



WRITE HERE, WRITE NOW!

Creating a Culture of Writing at PVCC

Piedmont Virginia Community College

On-Site Review October 6-8, 2009

Dr. Frank Friedman, President

Dr. Tara Atkins-Brady, Accreditation Liaison

PVCC Quality Enhancement Plan
Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary	1
II.	Introduction and History of PVCC	2
III.	Identifying the QEP Topic	4
	The QEP Topic Selection Team	4
	Broad-based Input for Selecting the QEP Topic	5
	Selecting the QEP Topic: Why Writing?	5
	Topic Selection Summary	10
IV.	Development of the QEP	11
	The QEP Planning Team	11
	Additional Assessment and Input from Faculty	12
	Review of the Literature and Refining the Focus	13
	Identifying Desired Student Learning Outcomes	13
	Identifying Strategies and Developing the Five-Year Implementation Plan	14
V.	Desired Student Learning Outcomes	16
VI.	Literature Review and Best Practices	17
	Why Writing?	17
	What is a “Culture of Writing”?	18
	What Improves Student Writing?	18
	Writing Intensive Courses	20
	College Composition Best Practices	26
	Conclusion	28
VII.	Actions to be Implemented	30
	Introduction	30
	Laying the Foundation: Changes to English 111	30
	Laying the Foundation: Develop and Disseminate a New PVCC Writing Rubric	33
	Reinforcing the Foundation: Writing in Required ITE/CSC Courses	34
	Reinforcing the Foundation: Changes to English 112	36
	Integrating Knowledge with Skills: Writing Intensive Courses	38
	Writing Center Support	40
	Professional Development	42
	Instructional Resources	44
	Faculty Resource Team	44
	Marketing Plan	45
VIII.	Timeline for Implementation	47

IX.	Organizational Structure	52
X.	Resources	54
XI.	Assessment Plan	59
	Introduction	59
	Summative Assessment of Student Learning	59
	Formative Evaluation of <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i>	66
XII.	Appendices	
	Appendix I: References	74
	Appendix II: PVCC Writing Rubric	81
	Appendix III: Writing Intensive Course Criteria	83
	Appendix IV: Cohort Activity Checklist	84
	Appendix V: Writing Intensive Course Proposal Form	85
	Appendix VI: Awareness Campaign Logo and Posters	89

Executive Summary

Write Here, Write Now!

Creating a Culture of Writing at Piedmont Virginia Community College

Many studies and reports have noted the deficits and shortfalls with written products and communication among college students. Data gathered on the writing abilities of students attending, graduating, and transferring from Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) echo these concerns. PVCC's QEP Topic Selection and Planning Teams, after considering all available evidence and input, concluded that student writing was an area in need of improvement and resolved to both emphasize the value of writing and provide students with appropriate opportunities to engage in the writing process. It is the collective desire of PVCC's faculty, staff, administrators, and board members that its graduates are prepared to meet the expectations of transfer institutions and employers in regard to written communication skills. Therefore, PVCC has established a vision for a "Culture of Writing" as (1) the collective belief within our community that the act of writing has value, and (2) the consequent actions that teach, reinforce, and instill in our students the processes and practices required of proficient writers.

The goal of PVCC's QEP is to prepare graduates to meet the writing expectations of four-year institutions and the workforce by providing increased and deliberate opportunities to expand the breadth and depth of student writing experiences at PVCC and by promoting the value of writing as a tool for learning and communicating. Strategies to achieve this goal include: (1) revising first-year college composition courses to include expanded writing requirements, specific instruction in grammar and punctuation, and engagement in writing process activities; (2) implementing a new PVCC Writing Rubric to provide a common language and format for assessment of student writing and formative feedback to students; (3) integrating writing-to-learn and writing process activities into required information technology and computer science courses; (4) implementing a Writing Intensive course requirement in each associate degree program; (5) expanding the role of PVCC's Writing Center in providing writing tutoring and other resources; (6) providing faculty professional development on writing strategies and assessment; and (7) marketing the value of writing to PVCC students and faculty.

As a result of implementing the QEP, students will: (1) compose texts that are appropriate for purpose and audience; (2) compose texts in which ideas are supported in well-developed, logical paragraphs; (3) compose texts that demonstrate unity and coherence; (4) compose grammatically and mechanically correct sentences that convey the writer's message in a clear, precise, and readable way; (5) use writing-to-learn and writing process activities *on their own* as a means to explore and articulate ideas; (6) perceive themselves as "improved writers" as a result of their PVCC experience; and (7) express confidence in their ability to write effectively.

Write Here, Write Now! will be phased in with cohorts of associate degree programs over five years. Multiple measures, including cross-sectional, value-added assessment of student learning in required courses and at graduation, as well as student and faculty surveys, will be used to assess the implementation and impact of the QEP. PVCC's QEP Implementation Team will monitor assessment results and make necessary adjustments to implementation.

II. Introduction and History

Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) is a comprehensive, public, associate degree-granting institution serving the city of Charlottesville and the counties of Albemarle, Buckingham, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, and Nelson. PVCC began operations in 1972 and is one of 23 colleges in the Virginia Community College System (VCCS). The College operates under policies established by the State Board for Community Colleges and with the advice and support of a local college advisory board. The college President is accountable to the local board and reports to the Chancellor of the VCCS. Internally the College is administered under the direction of the President's Staff, which includes the Vice President for Instruction and Student Services; Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services; Director of Institutional Advancement and Development; Chief Information Officer; and the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. The College employs more than 60 full-time faculty and up to 200 part-time instructional faculty each year.

In 2008-2009, PVCC served a record 2,668 full-time equivalent students (FTES) (an unduplicated headcount of 6,910 students). The student population taking classes for credit at PVCC is 61% female, 24% minority, 23% under the age of 18 and 35% age 25 and older, 76% part-time, and 36% new to PVCC each fall. Eighty-six percent (86%) of students reside within the College's service region. Fifty percent (50%) of students are in transfer programs, 15% in occupational/technical programs, 22% in high school dual enrollment/dual credit programs, and 13% unclassified in an academic program. More than 2,000 students took at least one course through distance learning last year. PVCC graduated 514 students in 2008-2009: 78 with an Associate of Arts, 122 with an Associate of Science, 95 with an Associate of Applied Science, 178 with Certificates, and 41 with Career Studies Certificates. More than 500 students (including over 100 graduates) transfer annually from PVCC to four-year institutions in the state and throughout the nation, many to the nearby University of Virginia in Charlottesville. In 2007-2008, 109 PVCC students were offered admission to this prestigious university.

PVCC promotes student success through excellent educational programs and services that are accessible and affordable. College transfer and workforce development are the core of the College's mission. Challenging coursework and a full range of support services are provided for students in both college transfer and workforce development programs. The first two years of baccalaureate study prepare students for success at four-year colleges and universities. Workforce development programs prepare students for successful careers and promote a skilled regional workforce by meeting the training and educational needs of employers. Programs and services in developmental education, general education, community service, and lifelong learning support and enhance the mission core and prepare students for success in life.

To achieve its mission, PVCC maintains a rigorous, continuous cycle of planning and assessment to evaluate and improve the quality of instruction, impact on students, and effectiveness of its programs and services. The College used a similarly rigorous, participatory process for gathering input and examining data to determine the topic and focus for this Quality Enhancement Plan. The QEP selected by the College is consistent with its mission, as evidenced in the College's QEP Goal Statement:

The goal of PVCC's QEP is to prepare graduates to meet the writing expectations of four-year institutions and the workforce by providing increased and deliberate opportunities to expand the breadth and depth of student writing experiences at PVCC and by promoting the value of writing as a tool for learning and communicating.

The College's faculty, staff, and administration are eager to create a culture of writing at PVCC, and, as a result, to improve students' writing.

