

**URI/COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
PROPOSED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM CHANGE**

A. Program Information

A.1. Name of institution: University of Rhode Island

A.2. Name of college: College Writing Program
College of Arts and Sciences

A.3. Title of proposed program: Bachelor of Arts in Writing and Rhetoric

A.4. Intended initiation date: Academic year following approval

Intended starting date: Fall 2006

Anticipated date of first degrees granted: Spring 2008

A.5. Intended location of program: University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI

A.6. Description of institutional review and approval process:

The proposal was reviewed under the process established by the Faculty Senate and approved by the program, the college, the Faculty Senate, and the president.

DATE APPROVED

College Writing Program _____ April 20, 2005 _____

College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Comm. _____ May 16, 2005 _____

Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences _____ September 27, 2005 _____

Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee _____ October 31, 2005 _____

_____ November 21, 2005 _____

Faculty Senate _____

President of the University _____

A.7. Summary description (not to exceed 2 pages) of the proposed program:

The proposed Bachelor of Arts in Writing and Rhetoric is a 120-credit program for undergraduate students who seek a career in professional writing, teaching, or publishing and will be the only writing major offered by a New England land-grant institution. Delivered with minimal new costs, this B.A. program is designed for students who want a liberal arts degree that also emphasizes the applied arts and technical skills that employers value. The B.A. in Writing and Rhetoric will provide graduates with a strong foundation in rhetorical theory and composing strategies as well as familiarity with various writing technologies. Graduates of the program will be qualified for positions in business, industry, education, public agencies, or community organizations—positions that demand good writing and the ability to draft, design, and deliver informative or persuasive documents for a variety of audiences and in a variety of collaborative situations. In particular, graduates will be well suited for jobs in the publishing industries (marketing, sales, and editorial work) and will be well prepared through the study of rhetoric for graduate education in a number of different fields. Graduates will leave URI with an electronic

portfolio suitable for sharing with prospective employers that will demonstrate their ability to design and write a number of different documents, targeted to different audiences and purposes.

The College Writing Program will continue to provide General Education courses that fulfill English Communication-Writing (ECw) and support already-established outreach services, including the Writing Center and the Undergraduate Peer Consultants program. The College Writing Program will also continue to support the writing minor for those students who seek to enhance their major program of study with courses in argument and persuasion, electronic writing, technical writing, or rhetorical theory.

A.8. Signature of President

Robert L. Carothers, President

A.10. Name of Person(s) to contact during the review:

Professor Nedra Reynolds, Director, College Writing Program
319 Roosevelt Hall
874-4665 or 874-5932
nedra@uri.edu

A.11. Signed agreements for any cooperative arrangements made with other institutions/agencies or private companies in support of this program:

None

B. Rationale

B.1. Program objectives:

Program objectives have been informed by current research in rhetoric and composition studies, by faculty research interests and areas of expertise, and by statements on standards and learning outcomes disseminated from the Conference on College Composition and Communication as well as the Council of Writing Program Administrators. Faculty members have developed learning outcomes goals for students completing the B.A. in Writing and Rhetoric. Please see **section E1.a for these outcomes statements** and supporting appendices (**E.1.1-E.1.3**).

B.2. Explain and quantify the needs addressed by this program, and present evidence that the program fulfills these needs:

The needs addressed by this new degree program are well documented. A recent survey of leading American businesses reveals that employees are required to write more than ever before (see the report *Writing: A Ticket to Work...Or a Ticket Out* from the National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and Colleges). Especially in those business sectors with the most projected growth, writing is critical for success, yet businesses say that many college graduates don't have the writing skills they need. Writers today need to produce such

documents as proposals, print or online instructions, reports, and newsletters—as well as research reports, many including graphs, charts, maps, illustrations, and other elements of visual communication.

The College Writing Program can respond to these recognized needs for writing instruction in the following ways:

- by offering existing courses in specialized kinds of professional writing (scientific and technical writing, business communications, writing in electronic environments, etc.);
- by making the study of rhetoric a serious academic pursuit within a Liberal Arts education;
- by offering new courses in the coming years to respond to new technologies for writing; and
- by preparing students for writing in the workplace and for careers in professional writing, teaching, or publishing.

B.3. External advisory committee to develop the program:

No external advisory or steering committee was used to develop this proposal.

C. Institutional Role

C.1. Explain how the program is consistent with the role of the institution and how it is related to the institution's academic planning:

The proposed program is consistent with the role of the institution in its emphasis on students' ethical development, on students' capabilities as critical and independent thinkers, and on students' need to be active participants in their own learning. Very few intellectual activities demand as much critical thinking or as much active participation as writing does. As part of the Liberal Arts and General Education Core, the study of rhetoric and composition guides students in achieving clarity of expression with diverse audiences in a wide variety of contexts. Rhetoric's crucial role in public life has been recognized for centuries, and study in this discipline helps students recognize, value, and understand different cultural values as they learn to write clearly and effectively about their own critical stances. The new B.A. in Writing and Rhetoric will meet rapidly changing needs of the State and the country. In our role in training future teachers and our commitments to community service learning, the College Writing Program contributes to the University's and College's various outreach efforts as well as to the institutional mission.

C.2. Explain the relationship of the program to other programs offered by the institution.

General Education: The College Writing Program will continue its service mission to the University and support its general education responsibilities, as follows:

- 1) by continuing to offer courses to satisfy the 3-credit writing requirement in the “ECw” category (English written communication) in the General Education Program;

- 2) by continuing to offer students the option of taking a second writing course from the same list of courses to satisfy the 3-credit requirement in the “C” category (communication);
- 3) by continuing to offer enough seats in some writing courses for programs of study (e.g., Business, Computer Sciences, and Marine Affairs) that require students to take a specific writing course beyond the Cw General Education Requirement; and
- 4) by supporting faculty who have named “writing effectively” as one of eight integrated skills required in over 200 newly certified courses. As General Education faculty in all disciplines take on the responsibilities of teaching writing, the College Writing Program will provide those faculty support for creating effective writing assignments and practices.

The Writing Minor: The College Writing Program will continue to offer the 18-credit writing minor for a number of students in a variety of majors. The minor has been in place since 2000; its popularity has contributed to the development of this proposal for a major.

The English Department Graduate Program: The College Writing Program will continue to offer, for the foreseeable future, a specialization in rhetoric and composition for both M.A. and Ph.D. students in English, and faculty in the College Writing Program will continue to serve as major professors for a significant number of students in the English graduate degree programs.

Learning Communities: Approximately 38 first-year writing courses are offered in learning communities every fall semester, and that will continue to be the case.

College of Business Administration: The College Writing Program will continue to offer several sections of WRT 227, Business Communications, every semester, required for all Business majors.

Honors Program: The College Writing Program will continue to offer HPR 112, an honors section of first-year writing, whenever the opportunity arises.

In addition, the College Writing Program will maintain close working relationships with undergraduate programs that require specialized writing courses and with related departments (English, Communication Studies, and Journalism).

