time to briefly skim the articles, and I look forward to reading them in more depth soon -- so these are mainly just my initial thoughts. My worry with grading is that my students would simply look for a grade and not look at my comments -- and thus not learn as much from their papers. However, I know that there would be ways to deal with this issue and make a grading system work -- and therefore, this is a conversation that I would like to continue with the WP. I think many students would appreciate a grading system, and I think that it could help to cut down on some of our workload issues.

9. I'd like to keep the essays ungraded, but not un-assessed or unevaluated. I myself use narrative remarks and grids, and I found many of Elbow's suggestions about horizontality and verticality good, too. In particular, I value the way that non-letter evaluation undercuts students' emphasis on grades and tries to direct that interest toward the work they're doing, instead. If we feel pressure to give grades on individual papers, does that pressure come from us?

10. I'm not at all sure how it would work - when I used to grade individual writing assignments (at another institution), students tended to write for the grade and downplay or ignore comments on how to actually improve the writing. So I'd have to spend some time unpacking the grade itself - what criteria are involved and so forth. But even if the Writing Program were to adopt a uniform approach and I was required to begin assigning letter grade on individual assignments, I'd still have students doing lots of group work, writing partnerships, assignment assessments and things like that, which are intended to give substance to both the assignment and to the method of assessment.

11. My "resistance" to grading essays is based on several beliefs. I believe grades encourage students to "stop" writing rather than continue; that grades distract from actual thinking or discovering what one thinks through writing or through understanding how the essay/formal writing is "reaching" an audience; and that grades often invoke a set of standards/skills we have to measure in order to select the grade as "teacher/assessors" constraint usually disallows risk-taking as one of the measures, even though I believe risk-taking and vulnerability are keys to unlocking "good" writing (and good writing process).

12. I agree with Elbow. I think grading essays would affect the way students approach the writing process. The same thing that happened when the university starting assigning grades would take place on a more frequent basis: students would be more concerned (and aggressive!) about getting a certain grade than understanding the principles of effective college level writing. I'm not sure why, but I suspect that grading essays may promote grade inflation.

13. I already use a grading rubric; so, while I don't put a letter grade on students' papers, students still get a sense of how they did. I, therefore, don't think giving a grade would change my pedagogy all that much. With or without grades, I would have students revise and continue to work on and refine their papers. That is, a grade on a paper would not necessarily be "the final word." While I understand and appreciate the rationale behind not giving grades, I would like to have the ability to give students grades as they so often seem anxious without them. Since students are so grade conscious and driven, I especially think that a really clear D or F could push/motivate those who check out.
14. Grading in a frosh level writing course simply makes no sense to me. Wouldn't it mean "punishing" students for not yet being the writers they can become? What would the criteria be for grading ESL folks? Or any non-practised analytical writer?

15. We teach our students that each assignment has its own purpose. Accordingly, I tailor my feedback strategies to fit the purpose and goals of each of my assignments. I meet in group conferences for the foundational or long assignments, and the longer verbal comments are completely necessary. Neither a written comment nor a grade could substitute for all that feedback I give them in conference. And I would like the option to *not* give them a letter grade in these instances so they have to work with my comments. However, having the *option* to give grades on certain assignments could help me meet my pedagogical goal of spending a LOT of time in conferences delivering a LOT of information without burning out on the smaller assignments. I am not one of those people who can just opt out of communication. I always feel obliged to supply long narrative comments on each of our (five required) essays. Having the option to communicate in a universal language on even a couple of those assignments could address the workload issue that, for many of us, has gotten out of hand (because I see SO many writing issues that need to be addressed--more and more, and this situation has changed drastically just in the last few years). I know I could achieve the "excellent" standard as a teacher more easily if I could just get my own work load under hand. My complete exhaustion is not helping them even though it's obvious that some of them need MUCH more than a single Writing 2 class can supply them. I'd like the option to experiment with grades to see if it would help. I can imagine it would help to be able to communicate directly with them within the academic discourse adopted by our entire campus--the letter grade--since they understand it. It *could* help those students who are obviously not even taking the time to read all our "blood, sweat, and tears" comments to perform a chin-up in their writing, since it doesn't take much time to read "C" for example. I would always accompany my grade with comments, but it's another form of communication that I would like to have available to me as needed.
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Committee’s Purpose
The research committee considered pedagogical approaches to teaching research, how the range of Writing 2 courses meet C2 requirements, and the role of research in C2 courses—in and of itself, as well as preparing students for upper-division writing in the majors. Beyond consideration of these and interrelated concerns (see below) we read some preliminary literature (Bean (1996, 2001) and Ballinger (in Newkirk, 1993), held a public colloquium (thanks to Roxi Hamilton) on research in writing courses, and put out a call for Writing 2 instructors’ research sequence assignments in order to survey and compare what’s being taught with greater specificity and empirical data. (Collecting assignments is being done in conjunction with the Writing Program eCommons archive site.)

Areas of Concern:
• the role of research in Writ 2/80b courses--how the unit fits into given courses
• ways of teaching research methods
• research paper as process—scaffolding activities
• teaching incorporation of sources
• how to pick topics
• how to guide students towards intellectually meaningful work
• argumentation in investigative/research papers
• types of sources
• role of librarians
• using reference materials (CQ Researcher, Gale Virtual Reference (encyclopedias))
• teaching citation in research papers
• maintenance of voice
• doing research for analytical and/or not specifically research papers
• types of paper genres we teach which require outside sources/research
• use of writing manuals or a research methods book (see Davis, The Rowan and Littlefield Guide to Writing With Sources)
• preparing students for research in the disciplines

Summary of Committee’s Work, Concerns and Plans
Our committee’s discussions and public colloquium have been generative in bringing to light both the successful range of practices we employ in teaching research and the inherent difficulties. While there’s a consensus, among committee members at least, that what would most benefit students is a separate “C3” course to teach research skills and writing specifically, over the course of an entire quarter, sharing what we actually do to teach the “inquiry” part of C2 courses is an extremely beneficial first step, especially since the likelihood of a new C3 requirement is slim (to say the least). The committee’s next task is to review specific assignments (hopefully as broad a range as possible) with one eye towards successful pedagogy and the other towards the C2 standards. (To that end the committee chair reviewed the C2 standards as an introduction to the colloquium.)

One philosophical tension the committee is cognizant of is between seeing ourselves as in service to the disciplines—as a preparatory, training-oriented program—as opposed to seeing what we do in Writing 2 (and Core) as an ends, in and of itself. The committee sees the skills of inquiry taught in C2 courses as crucial to students’ success in their upper-division courses. While we see our purpose as getting students to think, read and write critically, persuasively, passionately, etc. in general terms, to foster good general writing and reading skills, it’s with preparation in mind. Furthermore, communication with divisions and departments to more effectively teach with disciplinary conventions in mind strengthens the Writing Program’s relationships and stature across the university. Especially as we start to play a larger role in D.C. course instruction.

At our colloquium Lecturer Terry Terhaar generously took us through her Writ 2 course and showed us what a unique, single-project-by-way-of-many-pieces model can look like. It was eye-opening, instructive and represented one end of the spectrum of what a research sequence can be in Writing 2. It also highlighted many of the concerns outlined above of the committee.