III. Identifying the QEP Topic

In Fall 2007, PVCC began the process of selecting a topic for the QEP. PVCC's Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness and Vice President for Instruction and Student Services worked together to develop a plan (i.e., process and timeline) for selecting the QEP topic, as well as several communications and resources to inform and educate faculty, staff, and students about the QEP requirement. The plan was reviewed and approved by President's Staff with minor revisions.

The QEP Topic Selection Team

Integral to the plan was the formation of the QEP Topic Selection Team, a large group that incorporated representation of all major stakeholder groups, including faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The following individuals served on the QEP Topic Selection Team.

Faculty Representatives

Catherine Brown, Instructor, Nursing
Kelly Cannon, Associate Professor, IT-Networking
Terry Clore, Instructor, Developmental Math, and Math Lab Coordinator
Pryor Hale, Professor, Psychology
Barbara Heyl, Associate Professor, Chemistry
Jon Hexter, Associate Professor, Math
Jane Kingston, Associate Professor, Accounting
Jenny Koster, Assistant Professor, English, and Writing Center Coordinator
Colum Leckey, Assistant Professor, History, and *Chair*, QEP Topic Selection Team
Andrew Smith, Associate Professor, English
Joanna Vondrasek, Assistant Professor, Biology/Biotechnology

Staff Representatives

David Lerman, Student Success Advisor
Andrew Renshaw, Engineering Program Liaison
Charlotte Self, Supervisor of Circulation Services, Library
Lyn van der Sommen, Program Manager, Workforce Services
Laura Symons, Learning Center Coordinator

Student Representative

Danny Woody, President, Student Government Association (Fall 2007)

Administrative Representatives

Barbara Howard, VP Instruction and Student Services (Fall 2007)
Kathy Hudson, Interim VP Instruction and Student Services (Spring 2008)
Tara Atkins-Brady, Director of Inst. Research, Planning, and Inst. Effectiveness

Broad-based Input for Selecting the QEP Topic

The QEP Topic Selection Team was charged with educating the college community about the QEP, holding information and discussion sessions, and soliciting input regarding possible QEP topics. Team members were assigned to present at meetings of various stakeholder groups including PVCC's Faculty Professional Association, Professional Association of Support Staff, College Senate, Student Government, Curriculum and Instruction Committee, and others. Topic Selection Team members were provided with a QEP Information Sheet to share with stakeholder groups, and a suggested process and questions for facilitating discussion about QEP topics. In addition, QEP Topic Selection Team members were invited to respond individually to similar questions. Through these meetings, an estimated 100+ faculty, staff, students, and other stakeholders received information about the QEP requirement and had an opportunity to provide input on possible QEP topics. To gather additional student input, QEP-related questions were added to the College's Fall 2007 Student Satisfaction Survey. Four hundred seventy-three (473) students responded to the survey. Questions posed to participants during this input-gathering process included:

- Are there particular subjects, courses, or academic skills that are especially difficult for our PVCC students? Which ones?
- Which subjects, courses, or academic skills are NOT especially difficult for our students?
- What is the greatest academic challenge facing PVCC's students? Why?
- Is there anything our students need in order to be successful (in transfer, employment, as citizens...) that many or most haven't developed/acquired by the time they leave PVCC?
- When it comes to student learning, where do we need to make improvements, but haven't?
- Some students don't succeed academically at PVCC. What could PVCC change to help students learn?

The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness also compiled and summarized data related to assessment of student learning. QEP Topic Selection Team members were provided with summaries of all input, survey results, and assessment-related data for review.

Selecting the QEP Topic: Why Writing?

After reviewing the assessment and survey data, institutional research on student enrollment and success in writing courses, and input from PVCC's constituencies, the QEP Topic Selection Team selected *improving student writing* as the topic for the QEP. The evidence to support the selection of writing as the topic for QEP is presented below.

Writing Was Identified as a Challenge for PVCC Students

On surveys and in discussions about possible QEP topics, there was frequent mention of student writing as an area in need of improvement. There is a perception among faculty, staff, and even students that many PVCC students do not write well. Student writing lacks proper grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Students do not review and revise their own work before presenting it as a final product. Students believe writing is “just for English class” and that the rules for good written communication do not apply in other classes, subjects, or assignments. Every PVCC stakeholder group identified writing as an academic challenge for PVCC students:

- The Faculty Professional Association said that students lack basic writing skills and need overall improvement in written communication.
- The Professional Association of Support Staff suggested written (and verbal) communication skills as a QEP topic.
- The College Senate, which includes faculty, staff, students, and administrators, said the College needs to do more to increase students’ abilities to communicate well in writing (e.g., write with proper spelling, grammar, punctuation, and structure).
- The Student Government Association identified “English” as one of the weakest areas of learning/academic achievement for PVCC students. “Procrastination and hurried work results in low quality papers,” they said.
- The Curriculum and Instruction Committee supported the topic of “writing across the curriculum” stating that “students’ writing level, in general, is substandard.”
- On the survey of students, writing ranked third highest among academic subjects that students considered especially difficult (Math and Public Speaking ranked first and second, respectively).

Students Come to PVCC Underprepared for College-Level Writing

COMPASS Writing Placement Test

Each year, PVCC’s Testing Center administers over 1,200 COMPASS Writing Placement Tests to new students. One of every five assessments results in a developmental writing placement: 4% into ENG 1 (Preparing for College Writing I) and 14% into ENG 3 (Preparing for College Writing II).

Developmental Writing: Enrollment and Outcomes

Developmental writing students are a diverse group. The developmental English writing and/or reading students enrolled in Fall 2007 included:

- 75% new to PVCC
- 38% recent high school graduates
- 65% female, 35% male
- 59% minority
- 63% between 18 and 21 years of age

- 54% full-time, 46% part-time
- Most (75%) enrolled in a transfer degree program

Based on placement scores, PVCC enrolls more than 230 students in developmental writing each year. The successful completion rate for ENG 1 and ENG 3 is 75%. One in four enrollments does not successfully complete the course, with 8% withdrawing and 17% receiving a grade of unsatisfactory.

In a study of developmental reading and writing course-taking and outcomes conducted previously by PVCC, it was found that one in five developmental English students takes both developmental reading and writing, and nearly half of developmental English students (45%) concurrently enroll in developmental math. Furthermore, the cohort study of ENG 1 and ENG 3 students showed that a fraction of these developmental students realize success in ENG 111 (College Composition I). Thirty-two percent (32%) of students who began in ENG 1 progressed to ENG 111, and only 23% had completed the college-level course with a grade of C or higher in four years. Sixty-three percent (63%) of students who began in ENG 3 progressed to ENG 111, and 42% had completed ENG 111 with a grade of C or higher in four years. (*PVCC Developmental Reading and Writing: Analysis of Student Outcomes*, September 20, 2004, Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness.)

In 2005, PVCC was awarded a five-year U.S. Department of Education Title III Grant: *Improving Student Retention through Improved Student Services*. Major grant activities have focused on career services, required student orientation, developmental education, Learning Center resources, and development of an intrusive advising and registration process for students identified as “at-risk” (i.e., requiring two or more developmental education courses). At-risk students must obtain the at-risk counselor’s permission to enroll in courses, may not enroll during the “late add” period, and may not enroll in online courses. In addition, Title III funds supported the creation of developmental education learning communities, several of which included writing and reading courses linked with student success courses, and the establishment of PVCC’s Writing Center.

The Writing Center provides writing assistance for all students, but as part of the Title III initiative many activities have focused on success strategies for developmental writing students. The Writing Center Coordinator is a full-time English faculty member with 50% time allocated to assisting students in the Center and ensuring additional faculty/tutoring coverage during operating hours. Three years of data collection and analysis suggest students who seek Writing Center assistance two or more times for the same course are more likely to successfully complete the course than those who do not. Due to the success of students’ use of the Writing Center, the College has committed to continuing the Writing Center Coordinator position after Title III funding is phased out. The Writing Center activities and success also inspired the QEP Planning Team to create expanded and focused Writing Center activities as part of the QEP. The QEP will broaden the Writing Center’s mission and promote success of all students, including former developmental students, in college-level writing courses (see Section VII).