D. Interinstitutional Considerations

D.1. List similar programs offered in the state and the region and compare the objectives of similar programs:

All institutions of higher education in the state and region offer writing instruction as an important element in undergraduate education. Within the state and region, all colleges and universities offer composition instruction at the basic level (first-year composition); some offer developmental or remedial composition classes; and many offer advanced undergraduate courses in areas such as technical writing, business communication, writing in academic disciplines, and advanced composition. However, URI’s writing major will be the first for a New England land-grant institution and the only one of its kind in the state. Rhode Island College’s Department of English offers developmental and first-year composition, a second-year course elective in expository writing, and a business-writing course. In addition, RIC offers several undergraduate courses in creative writing. The Community College of Rhode Island offers developmental,

first-year, technical, and business writing courses. Roger Williams College has an independent writing program with its own faculty offering a core writing requirement in either expository or critical writing as well as a developmental course first-year writing course. None of these Rhode Island institutions, however, has a major in writing. Regionally, Rutgers University offers certificate programs in professional and technical writing while several other colleges and universities offer concentrations in professional or creative writing. Emerson College has a Department of Writing, Literature, and Publishing, but it focuses on creative writing and offers no courses in professional writing (i.e., business, technical, scientific, or workplace writing). New York University has a Center for Speech and Writing and offers three certificate programs in communication skills, journalism, and screenwriting with creative, professional and publishing courses. In the region, only Rowan University (N.J.), SUNY-Cortland, and the University of Maryland offer a writing major. The College Writing Program at URI will offer a wide range of courses—all but four already in the catalog—with substantial opportunities for in-depth study of rhetoric and professional communication.

D.2. Estimate the projected impact of the program on the other public higher education institutions in Rhode Island, a rationale for the assumptions made in these projections, and ways the other public institutions were consulted in developing the projections:

Because URI already offers undergraduate writing courses, the writing minor, and the specialization in rhetoric and composition studies for the graduate degrees in English, the formation of the proposed program will have little to no effect on other higher education institutions in Rhode Island. With the exception of four new courses, two of them required for the degree, the B.A. is based upon courses already in the catalog. In addition, the Joint Admissions Agreement Transition Plan will accommodate transfer students.

D.3. Describe provisions for transfer students (into or out of the program) at other Rhode Island public institutions of higher education. Transfer agreements / JAA Transition Plan:

Transfer of courses offered by the College Writing Program will be covered by the Articulation Transfer Agreement, as are current writing courses offered by URI. This list is revised and edited yearly to accommodate changes in courses offered by the three Rhode Island public institutions of higher education.

D.4. Describe any cooperative arrangements with institutions offering similar programs.

There are no cooperative arrangements with other institutions at the present time.

D.5. External affiliations.

No external affiliations required.

D.6. Indicate whether the program will be available under the New England Board of Higher Education Regional Students Program.

The Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs will consider the program’s availability in the New England Board of Higher Education Regional Student Program.

E. Program

E.1. Prepare a typical curriculum display for one program cycle.

A total of 120 credits is required for graduation. At least 42 of these must be in courses numbered 300 or above. Students choosing this major must fulfill the requirements of the Basic Liberal Studies program and complete 30 credits (maximum 51), including WRT 201, WRT 235, WRT 360, WRT 490 and WRT 495. At least 15 credits for the major must be completed from writing courses numbered 300 or above. A maximum of 6 credits for the major may be taken in online courses or through distance learning. Writing majors will be strongly encouraged to complete a practicum experience, either the internship or fieldwork course. Writing majors will also be encouraged to consider a double major or to select a minor in another field of study. Undergraduates wishing to take courses on the 500 level must secure the permission of the faculty member.

Course Requirements for the B.A. in Writing and Rhetoric

Course Number	Course Title	Credit Hours	Semester Offered
WRT 201	Writing Argumentative & Persuasive Texts	3	F, S
WRT 235	Writing in Electronic Environments	3	F, S
WRT 360*	Composing Processes and Canons of Rhetoric	3	F
WRT 490	Writing and Rhetoric	3	F
WRT 495*	Capstone in Electronic Portfolios	3	S

* indicates new course

Additional 15 credit hours of departmental offerings in writing at the 300-level or above.

Total Major Credit Hours:	30
General Education Core and Distribution Requirements Credit Hours:	39
Free Elective Credit Hours:	51
Total Credit Hours:	120

Here is a sample program of study:

First Semester (15 credits)	Second Semester (15 credits)
<u>First year</u>	
WRT at the 100 level for Gen. Ed. (3)	Basic Liberal Studies requirements (9)
Free elective (3)	Free elective (3)
Language (3)	Language (3)
Basic Liberal Studies requirements (6)	

Second year

WRT 201 (3)	WRT 235 (3)
Electives in major (3)	Electives in major (3)
Free electives (3)	Basic Liberal Studies requirements (6)
Basic Liberal Studies requirements (6)	Free electives (3)

Third year

WRT 360 (3)	Electives in major (9)
Electives in major (6)	Free electives (6)
Free electives (3)	
Basic Liberal Studies requirements (3)	

Fourth year

WRT 490 (3)	WRT 495 (3)
Electives in major (3)	Electives in major (3)
Free electives (9)	Free electives (9)

a. Names of courses, departments, and catalog numbers, and brief course descriptions for new courses, preferably as these will appear in catalog.

WRT 201 Writing Argumentative and Persuasive Texts
WRT 227 Business Communications
WRT 235 Writing in Electronic Environments
WRT 302 Writing Culture
WRT 303 Public Writing
WRT 304 Writing for Community Service
WRT 305 Travel Writing
WRT 333 Scientific and Technical Writing
WRT 353: Issues and Methods in Writing Consultancy
WRT 383: Field Experience in Writing Consultancy
WRT 435 (or EDC 435) The Teaching of Composition
WRT 490 Writing and Rhetoric
WRT 512 Studies in Rhetorical Theory
WRT 524 Histories and Theories of Teaching Composition

WRT 270*: Writing in the Expressivist Tradition.

Includes selected readings from expressivist rhetoricians to provide a theoretical underpinning for students' written work in this tradition. Genres practiced may include personal narrative, nature meditation, medical narrative, informal essay, and others.

WRT 360*: Composing Processes and the Canons of Rhetoric

Historical and contemporary theories of composing, including approaches to writing processes, style and arrangement, and relationships among writing, learning, social contexts, technology, and publication. Applied field research on professional writers.

WRT 483, 484*: Internship in Writing and Rhetoric

Practice and direct supervision in workplace writing. Placement options include community-based, governmental, technological, health services, military, educational, and non-profit organizations. Requires weekly writing logs and a final report. (Practicum) Pre: 60 credit hours with a minimum of 12 in WRT, 2.5 GPA, and permission of faculty advisor.

WRT 495*: Capstone in Electronic Portfolios

Capstone for WRT Majors. Readings in electronic writing technologies and portfolios. Preparation of a substantive collection of representative writings.

Culminates in an electronic portfolio and a public writing showcase.

* indicates new courses

Assessment of the Student Learning Outcomes

Faculty members have developed the following learning outcomes for students completing the B.A. in Writing and Rhetoric:

1. Rhetorical Knowledge:

- a. Students will be able to identify varied rhetorical situations calling for a wide range of appropriate responses.
- b. Students will demonstrate a command of different rhetorical theories and approaches.
- c. Students will apply various rhetorical theories, putting them into practice in a range of situations.
- d. Students will evaluate the appropriateness of rhetorical choices in light of anticipated social consequences.

2. Process and Collaborative Textual Evaluation:

- a. Students will produce documents with other writers.
- b. Students will evaluate and respond to each other's work using varied roles (peer, tutor, coach, editor).
- c. Students will demonstrate respectful negotiating behaviors during collaborative textual production (listening attentively, airing all viewpoints, valuing difference, coming to consensus or dissensus, dividing labor fairly, balancing competing agendas, expectations, and values).

3. Craft, Genre, & Editing:

- a. Students will arrange the organization of their texts appropriate to the rhetorical situation.
- b. Students will be able to recognize and self-edit errors in written discourse.
- c. Students will produce complex texts with correctness in syntax, grammar, usage, punctuation, mechanics, and spelling.
- d. Students will demonstrate coherence and cohesion in written discourse.
- e. Student writers will consider, apply, and control stylistic options (prose style, figurative language, voice, register, tone, word choice, etc.).

