1. Executive Summary (1 page max)

1.1 Name of the department
Writing Across the Curriculum

1.2 Description of department and its mission:
Writing Across the Curriculum maintains a writing center for peer writing tutoring as well as computer-based writing and research. The department also offers assistance to faculty in developing writing assignments, writing assessments, and writing projects. WAC collaborates with the English Department to support its first-year common curriculum courses, T122 & T125. The mission of Writing Across the Curriculum is to foster consensus that writing is integral to a liberal arts education at Loyola and to support the use of writing as a learning tool in all disciplines.

1.3 Assessment of the department
WAC is currently fulfilling its goals and expectations. WAC is near capacity with regard to individual tutoring.

1.4 Goals of the department:
1. To promote the use of writing in all classes through interdisciplinary faculty forums, class lectures, and consultation on writing in the disciplines.
2. To offer easily accessible peer tutoring that helps Loyola students improve the quality of their writing.
3. To maintain and operate computer centers and classrooms consistent with up-to-date writing and research technologies. (For objectives associated with each goal, see section 3.3)

1.5 Review of the past and current budgets
The budget for WAC remained essentially flat from the program’s inception in 1988 until 2003, when Dean Scully increased our budget for student assistants by $2,900.

Our student assistant budget was funded for years at $7,100 and did not receive an increase until the fiscal year 2003-04 to $10,000 (not including the summer budget).

Each year, we have received funds of approximately $4,500 from the Dean of A&S to pay for student tutors over the summer school terms. This allocation has been a supplement to our annual operating budget. This budget has never been adequate, and increasing demands on our program render it more and more inadequate each year.

After a decade of requests for English as a Second Language (ESL) tutors, we received funding of $3,000 from the Provost’s office in spring 2003. The source of these funds was transferred to City College in fall 2004; however, City College eliminated the funding early spring 2005.

1.6 Resource needs/wants/reallocation
Our highest budgeting priority would be an increase in funding for student assistants from $10,000 to $30,000 per year to allow us to employ an adequate number of the highest-quality students from across the disciplines as WAC tutors. Our next priority would be $6,000 per year specifically dedicated to hiring ESL tutors.
1.7 Summary of achievements
During the 2004-05 academic year, 3,456 students visited the Writing Center. Of these, 1,886 came in for individual writing tutorials. This number represents an approximate increase of 12% in the number of individual tutorials from the previous year. The WAC Electronic Classroom was utilized by 160 classes, with 2,735 enrolled students. WAC supervises tutoring for the Institute for Ministry Extension Program which assisted with 355 papers (their program does not follow the academic calendar). For more information about the tutoring for the Institute for Ministry Extension Program, see Appendix I.
2. Identification of the Department
(Official name) (1 page max)
Writing Across the Curriculum

2.1 General statement and descriptive information concerning the department
The mission of Writing Across the Curriculum is to foster consensus that writing is integral to a liberal arts education at Loyola and to support the use of writing as a learning tool in all disciplines.

2.2 General statement and descriptive information concerning the department
Since 1987, Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) has supported student writing at Loyola. WAC helps faculty design writing assignments for their courses and helps students develop the skills they need to make the most of their learning experiences. WAC offers writing tutoring to all Loyola students at any stage of the writing process and provides classroom facilities for computer-based instruction in writing and research.

2.2.1 Headcounts of full-time and part-time staff (as of 08/01/04 and 6/20/05)
Three professional staff, 16 work-study tutors and 6 student assistant tutors [fall] 14 work-study tutors and 10 student assistant tutors [spring].

2.2.2 Headcounts of faculty (as of 08/01/04 and 06/20/05): tenured, tenure track, full-time extraordinary, and part-time extraordinary.
One faculty member tenured in the English Department: Melanie McKay, Ph.D., English, WAC Director

2.2.3 Headcounts and student credit hours of fulltime and part-time undergraduate students (if appropriate) (Stats Day 04F & 05S)
WAC offered a one credit class, ENGL 491, in which 15 students enrolled for fall 2004.