College Composition: Enrollment and Outcomes

All PVCC degree programs require completion of ENG 111 (College Composition I). As a requirement for many advanced courses and an important part of PVCC’s transfer degree curriculum, student success in this course is essential. In 2007-2008, PVCC

enrolled over 1,400 students in ENG 111. Of these, 76% completed the course with a passing and transferable grade of A, B, or C. The remaining quarter received a grade of D or F (17%) or withdrew from the course (7%).

Students Lack Engagement, Reinforcement, and Practice in Writing

Community College Survey of Student Engagement Results

PVCC has administered the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) each year since 2005. The CCSSE contains several items related to student writing behaviors and the emphasis placed on writing by the College. CCSSE results indicate that PVCC students do not write and revise as often as is needed to develop writing proficiency, and while students are being given assignments requiring them to organize, synthesize, and integrate ideas and information, they spend little time outside of class actually doing so. A review of multiple years of CCSSE results revealed the following important results:

- Nearly all *full-time* students reported writing a paper or report (of any length) during the year, with the majority writing between one and ten papers. About 20% of full-time students reported writing 11 or more papers or reports. However, 20% of *part-time* students reported *never* writing a paper or report of any length during the year.
- 25% of all students *never* prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in. One in five students did so “very often.”
- One-third of the College’s full-time students reported spending fewer than 6 hours preparing for class each week.
- The majority of students reported they “sometimes” or “often” worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources. However, 7% of part-time students and 4% of full-time students *never* did so.
- One in five students said that PVCC has contributed “very much” to their ability to write clearly and effectively; however, another 20% said that PVCC has contributed “very little” to these abilities.

PVCC Writing Center Utilization and Outcomes

Established in 2006 as part of PVCC’s Title III–funded initiative to improve student retention and success, the Writing Center provides supported instruction in writing to all PVCC students, with an emphasis on developmental students. While 100% of students who used the Writing Center in 2007-2008 were satisfied with the services they received, only a little more than 3% of PVCC’s student population utilized the Writing Center. Analysis of course outcomes for students who visited the Writing Center two or more times revealed that students who received Writing Center assistance were more likely to successfully complete English courses than students who did not use the Center. In nearly all English courses, a greater percentage of Writing Center clients completed their courses with a grade of C or better compared to students who did not receive assistance from the Writing Center. Given these findings, greater student engagement with the Writing Center and related student services would have a positive effect on improving student writing.

Graduates' Self-Assessment

On the Graduate Exit Survey, graduating students are asked to indicate the extent to which PVCC has helped them achieve certain learning outcomes, including the ability to write clearly and effectively. On the 2007-2008 survey, 45% of graduates responded that PVCC had "very much" contributed to their ability to write clearly and effectively; 43% responded "somewhat." However, while graduates may believe that they can write clearly and effectively, or at least believe they have improved their writing skills as a result of their PVCC experience, other measures and observations cast doubt on this assessment, as shown below.

College BASE English and Writing Assessment

PVCC assessed 127 2007-08 associate degree graduates with the College BASE subject tests in English and Writing. The Assessment Resource Center describes the College BASE as "a criterion-referenced achievement examination that evaluates knowledge and skills" (<http://arc.missouri.edu/index.php?p=/CB/CBhome.htm>). The English cluster contains items to assess reading, literature, and writing. The Writing cluster assesses skills in understanding the writing process, using conventions of standard written English, and writing an organized essay. The College BASE reports skills scores as High, Medium, or Low, representing levels of proficiency in the concepts and abilities necessary for success in each. The assessment also reports a subject score on a range from 40 to 560 points. The assessment is normed such that the mean score for all examinees is 300.

Less than 20% of PVCC's graduates demonstrated "high proficiency" in the writing process, less than 10% in conventions, and 0% on the writing exercise. One in four graduates scored "low proficiency" in writing as a process, and on the spring administration to 102 students, nearly two-thirds scored "low proficiency" on the writing exercise. The mean Writing Subject Scores for PVCC students were 281 on the summer administration and 258 on the spring administration, both below the College BASE average of 300.

Whether low scores on the College BASE are due to lack of knowledge and skills, lack of student motivation, or both, the results indicate that improvement is needed. A subsequent internal review of the College BASE essays by English faculty revealed that most were significantly underdeveloped, lacking the structure to be expected of an "organized, coherent, and effective essay" as assessed by the College BASE. Perhaps many students simply did not try very hard, but some of the College's best and brightest took this assessment, and it is troubling that none achieved high proficiency.

COMPASS e-Write

In Spring 2009, PVCC administered the COMPASS e-Write to associate degree graduates. The e-Write is an electronically scored assessment of a student's written response to a standardized prompt. The assessment yields both a holistic score and secondary sub-scores. Sub-scores (ranging from 1 to 4) are generated for the areas of Focus, Content, Organization, Style, and Conventions. Of the 101 associate degree graduates who took the e-Write, fewer than 5% scored a "4" in content, style, organization, and conventions; one-third scored a "2" or below.

Topic Selection Summary

The results of the College BASE and COMPASS e-Write are consistent with faculty observations and other assessments. Writing is purposefully taught and reinforced in developmental courses and ENG 111 and 112. However, beyond composition classes, students do not often practice writing; they do not review and revise; they do not think the writing process is relevant in other courses, subjects, or circumstances; and perhaps they do not value writing as a vehicle for effective communication or value the written product as a reflection on the quality of their own knowledge, skills, and abilities.

Given the evidence, the QEP Topic Selection Team recommended *improving student writing* as the topic of the QEP. This recommendation was presented to the President's Staff and approved.

The QEP topic was also presented and discussed with the PVCC Board at its August 2008 meeting. The Board was supportive of the topic selected, and discussion centered on specific aspects of writing that employers and transfer institutions require of our graduates, including communicating thoughts and ideas with clarity, and using standard conventions of grammar, spelling, and punctuation in a format that is appropriate to audience.

Jessica Kingsley, Associate Professor of English, and Amy Gillespie, Associate Professor of Nursing, were asked to serve as chairpersons for the QEP Planning Team charged with development of the QEP, as described in Section IV.

IV. Development of the QEP

The QEP Planning Team

In Spring 2008, with the topic identified, the task of developing the QEP was handed over to a representative QEP Planning Team led by Amy Gillespie, Associate Professor of Nursing, and Jessica Kingsley, Associate Professor of English, to:

- Focus the QEP topic, as presented by the QEP Topic Selection Team
- Conduct a review of best practices related to the topic
- Develop implementation strategies that included a clear timeline and assignment of responsibilities
- Develop a comprehensive assessment plan clearly related to the QEP goals

The QEP Planning Team was to be faculty-driven and to represent faculty, both experienced and new, from each of the College's academic divisions: four from Humanities and Social Sciences; three from Mathematics, Sciences, and Human Services; and one from Business and Technologies (the College's smallest division). With expertise in writing instruction, three English department members were chosen to represent the Humanities and Social Sciences, including the Coordinator of PVCC's Writing Center.