4. Textual Production & Delivery:

- a. Students will choose effective strategies for processes, forum, genre, and technological tools for a range of situations.
- b. Students will design visually effective texts for a range of situations using appropriate technology.
- c. Students will identify and evaluate options for text production, circulation, and delivery.

- d. Students will use current information technologies to produce and deliver their texts.
5. Reflective Learning:
- a. Students will synthesize and integrate insights consciously from one project into another.
 - b. Students will articulate a statement of their own identity as a writer.

See the following Appendices for more information pertaining to student learning outcomes:

- 1) **Appendix E.1.1:** Summary of program-level outcomes for the major in Writing and Rhetoric, explanation of methods to be used for assessment, and timeline;
- 2) **Appendix E.1.2:** Curricular map illustrating course coverage and reinforcement of all intended outcomes across all WRT courses; and
- 3) **Appendix E.1.3:** Summary of program-level outcomes for General Education, explanation of methods to be used for assessment, and timeline.

b. Required courses in area of specialization and options, if any.

At this time there are no specializations or areas of concentration within the major.

c. Course distribution requirements, if any, within the program and general education requirements.

Students must fulfill the 39 credits required by the BLS program for the BA degree and 30 credits in the major.

d. Total number of free electives available after specialization and general education requirements are satisfied.

Elective credit available: 51 credits

e. Total number of credits required for the completion of the program or for graduation.

Credits required for graduation: 120 credits

f. Identify any courses that will be delivered or received by way of distance learning

Approximately 10 writing courses per semester are offered through URI's College of Continuing Education via WebCT. Students may fulfill *two* of their required courses or electives (maximum of 6 credits) through online courses.

F. Faculty and Staff

F.1. Faculty who will be assigned to the program.

Faculty Member	Degree	Rank	Status	FTE	New/Reassigned
Jeremiah Dyehouse	Ph.D.	Asst Prof	Tenure-track	1.00	Reassignment
Celest Martin	Ph.D.	Assoc Prof	Tenured	1.00	Reassignment
Elizabeth Miles	Ph.D.	Assoc Prof	Tenured	1.00	Reassignment
Michael Pennell	Ph.D.	Asst Prof	Tenure-track	1.00	Reassignment
Nedra Reynolds	Ph.D.	Professor	Tenured	1.00	Reassignment

Robert Schwegler	Ph.D.	Professor	Tenured	1.00	Reassignment
Linda Shamoon	M.A.	Professor	Tenured	1.00	Reassignment
Sue Vaughn	M.A.	Assoc Prof	Tenured	.50	Reassignment
Pat Logan	Ph.D.	Professor	Tenured	.33	Reassignment

F.2. Anticipated support staff.

- a. Mrs. Jean Long-Clark, senior word processing typist.
Time to be spent in program: 100%
Reassignment
- b. Total FTE 1.00

F.3. Annual costs for faculty and support staff.

Seven faculty members are assigned to the College Writing Program at 100% FTE. A .50 faculty member will teach one course each semester for the program. One senior word processing typist is assigned to the program at 100% FTE. All assignments are based on *existing resources*. Course requirements for the major will demand that, by Year 3 of the new program, FTE faculty teach an additional five sections per year; thus, five sections of General Education courses will need to be covered by per-course hires.

F. 4. Provide assurance that the institution’s chief financial officer has worked with the director of human resources in the development of the faculty and staff projections and estimates and that they agree on the adequacy of the estimates.

The Assistant Provost will review these projections and estimates before this proposal’s submission to the RIBGHE.

G. Students

G.1. Describe the potential students for the program and the primary sources of these students, the extent to which the program will attract new students or will draw students from existing programs, and a specific rationale for these assumptions:

Potential students for this new major will be interested in careers in professional and technical writing, tutoring and teaching writing, editing and publishing, rhetorical and composing theory, personal writing, nonfiction writing, document and information design and writing for public audiences and public service. Since this will be the only writing major in the state, some in-state students will now have another option for a major field of study. Of students enrolled in WRT courses at URI during the spring of 2005, 19.8% of those surveyed (n=597) were either “Interested” or “Very Interested” in a writing major. A small percentage of those students who have declared a writing minor may be interested in declaring a major since they will have some of the requirements completed already. The proposed major in Writing and Rhetoric will attract some students whose undergraduate majors currently include English, Communication Studies, or Journalism. Students in these majors tend to be interested in writing and may find that this degree program meets their needs; however, students interested in creative writing will be better

served by the writing minor. A number of students may find that a B.A. in writing will serve them well as a double major.

G.2. Estimate the proposed program size and projected annual full-time, part-time, and FTE enrollments for one complete cycle of the program, including rationale for the assumptions made in these projections:

Estimates include only full-time students. Once a full cycle has taken place, student enrollment is expected to be 70 students. Estimates for in-state/out-of-state students are based upon the institutional average of 65% in-state and 35% out-of-state students for the years 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009. Revenue estimates were based on tuition estimates provided by the Director of Budget and Financial Planning on April 1, 2005. In calculating the number of majors by 2009-2010, we figured a 15-20% attrition rate. Our projections for numbers of writing majors are based, first, on responses to a survey of interest from a sample of 597 current URI undergraduates. (See **Appendix G. 1.**) Second, we considered the numbers of majors at URI in related programs (See **Appendix G. 2.**) The estimate is also based on comparisons to the numbers of students in a sampling of writing programs (or writing focus areas) at institutions where there is either a program similar to the proposed URI writing program or a writing focus area available at a “competitive” school. (See **Appendix G. 3.**)

No additional sections or new FTE faculty will be needed for initiation of the program; however, some new seats in existing courses and eventually, some additional sections will be required. To give declared writing majors an opportunity to enroll in WRT 227, Business Communications (currently restricted only to business majors), three seats per section will be opened up to writing majors as elective credit. In the first two years of the new program (2006-07 and 2007-08), there will be enough available seats among sections of courses offered currently by the Writing Program. However, by 2008-09 and beyond, as the number of majors increases, additional sections of required courses will be needed. And once the program reaches the estimated 70 students, then additional *part-time faculty will be needed to cover five sections of WRT above the 100 level.* (See **Appendix G. 4** for calculations.)

Estimated numbers of enrolled students:

September 2006

Year 1: New Students: 5
 Students transferring from another URI program: 10

Expected numbers enrolled: 15

September 2007

Year 2: New Students: 10
 Students transferring from another program: 5
 Attrition -5

Expected numbers enrolled: 25

September 2008

Year 3: New Students: 25
 Students transferring from another program: 5
 Attrition -5

Expected numbers enrolled: 50

September 2009

Year 4: New Students: 25
Students transferring from another program: 0
Attrition -5
Expected numbers enrolled: 70

**G.3. List the program admission and retention requirement for students. . . .
Describe how satisfactory academic progress will be determined.**

Admission:

There are no additional admission requirements for the B.A. in Writing and Rhetoric beyond acceptance to the university.

- Students who fulfill the College of Arts and Sciences admissions requirements may declare their intention to major in Writing and Rhetoric.
- Students seeking the writing minor must declare their interest through their major program's advising system.
- Students seeking the General Education Program and specialized writing courses enter through regular registration after meeting with an advisor.

Retention:

For students to be retained in the program, they must fulfill the following criteria:

- Maintain a 2.0 GPA throughout the program.
- Maintain continuous registration during the fall and spring semesters.
- Complete the degree within 60 months.

