

---

### 3 Detailed Reports: The Institutions, Their WAC Programs, and Their Research Methods

---

#### UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

by Barbara E. Walvoord, Virginia Slachman, and Lisa Udel

#### **The University and Its WAC Program**

The University of Cincinnati serves approximately 36,000 students in seventeen different, highly autonomous colleges, ranging from two-year to graduate-level colleges, and from open-admissions to highly selective. WAC began there in 1989 as part of a general education reform that would, for the first time, require a communications component in every general education course. Quickly expanding beyond general education to serve faculty as a whole, WAC, led by a strong faculty committee, enjoyed high visibility and success, as perceived by participants and administrators.

During the first two years, the program focused almost entirely on five two-day off-campus workshops, each with twenty to thirty full- and part-time faculty from a wide range of disciplines. Workshops were led by Toby Fulwiler and Henry Steffens from the University of Vermont and held in a restored Shaker village ("Shakertown") in rural Kentucky. The committee worked hard to attract highly influential faculty into the workshops. We will refer to this cohort of 1989–1991 Fulwiler-Steffens workshop faculty as "Population A," and our study follows them most closely (see Table 2.3).

In autumn 1991, Walvoord arrived to fill the newly created WAC director's position, and from that time until the end of this study, she led all the workshops herself—still two days and still at Shakertown. By 1995, 337 additional faculty had attended, and more

were continually attending as the study developed. We will refer to these 1991–1995 Walvoord workshop faculty as “Population B.”

After Walvoord’s arrival, the WAC program grew rapidly and flourished. From 1991 to 1995, WAC offered a plethora of on-campus workshops ranging in duration from an hour to a day, as well as individual consultations. For example, during the academic year 1993–1994, WAC offered twenty-five on-campus workshops, three small groups of faculty working on classroom research, and numerous individual consultations, affecting, in all, 419 faculty who discussed WAC with Walvoord for more than half an hour (not all of them had attended the two-day workshop; thus not all are included in Population A or Population B).

WAC became a center of energy for the entire teaching-improvement emphasis at UC. WAC spawned a program to work with departmental cultures, which received a grant and established its own office, collaborating closely with WAC. WAC faculty were active in the many other teaching-enhancement initiatives springing up all across campus: ongoing plans for general education reform, oral and visual communication across the curriculum, critical thinking, math education reform, teaching workshops for engineers, assessment, Total Quality Management, and others. The WAC office organized a university-wide task force to construct a strategic plan for enhancing teaching and learning at UC. The WAC program was generously supported by top administrators, even through stringent budgetary cut-backs. The president began citing it widely in public as one of the stellar programs at the university. In the midst of running this growing and highly visible WAC program, then, we conducted our research on WAC outcomes.

### **Faculty Populations Studied**

This account and our book focus most heavily on Population A—the 1989–1991 Fulwiler-Steffens workshop attendees—because they have the longest history. Also, Population A faculty, we reasoned, could be more candid with Walvoord, since she had not been present for their initial years in WAC. The 146 who originally attended a Fulwiler-Steffens workshop included full- and part-time faculty from a wide range of disciplines and at various levels, from instructor to full professor. In the academic year 1991–1992, when Walvoord arrived and began tracking them, 131 were still teaching at UC. During the following three years, we collected data from 117 of them. Thus we had data from 89

percent of those who had continued teaching at UC until 1991 (80 percent of the total 146 who had originally attended). Table 3.1 shows the characteristics of the 117 Population A faculty we contacted.

It must be remembered that Population A faculty were recruited by WAC Committee members who were themselves campus leaders and who specifically tried to tap other campus leaders. This recruitment, plus UC's sharp curtailment of new faculty tenure-track hires during the late 1980s, helps to account for the fact that our sample is 71 percent tenured (versus 54 percent of all UC full-time faculty, according to an editorial in the *Cincinnati Enquirer* of June 2, 1993). Moreover, it is possible that being tenured conferred upon faculty who came from four-year and graduate (and therefore more research-oriented) colleges a greater freedom to pay attention to teaching rather than research. We mentioned earlier that the WAC adherents at each college were "early adopters" and were thus perhaps distinguished by their willingness to take risks and by their horizontal networks across departmental lines.