Members of the QEP Planning Team

Tara Atkins-Brady, Director of Inst. Research, Planning, and Inst. Effectiveness
Catherine Brown, Assistant Professor, Nursing
Patricia Franklin, Associate Professor, Biology
Amy Gillespie, Associate Professor, Nursing, *Co-Chair*
Kathy Hudson, Interim Vice President for Instruction and Student Services
James Jewett, Associate Professor, Information Systems Technology
Jessica Kingsley, Associate Professor, English, *Co-Chair*
Jennifer Koster, Assistant Professor, English, and Writing Center Coordinator
Benjamin Sloan, Professor, English
Kristine Swanson, Instructor, French

The QEP Planning Team met regularly to:

- Collect and analyze additional assessments and input from faculty about student writing at PVCC
- Complete the literature review (see Section VI)
- Identify student learning outcomes (see Section V)
- Identify strategies and develop an implementation plan (see Section VII)
- Develop an assessment plan (see Section XI)
- Discuss marketing strategies (see Section VII)

Additional Assessment and Input from Faculty

Analysis of English Course Outcomes

PVCC English faculty proceeded to collect data on student writing. They carried out a cross-sectional analysis on a random sample of pre-semester and post-semester assessment essays written as a required part of English 1 (Preparation for College Writing I), English 3 (Preparation for College Writing II), and English 111 (College Composition I). These sample papers were evaluated in three areas according to the English department rubric: Content, Organization, and Grammar. These areas were scored from one (poor) to five (excellent). Analysis revealed that English 1 students tended to show significant improvement—eight-tenths of a point gain in organization and grammar and over two full points in content—from the pre-test to the post-assessment. However, gains were modest in English 3, approximately four-tenths of a point in content and organization, and no change in grammar and mechanics. In English 111, there was no statistically significant change from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment.

Faculty Survey

The English faculty on the QEP Planning Team developed an electronic survey that was sent to all full- and part-time faculty for the purpose of determining the extent to which writing is currently incorporated in classes across the College and understanding more clearly the problems PVCC instructors perceive in student writing. Results of the survey were used to identify areas of literature review and develop appropriate student learning outcomes. Important results are summarized below.

Students' Attitudes Toward Writing

Forty-four faculty members, approximately 25% of all full- and part-time faculty, completed the survey. When comments from the faculty survey were analyzed, it became clear that faculty members were primarily concerned with students' attitudes about writing. When asked questions like, "What frustrates you most about including writing in your class?" the most prevalent comment type (representing 29% of all comments coded) involved words like "motivation," "not trying," "lack of effort," or "not caring." Faculty members do not feel that PVCC students value writing or view writing as an important, meaningful, or helpful activity. It seemed clear that, at least from the faculty perspective, PVCC does not have a "culture of writing."

Ways in Which Writing is Assigned

Survey results indicate that the ways in which writing is currently assigned do not promote the use of writing as a tool for learning and communicating: (1) Most assigned student writing takes place outside of class; and (2) student writing is used most frequently as a "product" to demonstrate what is known; it is used less frequently as a way to "come to know."

Students and the Writing Process

The majority of faculty responding to the survey estimated that *less than half of PVCC's students* can generate good ideas to write about, show sophisticated thinking in their writing, fully develop their ideas in writing, or write with a clear purpose in mind.

When assessing the products of writing, faculty indicated that idea generation and depth of thought are areas of concern. Yet, the very activities (i.e., writing-to-learn and writing process activities) that might improve these areas of concern appear underutilized at the College.

Review of the Literature and Refining the Focus

Using these survey results and feedback from a meeting held with PVCC's Faculty Professional Association (attended by 43 faculty members), the QEP Planning Team identified three possible areas of focus for the QEP:

- Writing to improve critical thinking
- Improving writing in the disciplines
- Creating a culture of writing

QEP Planning Team members reviewed literature in each of these areas and prepared white papers which were circulated among the team. After discussing each white paper, the Planning Team recommended a single, focused topic: "Creating a Culture of Writing: Strengthening Writing at PVCC." This focus was presented to PVCC faculty in August 2008 via a brief position paper sent to faculty by mail and electronically. During the College's Fall Planning Week, the QEP Planning Team led a meeting, attended by 109 full- and part-time faculty, to present the QEP focus, the process by which it was determined, the goal of the QEP, the data and input that led to this selection, possible outcomes and strategies, and potential assessments. The Planning Team also solicited questions, comments, ideas, and suggestions from faculty in attendance.

Faculty generally were enthusiastic about the QEP topic. They spoke of specific concerns about students turning in drafts rather than finished pieces, of the insecurity among students about writing skills, and about their own desire for a rubric to help them evaluate writing. One faculty member observed that the QEP would enable students to "[take] writing more seriously" and to "become less fearful about writing and sharing their work." Another observed that the QEP would "help [students] to see that we are trying to empower them, not to tear them down. If [students] can convince people in writing, their whole lives will be better." Receiving professional development toward the improvement of student writing, and assistance in assigning and evaluating student writing, were looked upon favorably by faculty.

Identifying Desired Student Learning Outcomes

The QEP Planning Team identified and refined student learning outcomes that reflect what the college community values with regard to writing. The seven final agreed-upon outcomes describe the writing skills that associate degree students should be able to demonstrate at the time of graduation, behaviors associated with good writing, and students' perceptions of the writing process and of themselves as writers (see Section V). Student learning will be assessed using written products from Writing Intensive courses (see below), a required graduate exit exam, and student surveys. A detailed assessment plan is provided in Section XI.

Identifying Strategies and Developing the Five-Year Implementation Plan

Next, the QEP Planning Team set out to determine how to achieve these outcomes. Both strategies (i.e., actions to be implemented) and assessment of outcomes were discussed in a series of meetings in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009. In mid-December 2008, the task force presented to the faculty in an open meeting five possible strategies for the QEP, including:

1. Revising English 111-112
2. Enhancing writing in ITE 119-120
3. Developing a common rubric to evaluate writing assignments
4. Developing writing enhanced and intensive courses in each program
5. Creating capstone courses

Faculty in attendance expressed concern about what they viewed as ambitious goals, requiring more of PVCC students than might be required of them at their transfer institutions. Specifically, faculty objected to the amount of writing in Writing Intensive courses and to the notion of capstone courses. They felt both were inappropriate for many of the College's programs, which are designed as the foundation courses for transfer to a four-year college or university. They felt many faculty would be unable to incorporate such lengthy writing requirements into their courses and that we would meet resistance.

Following this meeting, the Planning Team worked to further refine the strategies. The notion of capstone courses was dropped in favor of identifying and developing Writing Intensive (WI) courses (existing capstone courses could be identified and developed as WI courses at the discretion of individual programs), and requiring all associate degree students to complete one Writing Intensive course in their program of study. The resulting strategies include:

1. Implement a revised English 111 course that provides a foundation of writing process activities, expands the number and type of writing assignments to which students are exposed during the semester, introduces the PVCC Writing Rubric as a tool for formative assessment of writing, and provides instruction in specific grammar and punctuation concepts.
2. Reinforce writing process activities by using the PVCC Writing Rubric to give formative and summative feedback on writing assignments in required ITE 119 and 120 (Information Technology Essentials) and CSC 110 (Computer Science) courses.
3. Implement a revised English 112 course that expands the number and type of writing assignments to which students are exposed during the semester, reinforces writing process activities, and provides instruction in specific grammar and punctuation concepts.
4. Develop and implement an identified Writing Intensive course (or courses) in each program of study and require that associate degree-seeking students successfully complete the WI course. ENG 111, ITE/CSC, and ENG 112 are prerequisites for the WI course.

The QEP Planning Team also recognized the need for tools and activities to support the above strategies, including:

- A PVCC Writing Rubric establishing college-wide expectations for the quality of student writing and a common vocabulary for discussing that writing
- Professional Development to give faculty the tools and training needed to identify and develop WI courses, use the PVCC Writing Rubric, and support the culture of writing
- A Faculty Resource Team, comprised at first of English faculty, that will be available to assist discipline faculty in developing WI courses and integrating instructional strategies into courses. Experienced discipline faculty from one cohort will assist faculty in the next cohort
- Increased Writing Center involvement to support student learning

These strategies and supporting activities will be phased in by cohorts of associate degree programs over the five years of the QEP (see Sections VII and VIII) and supported with appropriate human and financial resources (see Sections IX and X); their effectiveness will be evaluated with a rigorous program of formative and summative assessment (see Section XI).