For the upcoming academic year we will continue to work with Annette Marines, Head of Library Instruction, and review what our assignments look like in order to make sure what we’re doing collectively and what we say we’re supposed to be doing in terms of the C2 standards jibes. Additionally, the committee might consider revision of the C2 standards (which apparently weren’t sufficiently addressed and modified in the transition from Writing 1 to Writing 2). The committee could then put itself in a position to make a recommendation for or against more uniformity in teaching the research component of the C2 requirement (among other options and approaches). At the very least the committee will have an archive of assignments and can prepare a compendium of best practices and model assignments.
WRITING PROGRAM ACADEMIC PLAN

Submitted by James Wilson, Chair
21 December 2012

Background Description and Academic Context

1. What are the Writing Program’s strengths and current assets?

The strengths and current assets of the Writing Program are primarily five-fold: 1) addressing the increasingly multilingual needs of students who arrive at UC Santa Cruz without having satisfied the UC’s Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR); 2) collaborating with the colleges to ensure a successful Core course writing experience; 3) creating rigorous and diverse offerings of Writing 2; 4) building cross-divisional alliances and writing opportunities for students prior to their major’s Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirements; and 5) preparing graduate students to teach first-year writing at UC Santa Cruz and comparable institutions. Collectively, these pedagogical responsibilities align the Writing Program’s educational mission with that of the campus at large: to enhance and celebrate diversity, and to encourage inter-discipline research and overall academic excellence.

1) The Writing Program recognizes the multi-lingual reality of California middle and high school students. UC Santa Cruz moved closer to Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) status in fall 2012, and the Writing Program joins the campus in thoughtfully planning for the pedagogical challenges of teaching first-year writing to new university students throughout the second decade of the 21st century. As a result, many Writing Program faculty members are actively engaged in conducting research on best teaching practices for multilingual students in Core/Composition (C1) courses, ELWR courses, or Writing 2/Composition 2 (C2) courses—and all faculty members receive regular opportunities throughout the academic year to learn about and adopt new reading and writing strategies during brown-bag lunches, presentations, or informal colloquia.

2) While the Writing Program at UC Santa Cruz does not offer courses in English as a Second Language (ESL), a number of courses are available to or required every quarter for ELWR-unsatisfied students—including classes that focus on grammar. Particularly distinct pedagogical experiments have been tested over the past few years, especially the two-quarter “stretch” sequence of Core courses: 11 sections at three colleges for fall 2012 and winter 2013. Writing Program “stretch” faculty members have worked closely with Provosts to craft tailored yet quality instruction for students most at risk for not passing Core in only one quarter. Writing Program
Core instructors have also employed new and more targeted tutoring options for the most academically vulnerable of the Core students to ensure efficient and effective support for them in their first quarter as they strive for ELWR-satisfied status—a key to the campus’s retention goals.

3)
One of the great strengths and distinctive qualities of the Writing Program at UC Santa Cruz resides in its stable cadre of composition teachers who are professionally trained in the field of first year writing. Nearly 100% of the roughly 40 Writing Program faculty members have annual campus appointments, and the program currently therefore experiences virtually no personnel turnover. More than 1/3 of Writing Program Lecturers hold PhDs in disciplines relevant for teaching first year students but also as diverse as Environmental Studies, Cultural Geography, and Comparative Literature; more than 1/4 have joined the Writing Program after completing UC Santa Cruz degrees—all receiving solid mentorship in first year writing pedagogy at this campus. As a result, the Writing Program offers UC Santa Cruz students an array of Writing 2/C2 classes with a variety of thematic orientations but also with a set of common guiding principles around reading and writing skills.

4)
Several Writing Program faculty members have been actively involved in a range of entrepreneurial efforts. For the past two years, for example, the Writing Program ELWR Coordinator has been working with the UC Santa Cruz Education Department, utilizing a $250K grant to help high school English teachers in the Pajaro Valley Unified School District prepare for new state standards in reading and writing. Other faculty members have participated in successful cross-unit writing partnerships, with Latin and Latin American Studies (LALS) and Environmental Studies (ENVS) most notably. Finally, plans are underway to initiate a Certificate in Writing option for upper-division students; UC Santa Cruz alumni who took courses in Journalism or Communication and Rhetoric (two now disestablished Writing Program minors) will be encouraged to contribute to and partially sponsor this endeavor.

5)
The Writing Program accepts graduate students from a range of disciplines and requires a theory and practicum course for graduate students who will be hired to teach 12-18 sections of Writing 2 each year. Many of these students are mentored for several years by at least two Writing Program faculty members, and they often receive offers from college Provosts to teach sections of Core. By the time they complete their PhDs at UC Santa Cruz, they are well qualified to teach first year composition courses at a comparable four-year institution. In partnership with the Graduate Division, during 2012-2013 the Writing Program initiated a series of writing workshops and a colloquium for graduate students working on their dissertations. Four Writing Program Lecturers with recent PhDs planned and
facilitated the workshops and colloquium: a very positive exercise in faculty development.

None of the Writing Program’s faculty activity and curriculum would be possible without exceptional staff support. Fortunately, the Office Manager is superb in running all aspects of the Writing Program’s day-to-day budget, personnel, curricular, and space operations. She also supervises a well-qualified administrative assistant who is responsible for substantial clerical duties, student advising on the campus ELWR and C2 requirements, and ELWR logistics throughout the year. The Writing Program office move to the Humanities Building encourages inter-unit and intra-divisional collaboration and coordination, and has increased the number of students who walk-in for advising. However, the position of the administrative assistant should be increased from 50% to at least 75% in order to fully address the requests that come across his desk; this suggestion is in keeping with the historic staffing level for the Writing Program noted in the previous Academic Plan. A positive divisional response to this suggestion would also help to mitigate the Office Manager’s significant (60-hour work week) demands. The need to advise distressed students who need to satisfy their C2 requirement by the 7th quarter at UCSC is significant and not an area that can be scaled back. Writing Program staff also meets a high level of scheduling, curriculum planning (~200 courses annually), and personnel actions; without sufficient institutional support, the Writing Program could find its overall intelligent and skillful management seriously compromised.

2. How does the Writing Program fit into the academic landscape of its discipline or field of study?

The philosophy and structure of the Writing Program’s curricular responsibilities jointly drive its mission of excellence and innovation for first year writing instruction at UC Santa Cruz. All courses offered are designed to help students become more competent and confident writers of prose: to approach writing as an essential way to make discoveries about themselves and the world, and to communicate these discoveries to others. All courses emphasize the importance of recognizing audience and particular rhetorical situation and purpose, and all provide students with strategies of invention, organization, revision, and editing.

Together with the colleges, the Writing Program administers the writing components (C1, C2) of the campus general education requirements; administers the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) (formerly known as Subject A); and advises students about ways to fulfill these requirements. Writing Program instructors in each college participate in the college’s core course (which satisfied the C1 requirement) and counsel its students about their writing. Each year, the Writing Program offers Writing 2 (a lower-division course that satisfies the C2 requirement); the Writing 20, 21, 22, 23 series to help meet the needs of students who have not passed ELWR, including students with multilingual backgrounds; and Writing 169 and Writing 203, which offer instruction in the theory and practice of
teaching writing for peer tutors and graduate students, respectively.

The educational objectives for both C1 and C2 courses are published on the Writing Program’s webpage under “Quick Links”: “In completing UCSC’s two-quarter General Education Requirement in Composition, students learn how to become effective participants in university discourse, spoken as well as written.” Also published on the Writing Program’s webpage under “Quick Links” are two program assessment documents, both useful contributions to ensure a) that the program improves its overall curriculum effectiveness and b) that the educational objectives remain as uniform as possible across multiple offerings of C1/C2 with different instructors. Since the last Writing Program review, the General Education requirements and expectations of Core/C1 have changed; and the ELWR-unsatisfied student population has risen above 40%, a fact that impacts the teaching of C1 as well as C2.

Also since the last Writing Program review, however, new hires and current faculty research efforts and pedagogical innovation have not kept pace with changing student demographics whereby first-year students arrive at UC Santa Cruz increasingly exhibiting English Language Learning (ELL) and English of Multilingual Students (EMS) challenges in their writing. While holding occasional workshops or even summer institutes on best teaching practices indicate the Writing Program’s good disciplinary intentions, expert faculty with a scholarly profile in ESL or Applied Linguistics (Spanish and/or Chinese) are sorely needed. The opportunities for impact will be offered below under question #4. At the moment, the Writing Program admits that it cannot comprehensively teach the multilingual students that populate its Core, Writing 2, and especially ELWR courses; the full array of teaching strategies can neither be employed by present faculty nor passed along to graduate students taking the pedagogy course on preparing to instruct first-year writers at the university.