2.2.4 Headcounts and student credit hours of fulltime and part-time graduate students (if appropriate) (Stats Day 04F & 05S)
N/A
3. Assessment (2 pages max)

3.1 General statement on how assessment is conducted within the department, both assessment of learning outcomes and departmental processes.
Assessment is conducted by student surveys, tutor session summaries, and faculty surveys; results are automatically entered into a database for use in planning. We assess the effectiveness of special projects by means of these instruments as well as portfolio analysis, and pre/post assessment of sample papers. See Appendices II – IV for survey instruments.

3.2 Year 04-05 goals/objectives for learning outcomes and departmental processes (include how these goals are strategic to both the department’s, college’s, and the university’s mission; these should be based on the department’s strategic plan).
During 2004-05, WAC developed learning outcomes associated with three main areas in our strategic plan. We implemented assessments of these learning outcomes (see 3.3) during fall 04. See learning outcomes and assessments in 3.3. See Appendix V for progress on other goals and objectives that grew out of our strategic plan.

3.3 Description of assessment activities and their results for year 04-05 goals including learning outcomes assessment and processes assessment.
Outcome assessments from spring 05:

Learning Outcome 1: WAC’s drop-in peer tutoring will help Loyola students identify their strengths and weaknesses as writers.

Outcomes: By working with WAC tutors, students will learn to
  a. identify which parts of the writing process (pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing) present challenges to them.
  b. evaluate the drafts of their papers for revision.
  c. recognize and correct major grammatical errors.
  d. apply what they’ve learned to future writing assignments.
  e. gain confidence in their ability to handle college-level writing tasks.

Assessments:
The percentage of students reporting that their tutoring experience was excellent/very good was 83.8%. For specifics about each of the outcomes, see Appendix V.

Learning Outcome 2: WAC’s drop-in peer tutoring will help Loyola students improve their writing.

Outcomes: By working with WAC tutors, students will learn to
  a. develop the necessary skills to plan and execute writing assignments.
  b. formulate thesis statements that respond appropriately to the assignment and articulate a defensible position.
  c. organize their ideas clearly and effectively.
  d. develop their ideas using factual evidence, illustrative examples, citations to authority, analogies, and other supporting devices.
  e. write paragraphs with substantive topic sentences, unified focus, adequate detail, and logical organization.

Assessments:
38% of students reported that WAC helped them improve their thesis; 66% state that WAC helped to develop ideas; 75% state WAC helped strengthen paragraphs; 87% state WAC helps with mechanical issues. For more details see Appendix VI.
On our faculty survey, 78% strongly agree/agree that WAC tutors helped their students develop the necessary skills to plan and execute writing assignments.

Learning Outcome 3: WAC’s instructional support to classes will help students learn to apply effective writing strategies to writing assignments in the disciplines

Outcomes:

a. students will learn to focus their papers using the assignment guidelines provided.
b. students will learn to improve their papers through revision using writing guidelines and/or by working with WAC tutors.
c. students will improve their ability to use the documentation systems appropriate to the discipline.
d. students will learn to prepare appropriate written support materials for oral presentations.
e. students will learn the basics of rhetorically effective website design.

Assessments:

Self-assessments by student writers
Assessments by WAC tutors
Faculty surveys on student writing
Portfolio analysis
Pre- and Post- course assessments of sample papers
Commercial assessment instruments

On our survey, 85% of students responded that the tutor provided them information they can use when completing assignments in the future.

Specific data for the WAC/Psychology peer assistant project indicate that the project was a success in getting students to write about subject matter in progressively sophisticated ways, from simple, factual summary, to analysis of issues and problems, to argumentation, evaluation, and synthesis. All measures tested showed statistically significant improvement. See Appendix VII.

3.4 Assessment of internal (within the university) and external (outside Loyola) environments affecting the department.

The increased commitment at the university and college level to assessing students’ writing skills—including the university level assessments of critical thinking and writing as part of the Collegiate Learning Assessment Consortium; the possible development of ‘writing-intensive courses; the writing skills included in experimental FYE courses—will involve WAC staff in a variety of new endeavors. This involvement will necessitate an increase in the number of our student assistant tutors as well as the addition of a faculty/professional staff line to manage the increased workload.
4. Planning (2 pages max)

4.1 General statement describing strategic planning in the department (The complete strategic plan should be posted on the department’s Intranet site.) Twice each year WAC staff meet with the WAC Advisory Board to discuss planning issues and progress on past goals and objectives and the evolution of our strategic plan. The WAC Advisory Board selects the WAC Fellows each spring. The Strategic Plan is posted on our website.