We augmented Population A data with data from Population B, the 337 who had joined WAC from 1991 through 1995. Some members of Population B came to multidisciplinary workshops as part of a departmental cohort, or to discipline-specific workshops, which, we reasoned, would tend to encourage those "middle adopters" who tended to network more narrowly within their own departments. But we found essentially the same themes in Population B. The total of Populations A and B, 454 faculty, is about 25 percent of the full- and part-time UC faculty who teach undergraduates. It's possible that the 25 percent are still largely early adopters, or that the WAC workshops have had similar effects on early and middle adopters, or that the "adopter" research, which was conducted in fields other than teaching innovations, doesn't really fit the complex, multifaceted growth of a teacher.

## Data Collection

Our data collection process followed the stages described in the next five sections.

### Stage 1: Initial Population A Workshops, Follow-Up Lunches, and a Booklet of Faculty Writing

Before Walvoord arrived, five workshops had enrolled the Population A faculty, who had written responses to the workshops on the last day. A few follow-up luncheon sessions had been held on campus,

**Table 3.1.** Characteristics of the 117 UC Population A WAC faculty

|   |     |                              |     |
|---|-----|------------------------------|-----|
| Tenured:                                | 71% | Tenure-track untenured:      | 11% |
| Nontenure track:                        | 16% | Unknown:                     | 2%  |
| Female:                                 | 51% | Minority:                    | 6%  |
| Two-year colleges of UC:                | 23% | Four-year/Graduate colleges: | 77% |
| Disciplines:                            |     | Disciplines:                 |     |
| Natural Sciences:                       | 10% | Social Sciences/Business:    | 18% |
| Math/Computers:                         | 10% | Humanities/Languages/Arts:   | 32% |
| Education and other<br>preprofessional: | 30% |                              |     |

where participants told of their experiences. No one took notes, but people later remembered some of what was said.

Also, in 1990, before Walvoord arrived, the WAC Committee published a booklet of essays and poems about teaching and learning, written by nineteen WAC workshop attendees.

### Stage 2: The Initial Questionnaire/Interview, 1991–1992

Stage 2, 1991–1992, began shortly after Walvoord's arrival. Our methods were guided by two factors: as a new director, Walvoord needed to find out what had been happening, to get to know past WAC workshop attendees (Population A), and to tap their ideas for the future of the program. Further, since university resources were being sharply curtailed and public criticism of the university was rising, she was keenly aware of the need to demonstrate the program's success to administrators and external audiences in order to ensure continued funding and support.

To meet these needs, we (Walvoord and the graduate students who assisted in the WAC office for one year each and who co-authored this UC section of the study) focused on *change in teaching* as the measure of workshop success because it could easily be communicated to external audiences and was in line with the agenda of the public. Change remained a strong theme throughout all the UC data and in the final interviews collected on all three campuses for this book.

We gathered information on change through questionnaires that were combined with group and individual interviews and examinations of classroom assignments, syllabi, and similar documents. After

a survey of questionnaires in the literature, we composed our own (Appendix C). The need for quick, easily comprehensible evidence of the program's "success" led us to ask faculty a few simple questions: "As a result of the Shakertown workshop, I have made at least some change in my teaching: Yes or No" and "The changes that I have made are . . . ." But our need for program planning and for getting to know these people led us to add several open-ended questions such as "Problems or questions that have arisen are . . . ."

In the first forty-three questionnaires, the question about what kinds of changes faculty had made was open-ended because we did not want to dictate the response options but rather to listen to what faculty said. We then used those forty-three answers to construct a set of stated options for the subsequent questionnaires (Appendix C shows these options). We stated the options because we wanted part of our sample to be responding to the same set of prompts so that we could compare the relative frequency of consistently worded responses.

Our need for more depth than a questionnaire could provide also led us to embed the questionnaires within small-group lunchtime discussions so that we could learn more. We invited all 131 Population A faculty who were then on campus. Eighty-four attended the luncheons in groups ranging from three to eight members. They filled out the questionnaire individually at the beginning, and then they discussed their WAC experiences and problems while Walvoord took notes.