The 2007 program assessment, “Standards for Passing Papers in C2 Classes,” is a 95-page document that annotates nine papers from various C2 classes in order to articulate C2 principles and to demonstrate a range of student writing: high, medium, low, and not passing. The 2012 program assessment, “Standards for Passing Essays in Core/C1 Courses,” is a 60-page document that annotates eight essays from several college Core courses in order to articulate C1 principles and to demonstrate a range of student writing: high, medium, low, and not passing. This pilot study raised significant questions about how students write (and how faculty evaluate that writing) on distinctly different subject matter and in response to diverse assignments; it also provided a model for each college to conduct its own assessment and more precisely calibrate faculty and student expectations of un/successful writing given each college’s particular Core curriculum.

The educational objectives for the ELWR courses—Writing 20, 21, and 23—are also published on the Writing Program’s webpage under “Quick Links”: these ELWR courses “are taken by students who have been assessed or self-described as needing
additional work on their writing after Core and before moving on to C2. Like all writing courses, Writing 20, 21, and 23 offer practice in both reading and writing... on multiple levels. While the topics addressed in Writing 20, 21, and 23 will overlap with those in C2, these topics will generally be addressed in Writing 20, 21, and 23 with more explicit scaffolding and with more detailed articulation of the distinct strategies and skills that can be applied at any stage of the composing process.”

The Writing Program is currently in the midst of several assessment projects relevant to ELWR courses and to ELWR-unsatisfied sections of Core. Towards the end of each quarter, as select Writing Program faculty members gather to determine whether students’ portfolios have satisfied the ELWR requirement, the ELWR Coordinator leads norming sessions and provides examples of passing vs. not passing student essays. An assessment document with annotated sample essays will soon be published on the Writing Program webpage under “Quick Links.” Moreover, the Writing Program is continuing its ambitious multi-year assessment of the use of writing tutors for ELWR-unsatisfied students (a ~$45K annual budget that involves 70-75 writing tutors serving roughly 1,000 students); a four-year report on best practices, ELWR pass rates, and subsequent student success at the upper-division level is expected by spring 2014.

Throughout the academic year, all Writing Program Continuing Lecturers with an “a” 1/6th course equivalency take part in several program tasks essential to curriculum development, implementation, and assessment: the September writing placement exam that requires dozens of faculty proctors; the November writing placement exam and appeals readings to determine student ELWR status; winter and spring writing placement exams; regularly scheduled faculty meetings; etc. The process begins each September with the program’s annual retreat with committee assignments: grading, library collaboration, C2 research and pedagogy, ELWR and “stretch” assignments, etc. Committees meet once per quarter, and committee chairs report on their progress at least once per year at a program faculty meeting and then submit a short document to the Writing Program Chair at the end of the academic year.

Other ways that the Writing Program attempts to ensure active participation of the whole faculty in developing writing skills across the curriculum include different kinds of retreats and intellectual gatherings. For the last two years, several faculty members have partnered with Retention Services to lead a mid-September skills course for at-risk Bridge students new to UC Santa Cruz. “Stretch” faculty members, both new and experienced, also met for their first September retreat to exchange ideas and draft a best practices teaching handbook. Brown bag pedagogy lunches are also a regular feature of the Writing Program at which Continuing and pre-six Lecturers discuss topics ranging from strategies for teaching multilingual students to proposals for upcoming regional or national writing conferences. Partly as a result of these ongoing brown bag pedagogy lunches, during 2012-2013 several Continuing Lecturers presented papers at important regional and national writing conferences. In addition, pre-six Lecturers have been increasingly integrated into
teaching the ELWR curriculum’s full spectrum—including the 3rd and 4th quarter ELWR courses, Writing 21 and 23.

The Writing Program’s primary internal mechanism to obtain feedback and assessment data from students on teaching and course effectiveness comes in the form of end-of-quarter student evaluations. These evaluations are central to Lecturers’ academic reviews. Lecturers are expected to read each student’s assessments and comments and, in their statements of pedagogy, to address any areas of concerns. Members of the Writing Program Personnel Committee read all student evaluations relevant to a Lecturer’s review—as do the Humanities Dean and the Divisional Committee on Academic Personnel. The evaluation form for Writing 2 is especially detailed and thorough in covering an array of skills; it was redesigned since the previous Writing Program review specifically to enhance feedback for faculty so that they might improve their teaching. Given the fall 2013 shift to a divisional online evaluation form, the legacy of the Writing Program evaluation form at this point is unclear.

3. What societal issues or needs are addressed by the work of the Writing Program? How do the ideas, projects, or opportunities associated with it contribute to that issue or need?

In addition to the ELWR tutoring noted above, the Writing Program’s signal contributions to undergraduate education are its outreach efforts and its commitment to excellence in first year student writing. Partnering with UC Santa Cruz’s Education Department, for the past two years the Writing Program has helped local middle school and high school teachers prepare their students for the rigor of college and career work through analytical reading and writing, as required by the new Common Core State Standards. The program, called Alliance for Language and Literary Instruction Effecting Standards (ALLIES), works with up to 40 English teachers from Watsonville, Pajaro Valley, and Aptos high schools.

The purposes of the Writing Program in concerning itself with outreach are to remain engaged with the present and next generation of California high school students—their cultural and linguistic make-up, as well as their personal and professional aspirations. Writing Program faculty share their pedagogy with K-12 teachers (in the long tradition of the Central California Writing Project, which the late Don Rothman directed for more than two decades). As a result, all teachers are challenged to enhance their teaching practices—and perhaps to recommit themselves to improving student retention at UC Santa Cruz; and Writing Program faculty can represent UC Santa Cruz positively to the greater community—as their public service contributions are displayed in other ways, such as teaching adult education classes for Santa Cruz County or volunteering to work with immigrants on acquiring or polishing their English language skills.
Now in its third year, the Humanities Don Rothman Writing Award honors the academic achievements of first year students at UC Santa Cruz. An annual October awards ceremony in front of family, friends, and writing faculty (who are also recognized for their pedagogical excellence) celebrates Rothman Endowment winners with a certificate, monetary compensation, and essay publication on the Writing Program’s webpage. In fall 2012, four student winners (1st and 2nd place, plus two Honorable Mentions) were acknowledged; their essays were selected from among more than 70 submissions as the most impressive in demonstrating—as the award guidelines articulate—“serious engagement with issues raised in the class, including the importance and impact of other writers’ ideas.” Named for Writing Program emeritus Don Rothman, the Endowment this year should easily surpass the sustainable mark of $25,000, having received (sometimes multiple) donations from more than 40 contributors; the Humanities Rothman award for first year student writing is perhaps the Writing Program’s most visible and successful profile to the campus, and the Endowment serves as a way for the public to join with the Humanities Division in supporting and shaping academic excellence at UC Santa Cruz.

Opportunities for Impact, and Writing Program Goals

4. What strategies and priorities does the Writing Program plan for the years ahead?

As suggested earlier, the Writing Program recognizes the need to hire new faculty with expertise in ESL and/or Applied Linguistics who can bring to UC Santa Cruz new writing strategies to effectively engage UC Santa Cruz’s increasing multilingual student population. Recruitment plans have been submitted to the division to hire up to two Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOEs). The pedagogical impact of two new academic senate members could be both immediate and far-reaching within the Writing Program and across the campus. ELWR courses constitute nearly 50% of the Writing Program’s curriculum offerings (and more than 50% of the budget); and faculty teaching courses for ELWR-unsatisfied students would welcome the addition of colleagues who are trained and practiced in teaching writing to ELL and generation 1.5 students. Moreover, faculty across the disciplines and the divisions work with students in DC courses whose English skills remain problematic even if they have successfully passed their lower-division C2 requirement. The opportunities for collaboration have never been greater or more promising.