The College Writing Program will engage in two successful retention strategies, good advising and extensive interaction between FTE faculty and students. The College Writing Program will provide advising for its majors and minors and will review students' academic records each semester to make sure that a 2.0 GPA is being maintained. The College Writing Program will hold organized gatherings for and programs about rhetoric and professional writing for faculty and students. In addition, the relatively small class size and the design of WRT courses will continue to provide a high level of interaction between FTE faculty and students.

Assessment of satisfactory academic progress: Once enrolled in a writing class, all undergraduates are expected to meet general performance standards: to demonstrate engagement in the writing process from invention to peer review and revision and to produce a variety of high quality written documents which are often assembled in a writing portfolio for public display. Assessment will culminate with a graduation portfolio that is indicative of the student's writing and learning during the semesters in the program.

In addition, the following assessment tools will be used to evaluate students' progress: Holistic assessment, primary trait scoring, portfolio grading (currently used in the College Writing Program) and uniform grading standards. (See more about our assessment plans in **Appendix E.1.1.**)

G.4. Indicate available funds for assistantships, scholarships, and fellowships.

Students in the College Writing Program are eligible, provided they meet the qualifications, for Centennial Scholarships as well as other scholarships and fellowships based on merit and need that are open to URI students, and those specifically available for majors in the College of Arts and Sciences. Once this new program is well established, we anticipate that donors will fund named endowments to support scholarships for writing majors.

H. Administration

H.1. How the program will be administered, and the effect on the administrative structure in which it is located.

The College Writing Program will use the same administrative structure as in the current College Writing Program; consequently *no additional administrative costs will be incurred*. There will be no effect on the administrative structure in the College of Arts and Sciences.

These administrative positions are

- Chair (called “Director” in the College Writing Program)
- Director of the Writing Center

H.2. Names and titles of the persons who will have administrative responsibility for the program, and the percent of time each will spend on the program. Total FTE positions required for the program.

- Director: Professor Reynolds, 100% in the College Writing Program; 25% of time spent on administrative responsibilities.
- Director of the Writing Center: Associate Professor Miles, 100% in the College Writing Program; 25% of time spent on administrative responsibilities.

H.3. Additional annual administrative salaries:

There will be no additional annual administrative costs associated with the new program. The College Writing Program has been an independent academic unit since 2002, and this proposed change does not increase administrative responsibilities.

I. Instructional Resources

I.1. Estimate the number and cost of relevant print, electronic and other non-print library materials needed, and those available, for the program.

Existing library materials currently used to support teachers and researchers in the College Writing Program are adequate to support the faculty's teaching and research needs. These library resources are currently supplemented by URI's Writing Center's library and by the faculty's own private subscriptions to the major professional journals.

Existing library materials used to support instructional activities in the College Writing Program are adequate to support instruction. The general book and periodical collections as well as the level of access to the Internet are adequate for the kinds of basic undergraduate research papers written in beginning writing courses. The book collection is adequate to support research papers in specialized upper level writing courses, and the periodical literature is adequate to support

research papers in upper level courses focused on rhetoric and writing pedagogy and on the discipline of rhetoric and composition studies.

The periodical collection is not adequate to support students' research papers in specialized upper level courses focused on professional writing and rhetoric, and particularly scientific, technical, and business writing. To fill this gap in the periodical collection, we propose adding four national journals to the library's collection: the Journal of Business and Technical Communication, the Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, Rhetoric Society Quarterly, and Written Communication. Each of these journals publishes studies appropriate for undergraduate research in several of the College Writing Program's upper level courses (e.g., WRT 227, WRT 333, and WRT 360). The cost of these journal acquisitions will amount to \$1387 for the first year's subscriptions.

No recognized measures of general library adequacy exist for programs like the College Writing Program. (See the Library Impact Statement, **Appendix M**.)

I.2. Identify and evaluate other instructional resources and instructional support equipment (such as computers, laboratory equipment and supplies, etc.).

The College Writing Program will make the same use of the instructional resources currently available to the College Writing Program to support WRT courses. Approximately six sections each semester are offered in a computer classroom, designed and equipped several years ago through a grant from the Champlin Foundations. In any given semester, the College Writing Program needs a classroom available for at least six sections that has 22 computers connected to the University's server, a printer, an LCD projector, a video and DVD player and other electronic equipment as resources for instruction. The Writing Center also has computer technology to support its services. The Writing Center and the College Writing Program work with IITS to locate cost-effective ways to maintain and upgrade this technology. In addition, the College Writing Program will need an electronic portfolio platform and technical support for its electronic portfolio capstone requirement. The university's site license for TrueOutcomes should be sufficient for storing students' portfolios (with password protection).

I.3. Estimate annual expenditures for instructional resources.

Library resources: \$1,387 annually for journal subscriptions. With a 5% increase in subscription rates, calculated on the Expenditures form (Operating Expenses/Instructional Resources/Other), the total becomes \$1,604 by 2009. Total Instructional Resources are also estimated on the Expenditure Estimates to increase by 5% each year.

J. Facilities and Capital Equipment

J.1. Facilities and capital equipment (e.g., classrooms, office space, laboratories, telecommunications equipment, etc.) and the adequacy of these resources relative to the program and to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act and state disability statutes.

Classrooms and office space are adequate to launch the proposed program. The following facilities are currently available to the existing program:

Seven faculty offices, each equipped with phone, direct connection to university internet server, desk, chairs, bookshelves, file cabinet, and similar office equipment.

One secretary/reception office, equipped with a phone, computer, direct connection to university internet server, file cabinets, book shelves, bulletin boards, fax machine, copy machine, office desk, chairs, storage cabinet, etc.

Two very small office spaces for part-time instructors to meet with students (with a table and two chairs).

One large basement room, to be shared by 20-25 per-course faculty members, equipped with desks, chairs, bookshelves, and filing cabinet, with room dividers to add privacy; this room has a conference table that seats 8 and doubles as a meeting room.

Several storage closets.

Writing Center in two large classrooms on the 4th floor of Roosevelt as part of the Academic Enhancement Center, equipped with several tables, chairs, bookcases.

Technology classroom (currently shared with Languages and Communication Studies and for several years in 308 Independence Hall, funded by the Champlin Foundations). Before the renovation to Independence Hall, this facility was equipped with 22 computers connected to the University's internet server, an LCD projector, a video and DVD player, audio speakers, a large screen, white marker boards, file cabinet, phone, 21 computer desks and chairs, and a large conference table.

J.2. Detailed explanation of renovated facilities.

n/a

J.3. Estimate of annual additional expenditures for new program facilities and capital equipment.

n/a

J.4. Indicate whether the needed facilities are included in the master plan.

n/a

J.5. Provide assurance that the chief financial officer has worked with the facilities director in the development of assessments and estimates.

The Assistant Provost will review these projections and estimates before this proposal's submission to the RIBGHE.

K. Financial Considerations

K.1. Expenditures for program initiation and annual operation.

Because the College Writing Program has been an independent academic unit since 2002, with its own budget, there are no initiation costs. Expenses will be required for new library resources (beginning at \$1,387 per year). Beginning in Year 3 of the new program, an additional five sections per year will need to be covered by per-course instructors.

Salaries for faculty and staff members have been estimated to increase 3% per year after the current contract expires in June 2007.

K.2. Revenue estimates.

Tuition rates and mandatory fee rates have been provided for this proposal by Linda Barrett, Director, Budget and Financial Planning. They reflect an estimated 8-10% increase over the next four years. No additional student fees will be instituted for this program.

K.3. Redeployment of current institutional resources.

n/a

K.4. Provide assurance that the chief academic officer has worked with the budget director and controller in the development of these financial projections.

