Program Descriptions Across the Curriculum

The SHSU Across-the-University Writing Program: Some New Twists to a Familiar Story

Patricia Williams

Director, Across-the-University Writing Program Sam Houston State University

Can calculus, criminal justice, and kinesiology courses be writing enhanced? Yes! Sam Houston State University, an institution with approximately 12,000 students and 500 faculty members, implemented a writing-enhanced requirement as of fall 1991. After studying how numerous universities incorporate writing-intensive courses, the Sam Houston State Across-the-University Writing Program Committee recommended to our Academic Policy Council that all undergraduate students be required to complete six writing-enhanced courses before graduation, two in English, two in the major department, and two in any area. A writing-enhanced course is defined as one in which fifty percent or more of the grade is based on writing assignments. Students often take more than the required number because of the large selection. For instance, the University offered over eight hundred writing-enhanced sections in 1995.

To aid faculty in developing assignments and curbing the grading time, we have held over sixty-five writing workshops and yearly retreats. For the 1995-96 academic year, several workshops focused on writing and technology. During these presentations, not only did faculty hear about ways for students to e-mail assignments and locate search engines, but also they participated in these hands-on sessions. Topics such as "Combining Internet and Writing in Business," conducted by one economics and two management faculty members, and "Using the Internet for Research and Writing," taught by one English professor and two librarians, helped pique faculty interest. Then, several participants wrote articles for the semester newsletters concerning how their students were now using technology in completing writing assignments. For example, an assistant professor of health had her students develop a home page. The article appears in the May 1996 newsletter, which can be viewed at our program's World Wide Web site, http://www.shsu.edu/~edu_paw/.

Along with workshops and newsletters, we hold yearly retreats at a resort twenty-five miles from campus. One faculty member from each department is invited to attend these two-day sessions with nationally-known speakers, such as Angela Williams, Barbara Walvoord, Rob Tierney, and Carol Holder. Individuals who currently teach writing-enhanced courses or who are interested in developing these courses attend the retreats at University expense. The four academic deans help defray the costs to the Across-the-University Writing Program.

As the program has grown, we have implemented various assessment strategies, including student/faculty questionnaires, faculty interviews, and workshop/retreat evaluations. For instance, we asked freshmen enrolled in English classes about their perceptions regarding the importance of writing to a university education and their success with writing skills. Students anonymously answered the questions at the beginning and end of the semester. In addition, the Faculty Senate surveys to faculty members concerning the entire University. One question asked the faculty to rate the director's office/position on a one-to-five scale. During this past academic year, the position was rated as a 3.7, which was one of the highest ratings of the fifty-two areas mentioned.

Also, a graduate student conducted twenty-minute interviews with individuals who have and have not participated in retreats. Almost ninety percent of the retreat participants had changed their writing assignments or developed new ones. They also used more writing-to-learn activities, journal writing, and peer group revision sessions than those who had not been active. And, approximately eighty percent of the retreat participants noted that they had used different evaluation techniques. For instance, they often provided criteria assignment sheets, showed their classes model papers, and used rubrics in grading. To improve, we have continually asked faculty to evaluate both the workshops and retreats. The consistently high ratings attest to our program's success.

As we strive to improve the program, we frequently steal other universities' program ideas and add new twists to suit our needs. Feel free to contact me if you have questions or would like to share information about your program.

The Writing Across the Curriculum Program: University of North Dakota

Joan Hawthorne

University of North Dakota

The Writing Across the Curriculum program at the University of North Dakota (12,000 students) has been up until recently primarily a faculty development program. Begun with outside funding from the Bush Foundation, the program offered multiple kinds of opportunities for faculty to become involved with WAC. In addition to workshops with varied focuses and lengths, faculty were invited to participate in interdisciplinary seminars where they worked on their own writing, to apply for small grants to fund teaching-with-writing projects, to participate in leadership and evaluation training, and to help plan or teach a linked writing/content area course.

Three years into the WAC program, as we were writing the renewal grant proposal, we added programs for students (for example, writing mentors in the disciplines, and support for the Writing Center), made small changes in the

activities already offered (eliminating leadership and evaluation training, for example, and added lunch meetings to encourage on-going conversations about teaching with writing). But two program changes proved to be particularly significant. First, we created the University Writing Program (UWP) as the overarching administrative structure to coordinate campus-wide writing programs. Composition remained separate under the auspices of the English Department, but all other writing program initiatives, including the Writing Center, found their home in the UWP. The newly-hired UWP Director reported directly to the VPAA/Provost.