In particular, the Writing Program envisions the possibility by 2016 or 2017 of hiring an LSOE who might be appointed jointly to the Language Program. The Chairs of both programs have already held several conversations around the future of the UC Santa Cruz campus: 25%+ Latino students, a significant group of Asian-born or Asian-language heritage students (who populate the 3rd and 4th quarter ELWR
courses), and a growing cohort of international students whose language of origin is predominantly Chinese. A joint LSOE hire would engage in scholarship to help keep the Writing Program current in its field of composition studies (and the Language Program current in teaching ESL) while also building bridges with other academic units such as Latin American and Latino Studies (LALS).

Pending such LSOE hires, the Writing Program is planning to hold a 3-day summer 2013 pedagogy institute devoted to current theories of teaching composition to multilingual students. A UC colleague, with experience leading workshops and teaching ELWR courses to ESL/EMS and ELL students, would equip UCSC Writing Program faculty with new writing strategies for first-year students who present increasingly complex linguistic and academic challenges. Prior to summer 2013, the Writing Program is also piloting a spring quarter 3-unit Writing 22B course aimed to support select post-stretch students concurrently enrolled in a section of Writing 2. The focus of Writing 22B would be to assist students with their research assignments in any section of Writing 2: to identify the skills sets needed to search for sources relevant to a particular topic; to analyze the purpose of sources and how each source offers different kinds of insight into a chosen topic; and to improve the linguistic facility (grammar, usage, idiomatic expression, sentence boundaries, paragraph transitions and internal control, etc.) of first-year students as they complete their final lower-division writing requirement. This Writing 22B pilot course (modeled after Writing 22A, taken in fall quarter by students who struggle with Core/C1 writing) expects to address various pedagogical concerns, especially in light of the UCSC Library’s budgetary decision to end Writing 2 research assistance (individual 1-hour library research sessions for each Writing 2 section) as of 2013-2014. For retention purposes alone, Writing 22B promises benefits for students from under-represented backgrounds whose academic preparation in high school often leaves them vulnerable to performing poorly on rigorous research assignments.

Ideally, towards multiple new pedagogical ends, in five years the Writing Program will look younger and more diverse. It will look forward to the next wave of composition theory more than it will gaze nostalgically on the halcyon days of process-focused publication and practice in the 1960s and 1970s. It will anticipate and create effective pedagogy for 21st century California students rather than defending past (and sometimes outdated) teaching methodologies. For the summer of 2013 the Writing Program is planning for a 3-day Institute devoted to immersing faculty in the national conversation around teaching strategies for multilingual students. Such an Institute, led by a current expert in the field, would admittedly constitute only the first of many steps needed to revamp the Writing Program at UC Santa Cruz; but present faculty are willing and excited by the prospects of applying the best ideas of their discipline.

Institutionally, the Writing Program is poised to enact its vision—in great part because of a more fixed financial model for mounting its ELWR, C1, and C2 curriculum. In addition, the program can realistically sustain a healthy mixture of
senate faculty leadership, Continuing Lecturers, and Pre-Six Lecturers. Pedagogically, the Writing Program embraces the exigencies of multilingual and multicultural California. While many Lecturers wish for a more robust academic unit that regularly offered an array of the program's upper-division courses, most faculty concede that they are poised for a reinvigorated dialogue with the campus at large. The Writing Program's academic mission over the next five years will be committed to ensuring the success of all students admitted to UCSC, regardless of their skills sets or their cultural/linguistic diversities.
Interrogating Education

Why are many students apathetic about what courses they take, the papers they "have" to write? If a course (like this one) is "required," who's doing the requiring, and why? And why are the woes of higher education so much in the news? In this class we'll explore who decides what "good" writing is and who benefits/who is excluded by these criteria, and we'll investigate who determines what constitutes an "education" and what political/social consequences accrue from various definitions, priorities, and choices. As you dig into debates about what's wrong with education (are students at fault? or teachers? or administrators? or legislators? or taxpayers? or...?), you'll become more adept as critical thinkers and interrogators of situations and issues (better able to discern writers' hidden agendas, competing values, unspoken assumptions, and slippery uses of evidence). And as you learn that professors/professionals read/write/think in ways differently from most students, you'll become more strategic users of language (more proficient in arguing, organizing, marshalling evidence, and in general employing the "secret codes" of academia, but also able to interrogate the conventions of academic writing). Required texts for this course are Rosenwasser and Stephen's Writing Analytically (5th ed only, NOT 6th!), and Graff and Birkenstein’s They Say, I Say (any edition, w/o readings), as well as a course reader.

The Story

This course focuses on the theme of stories: from narratives where what actually happened is questionable, to how we can think of intellectual writing as telling a story. We will write about a personal story, analyze long-form journalism—both print and audio—look at media coverage of current events, and write an investigative essay based on student research. Texts include articles from The New Yorker, Wired, The New York Times and others; podcasts of This American Life, The Moth, RadioLab, Studio 360, Bullseye and On the Media. This course prepares students to write across the disciplines. Students can expect to learn about all steps of the writing process—planning, drafting, revising and editing, to read interesting selections, and to engage in lively discussion.

What’s in the New Yorker

What makes writing good? To examine what makes a good discussion of something, students in this class will read and write about The New Yorker, the national magazine most noted for its peerless, interesting writing and cartoons. What do you find interesting? What is the role of surprise? These and other questions will spur your own writing in a variety of different directions. There will be frequent writing assignments, formal and informal, in class and out, drawing on what you learn about good writing from reading it every week. You can see part of the current issue at www.newyorker.com.

Writing About Food

From celebrity chefs to organic eating, from Fast Food Nation to the Slow Food movement, food has entered the popular imagination as never before. This course will explore the myriad ways people write about food today, paying particular attention to the stylistic modes and rhetorical strategies that writers employ when discussing a topic that is at once intimate and social, a basic necessity and an art form. We will look at restaurant reviews, cookbooks, diet guides, magazine and newspaper articles, blogs, memoirs, cultural and social histories, and other kinds of writing that deal with eating, cooking, the food industry, the politics of consumption, how food shapes personal and group identities, and much more. This course is first and foremost about writing, and its goal is to help you develop your writing through a range of informal and formal assignments that emphasize writing as a process through regular revision, peer workshops, and writing conferences.
Radical Writing

Do you find yourself frustrated by society’s complacency with respect to pressing issues like the degradation of our land bases or the growing disparity between the rich and the poor? Do you find yourself writing or reading impassioned treatises on solutions to problems facing the United States today? If so, join us as we explore the perspectives of American radicals, who will help us to rethink our approach to issues such as environmental activism, healthcare, immigration, and education.

As a participant in this class, you will be asked to read and consider the feasibility of ideas put forth by radicals such as Derrick Jensen (who argues that we ought to blow up dams to liberate rivers and save salmon), Ward Churchill (who argues that pacifism is a pathology), and members of the California arm of the Occupy Movement.

All writing projects will be based in research, and we will learn how to locate information that is typically hidden from us (for instance, through using primary research techniques and through making Freedom of Information requests). In addition, you will have the opportunity to contribute your own radical writing to the world; the final assignment in the class will ask you to prepare a manifesto on a topic that has been discussed in class.

Writing our Relationship to Animals

What is the nature of the relationship between human beings and the animal kingdom? In this composition course, we will explore the interdependence of humans and animals through critical reading and analytical writing. While animals are a vital and meaningful presence in our collective and individual lives, our attitude towards them is ambivalent and our treatment of them contradictory. We will investigate a wide variety of texts, including pieces by Frans de Waal, Jane Goodall, and George Orwell, as well as current news stories related to animals. Thinking and writing about our perceptions of and relationships with animals will help us make ethical determinations about animals’ rights and welfare in human society.