We conducted telephone interviews with an additional seventeen faculty who did not attend discussions. Telephone responses were not substantially different from the discussion-group responses; frequently, telephoned faculty told us they had missed the small-group discussions simply owing to scheduling problems, not owing to disaffection. However, a few faculty appeared in this phone sample who had made little use of the workshop or who expressed disappointment in it. With one exception, every faculty member whom we were able to reach by phone agreed to be interviewed. Several others were away on sabbatical, and one person's husband refused to let us speak with her.

In Stage 2, then, we contacted 101 Population A faculty, which was 77 percent of the 131 who were still teaching on campus during 1991–1992. (In later stages we picked up an additional sixteen faculty for our total of 89 percent of the 131—see Tables 2.3 and 3.1.) Already, we were beginning to listen more richly and fully to faculty stories, rather than simply asking, "Did you change or didn't you?" or distributing a "match-to-sample" (page 3, this volume) questionnaire based on researchers' definitions of WAC strategies.

### **Stage 3: Small Discussion Groups, Faculty-Authored Accounts, Ethnographic Studies of Departmental Cultures, and a Classroom Case Study, 1992–1994**

During the next two academic years, 1992–1994, we contacted fifty-seven of the 131 Population A faculty. About one-third of them were contacted two or more times. Sixteen of the fifty-seven had been missed in our 101 questionnaires of 1991–1992. Thus, within Stages 2 and 3 combined, we contacted 117 (89 percent) of the 131 Population A faculty (see Tables 2.3 and 3.1).

In Stage 3, we gathered data from small discussion groups of various kinds, from faculty-authored presentations or written articles, from ethnographic studies of departmental cultures, and from a classroom case study. The following numbers will add up to more than fifty-seven because some faculty participated in more than one activity. Walvoord took notes as forty-three Population A faculty, mixed with twenty-three Population B faculty, discussed their WAC strategies and problems in ninety-minute luncheon meetings. Walvoord also took notes, or we had the written texts and handouts, when twenty-four Population A faculty gave oral presentations or authored articles about their use of WAC strategies for audiences of other faculty. Seven Population A faculty, together with four Population B faculty, joined in classroom research groups that met three to eight times during an academic year. Thirty-three Population A faculty, along with Population B faculty and faculty who had not attended WAC workshops, served with Walvoord on various committees and task forces whose work gave rise to revelations about how the faculty member had been affected by WAC. Some examples were the WAC Committee, as well as the committee that planned and led lunchtime discussions on teaching, the committee that worked with other faculty to prepare and approve course proposals for general education courses which had a writing-intensive component, and committees that worked within individual departments to improve teaching. Walvoord took notes at these meetings.

During 1993, Walvoord, with several collaborators, began to study how the cultures of eight UC departments impacted teaching. Walvoord and her collaborators or interviewees discussed teaching and departmental cultures, examined departmental and teaching documents, or attended departmental meetings. The study, more broadly, gave Walvoord a rich view of the departmental contexts in which WAC faculty worked.

In 1993–1994, Walvoord collaborated with John Bryan (Population B) to study Bryan's business writing class, using interviews with students, classroom observations, interviews and informal

discussions during work sessions with Bryan, examination of documents, and classroom transcripts (Walvoord and Bryan 1995).

One classroom visitation by Walvoord was conducted at the faculty member's request.

These data gave Walvoord a fuller, more varied and detailed, longitudinal view of how fifty-seven Population A faculty and various Population B faculty were developing between 1992 and 1994.

#### **Stage 4: Mailed Questionnaire to Random Sample of UC Faculty, 1993–1994**

In order to get a notion of the changes that faculty in the general population, not just WAC faculty, were experiencing, during 1993–1994 we mailed a questionnaire (Appendix A) to a random 20 percent of the full-time and most stable types of part-time faculty at UC. We received 147 faculty responses—a 54 percent return. The questionnaire asked faculty whether, during the past two years, they had made any changes in their teaching which they believed had enhanced student learning. If they responded yes, we asked them to indicate from a list all of the kinds of changes they had made. The list was composed of items that the research literature indicated to be productive of student learning (e.g., Chickering and Gamson 1987; for a discussion of measuring teacher behaviors to assess student learning, see National Center for Education Statistics 1995).