Second, the "linked" courses were reinvented. This aspect of the program had not succeeded as originally envisioned. Logistical impediments made it difficult to fill sections of composition that were linked to other courses, so "special majors" sections of Composition II and Business and Technical Writing were developed in place of one-to-one links. Under the second Bush grant, we imagined expanding those special majors courses, and perhaps moving some of them to the sophomore or junior level. We hoped that at least some of those special sections would be taught by discipline-based faculty, so that someone from Political Science, for example, might choose to develop and teach a sophomore course that met the second semester writing requirement. Political Science majors then would be encouraged (not required to complete the second semester of composition through the special course. There eventually might be a variety of forms for those courses, we thought, including freestanding courses in writing (some taught by content area faculty or TAs, some by English Department faculty or TAs), writing-intensive courses, and linked writing components connected to specific major courses. Departments that wanted to develop their own options for the second semester composition requirement would be assisted to do so; at the same time, more traditional composition courses would continue to be offered and no department would be coerced into creating courses that were outside the interests and abilities of its faculty.

After these plans were developed but before they could be implemented, however, the English Department hired a new director of composition; he brought to the university a different view of composition. Although the new director planned to revamp both composition courses, he firmly believed that both courses needed to be English Department owned. He imagined an integrally connected sequence of assignments, spanning Comp I and Comp II, in college level reading, writing, and research. In the face of these altered circumstances, it was clear that the envisioned alternatives to Comp II would be much more controversial than first anticipated. UWP course development efforts needed to be refocused.

Just as we reached this critical juncture in our efforts to implement the planned curricular component of the UWP, the state Board of Higher Education approved policy changes that were to have unexpected ramifications for the writing program. The Board is charged with managing a system of 11 state institutions, including five two-year colleges. Transfer and articulation be-

tween those institutions are of great public interest. To ease perceived transfer problems, the Board mandated a common body of general education credits, which could be taken at any institution and which would meet requirements for all institutions. As part of the new general education requirements, nine credits of "Communications" were required.

For those state institutions that already required two composition courses and a speech course, no institutional response was necessary. At UND, where speech was optional for most students, the result was an immediate need to create new ways for students to meet the communications requirement. A task force agreed to develop options: students could take additional writing courses (already offered by the English Department), they could take speech or a foreign language, or they could take communications-intensive courses. Writing-intensive (WI) courses are currently under development as one communications-intensive option for some students.

An ad hoc committee of the UWP met to develop criteria for WI courses. Those criteria will undoubtedly be subject to revision as we gain experience, but they initially include the following guidelines:

- * Students produce a minimum of 30 typed, double-spaced pages or about 10,000 words (including drafts, revisions, informal and formal work, graded and ungraded pieces).
- * Students write about 15 pages of finished, polished prose.
- * Courses include instruction or guidance in clear written expression.
- * The course syllabus specifies why writing is included, how much writing is expected, and how the writing contributes to the course grade.
- * Optimum class size is 25 students or fewer. Faculty wishing to create a WI course will apply, with the support of their department, for the designation. A permanent subcommittee of the UWP Advisory Committee is expected to monitor on-going course certification, in conjunction with the General Education Committee.

It is clear that many UND students will have no need for these WI courses, since students who take speech or languages already meet the new requirement. For those students who might need a WI course, two kinds of options are imagined. At least initially, most WI courses are likely to be developed within majors where students have little curricular flexibility. Faculty in Chemical Engineering and Nursing, for example, find that their students have very few elective hours available. They don't want students to face three additional credits of required courses. But faculty in both departments have been very involved in WAC faculty development for the past several years; as a result, many current courses are already close to meeting new WI requirements. Faculty in such situations are working to enhance and expand the writing component within one or more existing course(s), so that WI credit can be obtained within the major.

Other WI courses eventually may be created in departments that more typically offer general education courses, like Philosophy, Religion, Sociology, and History. However, many courses that at first might appear suitable for WI credit are in fact too large (perhaps 40 students) for an ideal WI course. Furthermore, if such a course is designated as WI, it can be expected to attract at least a few additional students who are seeking to fulfill the communication requirement. So departments are very cautiously exploring their options.