The Budget Director and Assistant Provost will review these projections and estimates before this proposal's submission to the RIBGHE.

L. Evaluation

L.1. Performance measures by which to evaluate the program during the first program cycle, including frequency of measurement and personnel responsible. Provisions made for external evaluation.

The College Writing Program will use four performance measures to continually review current practices and implement appropriate revisions.

First is the assessment of student learning outcomes, both for our General Education commitment and for our Major in Writing & Rhetoric. Evaluation will take place annually on a different set of outcomes (see timeline in **Appendix E.1.1**), and will be conducted internally by a representative committee of fulltime continuing faculty, lecturers, graduate teaching assistants, and per course instructors. These direct measures of student learning will supplement the university-sponsored Student Evaluation of Teaching instrument already implemented at the end of each course.

Second, at intervals established for all departments, we will use the model for program assessment approved by the university. The Office of the Provost and the President will receive and assess the results of this instrument.

Third, we will request that an outside evaluation be performed by the Consultation-Evaluator Program of the Council of Writing Program Administrators, the nationally recognized evaluation service for writing programs. The Consultation-Evaluator Program provides a complete evaluation of all aspects of a writing program, including a review of program structure, organization, goals, administrative functions, services, teaching, staffing and outcomes. It provides comparisons to other programs at similar institutions, and it makes recommendations for beneficial change and improvements. Its reports go to the program and to the University

administrations. Initially, we will ask for this within three years of the start of the major; we will then seek follow-up on a six-year cycle.

Fourth, we will implement a community-feedback survey to examine two constituencies: students engaged in service-learning, internships, and other experiential opportunities; and those employed in the workplace after graduation. In both cases, the College Writing Program will administer a questionnaire to organizations working with our students to evaluate the appropriateness of our students' training for the work they are being expected to perform.

L.2 Describe and quantify the program's criteria for success:

The performance measures listed above will allow the College Writing Program to quantify whether we are approaching or attaining programmatic success, as follows.

Satisfactory progress toward student learning outcomes. Each year, we will evaluate our effectiveness on a rotating set of student learning outcomes, and will expect improvement each cycle. Thus, every three years we will expect higher percentages of students performing at the top level of each outcome. For the B.A. in Writing & Rhetoric, faculty members developed the following learning outcomes (for anticipated Gen Ed outcomes, please see **Appendix E.1.3**):

- 1. Rhetorical Knowledge:** Students will be able to: a) identify varied rhetorical situations calling for a wide range of appropriate responses; b) demonstrate a command of different rhetorical theories and approaches; c) apply various rhetorical theories, putting them into practice in a range of situations; and d) evaluate the appropriateness of rhetorical choices in light of anticipated social consequences.
- 2. Process and Collaborative Textual Evaluation:** Students will be able to: a) **produce** documents with other writers; b) **evaluate** and **respond** to each other's work using varied roles (peer, tutor, coach, editor); and c) **demonstrate** respectful negotiating behaviors during collaborative textual production (listening attentively, airing all viewpoints, valuing difference, coming to consensus or dissensus, dividing labor fairly, balancing competing agendas, expectations, and values).
- 3. Craft, Genre, & Editing:** Students will be able to: a) **arrange** the organization of their texts appropriate to the rhetorical situation; b) **recognize** and **self-edit** errors in written discourse; c) **produce** complex texts with correctness in syntax, grammar, usage, punctuation, mechanics, and spelling; d) **demonstrate** coherence and cohesion in written discourse; and e) **consider**, **apply**, and **control** stylistic options (prose style, figurative language, voice, register, tone, word choice, etc.).
- 4. Textual Production & Delivery:** Students will be able to: a) **choose** effective strategies for processes, forum, genre, and technological tools for a range of situations; b) **design** visually effective texts for a range of situations using appropriate technology; c) **identify** and **evaluate** options for text production, circulation, and delivery; and d) **use** current information technologies to produce and deliver their texts.
- 5. Reflective Learning:** Students will be able to: a) consciously **synthesize** and **integrate** insights from one project into another; and b) **articulate** a statement of their own identity as a writer.

Other Measures of Student Success and Retention. In addition to the specific learning outcomes above, we will also consider the following measures:

- a) The College Writing Program will track the percentage of its graduates who are hired by fulltime employers, are accepted to graduate schools, or who remain active writers in their communities in the spirit of community service and good citizenship. We will conduct this tracking upon graduation, and then again at 5 years out.
- b) The College Writing Program will compare its retention rate of students with the University average to ensure that it is sufficient. (Retention rate refers to the percentage of students who (a) transferred into this department from URI University College, another department or program, or another institution and who (b) complete their undergraduate degree requirements within five years of entrance into this program.)
- c) Student satisfaction will be evaluated for each course using the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) form. Our program goal is an average of 4 (satisfied) or higher on a 5-point Likert scale.

Demand for Delivery. Each year, we will track demand for our courses in the following areas:

- a) Student enrollment in our Writing Major will be either level or growing.
- b) The number of new course sections and new courses offered by the College Writing Program will be either stable or growing.
- c) Student enrollment levels in courses offered by this program will be either at or near capacity.

Faculty, Space, Labs, and Administrative Support. In order to ensure that we have sufficient resources relative to numbers of students, we will track:

- a) percentage of courses taught by faculty, and those taught by non-tenure track faculty within a structure of faculty-guided professional development and support (e.g., WRT 999 for all new teaching assistants).
- b) amount of personnel and resource support in the program to ensure that is sufficient for student registration, general fiscal management, and lab personnel, working with the Space Enhancement, Design, and Allocation Committee and the Instructional Space Advisory Group to ensure that we have enough classrooms and adequate lecture/seminar spaces for the program to deliver its curriculum.
- c) our supply of resources and body of expertise to support the technology needs for curriculum delivery, scholarship, and research.

Program Commitment to Teaching. With the understanding that the University norm is a 3/3 teaching load, we will track:

- a) percentage of faculty teaching at the maximum load, with allowances for approved release-time, with a goal of 95%.
- b) non-tenure track faculty hiring with an eye toward engaging external expertise from those in the profession, and appropriate professional development and support for those seeking to enter our profession.

Technological Innovation and Teaching. Every two years, we will survey all WRT instructors to ascertain their level of pedagogical innovation using appropriate technology with an eye to the following goals:

- a) Technology use *outside* the class will increase as student habits and expertise change.

- b) Technology use *within* the classroom will increase as facilities and tools become available for classroom use.

Program Commitment to Research and Outreach. With the understanding that the University norm is a 1-1 research and outreach load, we will track:

- a) percentage of faculty actively involved in a scholarly research program, including scholarship of teaching (quantified by conference presentations, publications, and other evidence of scholarly activity).
- b) percentage of faculty involved in outreach and service to the local, state, and national community with work related to research in our field.

Our goal is 100% of faculty involved in research, outreach, or both.

L.3. Accrediting agency name and address:

Currently, no specialized accreditation is available.