4.2 Top 3-4 strategic learning outcome and process goals/objectives for 05-06 year
(Indicate how the assessment information from Section 3 above informed the formation of these goals.)
The top priorities for WAC in 2005-06 are all included under Goals # 1 and 2:

**Goal 1:** To promote the use of writing in all classes through interdisciplinary faculty forums, class lectures, and consultation on writing in the disciplines.

- **Objective 1:** Work with A & S Dean’s office and the ad hoc committee on writing intensive courses to develop and implement writing-intensive courses as appropriate.
- **Objective 2:** To help A&S faculty designing first-year pilot programs/seminars incorporate writing instruction and support into their courses.
- **Objective 3:** To work with new faculty each year on incorporating writing and WAC tutorial support into their courses. By doing so, we will raise students’ awareness of our services as well.
- **Objective 4:** To participate in review of Loyola’s Common Curriculum, if such a review occurs, to assess where writing is being taught and to help integrate writing into courses where the reviewing committee determines that it should be.

**Goal 2:** To offer easily accessible peer tutoring that helps Loyola students improve the quality of their writing.

- **Objective 1:** To secure a permanent budget increase to allow the recruitment, hiring, and retention of Loyola’s most outstanding writers to serve as peer tutors in the WAC Writing Center.
- **Objective 2:** Revise assessment instrument and data collection procedures.

4.3 Description of resources needed to support the obtainment of the 05-06 goals
We need to increase the budget for student assistants from $10,000 per year to $30,000 per year. This amount would allow us to hire 20 outstanding student writing tutors on student assistant (not work-study) lines for 8-9 hours per week throughout the academic year (summer excluded). We need this number of qualified peer tutors now to handle our volume, which has increased by 12% since 2003-2004 to 1,886. This increase represents part of an overall increase in the number of individual tutorials of 138% since 2001-02.

4.4 Evaluation criteria and evaluation plan for these goals
**Goal 1/Objective 1:** Progress toward implementing Writing Intensive courses will be evaluated in consultation with the Dean’s office.

- **Objective 2:** We shall develop and administer faculty feedback instrument to assess the effectiveness of WAC’s input into FYE programs.

- **Objective 3:** We shall keep a database of work with new faculty and use existing faculty survey instrument to access our services.
Objective 4: Evaluation to be conducted in consultation with the Dean’s office.

Goal 2/Objective 1: Obtain funds to employ this number of outstanding writers.

Objective 2: Complete revisions and compare assessment data with 04-05 data to determine whether new systems have improved assessment.
5. Budget (2 pages max)

5.1 FY04-05 “budgeted” totals for both salary and operating budgets.
The budgeted total for salaries is $78,300; the operating budget is $20,830.

5.1.1 Budget discussion (This discussion is a comment on whether or not the budget for the current fiscal year (August 1, 2004 – July 31, 2005) seems adequate.)

The budget for the academic year 04-05 was not adequate (See sections 1.5, 1.6, and 4.3). Ongoing underfunding has prevented WAC from employing students with the necessary skills for over a decade. To meet existing demands in a high-quality manner, we need to triple our student assistant budget. As the developments projected in section 3.4 occur, our needs for this funding will become even more acute as will our need for an additional faculty/professional staff line.

5.2 NOT APPLICABLE for A&S Departments: FY05-06 “budgeted” totals for both salary and operating budgets *

5.2.1 NOT APPLICABLE for A&S Departments: Budget discussion (This discussion is a comment on whether or not the budget for the fiscal year (August 1, 2005 – July 31, 2006) seems adequate and what precautions the unit needs to exercise in its operations.) *

* Salary and operating budget information is available through the FRS system.

6.1 Personnel
Professional staff positions have been adequate thus far. New developments at the university will result in the need for an additional faculty/professional line (see sections 3.4 and 5.1.1).

6.1.1 General statement on adequacy of staffing to meet present and future strategic goals. New developments at the university will result in the need for an additional faculty/professional line (see sections 3.4, 5.1.1. and 6.1). In addition, WAC will need more discipline-specific student assistants to handle the increased work load associated with these developments.