Writing the Emerging Africa: beyond the four D’s

Charlayne Hunter-Gault, an award-winning American journalist who recently moved to Johannesburg, South Africa to work for NPR and CNN, stated in an October 2006 interview that Americans “aren’t getting the information they need to understand Africa. Reporting [in the US] is dominated by the four d’s ... death, disease, disaster and despair. ... If all you hear about is hunger, drought, disease and conflict, people conclude that Africa’s problems are intractable and that nothing in Africa ever changes.” In this course, we will examine two pervading notions of Africa as a lost continent: first, that Africa is lost from our view, or as in Hunter-Gault’s criticism of American media, only partially—and usually negatively—viewed; second, that Africa is somehow hopelessly lost due to “the four d’s. ... death, disease, disaster and despair.” In this composition course, we will examine these four d’s, but we will also strive to discover, through research, critical reading, and analytical writing, other, more complex and balanced visions of an Africa emerging into our view. We will research varied texts to find a new set of “d’s” of our own, with the intention of composing original, informative, and elegantly written essays. Goals of this course include helping you become a discerning reader, an incisive thinker, and an assured and effective writer capable of participating in the scholarly discourse of the university. The course will encourage you to create new strategies for generating and supporting ideas, improve your skill and confidence as a researcher and writer, and expand your understanding of the writing process through active revision—all while you articulate your own emerging knowledge of this enigmatic continent.
Films, Flaws and Fantasies: Character on the Screen

How do filmmakers create characters who are profound, delightful, disturbing, unforgettable? In this course we will examine the cinematic elements which bring these characters to vivid reality, from the unique choices made by the actors to the powerful rhetorical tools employed by directors—such as cinematography, music, editing, and mise en scene (visual composition). Works of Sofia Coppola, Lars von Trier, Wong Kar-Wai, and Robert Rodriguez, among others, will be examined.

Creating Green

Despite scary environmental headlines and trendlines, people are energized by the opportunity to rethink and redesign everything. In this section, we will generate creative green solutions, especially using social entrepreneur approaches. In the process, we will investigate and make sense out of a variety of complex and often scientific environmental issues, debates, and discussions, making persuasive arguments about them through understanding rhetorical principles. Students will engage in understanding and communicating concepts in environmental science, social justice and/or engineering, including communicating in different media for a variety of audiences and purposes. As in every Writing 2 course, students in this class will write several substantive essays, including a final research project. The final project will be a collaborative creative solution to an environmental problem.

Gaia's Revenge

This class is designed for those taking the College 8 Core 81C course, Designing a Sustainable Future, which will explore energy, transportation and emerging green technology (other student may enroll if space permits). We will investigate how to find and make sense out of a variety of readings related to environmental issues and make persuasive arguments about them through understanding rhetorical principles. Students will engage in understanding and communicating concepts in environmental science, including communicating in different media for a variety of audiences and purposes. As in every Writing 2 course, students in this class will write several substantive essays, including a final research project. The final project will be a collaborative group project, a creative solution to an environmental problem—ideally using a social entrepreneur approach.

Breaking Science

We will investigate and make sense out of a variety of complex issues in science, including tracking current news from issues of Science and Nature magazines (www.sciencemag.org and www.nature.com) and other sources. We will engage in understanding and communicating concepts in the physical and biological sciences, including communicating in different genres for a variety of audiences and purposes. Rhetorical principles will be engaged in forming persuasive arguments. As in every Writing 2 course, students in this class will write several substantive essays, including a research project (literature review) and a convincing, persuasive paper based on researched sources. Emphasis is on the relationships between good science and good writing, between clear thinking and clear writing. Multiple papers with substantive revisions required.

Climate Change, Biodiversity, and the Environment

Students will explore a major ecological problem: global climate change and the loss of biodiversity on planet Earth. Students choose a major essay topic, then complete several writing assignments that navigate the process of writing a research essay. Each student follows the same process as a scientist or policy analyst reviewing the current state of knowledge on a scientific or environmental issue. Individual writing assignments will be revised and then incorporated into the final essay. Although the class emphasizes reading, understanding, and writing scientific and policy reviews and arguments, non-science students will find the step-by-step writing process helpful for crafting written arguments in any discipline.
The Meaning of Food

A food movement of national proportion is astir, involving a network of activists, farmers, farm workers, entrepreneurs, and consumers. This course examines the myriad current debates between the organic movement and industrialized agriculture and the political forces at work, ending on a savory note as we examine the reasons for today’s piqued interest in farmers’ markets and Slow Food. While studying both popular and scholarly works, including such leading authors as Eric Schlosser and Michael Pollan, students are asked to consider how food shapes culture and how consumers affect this paradigm. We will also examine current literature on Farm Bill 2012. With whetted appetites, students will experiment with a various writing genres, beginning with a food memoir. Assignments include an analysis of contemporary texts and a research paper on a food-related topic of the student’s choice. To avail ourselves of the opportunities on campus and within the Santa Cruz community, we will also visit a Farmers Market and the UCSC Farm. The course uses a course reader and two texts: Eric Schlosser's Fast Food Nation and Michael Pollan's The Omnivore’s Dilemma.

Writing Across the Arts

In this class, students explore and write about various art forms—including poetry, visual art, music, performance, and cinema—on their own terms and in relation to other genres. There is a focus throughout on poetry and the inter-arts: i.e writing that is somehow “cross-genre,” such as performance poetry, visual art that includes text, including early inter-arts work by Futurists, Dadaists, and Surrealists. Students will also have ample opportunity to explore artists and movements of their own choosing in essays that require research. Our main goal is to learn how to write strong analytical essays that emerge from a variety of writing situations, such as explications, reviews, and researched position papers. This course will encourage students to work together as readers of each other’s papers and will require a significant amount of reading, informal writing for yourself and more formal writing for others.

Not Just Funny Animals and Superheroes

This course will explore the relationship between words and pictures, focusing on graphic novels (commix). The purpose of the course is for each student to discover effective strategies for purposeful and confident writing. We will read graphic novels and critical writing about comics; we will pay special attention to the act of reading words and pictures. We will practice analysis, debate, close reading, and research as we engage contemporary discussions about the (contested) literary category “graphic novel.” Students will produce a range of formal and informal writing, and will participate in class discussions developing ideas about written and pictorial rhetoric and the craft of making comics. This is a good course both for those who have a prior history with comics and those who don’t.

Writing About Film

This course focuses on writing and the study of film. Students will examine the formal aspects of filmmaking, such as mise-en-scène, camera angle, lighting and montage, and how these and other techniques help to construct “meaning.” Films are not ideologically neutral but highly charged “texts” put together to convey very specific messages, and students will explore the nuances of reading screen drama, from its attractive but illusive visual field to the politics of representation that informs so many of its narratives. But much of the day to day work of the course will be devoted to improving our writing, and we will spend a good deal of time practicing the techniques and strategies that are intended to help us produce clear, concise and effective essays. We will follow a “process” approach to writing, which includes brainstorming sessions on developing an argument, small group discussions on how to incorporate outside sources and workshops on editing and revising an essay. Students will write five papers altogether (including a research-based paper); each will involve draft work, peer reviews, editing, research and documentation. The text for this section is Writing 2 Reader (Faunce). Students will also be required to view three films outside of class.
Leisure, Labor, and Slacking

In its study of the way that our culture looks at leisure, work, boredom, and slacking, this course will explore the following questions: How have our society’s notions of work and play shifted over the years? What is the history of the weekend? What do popular leisure activities (including hobbies, travel, media consumption, etc.) reveal about our personal and social ideologies? What does it mean—personally, culturally, politically—to announce that you are bored? How have recent films and novels depicted your generation as a collection of misguided slackers? What is the social/political history of the slacker? How do the various ways in which we waste time function as cultural statements, acts of resistance, and acts of self-defeat or self-definition? Course readings will draw on theories of labor, Marxism, leisure studies, gender studies, philosophy, and popular culture. We will use our theme as a framework in which to practice various forms of writing, both formal and informal.