**Community College of Rhode Island
A.A. in General Studies**

**University of Rhode Island
B.A. in Writing and Rhetoric**

**WR
E**

– Core Curriculum –	– General Education –	Cr Tran:
Writing/Communications (6 credits) ENGL 1010	Writing/Communications WRT 104 [Cw]	
Choose one: ENGL 1060, 1400, or 2100 PHIL 2040	Choose one: WRT 1XC, COM 101, or PHL 101 [C]	
Math (3 credits) MATH 1430	Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning MTH 107 [M]	
Literature, Fine Arts, and Language (12 credits) <i>Literature:</i> ENGL 1040	Literature, Fine Arts, and Language/Cross-Cultural CLS 160/ENG 160	
<i>Fine Arts:</i> Choose one course from Art, Music or Theater	Fine Arts course [A]	
<i>Foreign Language:</i> Choose 2 sequential language courses	Foreign Language [F]	
Science (8 credits) Choose 2 courses in lab science <i>*Check with advisor on 2 code rule</i>	Natural Science Natural Science Requirement [N]	
Social Sciences (6 credits) Choose 2 courses from 2 different disciplines: sociology, political science, psychology, economics	Social Sciences Social Sciences Requirement [S]	
History/Other (6 credits) Choose 2 courses, one from history and one from another discipline meeting Letters req.(see Transfer Guide)	Letters Letters Requirement [L]	
– Major –	– Major –	
ENGL 2010 04 2015	WRT 201	
ENGL 1410 or ENGL 2100	WRT 227	
– Electives –	– Electives –	
ENGL 1000	URI 101	
ENGL 1430	ENG 205	
	Total Transferable Credits	
Notes:	URI Requirements	

Please note that general education requirements vary by college. Check the chart and general education course list in Section 1 of the Transfer Guide and speak with a URI advisor if you have questions.

Foreign language courses should be selected at an appropriate level. See an advisor.

Note: Students may not exceed 51 credits in their major (including courses taken at CCRI). Of the 120 credits required for graduation, at least 42 credits must be numbered 300 or above. Courses in the major, general education and electives may be used toward the 42 credits.

For more information visit the program web site www.uri.edu/artsci/writing/

Rev. 9.1.04

General Education	
Major	see
Students complete a minimum of 30	
credits (maximum of 51) 15 of which must be	
at the 300-level or above. All students must	
complete WRT 201,235, 360, 490, and 495.	
	see
Electives	
Consult advisor on courses and level	
Total Credits for Graduation	1

Assessing Student Outcomes – Writing & Rhetoric Majors

1. Stating Outcomes and Assessments

- a. In Column A, state the institution or departmental-level outcome(s) that you will assess. Use the list of verbs on page five to help develop the statements. In Column B, describe the direct and indirect methods you selected or designed to assess the learning described in each outcome statement.

Column A Outcomes Statements	Column B Direct/Indirect Method(s) of Assessment
<p>1. Rhetorical Knowledge:</p> <p>a. Students identify varied rhetorical situations calling for a wide range of appropriate responses.</p> <p>b. Students demonstrate a command of different rhetorical theories and approaches.</p> <p>c. Students apply various rhetorical theories, putting them into practice in a range of situations.</p> <p>d. Students evaluate the appropriateness of rhetorical choices in light of anticipated consequences.</p>	<p>Direct: examine majors’ portfolios for evidence of situational variety and applicability.</p> <p>Direct: evaluate an embedded assignment (“critical incident” or “magic box”) from two core courses: WRT 360 and WRT 490.</p> <p>Indirect: survey students’ perceived understanding of different theories as juniors and seniors.</p>
<p>2. Process and Collaborative Textual Evaluation:</p> <p>a. Student writers produce documents with other writers.</p> <p>b. Students evaluate and respond to each other’s work using varied roles (peer, tutor, coach, editor).</p> <p>c. Students demonstrate respectful negotiating behaviors during collaborative textual production (listening attentively, airing all viewpoints, valuing difference, coming to consensus or dissensus, dividing labor fairly, balancing competing agendas, expectations, and values).</p>	<p>Direct: examine peer feedback forms completed for other writers included in portfolios.</p> <p>Direct: observe student groups on task in an embedded assignment in WRT 490.</p> <p>Indirect: survey students’ perceptions of their comfort in assuming different roles during feedback.</p>
<p>3. Craft, Genre, & Editing</p> <p>a. Students arrange the organization of their texts appropriate to the rhetorical situation.</p> <p>b. Students can recognize and self-edit errors in written discourse.</p> <p>c. Student writers produce complex texts with correctness in syntax, grammar, usage,</p>	<p>Direct: evaluate an embedded assignment in WRT 490 requiring revising an imperfect piece of writing to fit a particular situation.</p> <p>Direct: examine student revisions in their portfolios.</p>

<p>punctuation, mechanics, and spelling.</p> <p>d. Students demonstrate coherence and cohesion in written discourse.</p> <p>e. Student writers consider, apply, and control stylistic options (prose style, figurative language, voice, register, tone, word choice, etc.).</p>	
<p>4. Textual Production & Delivery:</p> <p>a. Students will choose effective strategies for processes, forum, genre, and technological tools for a range of situations.</p> <p>b. Student writers will design visually effective texts for a range of situations using appropriate technology.</p> <p>c. Student writers will identify and evaluate options for text production, circulation, and delivery.</p> <p>d. Students will use current information technologies to produce and deliver their texts.</p>	<p>Direct: examine student products and reflective cover notes in their portfolios.</p> <p>Direct: evaluate choices made in an embedded assignment in a “magic box” WRT 490.</p> <p>Indirect: survey students for self-reports about the technology choices available to them.</p>
<p>5. Reflective Learning</p> <p>a. Students consciously synthesize and integrate insights from one project into another.</p> <p>b. Students articulate a statement of their own writerly identity.</p>	<p>Direct: examine portfolio cover notes for evidence of integration and identity-formation.</p> <p>Indirect: conduct focus groups to discuss connections among classes in the major.</p>

b. Describe briefly how you developed the outcomes statements.

1.) We derived our outcomes from the Council of Writing Program Administrators, which has endorsed, revised, and reaffirmed the “WPA Outcomes Statement,” broadly circulated through the National Council of Teachers of English and the Conference on Composition and Communication.

2.) We adapted the WPA Outcomes Statement to the University of Rhode Island as appropriate for the scope of our major. The WPA statement assumes a two-semester writing sequence, whereas our major has far broader goals and assumptions.

3.) Most of our faculty have attended workshops here at URI with Peggy Maki, where we collectively agreed on the “habits of mind” particular to Writing & Rhetoric majors at URI.

2. Assessment Methods

- a. **Describe how the methods align with what and how students learn and with the kinds of inferences you want to make.**

Our students will write in real and realistic situations, and therefore it is appropriate to use direct, authentic assessment methods: examining student writing. For the more affective and reflective outcomes, we will rely on self-reporting through students surveys as an indirect method.

- b. **Describe how you determined the validity of these methods.**

Our outcomes are closely keyed to the WPA outcomes, which form the construct for our field. In other words, these are the core concepts agreed to by our national body. By using direct textual analysis for those core courses, we are also using methods well established as valid within our field.

- c. **If you designed your own methods, describe how you determined your standards and criteria for scoring student work and how you determined the reliability of those standards and criteria.**

We will establish inter-rater reliability by collaboratively developing a scoring rubric using benchmarked portfolios, agreed upon by at least three raters. Once the rubric has been developed, we will conduct a norming session prior to each assessment episode. Portfolios will then be rated by two raters, with a third rater used in cases of more than a 1-point disparity in scores.

3. Analyzing the Results

- a. **Describe how you will sample and collect student work, and who will score the work.**

All Writing & Rhetoric majors will compile and continually revise a Writing Portfolio as a requirement for graduation. Most of the authentic assessment will come from examining the work in their portfolios. Eventually, we will have Electronic Portfolios uploaded to our own server, but until then we will collect the physical portfolio.

However, some of our outcomes may not necessarily be apparent in student portfolios, so we are designing two assignments (one in WRT 360 and one in WRT 490, both required “core” courses) to offer evidence of particular outcomes. The assignments will be designed using either the “critical incident” approach (in which students are given a situation with some research and data, and required to construct a response to the

situation), or the “magic box” approach (in which students are presented with a “box” of approaches and tools, and are required to create something meaningful ... much like the Food Network’s *Iron Chef*).