6.1.2 Priority listing of additional/revised faculty/staff positions
1. Student Assistants
2. Additional staff, depending on factors described above.

6.2 Facility improvements
During the mid-terms and finals periods of each semester, there is not enough space conducive to tutoring sessions. If writing intensive courses proliferate, WAC will need additional space.

6.2.1 General statement on facilities including classrooms, office space, meeting spaces, etc. to meet present and future strategic goals
Presently, WAC utilizes an electronic classroom, three small offices for professional staff, and a small open area for student tutoring. Although this space has been adequate in the past, curricular changes may necessitate additional space for tutoring.

6.2.2 Priority listing of facility improvements (Include cost estimates to the extent possible.)
Additional tutoring space needs cannot be estimated at this point, as they depend on developments in the internal environment.

6.3 Technology/professional development support
Technology/professional development support is adequate at this time.

6.3.1 General statement on technology/professional development needed to meet present and future strategic goals
Our technology needs will depend on implementation of plans by the college to increase the writing requirements of classes.

6.3.2 Priority listing of technology needs, including media, professional development
We cannot estimate at this point; see 6.3.1.

6.4 Budget reduction/reallocation/revenue generation plans

6.4.1 General statement regarding areas for reallocation, reduction of expenses, or generation of additional revenue
N/A

6.4.2 Priority listing of budget reduction/reallocation/revenue generation plans
Cannot estimate at present.
7. Summary of Achievements (1 page max)

7.1 Department as a whole
See 1.7

7.2 Faculty achievements/service summarized (if appropriate)
Melanie McKay: 1) developed and offered an experimental FYE course entitled “New Orleans Texts and Contexts” fall 2004. The English T125 course was linked with Dr. Mark Fernandez’ s History X194 course on Louisiana history. Dr. McKay developed the course proposal and plan as a PIES project to introduce students to New Orleans history and literature from the colonial period forward. Both courses develop critical thinking and writing skills. The English T125 course incorporates experiential learning exercises led by Student Affairs staff. The linkage will be offered as part of a year-long FYE program in 2005-06.

7.3 Staff achievements/service summarized (if appropriate)
Robert Bell 1) presented a paper entitled “The Tomb of Nationalism: The (Im)possibility of the “Other” in A Tomb for Boris Davidovich” at the 2005 Joint Conference of the National Popular Culture and American Culture Associations in San Diego.
2) received with Dr. Elizabeth Hammer, Chair of Psychology, a Program for Instructional Effectiveness Support (PIES) grant to link a common curriculum class, The Emerging Self (Eng T125) with a major’s class, Social Psychology (PSYC A240).
3) in conjunction with Assistant Provost John Cornwell, researched and created the SACS re-accreditation report on Loyola’s academic support services.
4) Associate Fiction Editor, New Orleans Review 30.2 & 31.1.

Avia Alonzo 1) completed a seminar: “Dealing with Difficult People.”
2) attended monthly Administrative Assistant meetings.
3) member of executive board Black Student Union.

7.4 Student achievements summarized (if appropriate)
We are very proud of the following tutors’ achievements in 2004-2005:
Katherine Faust— The Chemical Rubber Co. General Chemistry Achievement Award
Nicholas Holtzman— The Outstanding Research Award in Psychology
Meghan Iverson— David L. Boren Undergraduate Scholarship Recipient (National Security Education Program)
Katherine Jones — Andrew W. Mellon Fellowship Recipient, Rhodes Scholar State Finalist, Pearson Finalist, The Optima Discipula Classical Studies in Latin Award, The Αριστεύειο Μαθητής Classical Studies in Greek, The M. St. Romain University Honors Program, Outstanding Student Award, College of A & S Percy A. Roy, S.J. Memorial Award
Zack McGar— Dawson Gaillard Excellence in Short Non-Fiction Award
Clare M. Nemanich— Dawson Gaillard Excellence in Fiction Award
David Riche— WAC Writing Fellowship
Abby Roberts— Truman Award Finalist
Annie Kate Scott— The Eugene Cota Robles Fellowship (UCLA), Dux Socioloicus, Who’s Who Among American Colleges and Universities, Loyola’s Women and Men of the Third Class Award College of A & S Percy A. Roy, S.J. Memorial Award
Institute for Ministry Extension Program Tutor Report for 2004

The total number of papers submitted to the tutoring service during 2004 was 355, the same number as in 2003. The number of papers submitted in 2005 through 15 June was 190.