During the Spring 2009 semester, members of the QEP Planning Team continued to meet with campus stakeholders, including the College Senate, Faculty Professional Association, Curriculum and Instruction Committee, Professional Association of Support Staff, Student Government Association, and President's Staff. Team members provided updates on the status of QEP development, answered questions, and solicited feedback, which was then shared with the rest of the Planning Team and considered as final decisions were made about actions to achieve the desired Student Learning Outcomes.

V. Desired Student Learning Outcomes

A “Culture of Writing” as we define it includes (1) the collective belief within our community that the act of writing has value, and (2) the consequent actions that teach, reinforce, and instill in our students the processes and practices required of proficient writers. The QEP Topic Selection and Planning Teams, after considering all available evidence and input, concluded that student writing was an area in need of improvement and resolved to both emphasize the value of writing and provide students with appropriate, purposeful, proven opportunities to engage in writing processes and practices. It is the collective desire of PVCC’s faculty, staff, administrators, and board members that its graduates are prepared to meet the expectations of transfer institutions and employers in regard to written communication skills. This focus and desire, reflected in the College’s QEP goal statement below, is consistent with the emphases on transfer and workforce preparation that are at the core of PVCC’s mission and consistent with two of the five Institutional Priorities in the College’s current Strategic Plan (Ensure Transfer Success and Support Economic Vitality and Workforce Development):

The goal of PVCC’s QEP is to prepare graduates to meet the writing expectations of four-year institutions and the workforce by providing increased and deliberate opportunities to expand the breadth and depth of student writing experiences at PVCC and by promoting the value of writing as a tool for learning and communicating.

As a result, students will achieve the following Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):

- SLO 1: Students will compose texts that are appropriate for purpose and audience.
- SLO 2: Students will compose texts in which ideas are supported in well-developed, logical paragraphs.
- SLO 3: Students will compose texts that demonstrate unity and coherence.
- SLO 4: Students will compose grammatically and mechanically correct sentences that convey the writer’s message in a clear, precise, and readable way.
- SLO 5: Students will use writing-to-learn and writing process activities *on their own* as a means to explore and articulate ideas.
- SLO 6: Students will perceive themselves as “improved writers” as a result of their PVCC experience.
- SLO 7: Students will express confidence in their ability to write effectively.

VI. Literature Review and Best Practices

“A writer is not so much someone who has something to say as he is someone who has found a process that will bring about things he would not have thought of if he had not started to say them.”

--William Stafford

Why Writing?

Though this document details in Section III the specific reasons Piedmont Virginia Community College chose to focus on writing for its Quality Enhancement Plan, it is useful to take a brief look at some general considerations about writing and its place in our culture and our schools. In 2002, the College Board, an organization of 4,300 schools and colleges, established the National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges (NCWASC) in its effort to understand the complexities and problems of writing instruction in American schools (elementary through college level). This body's 2003 report, *The Neglected 'R,'* opens, “Writing, education's second ‘R,’ has become the neglected element of American school reform,” noting later that “the teaching and practice of writing are increasingly shortchanged throughout the school and college years.” The NCWASC explains that despite educators and employers alike emphasizing the importance of improved written communication and acknowledging the many writing deficits of our nation's students, neither our national nor state and local governments have made unified, substantial progress towards improving writing across American schools.

Many college educators, including our own here at PVCC, note student writing deficiencies. Ambron (1991) notes writing deficiencies at the community college level that can be attributed to open access enrollment, increasing numbers of students in higher education, and diverse student socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds. Colleagues across campuses have noted that students do not possess the skills needed to write effectively within a course (Jerde & Taper, 2004; Mahnan, Jayasumana, Lyle & Palmquist, 2000). *The Neglected 'R'™* also notes that many college freshmen cannot readily produce texts that analyze and synthesize information nor can they produce texts free of errors (p. 14). In addition, the National Assessment of Educational Progress found that “few [students] are able to create precise, engaging, coherent prose” (qtd. in NCWASC, p. 16).

Educators are certainly not alone in their dissatisfaction with the state of student writing. Employers in the nation also indicate not only that writing is a significant determining factor in hiring and promotion, but that many recent college graduates do not meet the writing needs the workplace demands. As a result of its survey of 120 American corporations associated with the Business Roundtable (a consortium of chief executive officers), the College Board concluded that “writing is a ticket to professional opportunity, while poorly written job applications are a figurative kiss of death” (2004, p. 3). Further, an impressive “eighty percent or more of companies in the service and finance, insurance, and real estate sectors, the corporations with the greatest employment growth potential, assess writing during hiring” (p. 3). Unfortunately, the survey also found that about one-third of respondents indicated that one-third or fewer current new-hires “possess the writing skills that companies value” (p. 13). The report indicates that “corporations...express a fair degree of dissatisfaction with the writing of recent college graduates” (p. 14).

What is a “Culture of Writing”?

If we define culture as a “collection of beliefs, behaviors, rituals, and language” (Sunstein, 1994, p. 11) shared by a given group at a given time, a “Culture of Writing” might be seen as the collective belief, and consequent actions, within our community that the act of writing has value, not just as the necessary demonstration of what has been learned, but as a way *to* learn, a way to come to know, to generate ideas, to reflect, to understand, to synthesize ideas, to organize ideas, to come into contact with our thoughts in informal ways, *as well as* a way to express those thoughts formally. With this definition in mind, the QEP Planning Team recommends that Piedmont Virginia Community College implement a major curricular change: revise program specifications such that a Writing Intensive course is a graduation requirement. To lay the foundation for Writing Intensive courses, and to create logically sequenced writing experiences, the QEP Planning Team also recommends changes to College Composition I and II, as well as changes to ITE and CSC courses (see Section VII).

Studies of writing instruction show two important possibilities: (1) the act of writing itself (in various shapes and forms and for various purposes and audiences) improves writing (and learning); and (2) awareness of and engagement in writing process strategies improves writing. Because writing-to-learn and writing process strategies capitalize on the notion that writing is a way to discover knowledge, to connect ideas, and, therefore, to think more deeply and richly and to compose more thoughtful, and more carefully crafted, written texts, these strategies will become an integral part of our Writing Intensive courses. PVCC will act to ensure that such strategies are introduced in English 111 (College Composition I) and reinforced in English 112 (College Composition II), the College’s two introductory writing courses. Additionally, revised formal writing assignments and informal writing-to-learn activities and the PVCC Writing Rubric will be introduced to ITE and CSC courses to further enhance students’ writing experiences at PVCC. The Virginia Community College System (VCCS) General Education Competencies state that “degree graduates will demonstrate the ability to...*assimilate, organize, develop, and present an idea formally and informally.*” Revisions to English 111, English 112, and CSC/ITE courses, and the integration of Writing Intensive courses will ensure that students here at the College meet, and exceed, the expectations laid out in this outcome.

What Improves Student Writing?

E.B. White and William Strunk’s (1972) text *The Elements of Style* has become a veritable bible for writers and writing educators alike. In the last chapter of this short but influential book, and after four chapters dedicated to correcting the most common writing problems, they acknowledge the ultimate mysteriousness and sometimes elusiveness of “good writing.” They write, “There is...no infallible guide to good writing, no assurance that a person who thinks clearly will be able to write clearly, no key that unlocks the door, no inflexible rule by which writers may shape their course. Writers will often find themselves steering by stars that are disturbingly in motion” (66). Those who read student writing are well aware of writing’s complex and slippery nature. It is too simplistic to believe a back-to-basics strategy that encourages mastery of grammar and punctuation – the most easily identifiable and correctable elements of proficient writing – alone would improve student writing when we instinctively know that “the ability to diagram a sentence does not make a good writer” (NCWASC, 2003). Studies over the past forty years indicate that increased grammar instruction does not improve writing

quality (Hillocks, 2003) and, in some cases, might have a detrimental effect on writing ability (McQuade qtd. in Weaver, 1996). So what does improve writing, this “complex intellectual activity that requires students to stretch their minds, sharpen their analytical capabilities, and make valid and accurate distinctions”? (NCWASC, 2003).