- b. Describe how results will be analyzed and presented so that you can determine the fit between expected student performance and actual student performance, such as results reported along mastery levels of each scoring criteria or reported against national norms.**

We will collate rating results with our desired outcomes on the common rubric, then compare with our expected levels of student performance. The common rubric is being developed locally to fit URI’s institutional situation, but has been informed by the national outcomes statement and similar rubrics developed at comparable institutions.

- c. Describe how results will be collectively interpreted, leading to agreed upon changes, revisions, adaptations, innovations in pedagogy, curricular and co-curricular design, design of instruction, and use of educational tools.**

If we find a gap between our expected level of student performance and their actual performance, we will address that gap by inviting majors to focus groups to hear their perceptions and collectively vet alternatives and revisions, both at the structural level of the major, and in micro-practices in classrooms and co-curricular activities.

Two of our upper-level required courses will bear much of the responsibility for both assessing and addressing student learning outcomes. Because WRT 360 and 490 are required in sequence for all majors, they are the best place to assure we have introduced, reinforced, and adequately emphasized our desired outcomes. After a four-year cycle, we will be able to ascertain if three required courses in a vertical curriculum are sufficient, or if we need to increase the formal structure of the major.

4. Timetable

Provide a timetable to implement agreed upon changes and then to reassess these learning outcomes.

Each spring, when the required core courses are offered, we will undertake a different set of student learning outcomes, with implemented changes the following spring. Because we have five major categories of outcomes, we are planning an initial three-year cycle of review and implementation.

[Year]	Fall	Spring
Year One		Collect junior-level mid-progress evidence of Outcomes #1 and #2 in WRT 360.

Year Two	Analyze results and propose changes for Outcomes #1 and #2 to be included in WRT 360 and 490.	Implement revisions for Outcomes #1 and #2 in WRT 360 and 490. Collect Evidence of Outcomes for #3 and #4
Year Three	Analyze results and propose changes for Outcomes #3 and #4 for WRT 360 and 490.	Implement revisions for Outcomes #3 and #4 in WRT 360 and 490. Collect Evidence of Outcome #5
Year Four	Analyze results and propose changes for Outcome #5	Implement revisions for Outcome #5 Begin cycle again, with Outcome #1.
<i>And so on ...</i>	<i>collect ...</i>	<i>analyze ... revise ... implement ...</i>

Assessing Student Outcomes – General Education Writing Courses and WRT courses at 100- and 200-levels

1. Stating Outcomes and Assessments

- c. In Column A, state the institution or departmental-level outcome(s) that you will assess. Use the list of verbs on page five to help develop the statements. In Column B, describe the direct and indirect methods you selected or designed to assess the learning described in each outcome statement.

Column A Outcomes Statements	Column B Direct/Indirect Method(s) of Assessment
<p>1. Rhetorical Knowledge:</p> <p>a. Students recognize different situations for writing and responding, building situational sensitivity.</p> <p>b. Students practice different types of writing appropriate to different situations.</p> <p>c. Students reflect on the appropriateness of the choices they make for the rhetorical situation.</p>	<p>Direct Assessment: Textual analysis of collected portfolios, including completed projects and reflective cover note.</p> <p>Indirect Assessment: Simple survey instrument to gauge <i>awareness of</i>, <i>understanding in</i>, and <i>confidence with</i>, differing rhetorical situations.</p>
<p>2. Composing, Revising, & Editing Processes:</p> <p>a. Students recognize writing as a multi-step process.</p> <p>b. Students practice multiple rounds of invention, research, feedback, and revision.</p> <p>c. Students reflect on which strategies work for them, and identify crucial components of their own writing processes.</p>	<p>Direct Assessment: Textual analysis of portfolio cover notes for descriptive evidence of writing processes.</p> <p>Indirect Assessment: Descriptive survey and/or focus groups to describe what students do, and whether they can articulate their own processes.</p>
<p>3. Collaborative Production & Evaluation of Texts:</p> <p>a. Students recognize the value of others' insights, research, and reactions.</p> <p>b. Students practice finding research that deepens their understanding of a topic.</p> <p>c. Students practice providing formative responses to one another</p> <p>d. Students reflect on the value of what they have learned by collaborating with other thinkers and writers.</p>	<p>Direct Assessment: Textual analysis of projects to determine how research sources are integrated, and for evidence of multiple perspectives. Textual analysis of reflective statements for evidence of collaboration with others.</p> <p>Indirect Assessment: Simple survey assessing students' <i>confidence</i> in finding sources, evaluating them critically, and using them effectively.</p>

(continued on next page)

<p>4. Reflective Learning:</p> <p>a. Students recognize the difference between the project itself, and their reflective thinking on the project.</p> <p>b. Students practice integrating insights from reflections in one context to other projects.</p> <p>c. Students reflect on themselves and articulate a developing writerly identity.</p>	<p>Direct Assessment: Textual analysis of portfolios and cover memos to find evidence of reflective practice.</p>
<p>5. Conventions of Craft:</p> <p>a. Students recognize difference in correctness, usage, and style.</p> <p>b. Students practice a range of styles, registers, and conventions.</p> <p>c. Students practice editing for repeated patterns of errors.</p> <p>c. Students reflect on their “personal” style and learn strategies for expanding their repertoire.</p>	<p>Direct Assessment: Textual analysis of polished texts for adherence to conventions appropriate for the genre and situation. Evidence of a range of styles within a single portfolio.</p>

d. Describe briefly how you developed the outcomes statements.

1.) We derived our outcomes from the Council of Writing Program Administrators, which has endorsed, revised, and reaffirmed the “WPA Outcomes Statement,” broadly circulated through the National Council of Teachers of English and the Conference on Composition and Communication.

2.) We adapted the WPA Outcomes Statement to the University of Rhode Island as appropriate for our scope and our offerings; the WPA statement assumes a two-semester writing sequence, whereas URI will assess at the end of one semester. Thus, we do not include everything they do, and we have changed the ordering.

3.) Workshops with Peggy Maki and conferences with the American Association of Colleges & Universities have convinced us of the desirability of adding “reflection” (meta-cognition) as an outcome worthy of its own category.

2. Assessment Methods

- d. **Describe how the methods align with what and how students learn and with the kinds of inferences you want to make.**

Because we teach writing, we hope to find evidence of student learning in the writing projects we assign. Thus, direct assessment often makes more sense. For some of the more affective and reflective outcomes, we will rely on self-reporting from students as an indirect method.

- e. **Describe how you determined the validity of these methods.**

Our outcomes are closely keyed to the WPA outcomes, which form the construct for our field. In other words, these are the core concepts agreed to by our national body. By using direct textual analysis for those core courses, we are also using methods well established as valid within our field.

- f. **If you designed your own methods, describe how you determined your standards and criteria for scoring student work and how you determined the reliability of those standards and criteria.**

We will establish inter-rater reliability by collaboratively developing a scoring rubric using benchmarked portfolios, agreed upon by at least three raters. Once the rubric has been developed, we will conduct a norming session prior to each assessment episode. Portfolios will then be rated by two raters, with a third rater used in cases of more than a 1-point disparity in scores.

3. Analyzing the Results

- d. **Describe how you will sample and collect student work, and who will score the work.**

All portfolios from 100- and 200-level General Education courses will be collected after the instructors have graded them. Eventually, we will have Electronic Portfolios uploaded to our own server, but until then we will collect the physical portfolio. From those collected, we will conduct a stratified random sample, assuring proportionate representation from our courses, totaling 5% of our student population. Our first cycle will examine only portfolios from WRT 104, 105, and 106; other 200-level courses will be cycled in as those classes increasingly require final portfolios.