Table 1: Total Number of Papers Submitted to the LIM Tutoring Service by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Papers Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 (through 15 June only)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in previous years, the bulk of papers submitted to the tutoring service were concentrated in the early courses (90 papers were submitted for courses 2 and 3 in a ten course sequence); however, there was a sharp upswing in Course 10 papers submitted to the service (64 in 2004 as compared to 8 the previous year).

Table 2: Number of Papers Submitted to LIM Tutoring Service by Year and Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Courses</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fall 2004, the tutoring service implemented an online Student User Survey to measure student satisfaction and to assist in evaluating outcomes. In fall 2004, of 78 users, 16 responded to the survey, a 5% response rate. Up to 15 June 2005, of 190 users, 29 responded to the survey, a 15% response rate.
Appendix II

Assessment Instruments for Learning Outcomes: Student Surveys

Every student visiting the writing center for tutoring is sent an on-line evaluation to complete and return to us. The instrument evaluates the type and quality of the help the student received. The results are automatically entered into a database for use in planning.

Writing Across the Curriculum
Student User Survey

Please complete the following survey so that we may assess our tutoring services and continue to improve them.

Name of tutor who helped you: ____________________________

Name of the faculty member grading this assignment: ____________________________

1. In your session with the tutor, what parts of the writing process did you work on?
   a) prewriting
   b) drafting
   c) revising
   d) editing
   e) N/A

2. Did your session help you write a thesis that
   a) responded more appropriately to the assignment
   b) articulated a stronger position
   c) N/A

3. Did your session help you develop your ideas more effectively using any of the following devices? (Check all that apply)
   a) factual evidence
   b) illustrative examples
   c) citations to authority
   d) analogies
   e) supporting devices
   f) adequate detail
   N/A

4. Did your session help you strengthen your paragraphs through stronger
   a) topic sentences
   b) unified focus
   c) logical organization
   N/A

5. Did your session help you learn more about documentation using
   a) MLA Style
   b) APA Style
   c) Other

6. Did your session help you improve
   a) sentence structure and style
   b) comma use
   c) grammatical correctness
   d) other mechanical issues
   N/A
7. How would you rate the overall quality of tutoring?
   a) excellent
   b) very good
   c) good
   d) average
   e) poor

8. Do you feel that the tutor gave you information you can use when completing other assignments in the future?
   Yes  No

Would you recommend the WAC Writing Center to others?
   Yes  No

If you have any specific comments you feel would help improve the quality of our services, please write them below.
Appendix III

Assessment Instruments for Learning Outcomes: Tutor Surveys

After each tutoring session, WAC tutors complete a report explaining the purpose of the session and the problems addressed. Tutors evaluate the participation of the writer and the progress made during the session. Surveys are completed online; results are automatically entered into a database for use in planning.

Tutoring Session Summary

Writer’s Full Name: ___________________________ [PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY]

Writer’s email: ___________________________ Date: ____________ Time: ____________

Professor’s Name: ___________________________ Class Name & Number: _________________________

First Visit: Yes  No Tutor: ___________________________

1) What part of the writing process did you and your tutee work on today?
   prewriting   drafting   revising   editing   n/a

2) Did you help the tutee by working on a thesis that
   a) responded more appropriately to the assignment
   b) articulated a stronger position
   c) n/a

3. Did your session deal with development of ideas using any of the following devices? (Check all that apply)
   a) factual evidence   b) illustrative examples
   c) citations to authority   d) analogies
   e) adequate detail   f) N/A

4. In terms of paragraphing did you work on
   a) topic sentences
   b) unified focus
   c) logical organization
   d) transitions
   e) N/A

5. Did you address documentation issues using
   a) MLA
   b) APA
   c) Chicago
   d) Other: ___________________________
   e) N/A
6. In terms of sentence level issues did you work on
   a) Sentence structure and style
   b) Comma use
   c) Grammatical Correctness
   d) Other mechanical issues
   e) N/A

7. Writer’s Involvement in the Session:

8. Tutor’s Analysis of the Session:

   Tutor: Make sure your name is filled in!!!!!!!!!!!
Appendix IV

Assessment Instruments for Learning Outcomes: Faculty Survey

WAC Faculty Survey

Professor’s Name___________________________________

Class Name and Number_____________________________

Date______________________________

Thank you for inviting Writing Across the Curriculum to help your students with their writing. Your feedback on this survey will help us assess how well we are meeting our goals of supporting student writing at Loyola. Please take a moment to complete the survey and return it to us.