Many strategies to improve student writing have been implemented since the first college composition course was designed in the 1870s, but what most language theorists agree on today is that “writing is not a single, generalizable skill.” David Russell (1991) refers to the idea that learning to write can be completed once and for all as the “myth of transience” and argues that writing instead develops over time as need dictates and circumstances permit. Another way to consider this issue is to understand the current and popular views of writing in general and college composition specifically. One view of writing stems from the idea that “good writing” is simply a set of skills that can be learned in one course (or a series of courses) and then generalized to various situations and disciplines. Thus we hear the lament, “Why don’t these kids coming out of high school know how to write!” Faculty have come to expect that writing skills are taught (or not) within a freshman English composition class; English composition faculty expect that core writing skills are learned within secondary educational courses. A second view, however, is that expressed by Susan Well (1997), Director of Writing Programs at Whittier College. She writes, “...the process of teaching writing *only begins* (emphasis added) with freshman writing courses.” Well goes on to explain that students should learn the “core procedures” for writing in their freshman composition courses, but because “conventions...differ from one discipline to another...” their development as writers must continue beyond their initial writing courses as they encounter “different vocabulary and rhetorical modes.” As various disciplines work together to implement effective writing techniques as a form of learning strategy within a course, two specific needs are addressed: “effective [written] communication skills and the ability to critically think. Both are essential to life long learners in a rapidly changing society” (Ambron, 1991). Thus, these foundation skills need to be practiced and applied in subsequent courses, making for more skilled and nimble writers.

It has been shown time and again that writing is something that develops over time and across disciplines as students mature and encounter new writing situations and writing tasks, gaining both content knowledge and discipline-specific ways of writing and knowing (Carter, 2007; Downs and Wardle, 2007 citing Ackerman: Ahrenhoerster, 2006; Carroll, 2002; Berkenkotter and Huckin, 1993; Kaufer and Young, 1993; Fulwiler, 1990). In the executive summary of “*The Neglected ‘R’*,” the College Board’s NCWASC, comprised of teachers and other experts in the field of writing, college and university presidents, and school district superintendents, states, “Writing is everybody’s business.” This group offers five recommendations to improve the state of writing in our schools. The report states:

- Time: The commission believes that the amount of time most students spend writing should be at least doubled. This time can be found through assignments at home and by encouraging more writing during the school day in curriculum areas not traditionally associated with it. This change alone will do more to improve student performance than anything else state or local school leaders can do.
- Writing Across the Curriculum: We strongly endorse writing across the curriculum. The concept of doubling writing time is feasible because of the near-

total neglect of writing outside English departments. [In discipline-specific courses] all students can be encouraged to write more—and to write more effectively.

- Assignments: We suggest more use of out-of-school time for writing.... Research is crystal clear: Schools that do well insist that their students write every day and that teachers provide regular and timely feedback...(2003).

The need for writing across the disciplines is also echoed in recent research, such as that presented by Lee Ann Carroll (2002) in her text *Rehearsing New Roles: How College Students Develop as Writers*, in which she recommends that colleges “Redesign the literacy environment to provide more options...[in which students] negotiate complex literacy tasks over a sequence of courses” across disciplines. Carroll also recommends instruction in all disciplines that “provide[s] scaffolding by teaching discipline-specific...writing skills, use grading strategically to reward improvement, require classroom workshops...” and, in general, widen the often narrow view of what it means to include writing in content specific courses.

Writing Intensive Courses

The Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) movement erupted in the 1960s and 1970s in response to social changes and the diversity of students applying for college enrollment (Hennessey & Evans, 2005; Lester et al, 2003; Ambron, 1991;) after concerns about poor writing and communication skills were identified within these diverse populations of students. From these concerns, studies and statistics were compiled in both the United Kingdom and the United States to address problem areas with the dynamics of student writing. “These studies along with others identify that (a) writing is intimately linked with thinking and learning, (b) success depends on a student’s behavior and skills that must be [continually] *reinforced throughout* [emphasis added] a student’s learning career, and (c) that writing skills develop sequentially and hierarchically” (Ambron, 1991, p 4). Many instructional strategies were identified, and multidisciplinary faculty workshops and training sessions were offered across college and university campuses for faculty development.

One such strategy that has developed as an offshoot of writing across the curriculum programs to address the writing deficit of students in many two- and four-year colleges is the inclusion of writing intensive courses within curricular programs. Dozens of colleges across the country are enhancing curricular requirements to ensure that students take at least one discipline-specific course that has a significant writing component. Such writing intensive courses can help colleges and universities fulfill the NCWASC’s recommendations. Though the specifics of what constitutes a writing intensive course vary in terms of individual course requirements, definitions are fairly consistent regarding the overarching purpose and general guidelines, as are some basic requirements of what constitutes writing intensive courses. Further, the inclusion of writing intensive courses into curricular programs is based on a universal set of premises.

Toby Fulwiler, well known in the field of writing across the curriculum, outlines several premises that underscore including writing in non-composition, discipline-specific courses. He suggests the following: (1) increased writing improves learning; (2) increased writing empowers students to personalize their educational experiences; (3) increased writing improves writing (ref. in *Writes of Passage*, 2006). The National

Council for Teachers of English echoes Fulwiler in their Guideline “NCTE Beliefs about the Teaching of Writing” in which they state, “(1) Everyone has the capacity to write...”; (2) People learn to write by writing...; (3) Writing is a process...; (4) Writing is a tool for thinking...; (5) Writing grows out of many different purposes...” (2004). The remainder of this literature review focuses on several of these premises.

A writing intensive course can be defined as a discipline-specific course (not a composition course) that purposefully embeds formal and informal writing activities throughout the semester with the intention of encouraging meaningful engagement with course content, encouraging thoughtful composing practices, and creating polished texts. The general goals of writing intensive courses are to improve both writing and content mastery. Typically, two- and four-year colleges that require writing intensive courses require that students take as few as one course identified as writing intensive (such as University of Virginia, Florida’s Gordon Rule, University of Missouri, George Mason University) and sometimes as many as four or five courses identified as writing intensive during their college tenure (such as University of Mary Washington, University of North Carolina at Greensboro).

The need for clearly defined institutional guidelines to determine what constitutes a writing intensive course is echoed over and over again in the current literature. Though the specific requirements for writing intensive courses differ from institution to institution, according to Farris and Smith (2000), most writing intensive course criteria include statements regarding:

- Teacher-to-student ratio
- The number of pages or words to be completed throughout the course of the semester
- Revision and writing process requirements (including drafting, peer and/or instructor feedback, and editing)
- How writing will be factored into the students’ final grades
- Types of writing assignments and how they might be distributed throughout the semester
- Requirements for direct writing instruction regarding assignments
- Support services

The University of Missouri, Columbia, for example, has adapted Farris and Smith’s list to institute their writing intensive requirement. Martha Townsend (2001), Director of the University of Missouri’s Campus Writing Program, details the guidelines her campus has put into place. These guidelines include the following: (1) WI courses must have a student-to-teacher ratio of 20:1; (2) WI courses must include multiple writing assignments; (3) These assignments must be distributed throughout the course of the semester; (4) These assignments must include at least one paper that is drafted, revised, and resubmitted; (5) WI courses include peer review, instructor feedback, drafting, revising, editing, and submission; (6) Assignments in WI courses must total 5,000 words, divided as follows: 2,000 words of final, polished writing and 3,000 words that can include writing-to-learn assignments, drafts, revisions, etc.; (7) written assignments must be part of the students final grade. Many other institutions include

similar criteria for their writing intensive courses. Townsend also outlines other factors that contribute to the success of the integration of an institution-wide writing intensive requirement. This kind of initiative, she believes, must be faculty conceived, initiated, and reviewed. It must have administrative support, both ideological and fiscal. It must be aligned with the institution's mission and carefully integrated into the fabric of the institution. Guidelines for course criteria must be established and clear, yet flexible enough to "fit" the course goals and pedagogical styles of individual instructors. There must be incentives for faculty willing to teach writing intensive courses to show that the institution values their additional effort. Further, these initiatives must have strong and well-informed leadership and periodic and rigorous assessment.