Portfolios will be read “blind” without identifying the student, the instructor, or the course to the rater. Our raters will be representative of our staff: faculty, lecturers, teaching assistants, and per course instructors.

- e. **Describe how results will be analyzed and presented so that you can determine the fit between expected student performance and actual student performance, such as results reported along mastery levels of each scoring criteria or reported against national norms.**

We will collate rating results with our desired outcomes on the common rubric, then compare with our expected levels of student performance. The common rubric is being developed locally to fit URI’s institutional situation, but has been informed by the national outcomes statement and similar rubrics developed at comparable institutions.

- f. **Describe how results will be collectively interpreted, leading to agreed upon changes, revisions, adaptations, innovations in pedagogy, curricular and co-curricular design, design of instruction, and use of educational tools.**

If we find a gap between our expected level of student performance and their actual performance, we will address that gap through our ongoing faculty and staff professional development – particularly curricular workshops and orientation programs open to our full teaching community. Additionally, we will invite undergraduate students for focus groups to look at the data with us, and invite them to collaborate with us in revising our practices.

4. Timetable

Provide a timetable to implement agreed upon changes and then to reassess these learning outcomes.

Each fall, we will undertake a different set of student learning outcomes, with implemented changes the following fall. Because we have five major categories of outcomes, we are planning an initial three-year cycle of review and implementation while our emphasis is on our General Education courses, followed by an eventual five-year cycle when we also assess our major.

[Year]	Fall	Spring
Year One Gen Ed only	Collect Evidence of Outcomes #1 and #2	Analyze results and propose changes for Outcomes #1 and #2
Year Two Gen Ed only	Implement revisions for Outcomes #1 and #2 Collect Evidence of Outcomes for #3 and #4	Analyze results and propose changes for Outcomes #3 and #4

Year Three Gen Ed only	Implement revisions for Outcomes #3 and #4 Collect Evidence of Outcome #5	Analyze results and propose changes for Outcome #5
Year Four WRT major and Gen Ed	Implement revisions for Outcome #5 Begin cycle of Gen Ed Outcome #1 Collect Evidence of Major Outcome #1	Analyze results and propose changes
<i>And so on ...</i>	<i>collect ...</i>	<i>analyze ... revise ... implement ...</i>

Appendix G.: Data Sources for Anticipated Numbers of Writing and Rhetoric Students (Tables 1-4)

G.1: Survey of student interest among 597 current URI undergraduates. Implied student yield = 50-100 students

Respondents	Level of Interest	Number of Responses	Percentage of Overall
N=597	Very Interested	48	8.60%
	Interested	69	11.2
	Somewhat Interested	132	21.8
	Slightly Interested	140	23.5
	Not Interested	208	35

APPENDIX G.2: Numbers of students in URI undergraduate degree programs whose students may be interested in a writing major:

URI Programs	# of majors (approx.)
English	280; (30 in Writing Focus Area)
Journalism	220
Communications Studies	915

APPENDIX G.3: Numbers of students in a writing program or a writing focus area at four other institutions. The first two schools listed have writing programs similar to the proposed URI writing program; the second two are “competitive” schools with writing focuses within their English departments. Implied student yield = 30 – 100 majors

School & size	Dept. or Focus Area	WRT requirements	# of majors
Similar program: U. of Arkansas, Little Rock 9,000 undergrads.	Rhetoric and Writing	6 required courses 12 hour of electives 30 credits, total	About 120 majors
Very similar program SUNY Cortland 4,500 undergrads.	Professional Writing	33 credits, total	25 majors (3 yrs. old program yr. 1 = 5 yr. 2 = 10 yr. 3 = 25)
Competitive School: UMass Amherst 18,966 undergrads.	Focus area in English “Professional Writing and Technical Communication” (PWTC) 800 English majors	15 credits beyond English core requirements	20 – 30 in focus area
Competitive school: U Delaware 16,548 undergrads.	Focus area in English: “English for Business and Technology” Other focus areas: Journalism, Creative Writing 850 English majors	12 credits in EBT beyond core English requirements	60 students

APPENDIX G.4: Numbers of WRT sections and seats per year currently offered and additional sections and seats needed to accommodate a projected 75 students in the major.

WRT Course	# of sections per year (current)	Seats available (current)	Additional seats & sections needed to accommodate 75 students in major	Current teaching resources	Additional teaching resources to accommodate 75 students in major
201	4	88	0	1.0 FTE	
227	17	374	1 section; 22 seats	1.0 FTE 11 PTE	2 PTE
235	2	44	1 section; 22 seats	.50 FTE	1 PTE
Proposed 270			1 section 22 seats	0	.25 FTE or 1 PTE
302	1	22	0	.25	
303	1	22	0	.25	
304	1	22	0	.25	
305	1	22	0	.25	
333	5	110	1 section; 22 seats	1 FTE	1 PTE
353	1	22	0	.25	
Proposed 360	0	0	2 sections; 44 seats	.50 FTE	
383	1	30	0	.25 after 3 semesters	
435	1	25	0	.25 FTE	
490	0	0	2 sections; 30 seats	.50 FTE	
495	0	0	1 section; 25 seats	.25 FTE	
512	1	15	0	.25 FTE	
524	1 every 3 semesters	15	0	.25 FTE	

APPENDIX M.

NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL LIBRARY IMPACT STATEMENT LIBRARIAN'S ASSESSMENT

PROGRAM: B.A. in Writing and Rhetoric

COLLEGE: A&S, new Dept. of Writing and Rhetoric

FACULTY MEMBER: N. Reynolds

DATE: April 20, 2005

LIBRARIAN: WTO'Malley

The University Library has been supporting the Writing Program and its offshoots for many years. During that time it has purchased and processed a variety of library materials directly related to the course offerings of that Program. We will continue to support the College Writing Program at the levels required, consistent with the funds provided by the University.

1. Summary of exiting holdings: the University Library has a modern, up-to-date, well organized collection supporting this degree. Funding for our existing collections has, in the past, come from those parts of the library materials budget that go toward the support of English, Communications, Education, Journalism, Education, etc. We will make the necessary adjustments to the existing fund allocations so that the work of the Program can continue. If one searches our HELIN catalog one will find under subject 'writing' 209 items, of which 58 have been published since 2000. Of those 58 titles, 19 are held by URI. Under the subject 'rhetoric', we find 3,052 titles, 284 of which are published after 2000, and 130 of these have been acquired by URI. Even with this small sample, we see that URI has up to date current collections, supplemented substantially by the HELIN consortium. The average cost of a new book is about \$50, so that the support level is already substantial.
2. The Proposal identifies 4 essential journals [not now held by URI] which will be needed to support the Program: J. of Business and Technical Communications, J. of Technical Writing and Communication, Rhetoric Society Q., and Written Communication. These are modestly priced journals which could be acquired if the promised additional funds for the library materials budget is realized. We do have 'embargoed' access to one of these titles [i.e. 12 month delay in online access], and online access to backfiles on another, so that the additional funds [over what we normally allocate] is minimal.
3. No other additional resources were identified. I agree.
4. No additional mastery sessions identified. Perhaps the 4 new courses in the Proposal would eventually develop a library component, which would be fine by the library.
5. Continuing costs: The Library is committed to supporting this Program at the present level of expenditures [even the 4 new courses within the B.A. program would not require 'new' funds, as we have been purchasing library materials which directly support the new courses, but have been required to support other existing teaching and research interests of the University]. The 4 new journals, which will cost about \$1,500 p.a., will require 'new' funds.

WTO'M