5  4  3  2  1
Strongly Agree      Agree      Not Applicable    Disagree      Strongly Disagree

1. Working with WAC tutors helped my students develop the necessary skills to plan and execute writing assignments. (Circle one below).

2. Working with WAC tutors helped my students formulate thesis statements that responded appropriately to the assignment and articulated a defensible position.

3. Working with WAC tutors helped my students organize their ideas clearly and effectively.

4. Working with WAC tutors helped my students develop their ideas using factual evidence, illustrative examples, citations to authority, analogies, and other supporting devices.

5. Working with WAC tutors helped my students write paragraphs with substantive topic sentences, unified focus, adequate detail, and logical organization.

6. Working with WAC tutors helped my students improve their ability to use the documentation systems appropriate to the discipline.
7. Lectures and handouts by WAC staff helped my students learn to focus their papers effectively.

5  4  3  2  1

8. Assignment guidelines provided by WAC staff helped my students improve their papers through revision.

5  4  3  2  1

9. Lectures and handouts by WAC staff helped my students improve their ability to use the documentation systems appropriate to the discipline.

5  4  3  2  1

Please add written comments below. Thanks again for working with Writing Across the Curriculum to support student writing at Loyola.
**Appendix V**

Progress on 04-05 Strategic Goals and Objectives

**Goal 1:** To promote the use of writing in all classes through interdisciplinary faculty forums, class lectures, and consultation on writing in the disciplines.

  **Objective 1:** Help PIES faculty design writing assignments and revise syllabi to incorporate these assignments in a way that promotes learning/critical thinking in their freshman courses.

  **PROGRESS:** WAC Director worked with Drs. Emily Drew (Sociology), Guillermo Tonnsman (Math and Computer Science) Elizabeth Hammer and Lawrence Lewis (Psychology), and Judith Hunt (History) with syllabi and assignment development. The professors made changes to both syllabi and assignments and report that their classes are more effective and WAC’s guidelines has had a positive effect on student performance.

  **Objective 2:** Incorporate lessons from year one of the WAC / Psychology department partnership in a writing-to-learn program for freshman psychology majors.

  **PROGRESS:** WAC Director and Assistant Director helped Drs. Hammer and Lewis develop segmented writing assignments for the first-year psych learning community; supervised psych peer assistants; delivered lectures on writing in learning community classes; developed and implemented assessment instruments to measure improvements in students’ writing skills. According to data collected, students’ writing improved in a statistically significant manner. See Appendix VI for details.

  **Objective 3:** Work with the SACS Reaccreditation Team on university-wide assessment of seniors’ writing skills to determine whether writing should be assigned and taught in more classes across the curriculum.

  **PROGRESS:** On hold pending go-ahead from Assistant Provost Cornwell.

  **Objective 4:** Work with the appropriate office (A&S Dean’s Office or Provost’s Office) to collect data on which courses include writing assignments and instruction in the College and/or the university.

  **PROGRESS:** At the request of the A&S Dean, WAC Acting Director served on the ad hoc committee to develop a plan for writing-intensive courses at Loyola. He surveyed writing-intensive programs at similar institutions and, in collaboration with the English department chair, developed a preliminary proposal to the committee. That committee is now working to create a writing intensive proposal for the A&S Dean.

**Goal 2:** To offer easily accessible peer tutoring that helps Loyola students improve the quality of their writing.

  **Objective 1:** Review assessment plan to ensure that WAC tutoring is helping students improve their writing.

  **PROGRESS:** Learning outcomes revised according to Advisory Committee input, fall 2004. Assessment mechanisms in place, and according to our 2004-2005 student survey results, 83.8% of students who were tutored report that the quality of tutoring was
Excellent/Very Good. 96% of students, who sought tutoring, would recommend WAC services to other students.

Objective 2: Link assessment more closely to program planning.