Several studies have begun to look at the effectiveness of writing intensive courses to improve writing and affect change in students' perceptions about their writing experiences. The findings of recent research have been promising. Some such studies have focused on students' perceptions of their own writing achievement (Sinclair, 2002; Smithson, 1995), while others have focused on a more objective assessment of writing improvement (Cline, 2008; Murphy, 2001; Dobie and Poirrier, 2000; Smithson, 1995; Oliver, 1995). One major study of 1,000 freshmen at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, found "a positive relationship between the number of 'C courses' [writing intensive] and success in passing" the University's Writing Proficiency Requirement (WPR) (Murphy, 2001, p. 94). Though this trend was noted across students, the results were especially significant for those freshmen entering the University with VSAT scores lower than 500 or those with ESL designations. Isaiah Smithson's (1995) comparison of essays written in a non-writing intensive economics class and a comparable writing intensive class also indicated that writing intensive courses improve writing. He found that, when assessed by independent, trained graders, 68% of essays written in the non-writing intensive class passed with a C or above, while 78% of essays written in the writing intensive class passed with a C or above.

While these studies reviewed writing improvement, others attempted to determine the effect writing intensive courses have on students' perceptions of their writing skills, their understanding of course material, and their experience in writing intensive courses. Andrea Sinclair's (2002) survey of 2,570 students across disciplines in 40 departments found that while students in some disciplines favored revision opportunities, and others favored instructor and peer feedback, a statistically significant number of students "strongly agreed" that writing intensive courses improved their writing skills. Smithson (1995) also found a positive relationship between writing frequency in writing intensive courses and students' perceptions that the course was "intellectually challenging" and "personally engaging" in his study of the impact of writing intensive courses in eleven academic departments. Further, he writes:

Responses to the student survey also indicate that a high percentage of students felt they improved substantially in "thinking through my ideas before writing," "outlining," "clarifying my topic through writing," "directing my writing to appropriate audience," and "editing and rewriting drafts." Responses indicate that "thinking through my ideas" and "editing and rewriting drafts" are writing behaviors in which students felt they had made the most improvements as a result of the writing intensive courses. (p. 9-10)

Educators offer some cautions about writing intensive courses based on their own "bumps along the road." Among the most significant are that (1) discipline faculty may

not feel equipped to include writing in their courses; and (2) discipline faculty may be unfamiliar with writing process and writing-to-learn practices necessary to incorporate useful writing activities into their classes. Both of these can impact the success of individual writing intensive courses as well as program success as a whole (Gottschalk and Hjortshoj, 2004; Shankle, 2001; Barnes, 1999). Research suggests the importance of several activities:

- Engaging, inclusive, and extended professional development to address these issues (Hennessy and Evans, 2005; Barnes, 1999; Fulwiler and Young, 1990; McLeod, 1989)
- Specific guidelines for writing intensive courses (Gottschalk and Hjortshoj, 2004; Shankle, 2001; Barnes, 1999)
- The creation of a means by which to share ideas and to disseminate information (Townsend, 2001; Barnes, 1999)

The above findings confirm what Toby Fulwiler wrote in his essay, “Journals Across the Disciplines”:

Student writing will not improve by simply increasing the number of assignments in a course, adding a term paper, or switching to essay tests. While these changes may be appropriate for some disciplines, they are not for others; in any case, such changes alone will not significantly alter the quality of student writing. Students need to write often, and in every discipline, but equally important is the kind of writing students are asked to do. (1989, p. 170)

With this additional caution in mind, the next portion of this literature review will focus briefly on two kinds of writing activities essential to writing intensive courses: writing-to-learn activities and writing process activities.

Writing-to-Learn and Writing Process

A culture of writing in the College, fostered by the curricular changes noted above, would mean that students are actively engaged in various forms of writing throughout their college experience, not solely in their college composition classes. This initiative presupposes two ideas: (1) students can learn *through writing*, and (2) increased writing with an emphasis on writing-to-learn and process writing *will improve final written products*. However, as stated above, simply increasing writing by, for example, including one twenty-page paper at the end of a course will not do the trick (Fulwiler, 1989). Instead, current practice in writing intensive courses indicates that both composition instructors and WI faculty should incorporate two important strategies in their courses: (1) writing process strategies, and (2) writing-to-learn strategies. Research has suggested that more than anything else, writing process and writing-to-learn activities have the most promise for improving student writing. David Russell’s (1991) review of the research on writing-in-the-disciplines (WID) suggests that helping students to better understand their own writing process is especially key to helping students improve their writing in writing intensive courses. He writes, “What does seem to work is a process of writing that involves students in the activity of a discipline” (p. 302). Though this “process of writing,” he explains, might not look exactly like the steps of the writing process as seen in composition classes, the main underpinnings of the writing process theory, some

form of writing-before-writing and some form of revision, for example, are sound practices and helpful tools in writing intensive courses. In the conclusion of his review, he writes of the four directions that arise from WID research. One of the four points suggests the inclusion of writing process activities in writing intensive courses:

Designing assignments and courses so that students engage in a process of learning to write and writing to learn over time, allowing them to build, refine, and reflect on their composing, seems to be more effective than assigning a paper and taking it up on the due date, with nothing in between—though what comes in between will vary enormously. (p. 302)

In their text entitled *The Elements of Teaching Writing: A Resource in All Disciplines*, Katherine Gottschalk and Keith Hjortshoj, both from Cornell University's Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines, also indicate that writing-to-learn and writing process activities are key strategies to improving student writing in discipline-specific courses. They cite the following as some of the "best practices" when integrating writing into discipline courses:

- Write instructive feedback/comments on both drafts in progress and completed texts submitted for a grade
- Require revision of some assignments
- Incorporate peer review
- Include informal and preparatory writing ("prewriting" and "writing-to-learn" activities) as part of a writing process
- Encourage students to attend to errors at the appropriate stage of the writing process

In the following sections, writing process and writing-to-learn are discussed separately. To distinguish between writing process strategies and writing-to-learn strategies might at first seem artificial. Certainly, many specific activities instructors use to implement these strategies look similar, and the ultimate goal of both is the same: to improve student writing. However, the two can be differentiated by the kind of writing each is intended to produce. The "product goal" of writing-to-learn activities is not communicative but expressive. In this strategy, writing is not intended for an audience, but for the self. The "product goal" of writing process activities, though such activities make use of expressive and discovery writing, is ultimately to produce text for the purpose of communication. Due to the emphasis on expressive and discovery writing in both strategies, however, they remedy the deficiencies Janet Emig (1971) saw in school-sponsored writing (such as insufficient time for writing and idea development and limited types of writing tasks) as early as 1971; bodies such as the NCWASC continue to note these deficiencies today. Further, both pedagogical approaches have been shown to improve writing.

Writing Process

The study of writing process began in 1971, with Janet Emig's groundbreaking study "Composing Process of Twelfth-Graders." After this, other educators began to see the merit of studying the composing process of students. In her study, Emig criticized schools for the simplification of a process that is actually a complex activity. Emig was one of the first researchers to look to experienced authors for models of successful

composing processes, and she applied this model to the composing activities of twelfth-grade students (Emig, 1971; Schreiner, 1997). Emig writes, “The composing does not occur as a left-to-right, solid, uninterrupted activity with an even pace. Rather, there are recursive, as well as anticipatory, features; and there are interstices, pauses involving hesitation phenomena of various lengths and sorts” (1983, p. 74). Emig’s research is not merely a description of her participants’ processes, but an indictment of school-sponsored writing. Despite the intelligence and fluency of the students, Emig was discouraged by some of the writing behaviors they exhibited or lacked, and she blamed an environment that did not create the conditions for reflexive writing and thoughtful composing (1983, pp. 63-94). Emig’s intensive study of how students write encouraged other researchers to study the composing process of both skilled and novice writers, leading to a plethora of information about how writing happens, how instructors should teach “the writing process,” and how writing leads to learning (Dyson and Freedman, 2003, p. 974).