#### **Stage 5: Interviews for This Book, 1993–1995**

During 1993–1995, as we explained earlier, the book's co-authors collected interviews and faculty-authored accounts on all three campuses, specifically for this book. At UC, we did twenty-two interviews with Population A faculty, deliberately trying to include some who had varying reactions to WAC. All interviews were taped and transcribed. Slachman conducted twelve of the interviews, drawing on her experience as a professional journalist and writer and going over her interview techniques with Walvoord as they reviewed her first few interview tapes. Five of the interviews were conducted by graduate students from Walvoord's "Research Methods in Composition" class. Three other faculty contacted by the graduate students declined to be interviewed, citing time constraints or not having used WAC strategies. Walvoord conducted five interviews.

The interviews were semistructured—that is, the interviewer tried to cover a list of questions (Appendix E) but not in any particular order, and the researcher used interviewee responses as the basis for further questions.

The UC interviewees quite closely resemble the Population A faculty profiled in Table 3.1, except that the interviewees included 20 percent natural science faculty and only 10 percent education and pre-professional faculty.

The quoted statements from UC faculty in this book are derived mainly from these last twenty-two interviews because these provided the most long-range and recent data. We also drew upon all the other data we had collected, including our often numerous, previous contacts with these same faculty.

In addition to the questionnaires, interviews, and discussion groups with WAC participants and the random questionnaire to UC faculty in general, we also, for this study, drew upon Walvoord's myriad informal contacts with WAC participants at UC between 1991 and 1995. At meetings, social occasions, or campus walks, people would come up and describe the latest things they were doing. Walvoord also periodically made dozens of "cold calls" to faculty listed in the campus phone directory, inviting them to workshops. These calls elicited their responses as well as stories they had heard from others. The specific data we have mentioned, then, were embedded in a rich anecdotal fund of information about what WAC participants were doing—information that proved consistent with what we heard in the more formal types of data.

---

## **TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY**

by H. Fil Dowling Jr., Joan D. McMahon, and Barbara E. Walvoord

### **The University and Its WAC Program**

Towson State University, near Baltimore, has 15,000 students in its baccalaureate and master's programs. Towson has one of the earliest writing-intensive course requirements, instituted in 1976 when a revised curriculum requirement mandated that all students take a W-I course (usually elected in the student's major field). By 1994, forty-four different W-I courses in twenty-five departments were offered, taught by faculty in those departments. Most of these faculty were full-time tenured or tenure-track.

TSU's WAC activities have been interdisciplinary from the start. An Advanced Writing Course Committee, started in 1976 and commonly consisting of eight faculty members from five or six different disciplines, creates standards and guidelines for the W-I courses, eval-

uates and approves new W-I courses, and (since 1982) sponsors workshops and other faculty development activities. A coordinator of WAC (Dowling) chairs the Advanced Writing Course Subcommittee and helps implement its activities.

These activities were stimulated in 1981 when Towson joined the newly created Baltimore Area Consortium for Writing Across the Curriculum (BACWAC), which in turn launched the Maryland Writing Project (MWP), affiliated with the National Writing Project. MWP has been headquartered at Towson since 1984. TSU's WAC coordinator, Dowling, attended MWP's first five-week Summer Institute in 1981 and has played a leadership role in BACWAC (See Walvoord and Dowling 1990). Many other Towson faculty have been involved in WAC training offered by those two groups. A variety of other campus activities have influenced Towson's WAC teachers, among them a series of workshops funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) during 1985–1987 to mainstream women's studies into Towson's regular curriculum, including W-I courses; a Center for the Teaching and Study of Writing, established in 1989; and the faculty development activities of McMahon (who earlier had attended and then co-led WAC workshops with Dowling), culminating in her 1994 appointment as project director for the University Teaching Initiative. Both Dowling and McMahon received released time to coordinate WAC activities.

### **Faculty Population Studied**

The faculty population consisted of approximately 200 faculty who were involved in workshops, the Faculty Writers' Response Group, and other WAC activities on Towson's campus, in the BACWAC consortium, in the Maryland Writing Project, and at neighboring schools. Nearly 100 of the TSU faculty at any given time teach W-I courses.