PROGRESS: In spite of the favorable statistics, WAC will continue working to improve the quality of tutoring the students’ receive and continue to assist faculty incorporating more writing into their classroom activities.

Objective 3: Continue to work with City College to ensure that ESL tutoring is available for all non-native writers at Loyola.

PROGRESS: Funding for ESL tutors eliminated by City College, Spring 2005; however, WAC feels this population is underserved and seeks funding to re-implement the program.

Goal 3: To maintain and operate computer centers and classrooms consistent with up-to-date writing and research technologies.

Objective 1: Supervise upgrade of WAC writing center equipment.
Objective 2: Test upgraded equipment to ensure proper functioning of hardware and software.

PROGRESS: Both objectives completed, fall 2004.
## Appendix VI
### WAC Student Survey Results academic year 04-05

1. **In your session with the tutor, what parts of the writing process Did you work on? (Check all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not answered)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prewriting</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>51.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Responses** 451 100%

2. **Did your session help you write a thesis that (Check all that apply):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not answered)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded more appropriately to the assignment</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulated a stronger position</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>60.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Responses** 306 100%

3. **Did your session help you develop your ideas more effectively Using any of the following devices? (Check all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not answered)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual evidence</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrative examples</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations to authority</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate detail</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>26.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>32.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Responses** 381 100%

4. **Did your session help you strengthen your paragraphs through Stronger (Check all that apply):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stronger</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not answered)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic sentences</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified focus</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical organization</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>29.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Responses** 413 100%
5. Did your session help you learn more about documentation using:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not answered)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA style</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA style</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>59.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. During the discussion of your paper, did you also learn about (Check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not answered)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence structure and style</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comma use</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Correctness</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mechanical issues</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>519</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How would you rate the overall quality of tutoring?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not answered)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>50.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>33.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do you feel that the tutor gave you information you can use when completing other assignments in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not answered)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>85.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Would you recommend the WAC Writing Center to others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not answered)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>96.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VII

Summary of Data for the WAC/Psychology Peer Assistant Project
complied by Dr. Elizabeth Hammer

This year we continued the WAC/Psychology peer assistant project. This project, previously funded by a Louisiana Board of Regents grant, was funded by the dean’s office. Approximately 70 freshmen participated in this project from fall through the spring (AY 04-05). F04 students were enrolled in Dr. Hammer and Dr. Lewis’s PSYC A100 courses. Students participating in S05 were enrolled in Dr. Hammer and Dr. Etherton’s PSYC A240 and PSYC A235 courses respectively. A random sample of 10 students’ writing was assessed at 3 points in time: a pre-writing sample before entering the project, a final sample at the end of F04, and a final sample at end of S05. Two English faculty members uninvolved with the project independently evaluated each sample using a rubric developed to assess the following writing skills on a scale of 1 to 6:

- Strength of thesis
- Effectiveness of organization
- Development of ideas/evidence
- Strength and clarity of argument
- Grammatical and mechanical correctness

Data indicate that the project was a success in getting students to write about subject matter in progressively sophisticated ways, from simple, factual summary, to analysis of issues and problems, to argumentation, evaluation, and synthesis.

• Encouragingly, the biggest difference was noted when comparing students before they entered the project to their final writing assignment at the end of two semesters in the project. Every student (except 1 who stayed the same) showed improvement from the pre-writing assignment to the final assignment in S05. The mean score for the pre-writing sample was 2.95 with a mean of 5.25 on the final S05 assignment. This was a statistically significant difference ($t=-6.41$, $p<.001$).

Analyzing the first semester only, 7 students showed improvement from the pre-writing assignment to the final assignment in F04, 1 decreased, and 1 stayed the same (one did not have F04 data). The mean score for the pre-writing sample was 2.95 with a mean of 4.611 on the final F04 assignment. This was a statistically significant difference ($t=-3.95$, $p=.004$).

As a measure of carry over from one semester to the next, 6 students showed improvement from the final assignment in F04 to the final assignment in S05, one (1) decreased, and two (2) stayed the same. The mean score for the final F04 assignment was 4.611 with a mean of 5.25 on the final S05 assignment. This was difference approached statistical significance ($t=-2.14$, $p=.065$).