Languages, Lingos, and Literacy

What language(s) do you speak to your family? to your friends? to your teachers and supervisors? What kind of lingo do you use in a text message? In an card that you send to your grandmother? Whether you only speak English or you are bi- or tri-lingual, chances are you are fluent and literate in many ways of communicating. In this Writing 2 course, discussions and paper topics will focus on this theme of language and communication, varying from your personal experiences with language to national debates about bilingual education and the English-only movement. Course readings will be primarily non-fiction essays in which writers explore their own experiences with writing, reading, speaking, translating, understanding, and misunderstanding language(s). Writing assignments will prompt you to develop a range of voices attuned to the needs of specific readers and specific contexts (both academic and non-academic); assignments will include personal narratives, letters, reflections, and essays using comparison, analysis, research, and argument.

Wave-Writing: the Rhetoric of Surf Culture

In this course, we explore the dynamics of ‘surf culture’—the set of social, cultural, economic, political, and environmental elements involved in the activity of surfing. This dynamism invites us to think, read, and write about surf culture, often through the interdisciplinary frameworks of Ethnic Studies, Feminist Studies, Postcolonial Studies, and Environmental Studies. Whether we reflect on the images and messages conveyed in a ‘surf film,’ interrogate the motivations behind localism through reading scholarly and fictional prose, or represent our ideas on the debates about coastal cliff erosion and building seawalls, surf culture provides an entire ocean of elements to be curious and write about! The broad range of course materials will provide the basis for our discussions and will constantly ask you to consider why you find certain materials intriguing, problematic, complicated, and/or convincing. By thinking critically about surf culture and the rhetoric that is a part of it, we will explore the processes involved in making our writing convincing, coherent, fluid and engaging.

Reading the News

This class examines the way meaning is made through print news as a way to think about how meaning is made in any writing meant for readers: how facts are selected, arranged, and presented; how positions are characterized and represented; how arguments are made and contested; how "objectivity" enables and obscures. Because news is meant to be read, examining the news also means analyzing approaches to different audiences. Though there will likely be opportunities to examine news in other formats (e.g., excerpts from The Daily Show or from Fox News, Politico.com or Slate.com, radio spots) this class will concentrate primarily on print news. Readings will include the daily New York Times and selections from weekly news and culture magazines, alongside previously selected articles available either by course reader or in electronic format. Research questions will be drawn from the news as it evolves over the quarter. Students will write regularly, revise often, and frequently work with peers.
The Writing Process


– Samuel Beckett

In order to grow as writers we need to write, write, and write some more, and we need to push ourselves and take chances: to fail better. In addition to working through an extensive writing process (drafting, sharing and receiving feedback from your peers, reflecting, revising, and copyediting), the course will also focus on helping you understand the choices available to you as a writer. You will write several major essays: a personal narrative, a how-to essay, a persuasive letter, an essay in which you will interact with texts by other authors, an essay in which you will use research to add to a conversation about a particular topic that interests you, and a final reflection of your own work throughout the quarter. You’ll also be required to keep a writer’s notebook—some of this writing will be related to the essays, some will be more informal (like a journal). Readings will include Peter Elbow’s Writing With Power, Anne Lamott’s “Shitty First Drafts,” Lorrie Moore’s “How to Become a Writer,” Debra Seagal’s “Tales From the Cutting-Room Floor,” and George Saunders’ “In Persuasion Nation.” The goal of this course is to help students develop their writing abilities, not only for college assignments, but for writing powerfully in the rest of their lives.

Happiness in Modern Society

Does money make us happy? Can meditation improve our sense of well-being? How can we find meaning in our lives? In this section of Writing 2 we will discuss these questions and many others relating to the topic of happiness. The readings for this course are drawn from a number of different disciplines and traditions: philosophy, psychology, sociology, environmentalism, social criticism, and Buddhism. These readings explore not only the personal choices and conditions that contribute to our individual well-being, but also the social norms and practices that affect all of us in American society today. Through a thoughtful engagement with these ideas, you will be encouraged to think critically and write papers that you really care about. Everyone will participate in class discussions, work collaboratively in peer groups, write several formal and informal papers, and complete the course with a multi-stage research essay.

Literature as a Weapon: Reading and Writing about Fiction

ONCE UPON A TIME, mankind clawed its way from the primordial abyss. People fought the elements; they fought each other; they fought the beasts that circled their fires. They hid themselves in trees and caves; they built castles and cities. And, then, they sat down to tell stories about it all, stories to make them laugh and to make them cry, to inspire fear and to instill pride. For Aristotle, fiction was more powerful than history; for Plato it was so threatening that he banished it from his Republic; for Shelley, poets were nothing less than then acknowledged legislators of the world. Through short fiction by authors ranging from Tolstoy and James to Cortázar, Conrad, and Cheever, this course will explore various attempts to narrate the human experience while helping students to develop the writing skills—how to generate topics, how to structure cogent and persuasive arguments, how to employ evidence—needed to engage fruitfully with all texts. Reflecting a collaborative writing process that includes invention and research, as well as drafting, revising, and editing, assignments will seek to promote the composition of trenchant, inventive, and elegant essays.
**Kill Your Television?**

In this course, we will investigate American society through the lens of popular television programs, and in doing so, take critical stances on the limits and possibilities of television as a venue for cultural criticism. That is, we will analyze media while also examining how to use it to dissect American trends, values, and norms. We will ground such discussions in the following questions: Why study pop culture in an academic context? What does our obsession with reality TV reveal about us as a society? Do reality-based programs serve as modern-day, re-imagined freak shows? Can the comedic, as witnessed in cartoons like Family Guy and South Park, serve as potent satire? Do such shows, through their ridiculousness and exaggeration, go beyond what is often seen as offensive spectacle? What role do “fake” news programs like The Daily Show with Jon Stewart and The Colbert Report play in society? Even though they are meant to entertain, can we learn from, and be enriched by, their witty reporting? To help us answer these questions, we will read journalistic and academic articles, using them as fodder for class discussions and models of purposeful writing. You will also compose both informal responses to these texts and more formal essays, utilizing what you have read as support for your own arguments. To further your engagement with the course topics, you will also conduct outside research. Each assignment will allow you to play with different rhetorical moves and modes of inquiry, much of which you will collaborate on with your peers. And, because writing is a messy process, revision will be a key component of the class, each formal essay going through multiple idea-generating, drafting, and refining steps.

**Sites of Conflict, Reflections of Justice**

In this course we will read about, explore, and write on a number of contemporary social problems and conflicts. Our work will also include—through reading, discussions, and writing—a consideration of various approaches to social justice. We will begin the quarter by reading several short selections, all of which open up a series of challenging and provocative questions. We’ll look at specific issues on cities and the urban struggle, history, race and class, gang membership, gentrification, community activism, and other current topics of interest to students in the class. We will also take some time to think about, consider, and write on the different ways that artists, writers, musicians, activists predict a just society. Readings will include selections by Howard Zinn, Noam Chomsky, Gloria Anzaldúa, bell hooks, Jorja Leap, Luis Rodriguez, and others. Students will write several short essays throughout the quarter as well as one longer research paper that will involve an overview of the research process. Revision will be a major focus of all writing projects.

**Visualizing Health: Nutrition and the Mass Media**

In this section of Writing 2 we will explore the ways in which mass media and other channels of social communication promote messages about health and well being. Through formal essays and class discussion, students will critically examine written arguments about the politics of health and food, as well as conduct inquiry into how messages shape human perception about health, body image and well being.