Despite the Board of Higher Education mandate for immediate response to the new gen ed requirements, we find that the UWP, too, has the time and space to be cautious. Students entering the university this fall can begin with their required composition courses, and those who are eager to immediately fulfill the whole body of requirements can follow those up with another existing course that meets their needs. A few WI courses are expected to be available by spring, mostly taught by faculty in professional majors, but we don't anticipate wholesale program expansion. The relatively slow transition to WI courses should allow us to avoid the problems reported at some other universities in the wake of institutional mandates.

But, on the whole, the new requirements may be healthy for the writing program, the students, and the university at large. They have provided a backdoor opportunity for developing courses very similar to those imagined under the renewal grant proposal some years ago. Furthermore, we are able to create those courses in exactly the gradual way initially envisioned. They allow us to imagine campus wide development of discipline-specific courses emphasizing writing, but without coupling that gain with perceived losses to the English Department. Finally, they provide an opportunity for still more faculty development of the kind we already do best: helping faculty across campus more effectively teach courses that include an emphasis on writing.

The University of Missouri's WAC/WID Program

Martha A. Townsend

University of Missouri

History/Philosophy/Context

The University of Missouri's WAC/WID program comprises four missions which link directly to MU's broader mission statement: (1) to improve undergraduate education through required writing intensive (WI) courses; (2) to enhance graduate students' education and professional preparation by assigning qualified graduate students to work closely with WI faculty teachers; (3) to provide faculty and GTA development so that instructors are supported in offering academically rigorous WI courses; and (4) to promote and conduct research and assessment related to these.

MU's fourteen-year-old Campus Writing Program had its genesis in Arts and Science faculty's request for an additional composition course. The Dean and Provost responded by convening an interdisciplinary faculty "task force on English composition" chaired by then-MU-English professor Winifred Bryan Horner. (To this day, Win delights in having demanded china not styrofoam cups for the committee's weekly early-morning meetings.) Rather than adding another composition course to the curriculum, the task force recommended a writing-across-the-curriculum program on the grounds that the English Department alone could not staff a second course, that WAC is academically sounder, and that WAC distributes resources and responsibility among all departments.

The committee's final report became CWP's founding document. MU's administration supported all of the recommendations philosophically and, equally important, fiscally. Within a short time all colleges on campus accepted the committee's suggestions by requiring at least one WI course for their students. Later, the Dean wrote that WAC "...is affecting the entire campus in ways that go far beyond . . . student composition competencies. [CWP] has become symbolic of the potential for improved teaching and active learning on this campus . . . [with] far-reaching implications for the quality of education and improvement in faculty morale..." (Glick, "Writing Across the Curriculum: A Dean's Perspective," WPA: Writing Program Administration, Vol. 11, No. 3, spring, 1988, 53-58). Pilot courses began in 1985, full implementation in 1988. A second WI course-requirement was added along with the adoption of a new general education program in 1993.

Courses in the Disciplines

MU requires three writing courses: a one-semester composition course (taught through the English Department) which is prerequisite to two writing-intensive courses (taught throughout all departments) which are facilitated by CWP. Students may take one WI course anywhere in the University curriculum; the other must be an upper division course in the student's major. Established by the Campus Writing Board (CWP's oversight committee), WI course guidelines are intentionally flexible and are intended to ensure that:

- 1. courses are taught by tenure-line faculty, at a 20:1 student-to-faculty ratio
- assignments are complex enough to require substantive revision for most students, and include instructor feedback and preferably peer review during the drafting
- 3. a minimum of 20 pages (5000 words) of writing is done
- 4. at least one assignment addresses a question for which there is more than one acceptable interpretation, explanation, analysis, or evaluation

- writing is distributed throughout the semester rather than concentrated at the end
- 6. writing assignments account for a major part of the course grade
- 7. graduate teaching assistants work with WI faculty to maintain the 20:1 ratio
- WI faculty retain oversight of student writing and paper grading, to preclude GTAs from becoming merely "graders" (an additional set of eight suggestions describes the Board's intent for the unique complexities of large-enrollment courses).

Administrative Issues

Approximately 100 WI courses are offered each semester, with 4400 of MU's 16,000 students enrolled each term. Course enrollment ranges from 7 to 300. A typical course enrolls 40 students, with one professor working with one GTA. Only three courses, relies of CWP's early concern that some students may not graduate on time, approach the 300 mark; they are being phased out. Faculty rarely offer two WI courses simultaneously; usually 100 different faculty are teaching WI courses in a given term. Currently, over 200 faculty are considered "active" WI instructors. Approximately 100 GTAs (25 FTE) are employed each semester, nearly all coming from the discipline in which the WI course is taught. GTAs are selected by the WI faculty member in collaboration with the department's director of graduate studies; CWP provides their training.