### **Data Collection**

#### **Presentations by WAC Participants**

Towson began its own series of WAC workshops in 1984, ranging from ninety minutes to two days long and led by members of its own faculty. The two-day workshops present a concise but detailed guide to WAC theory and practice, including assignment planning, writing-to-learn, syllabus revision, handling peer-response groups, evaluation of writing, and helpful auxiliary services (such as the Student Writing Lab).

The workshops encourage active learning: participants write throughout the workshop and develop at least one practical item, such as a writing assignment, that can be used immediately in their W-I courses. These two-day workshops are supplemented by ninety-minute workshops, also led by TSU faculty from a range of disciplines. They focus on a single ingredient of WAC teaching, such as developing effective ways of responding to and evaluating student writing, combating students' basic writing problems, or organizing effective student-response groups. These faculty presentations were one source of data at Towson.

### **Classroom Observations**

One of the richest sources of data at Towson (and an activity that our data indicate had a strong impact on participating faculty) was the individual, one-on-one, intensive work that Dowling did with twenty-one faculty between 1982 and 1994. At the invitation of the faculty member, Dowling attended a class for three to four weeks, talking with students and consulting with the teacher on curriculum, assignments, methods, and evaluation of writing. Not an evaluator of the visited courses, Dowling simply tried to serve as an equal and non-threatening colleague who happened to be informed about writing theory and practice. Through this classroom observation, Dowling was able to observe and compare techniques used by the WAC faculty, including methods presented to those teachers in workshops, and to observe the faculty members' thinking and approach to WAC.

### **Observations of Faculty in Groups**

The Faculty Writers' Response Group, with a membership of ten to twenty at any given time, has involved at least forty different teachers since its inception in 1985. The group provides a supportive environment for faculty to work on their own writing by acting as a peer-response group for faculty drafts. It also models WAC concepts such as writing-to-learn, the writing process, and response groups, which faculty can then use in their own teaching. Dowling has been a member since 1985, observing how faculty use workshop-suggested techniques within both the group and their own classrooms and how they have grown and developed over time.

### **Case Study of a Biology Classroom**

Between 1983 and 1986, Anderson, a TSU biologist who had attended WAC workshops, and Walvoord conducted a naturalistic study of one of Anderson's courses, an upper-level W-I course, during three differ-

ent semesters. During the three years, Anderson significantly changed the way she taught the course. The study focused on the difficulties that students encountered, the new teaching strategies that Anderson used, and the subsequent differences in student work on the assignment. Published in 1991 (Anderson and Walvoord), it provided a rich, deeply contextualized view of a WAC teacher's growth over time.

### **McMahon's Interviews**

In 1991, McMahon, using a sabbatical, interviewed eighteen Towson WAC teachers about their use of writing in their courses and published an in-house booklet in which they described their theories, methods, and problem-solutions for teaching writing.

### **Workshop Evaluation Data**

We had evaluation data collected from ninety-eight faculty at the conclusion of six of Towson's in-house WAC workshops between 1984 and 1989.

### **Interviews for This Book**

After this book project began, during 1993–1995, Dowling and McMahon conducted, taped, and transcribed interviews with five active WAC faculty at Towson (questions, Appendix E) and solicited narratives from five other WAC faculty who described the impact WAC had on them. Most of these faculty narratives were read and discussed by the Faculty Writers' Response Group and then revised.

---

## **WHITWORTH COLLEGE**

by Linda Lawrence Hunt

### **The College and Its WAC Program**

Whitworth College, a private, liberal arts, Presbyterian-related college in Spokane, Washington, has about 2,000 students. The increasingly selective undergraduate population of 1,400 has an entering grade-point average of 3.5; there are master's programs in education, music, and international management.

WAC began at Whitworth in 1987, when the Faculty Assembly voted to require a writing-intensive course in the major, after many faculty expressed frustration with their students' lack of writing skills.

The director of Composition (Linda Hunt) and the assistant to the Provost (Tammy Reid—a former English faculty member and now Acting Dean of the Faculty) co-authored a grant for a two-year faculty development program funded by CAPHE (Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education) and the M. J. Murdock Charitable Trust. This faculty administration cooperative spirit has permeated WAC efforts at Whitworth.