Three primary tools of inquiry and exploration are essential to our study of the rhetoric strategies of academic writings and mass communication: essay writing, analytical reading and class discussion. Conscientious engagement with these tools will help you fulfill the most important goal of this class—increasing your command of the principles of writing effective, college-level, academic essays.
Youth Identity in a Networked Culture

In this course, we will investigate how to write effectively, for multiple audiences, by examining how we invent and reinvent ourselves online in contemporary America. In the process, we will read and respond to a variety of texts, focusing on the ways in which our identities—including our own digital selves—are created and manipulated online. We will seek to answer questions such as these: What are the kinds of writing youth are producing online to engage in their own process of identity production? What kinds of learning take place online or in virtual worlds? How is your constructed online self a mirror of your own identity? How have you been defined by your personal involvement with social media, social networks, and digital devices? You will write a number of essays, including a research paper, and will also engage in informal response writing. Additionally, you will participate in regular writing groups--peer editing conferences designed to help improve the style, content, and structure of your written work.

The Humanities and Climate Change

What do the humanities have to contribute to understanding the causes and effects of climate change? We are accustomed to thinking of climate change as featuring principally within the spheres of science and politics--with disciplines like history, literature, spirituality and philosophy on the sidelines of this important contemporary issue.

Examining both fiction and non-fiction we will look at the ways in which writers, historians, artists and philosophers shape our understanding of the relationships between nature, modernity and humanity. Some of the texts we will read are Bill McKibben's *The End of Nature*, Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, Donovan Hohn’s *Moby Duck*, and Henry David Thoreau’s *Walden*. Students will have the opportunity to apply these analytical frameworks and methods to their own writing and research projects. This course will emphasize the writing and revision process as well as peer collaboration in weekly writing workshops. All majors are welcome.

War Stories

This is a writing course that addresses the theme of war. We will read a number of war stories, and some critical pieces on war, focusing on certain aspects of war as it has existed in the twentieth century. In addition, you will keep up with current events, keeping a journal of your daily engagement with the news media and, eventually, generating and crafting a research essay that grows out of your engagement. Throughout the quarter we will also be writing a lot, and reflecting on the different aspects and skills involved in the writing process: exploratory writing, such as brainstorming or free writing; reading closely and assessing sources; summarizing and making arguments; researching and gathering information; planning and structuring a written composition; revision and peer feedback; editing, formatting, and polish. This is a course about writing, and about war, and about writing about war—and about being at war with writing.

Like Us on Facebook: Reading, Writing, and Living with Technology and New Media

One of the guiding ideas behind the class is that in order to be better readers and writers, we have to understand the media through which we get our information. Therefore, we'll be focusing on how new technologies shape the way we think and act, with special attention to the internet and social media. We'll try to tackle some deep questions, such as: What can social networks like Facebook tell us about how we construct identity? Does Google make us stupid? and How can we ethically address the digital divide? The course culminates in a research paper at the end of the quarter. By analyzing new media and technology in this Writing 2 class, you'll also learn how to be more discerning consumers of information and, thus, better researchers.
The Creative Spirit

"Imagination is more important than knowledge."

—Albert Einstein

A course designed to explore the role of creativity and the imagination in the development of children and in the lives of adults. Working with both informal and formal essays, course readings, and individual research, we will focus on a wide range of topics related to creativity. Field research and other forms of creative community involvement are encouraged. Each student will design and present a final project expressing her/his creativity.

Telling Our Stories: Autobiography as a Radical Act

What compels us to tell our stories and to listen to the stories of others? How well does what we tell about ourselves convey “the truth”? How do our individual stories contain the stories of our people and “the narrative of the nation”? How can telling our stories be a powerful political act? We will focus on these questions and others as we explore the nature of autobiography. Throughout the quarter we will read, read about, and create autobiography as we strive to develop effective writing strategies. The work of the course will include formal and informal writing assignments, both personal and analytical. We will also explore methods for inventing and developing ideas, for organizing ideas intentionally, and for drafting, revising, and editing. This course is about the power of telling and the power of listening. Writing helps us to think more clearly, and writing about ourselves and others will help us to better understand who we are and why what we have to say really matters.

Where the Wild Things Are

Through both formal essays and informal writing assignments, class presentations and seminar discussions, this writing course will wrestle with different notions of “wild,” “wilderness,” “human” and “civilized” and the interplay amongst these concepts. A few of the many questions we might consider are: How do we define the wild without resorting to nature-environmental cliche? Do we need to have wild spaces even if – especially if – we never see them? How does wilderness – or wildness – shape humanness? This set of questions is by no means exclusive. Students’ specific interests will shape the particular path this course will take.

Mysteries of the Brain: Dr. Oliver Sacks & *The New York Review of Books*

Why do we enjoy music? Why can we dance while no other animal species can? How does memory work and how reliable are our memories? These are just some of the many questions raised by neurologist Oliver Sacks who, in a series of essays in the New York Review of Books (NYR), challenges us to pose our own questions about how the brain works. In this course, we will read a variety of provocative essays by Sacks and other contributors to the NYR. While Sacks’ pieces on the mysteries of the brain will prompt our research projects, we will also read a variety of contributors to the NYR on subjects ranging from film criticism to contemporary debates. Requirements for this course include active class participation, short weekly readings from the NYR, informal writing exercises, and a series of formal essays each of which involves research and several substantive revisions. After taking this course, you will not only be more confident in your academic writing, but also more comfortable conversing with your professors and friends! Required texts for this course include a (discounted) subscription to the *New York Review of Books,* *They Say / I Say: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing* by Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein (w/o readings) and J. Trimble’s *Writing with Style* all available at Bay Tree.
Composition and Decomposition: Writing and the Undead

Monsters, like books, exist only to be read. Each is a sign to be interpreted; each signifies something other than itself. Of all monsters, none quite has the plasticity of the zombie. As a metaphor, the zombie is the most fungible of all monsters because it can be used to represent so many different cultural anxieties. This is perhaps why it has become the dominant monster of our age; this is why some have labeled us Generation Z. Dead has become the new alive. This intensive writing course will explore the contemporary phenomenon of the zombie and use the figure of the undead to promote inquiry, research, and purposeful writing. Close attention will also be paid to the conventions of academic writing, the art of persuasion, and the craft of the sentence. Our readings will range from Plato to Edgar Allen Poe, from the films of George A. Romero (Night of the Living Dead) to the graphic novels of Robert Kirkman (The Walking Dead).

Writing Disney

Whether you are Mickey's #1 fan, or you would rather catch that mouse in a trap, there is no denying that Disney has a major impact on our culture. In this class, we'll explore the role of the mega corporation that is Disney, looking at the myriad ways Disney affects notions about family, vacations, and identity. From theme parks to film, we'll explore the way Disney shapes who we are, taking an especially close look at the messages Disney sends to children. It may well be the happiest place on earth, but in this class, we'll have some fun critiquing Disney, with our ears on and our eyes wide open!

Do We Have Alternatives?

What kind of choices do we have about how to live and organize ourselves in this society? In an age of economic and environmental instability, are there ways of living together that are more economically, socially and environmentally viable?

In this course we will look at different ways of arriving at conclusions about how to live. We will examine how different authors have expressed their personal experiences and views about the world. These writings occur in different forms of inquiry: in personal reflection, academic papers, fiction, and more. In classroom discussion, small group work, and written assignments, we will consider a variety of ways an author can choose to articulate his or her values. You will hone your ability to express yourself in a variety of different ways. A research component will address alternatives: communal living, artist colonies and cooperatives, among others.

Please see introductory note for goals and practices shared by all Writing 1/2 classes.
Writing for Social Justice: Perspective Taking and Taking a Stand

Our best writing happens when we care passionately about our topics. That sense of passion often emerges in relation to social issues that affect us personally every day, such as multiculturalism, gender in society, schools and education, race, class, weight, disability, youth culture, freedom and responsibility, the environment, sexual orientation and gender identity. This course offers a safe space to practice our writing as an avenue of engagement, so that we can understand issues more thoughtfully and deeply, communicate that understanding to the public, and advocate for positive social change.

We will read widely in a variety of literature that addresses these issues, from nonfiction to fiction to drama to poetry. As we read, discuss and write, we will work to see ourselves within a tradition of these authors who have used the power of the pen to inspire new ways of thinking, and have changed our world for the better. This writing course also focuses on the visual power of TV and film, which combined with print media, help raise awareness of social problems and advocate for solutions.