Incentives for faculty include (1) a \$300 stipend for attending a required three-day pre-WI-teaching workshop; (2) close individual support for their teaching efforts by CWP's seven-member staff; (3) hour-long tutorials for students in WI courses by experienced graduate students with background in the discipline; (4) on-going development opportunities such as informal "brown bags", occasional outside speakers, and support for travel to professional conferences at which they are presenting WI-related papers; (5) one-quartertime GTA for every 20 WI students enrolled in the course; (6) ability to support additional students in their department's graduate program; (7) access to a community of scholars holding similar values about teaching at a researchfocused institution; (8) knowledge that a significant proportion of the campus' various teaching awards go to WI faculty. Incentives for GTAs are similar: (1) stipends for training and teaching; (2) tuition remission; (3) opportunity to work with some of MU's finest faculty; (4) consideration for graduate teaching awards; (5) the same teaching support and development activities that are open to faculty, including conference travel monies.

Writing Program Location

CWP's three "bosses" are the Provost, because the program is University-wide; the Deans of Arts and Science, whose college provides roughly

one-half of all WI courses; and the Campus Writing Board, which determines all program policy. The Provost funds the program; the Dean keeps tabs on operational matters; all serve as advocates for the program as needed. The Dean and Provost, in consultation with program staff, jointly appoint Board members for staggered three-year terms. Board membership is balanced for college representation, academic rank (assistant, associate, and full professorship), gender, and previous WI teaching experience and philosophy. Six faculty and one student (with full voting rights) serve on each of three subcommittees: Natural and Applied Science, Education and Social Science, and Humanities and Arts. Six additional ex officio members represent various other campus constituencies.

Instruction

Tenure-line faculty teach WI courses, with the assistance of a quarter-time GTA from the faculty member's department for every twenty students enrolled. Non-tenure-line faculty are approved by the Campus Writing Board on a case-by-case basis. Ideally, WI faculty are self-selected. In those cases where pressure on departments (to offer sufficient WI courses for their students to graduate on schedule) compels chairs to assign faculty to teach WI courses, the program offers a variety of assistance. Faculty and GTAs take pre-teaching and on-going workshops ranging from several hours to several days. Faculty are welcome to attend the stipended workshop without subsequently offering a WI course.

Certification

Faculty submit written proposals that include a syllabus, the writing assignments and grading criteria, a description of additional ways the course uses writing, the percentage of course grade determined by out-of-class writing and, if GTAs will be required, a plan for working with them. Approvals are given to a specific faculty member for a specific course; if the instructor changes or offers a different course, a new proposal is submitted. Updates are submitted each time the course is taught. CWP staff work with faculty to draft proposals which are sent monthly to the appropriate subcommittee for review. A week later, subcommittees convene for discussion, with the full Board meeting the following week to consider all proposals. Because the process is intended to be supportive and developmental, proposals are rarely denied; at each stage if problems arise, CWP staff or the proposer's subcommittee faculty representative follows through with constructive suggestions. Once approved, courses are flagged by Registration as "WI" in the schedule and students select courses accordingly. Courses on student transcripts are also flagged with a "WI" and a footnote that reads, "A course requiring 5000 words of writing and revision."

Evaluation

In keeping with CWP's four missions, evaluation focuses on overall programmatic effectiveness and uses both qualitative and quantitative methods, with the emphasis on the former. Because students' final WI course is an upper division requirement in their major, judgment about student performance is considered largely a departmental responsibility based on the demands and expectations of that discipline. Standardized tests required of all students are not used. The program uses a variety of assessment instruments including faculty and student attitude surveys; student course and tutorial evaluations; end-of-semester interviews with WI faculty; course file reviews during the certification process; faculty case studies; workshop evaluations; and a comprehensive annual report to the Dean, Provost, Board, and selected others.

In 1992, CWP and a University-wide independent committee conducted separate year-long studies of the program, preliminary to an external review commissioned by the Provost and Dean conducted by the Consultant/Evaluator Service of the National Council of Writing Program Administrators. Extraordinarily valuable, the process and outcomes are featured in "Integrating WAC Into General Education: An Assessment Case Study" (WAC and Program Assessment: Diverse Methods of Evaluating Writing Across the Curriculum Programs, ed. Huot and Yancy, Ablex, in press).