The primary emphasis has been a series of three- to five-day writing workshops led by Barbara Walvoord and augmented by in-house consultants and faculty presentations. Twenty-six faculty (about one-third of the total faculty) volunteered in May of 1989 for the initial five-day workshop, held on campus. The topics included connecting course goals with types of writing assignments, designing effective assignments, peer editing and faculty conferencing on rough drafts, revising, managing grammar and usage, and reallocating faculty time evaluating papers. Each faculty member chose one class to redesign. Faculty brought their new course syllabi or writing assignments to colleagues for response. For most faculty, this was the first time they had had a chance to hear faculty outside their departments talk in depth about their goals and enthusiasm for their discipline. Often, it was also the first time they had experienced peer response on course assignments. Written evaluations of the workshops were very positive.

In the fall of 1989, Whitworth dedicated an entire faculty development day to WAC, led by William Zinsser. The following May, twenty faculty volunteered for the second Faculty Writing Workshop, a four-day event. Twelve faculty who had been through the previous workshop also returned for a two-day advanced workshop. These were led by Walvoord, with Hunt and Reid acting as consultants. The advanced workshop focused on critical-thinking skills. Considerable time was given to faculty reports on what was working and what was still troublesome. Also, Walvoord held individual conferences with faculty to discuss specific syllabi, assignments, or general frustration.

By 1991, sixty-six faculty (over three-fourths of the total faculty) had experienced some version of a writing workshop. The general response remained very positive. Several faculty wrote in their self-evaluations for promotion and tenure about the specific ways these workshops had shaped their classroom teaching.

Since the completion of the grant, Whitworth has offered further in-house workshops for new faculty and veterans each year. These workshops are generally co-directed by Hunt and Reid, with faculty serving as primary resources.

In the spring of 1991, Whitworth sponsored two in-house workshops designed by Hunt and Reid. One was for faculty who had missed the earlier two workshops. Five previous faculty workshop attendees, who represented a range of disciplines, presented the changes they had made and showed the impact of those changes upon the learning in their classes.

Another "follow-up" workshop was an afternoon/dinner/evening meeting for fifteen faculty in a conference room at a Spokane hotel. Again, the focus was on "What's working, and where do you want more help?" Several faculty spoke of the exciting responses they'd received from students about their new assignments.

In the fall of 1994, with a smaller grant from Washington Trust matched by institutional support, Walvoord returned for two days of workshops. On the first day, fourteen new faculty were introduced to WAC, and on the second day, a follow-up was held for twelve faculty, in which considerable time was given for them to report their WAC experiences. In 1995 and 1996, Walvoord again led workshops.

When Whitworth began its WAC program, there was no Writing Center on campus, a critical support component if writing-intensive courses are required. By 1991, a center was begun in the new library with leadership provided by Marty Erb, a member of the composition faculty. From the inception, it was intentionally designed for all students, not just those perceived as needing "remedial" support. The center was staffed primarily by trained student writing consultants; however, from the beginning, several faculty volunteered to be consultants by holding one of their traditional office hours in the Writing Center instead of their offices. This has provided faculty with an ongoing awareness of how students perceive writing assignments, what difficulties they encounter, and what specific suggestions prove helpful. Students also bring in graduate school and scholarship applications for which faculty can be a prime resource. This program has continued as a distinctive component of Whitworth's WAC emphasis.

## **Data Collection**

### **Interviews with Faculty**

In 1990–1991, Hunt interviewed twelve faculty from a range of disciplines to learn what was working and also where faculty felt frustrated. She also met with student TAs in the psychology program. The

primary purpose of these interviews was to allow faculty to discuss their experiences and to offer assistance with specific issues (for example, how to work with large classes, or strategies for effective conferencing). Another important purpose was to help design each new workshop.