During the course, we will often raise the question of how individuals from different gender, racial, generational, religious, political and economic groups may understand the same social and ethical issues. All students will engage in class discussions, participate in collaborative group work, and write several formal and informal papers.

Writing about Hawai‘i

In this class, students explore the writing process by examining representations of Hawai‘i as a colonized space, a U.S. frontier, a tourist’s paradise, and a cultural melting pot. Through our readings about Hawai‘i, we will explore how to engage texts critically while developing effective prewriting, research, drafting, revision, and editing skills. Approaching writing as a process, we will work collaboratively and individually via journal responses, free-writes, and other strategies to create both formal and informal papers. As writers and readers we will seek to sharpen our critical writing and reading skills as we explore writing about Hawai‘i.

Writing About Crime and Criminals

Are people born evil or does society make them that way? In what ways does the media perpetuate and reinforce myths about crime and criminality? Why are we so fascinated with crime? This class will examine these and other questions about crime and criminals through an analysis of how crime is portrayed in the United States and the complex interaction between the individual and environment. By exploring crime and constructions of criminals in fiction and nonfiction, film and periodicals, we can better see the assumptions American culture has about criminality, consequences, and justice. The main purpose of this class is for students to gain experience with generating ideas, revising, and editing their own writing. Writing assignments are structured to provide practice with writing in various genres, from informal response assignments to academic research papers. Students will participate in writing workshops, facilitate class discussions, and act as editors for each other’s work.
Envisioning a Sustainable Future

How can we create a sustainable future? In this composition course, we will investigate solutions to the threats posed by resource depletion, climate change, and corporate hegemony, and explore widely varying visions of our shared planetary future. We will consider positive responses like sustainability, voluntary simplicity, deep ecology, and natural capitalism. Through sharing our writing online and through participation in small group and class discussions, we will create a classroom community that improves our ability to write successful academic papers. The primary texts for the course will be The Transition to College Writing by Keith Hjortshoj and various essays from Orion, a magazine focused on the intersection of the environment, politics, culture, and spirituality. You will write the opening pages of a science fiction novel and a personal narrative, research your own future occupation and a significant environmental issue, and persuade others on pressing issues of environmental concern. This course will help you to understand the possibilities of our shared future and hone your skills in writing successful academic papers.

On the Road

Being on the road signifies a range of experiences, histories, meanings, and politics. What kinds of stories emerge from the road? How does travel by road shape our sense of selves? What role do class, nationality, gender, and race play in highway journeys? This course addresses some of these implications through reading and writing about road travels in the United States and Latin America. We will engage with and understand works of fiction, nonfiction, essays and films. Through writing and research, we will develop interpretations and arguments about the significance and implications of being on the road. You can expect to write descriptions, summaries, reading responses, reflections, and formal essays.

War Stories: Contemporary War and War Reporting

We are currently still engaged in the longest war in U.S. history. This course will ask what kinds of war stories we are receiving or occluding and how different kinds of writing affect the practice of war. In addition to examining war reporting in print and films like Restrepo, we will explore what it means to report on war when journalists, soldiers, and civilians have immediate and global access to digital recording and publication. In light of these changes in production and reception, what is the responsibility of war reporters? Who gets to tell stories about war, and how do we judge these stories? Our inquiry will focus on issues from Iraq and Afghanistan, including discussion of the experiences of combat soldiers, the role of women in the military, drones, counterinsurgency, PTSD, memorialization, and the use of dead soldiers and civilians in past and present wars. Through analysis of texts and images in a variety of media, students will consider the ethical responsibilities of writers in general and war reporters in particular. They will also utilize formal and informal writing to articulate their own responses to war and its representations, with opportunities for creative projects.
JOB DESCRIPTION--COLLEGE WRITING COORDINATOR  
(by service to different units)

The responsibilities of the College Writing Coordinator (CWC) lie largely within her or his college, but also involve the partnership between the Writing Program and Learning Support Services in respect to the provision of writing assistance for EOP students in the core course in fall quarter, and in respect to the Writing Program. These three areas of responsibility will be addressed in turn. At the end are some general guidelines.

The College:

- Work with the Provost (or Associate Dean, in the case of Colleges Nine and Ten) to strengthen and support writing instruction in C1 and C2 sections of the college core course
- Work with other ELWR instructors in the course to strengthen writing instruction in C1 ELWR sections, especially those instructors new to teaching ELWR sections, and most especially non-Writing Program instructors
- Work closely with the college academic staff in determining the number of ELWR sections needed in the core course each fall
- Hire Writing Assistants (tutors) in spring quarter, following the guidelines and timelines provided by the Convenor, College Writing Coordinators, endeavoring to hire as diverse a group of Writing Assistants (WAs) as possible
- Orient the college WAs at the beginning of fall quarter, either individually or as a group
- Supervise the college writing center, including ensuring that the college provides space for WAs to work with their students
- Be available to WAs in need of guidance and advice
- Assist WAs in accurate record keeping
- Mediate in any problems between WAs and the instructors with whom they work
- Mediate in any problems between students and Was, including assigning a student to a different WA
- Assign WAs to section(s), with respect to the number of hours the WA wishes to work, and the mix of EOP and non-EOP students in the section(s), and with respect to any preference for a particular instructor a WA may have, if possible
- Post pass lists in the college after each Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) during the academic year, and ensure that the college academic staff has both pass and fail lists
- Keep all AWP exams of students in the college for at least five years. in case of discrepancies between what the Registrar claims, and what score the student’s actual exam shows
• Help make the fee-for-service writing assistance program work as smoothly as possible, as long as we have this program
• If/when we return to writing assistance provided by the university, ensure that all students in ELWR sections receive writing assistance through enrolling in Writing 10A

Writing Program/Learning Support Services Partnership:
• Work with the Coordinator, Learning Support Services to ensure that EOP students get enough writing assistance
• Attend Tutor Training Day at beginning of fall quarter for which Learning Support Services will pay an honorarium, provided that the CWC is not already employed full time (this training day is normally the Saturday after the first full week of instruction)

Writing Program:
• Coordinate closely with the Convenor, CWCs, including being responsive in a timely fashion to queries via email or telephone from her or him
• Coordinate closely with the Student Employment Coordinator, Humanities Human Resources, ensuring, among other things, that the WAs are properly on payroll before they begin to work in the fall
• Attend any meetings of CWCs called by Convenor
• Report results of AWP exams to the ELWR Coordinator as directed and requested in a timely fashion, as well as to the college
• Attend the ELWR instructors meeting at the beginning of fall quarter (normally mid-September)
• Read and score AWP exams in September and November, and
  o In September, take the college’s exams to do third reads in the college, to resolve splits and discrepancies and complete placement in appropriate C1 sections.
  o In November, attend a third-read session with other CWCs to complete Pass/NP scores.
  o After the November exam, collect and deliver appeals for the college.
  o After every exam or portfolio reading during the year, post or otherwise make available results in the college.
• Provide any data requested by the Convenor in a timely fashion

General Guidelines:

  o EOP students may receive up to two hours per week of writing assistance, or twenty hours per quarter. In fall quarter, ensure that each EOP student in ELWR C1 sections of the core course receives at least one hour of assistance per week, and more (in two
meetings) if the EOP student wishes more assistance

- Non-EOP students receive one-half an hour of assistance per week, or five hours per quarter. Practice differs among the colleges in this area, however: some colleges schedule seven 45 minute meetings per quarter, some schedule four hours of assistance (eight half-hour meetings), leaving one hour to be used at the request of the student, or at the discretion of the WA or the instructor. The various college arrangements are designed to support as effectively as possible the curriculum of the particular core course.

- WAs may work no more than 19 hours per week. They more usually work 10-12 hours per week. Experienced WAs often work 15 hours per week.