Research

WI faculty often find that their classes allow them to combine their teaching interests with MU's research focus. Faculty and GTAs from entomology, engineering, animal science, art history, psychology, Black Studies, English, human environmental science, and nursing, among others, have presented papers or published articles based on scholarship resulting from their WI courses. CWP staff work-in-progress includes merging technological literacy with mainstream literacies; studying the relationship between junior faculty in the disciplines teaching WI courses and their tenure and promotion cases; collecting disciplined-based writing assignments that foster critical thinking; analyzing students' science-writing discourse through vocabulary management profiles; and examining students' analogic thinking in calculus and genetics courses.

Students

Since the English Department's composition course is prerequisite to any WI course, WI students are at least second semester freshman. Although there is an implied hierarchy to the WI course sequence first, a WI course of the student's choice anywhere in the curriculum; second, an upper division WI course in the student's major students are free to take courses in either order so long as both are completed before graduation. Many students take

more than the two required courses because of the opportunity for instructor feedback on writing assignments and the assignments often replace traditional examinations.

Clemson's Many CAC Components

Jane M. Perkins

Clemson University

It's not a simple task to describe Communication Across the Curriculum (CAC) at Clemson University. Historically, the program encompasses much more than writing-intensive courses; philosophically, it promotes creative change—opening new avenues to enhance effective communication and building upon synergistic program components. A description of this complex program needs to begin with two key players, Art Young and Carl Lovitt, who initiated the Clemson version of CAC.¹ This description also needs to include some of the important components of the program, and finally to detail its newest accomplishment—the requirements for communication-intensive courses in the disciplines.

Beginnings and Philosophies

Clemson University's CAC program began in 1987 with Art Young's appointment as the Campbell Chair in Technical Communication. This unique position, the nation's first endowed chair in professional communication, is a joint appointment in English and engineering. Charged with the goal of enhancing communication skills of engineering and liberal arts students across the University, Art drew on his successful WAC experiences at Michigan Tech to fashion a program of interdisciplinary communication workshops. Art introduced WAC philosophies of writing to learn, journaling and its interactive use, integration of all language abilities, and collaboration and peer response. Soon afterwards, a new endowment opportunity presented itself, and Art began fashioning a concept for enhancing communication that would reach even beyond Clemson students to the public schools and businesses in South Carolina—The Pearce Center for Professional Communication.

As the newly appointed Director of the Pearce Center for Professional Communication, Carl Lovitt helped to further define its goals and scope and to win approval from the state's Commission on Higher Education in July 1990. Originally, the Center was under the umbrella of the College of Liberal Arts and now, after the University's restructuring, is housed in the College of Arts, Architecture, and Humanities. The Center's interdisciplinary mission is reinforced by its autonomy from any academic department. Furthermore, because of its endowed funding, which provides continuing resources, and because of low overhead and salaries, the Pearce Center is able to keep resources flowing

in support of interdisciplinary programs. In addition to the original WAC philosophy, Carl has added that of Writing in the Disciplines (WID), fostering research in disciplinary and discourse conventions, especially as it ensures that all Clemson University students, irrespective of major, graduate with skills in spoken and written communication necessary to contribute meaningfully to their chosen fields of employment.

Clemson's CAC efforts are on to a new phase with the recent endowment of the Roy Pearce Class of 1941 Endowed Professorship in Professional Communication. This position will bring an established scholar to work with the Pearce Center and the students and faculty of the Master of Arts in Professional Communication program. In addition to the Pearce Professor and the leadership of Art and Carl, the Pearce Center involves numerous faculty in CAC efforts, and outreach to the public schools and industry. During the past six years, the Pearce Center Research Team, comprised of various faculty in English and Speech, has helped plan and coordinate communication projects and has provided consulting services to other disciplines. Research Team members also design components such as Writing Assessment in General Education, working with faculty in many University disciplines and presenting program innovations to regional and national assessment communities. In addition, faculty from many disciplines are involved as recipients of Pearce Center Communication, Teaching, and Research Grants that promote research and classroom innovations in WID; as speakers for interdisciplinary workshops; as contributors to the newsletter; and as members of the CAC Advisory Board.

Interconnecting Components

Although the design of the Pearce Center's activities can be roughly grouped into three areas, those areas and the many components that fall under them are interdependent and mutually supportive. Effective communication activities engender new activities, often through faculty coordinators, participants, and students. Below are some of the Pearce Center components, listed under the three main areas.