### **Observation of Faculty CORE Teams**

All students at Whitworth take three required CORE (“core curriculum”) courses which are team taught and must have a writing component. The CORE teams work together closely to plan the course and the assignments. This interchange, in which Hunt participates, has given faculty intimate acquaintance with each other’s pedagogical and philosophical thinking and growth over the years. The teamwork also supported that growth. As she led the workshops, Walvoord found the coherence within teams to be a unique characteristic that set Whitworth faculty apart from those in other workshops she had led, even at small schools. In 1990–1991, Hunt met with the four-person faculty team that was teaching one of the CORE courses. Over the years, she observed five additional CORE faculty in teams of which she was a member.

### **Faculty Presentations**

Throughout the WAC program, faculty have frequently been called on to give reports on their classroom experiences to other faculty colleagues. In the second year of the grant, for instance, six faculty presentations included conferencing methods, writing research papers, designing new assignments, helping students with lab reports, and connecting goals to writing projects. Faculty talked about both satisfying and frustrating experiences, since one goal of the grant committee was to create a climate of trust, where faculty could be honest about both the positive and negative dimensions of attempting changes in their teaching. Hunt and Reid took notes on faculty feedback.

### **Student Questionnaires and Interviews**

Throughout the initial two-year grant period, 1989–1991, student-response sheets gave quantifiable feedback for faculty at the end of writing-intensive courses and CORE courses (which had a required writing component). During four semesters, 1,157 students responded to a short questionnaire (Appendix D) on the writing component

of the class, which assessed their attitudes toward rewriting papers, learning course material through writing assignments, clarity of the writing instruction, effectiveness of faculty-student conferencing, and their improvement as writers. These were shared with faculty members.

In the spring of 1991, student consultants from the Writing Center interviewed a random group of sixteen juniors and seniors who had been through the CORE courses and writing-intensive classes. These taped thirty- to forty-five-minute interviews with their peers provided a candid glimpse of how students perceived Whitworth's increased emphasis on writing. They also provided an insightful critique concerning the help students needed from faculty. These interviews were transcribed and communicated, in summary, to faculty through the WAC booklet described below.

### **The Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Booklet**

By the end of the two-year grant period, Whitworth faculty had reported so many significant changes in their classroom teaching that the college wanted to ensure that the WAC program would continue. One effort was the 1992 in-house publication of *Writing Across the Curriculum*, a 113-page booklet which showcased eleven faculty-authored stories. Faculty reports followed a common pattern: first, faculty's initial classroom experience with writing which motivated their participation in the workshops; then, the specific changes they had made in one class after the workshop; and finally, the results of these changes, both positive and negative. They also included assignment sheets or syllabi which demonstrated these changes. The purpose of the stories and sample assignments was to provide models for other faculty, including new faculty, who would be teaching writing-intensive classes. The booklet also included a history of the grant, campus goals, writing-intensive course requirements, W-I course lists, handouts from Walvoord's workshops, student-feedback sheets which faculty could "lift," and summaries from the student questionnaires and interviews. This booklet was given to each faculty member and to all new faculty during their orientation at Whitworth. It also was offered as a resource to other colleges. An enthusiastic review of the booklet in a CAPHE publication led to inquiries from sixteen to twenty other small liberal arts colleges across the country.

### **Final Round of Interviews for This Book**

Ten faculty, representing a broad range of disciplines, were interviewed by Hunt in 1994 (questions, Appendix E). These forty- to fifty-minute interviews were taped, transcribed, analyzed, and shared with the other researchers working on this book.

### **Witworth College Faculty Survey**

In the spring of 1995, the Whitworth Faculty Writing Committee decided it was time to survey all faculty teaching Writing-Intensive (W-designated) courses. The undergraduate enrollment had been climbing steadily in the past two years without an equal growth in additional faculty; consequently, this was affecting aspects of the WAC program, particularly class size in some of the W-designated courses. We also wanted data on the types of assignments, various approaches to writing objectives, options offered for revision within each major, the use and usefulness of peer and/or faculty conferences, and feedback on additional support faculty wanted and needed.

The response was excellent. Thirty-eight faculty, representing fifty-five classes, answered the two-page, open-ended questionnaire, almost an 80 percent return rate. This provided significant information to the Writing Committee, which has been useful in planning strategies and programs to address faculty concerns. It also provided encouragement on the value faculty place in the use of W-courses in the majors.