Communication Across the Curriculum (CAC) Program:

- interdisciplinary faculty-development workshops
- · discipline-specific workshops
- · consultation with faculty in developing discipline-specific projects
- · Pearce Center Assessment Program
- · Freshman Engineering Survey
- · National Writing Across the Curriculum Conference, co-sponsors
- · publication of biannual newsletter
- · Faculty Research and Development Grants

Collaboration in the Public Schools:

· Writing and Thinking Workshop for young writers

- · Writing for the Community Institute
- · Clemson Writing Project

Professional Communication Activities:

- support of communication technologies, including Document Design Lab,
 Usability Testing Facility, Multimedia Authoring and Computer Classroom
- · sponsor of workplace projects and internships
- Corporate Advisory Board

In addition to these components and others, the Pearce Center and its CAC programs have been influential in the recently mandated communication-intensive courses.

Communication-intensive Courses

After three years of development, the University Curriculum Committee has redefined the General Education junior-level advanced communication requirement. The new requirement will go into effect for the fall semester 1997. Currently, the Oral and Written Communication Subcommittees of the University Curriculum Committee have created guidelines for implementing these communication requirements and are in the process of evaluating course syllabi submitted by faculty in a number of disciplines. The Pearce Center has coordinated workshops to help faculty design courses, assignments, and syllabi, and Carl Lovitt chairs the Written Communication Subcommittee, which advises and evaluates W course proposals.

Depending upon the amount of writing required in the course, writing-intensive courses are designated W-1, W-2, or W-3; students must complete a total of 3 Ws. With these designations, students may earn their W-credits in from one to three courses in their discipline. Although specific criteria have been established for the different levels of writing intensity, in general, all writing-intensive courses must meet the following requirements:

- 1. Only courses at or above the 300-level will be designated W courses.
- 2. W courses will be designated and taught by faculty members who hold the terminal degree in their field or who have commensurate professional experience; faculty members who teach such courses will also be substantially responsible for reading, marking, and grading student writing.
- 3. Students in W courses will receive constructive feedback on some of their writing that will provide guidance for improving subsequent drafts or subsequent writing assignments in the course.
- 4. Writing assignments in W courses will be distributed throughout the semester rather than concentrated at the end.
- 5. Writing will be integrated into W courses to provide opportunities for students to further their learning in the course, instead of being used only to demonstrate acquired knowledge or to exercise writing skills.

- 6. W courses should provide a variety of writing experiences, enabling students to use different genres of writing to address different audiences and purposes. The total number of pages written for W courses may include informal writing, substantive revisions, and final versions of formal documents.
- 7. In most cases, student writing will account for two-thirds or more of the course grade in W-3 courses, for one-half or more of the course grade in W-2 courses, and one-quarter or more of the course grade in W-1 courses. Each piece of graded writing in W courses will receive a single grade that evaluates both the content and the quality of the writing.
- 8. W courses have enrollment limits: W-3 courses will be capped at 23 students per section, W-2 at 31 students per section, and W-1 at 38 students per section.

Because these requirements are in the implementation stage, details of scope and impact are still unknown; however, the groundwork has been carefully laid for Clemson's communication-intensive courses in the disciplines.

As an endowed center, the Pearce Center occupies a unique position at Clemson University. On the one hand, its independence from official administrative structures, programs, and mandates represents a drawback that it must constantly struggle to overcome: lacking the clout of administrative sponsorship, the center faces the ongoing challenge of demonstrating its relevance to the University's mission and its valuable contributions to meeting the institution's goals. On the other hand, that very autonomy gives the Pearce Center a freedom that few University departments enjoy, namely the freedom to innovate, to experiment, to reassess and redirect its resources to meet the ever-changing needs of the faculty and students. Its encouraging success in attracting the voluntary participation of faculty, public school teachers and students, and business representatives attests to the vitality of an active and growing program.

Notes

1 Art Young and Carl Lovitts' influence in CAC development beyond Clemson University is evidenced by their publications in the field, some of which include the following:

- Lovitt, Carl and Art Young. "Portfolios in the Disciplines: Sharing Knowledge in the Contact Zone." New Directions in Portfolio Assessment. Edited by Laurel Black, Donald Daiker, Jeffrey Sommers, and Gail Stygall. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann, 1994.
- Young, Art. *Programs That Work: Models and Methods for Writing Across the Curriculum.* Co-edited with Toby Fulwiler. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann, 1990.

A Reminder:

If you head a WAC program, and especially if it is an upperdivision program or includes upper-division courses, please send a description of your program to us. We would like to share this information with other readers of this journal.