Today, many English teachers who teach the writing process incorporate the following steps into their instruction: (1) prewriting; (2) planning; (3) drafting; (4) revising; (5) editing; (6) proofreading; (7) publishing. In addition, instructors who include writing process activities in the classroom might also integrate peer feedback or “workshopping” groups, instructor feedback on drafts-in-process, and writing conferences into their course framework. Both professional writers and writing instructors agree that teaching writing as a process is a giant leap for writing instruction because it “can offer a vocabulary for talking about the nature of writing...and insight into how these processes work for particular writers in particular situations” (Dyson and Freedman, 2003, p. 974). Process writing strategies have the potential to improve content knowledge, thinking, attitude, and writing, as the following review of the literature will suggest. Yet, instruction in the writing process has yielded inconsistent results for several reasons: (1) lack of consistency in writing process instruction; (2) the use of a “lock-step” approach to writing process when, in fact, literacy events vary drastically from writer to writer and from purpose to purpose (Dyson and Freedman, 2003, p. 976); and (3) infrequent reinforcement of writing process activities in discipline-specific courses.

Well-known writers and educators have advocated the teaching of writing process activities (Murray, 2002; Elbow, 1998; Howard and Barton, 1986). In their review of the literature on writing process in the classroom, Anne Haas Dyson and Sara Warshauer Freedman (2003), citing Hillocks (1995) and Yeh (1998), indicate that students “benefit from explicit teaching of heuristics of composing genre forms” (p. 976). Peter Smagorinsky’s (1991) study found that students taught writing via “models [of good writing] combined with instruction in composing procedures” were more successful writers. He continues, “...the general procedures of freewriting and brainstorming...appeared to give students strategies for producing the particular elements stressed in the model essays...” (p. 359). The most compelling evidence that instruction in writing process strategies improves writing comes from a comprehensive study by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 1996). For this study, the NCES analyzed over 29,000 student essays nationwide and reports “evidence of the positive association between process-oriented activities and writing performance” (p. 3). Process writing activities, such as prewriting, can also result in more positive attitudes towards writing and less anxiety about writing (Marra and Marra, 2000; Oliver, 1995; Jones, 1995).

Writing to Learn

Writing-to-learn activities can be defined as strategies involving informal writing activities done in class and at home to engage students in the course material. These activities could include “journals, logs, microthemes, and other, primarily informal, writing assignments” (Purdue University, OWL, 2008). The purpose of these activities is not “transactional” (Britton, 1975), in other words, intended to inform an audience; instead, writing-to-learn activities can be considered “expressive,” the primary function of which is to “order and represent experience to our own understanding. In this sense language provides us with a unique way of knowing and becomes a tool for discovering, for shaping meaning, and for reaching understanding” (Britton, 1975 qtd. in WAC Clearinghouse, 2008). Similarly, Sondra Perl, in her seminal study of “unskilled” college writers, found that “composing always involves some measure of both construction and discovery” (1979, p. 331), further stating that her subjects “know more fully what they mean after they have written it” (p. 331). Many studies have shown that journal writing and other writing-to-learn strategies in content-specific courses can enhance student performance on exams, in overall coursework, and with information retention in classes across disciplines, including nursing, math, anatomy and physiology, finance, psychology, sociology, among others (Cisero, 2006; Hohenshell and Hand, 2006; Bangert-Drowns, Hurley, and Wilkinson, 2004; Connor-Greene, 2000; NCTM, 2000; Dobie and Poirrier, 2000; Johanning, 2000; Coker and Scarborough, 1990; “Writing-to-Learn,” WAC, 2008). More to the purpose of PVCC’s QEP Student Learning Outcomes, however, in-class writing-to-learn and writing process activities, the very writing activities our students engage in least (Faculty Survey), have been shown to improve writing performance in writing classes and in the disciplines (Dobie and Poirrier, 2000; Elbow, 1998; Oliver, 1995; Perl, 1979).

The National Council for Teachers of English document entitled “College/University Writing Policy Development” (2003) states that “writing-to-learn activities help students develop their own critical voice for reading, discussion, and writing,” suggesting that college writing policies should support “writing activities through all learning experiences in all courses.” Further, the VCCS General Education Competencies state that “degree graduates will demonstrate the ability to...*assimilate, organize, develop, and present an idea formally and informally.*” These are some of the main foci of writing-to-learn and process writing activities.

College Composition Best Practices

Writing Process Instruction

The National Commission on Writing for American Families, Schools, and Colleges’ 2005 report, *Writing and School Reform*, was an outgrowth of the Commission’s initial 2003 report, *The Neglected “R”: The Need for a Writing Revolution*. This 2005 report is a “best practices” document, of sorts, that grew out of a year-long series of five hearings held throughout the United States and attended by “teachers, school administrators, university faculty, and academic leaders, including experts from school and campus writing programs” (p. 3). According to this body, effective writing teachers modeled “inquiry, study, and learning for their students,” becoming “co-learners” in the classroom; they “asked students to use writing to collect, analyze, synthesize, and communicate information and opinions”; and they “called on students to draft, compose, and revise a

variety of writings for a variety of audiences, purposes, and occasions” (p. 10). As one teacher attending the seminar put it, “Writing is not just saying something. It’s acquiring a process by which to think about what to say.” To this end, and as noted elsewhere in this literature review, consistent instruction in the composing process seems key to writing improvement. However, not all writing instructors implement, or effectively implement, writing process and composing activities, such as offering instructive feedback on drafts in progress, conducting fruitful workshopping sessions, or including opportunities for revision (Patthey-Chavez, Matsumura, Valdes, 2004; Williams, 2003).

James Williams (2003), in his text focusing on the research, theory, and practice of writing instruction, citing *National Assessment of Educational Progress Writing Report Card* data, asserts that when process pedagogy is compared to other approaches to teaching writing, this pedagogy “offers the best chance for improving student skills” (p. 99). His discussion of “writing process pedagogy” as a “best practice” in teaching composition relies heavily on the NAEP report, which concludes, “the process approach to writing, in which planning, writing, and revision through several drafts are practiced, gives students the opportunity to write more and to employ editing strategies, which in turn affords them opportunity to improve their mastery of writing conventions” (p. 100). Williams insists that writing process encourages students to engage in the same activities that “good writers” engage in, and he identifies three key instructor activities that help to improve writing via the writing process approach: (1) asking students to write more often and in meaningful contexts; (2) providing frequent feedback on works-in-progress; and (3) requiring numerous revisions based on that feedback. Like David Russell, this author clarifies that writing process activities should not be taught as rigid universals because writing is an individual act, but instead as flexible and recursive “phases” that might vary with writer, purpose, and message. By introducing not only the steps of the writing process, but also the various options within each phase, students can understand the wide range of activities they can choose from to craft texts that suit their style and purpose. Further, citing the NAEP report once again, Williams notes that “performance improves when teachers talk to students about their writing” (p. 102). An integral part of the writing process is revision, and student revision on essays is most successful when it is guided by informative instructor feedback on drafts-in-process. This feedback can be written or oral, in student-teacher conferences, also identified as a “best practice” by many (Harris qtd. in Trupiano, 2008, pp. 190-191).

Writing Workshops

An additional “best practice” noted by the NCWASC report was teamwork: “ ‘Acquiring a process by which to think about what to say often depends on teams,’ noted Jerrie Cobb Scott of the University of Memphis at the Mississippi meeting. ‘Good writing teachers often teach students how to work in pairs or teams,’ said Scott, but ‘that’s not something we can assume will happen naturally in the traditional classroom’ ” (p. 15). Again, Williams’s text supports the findings of the NCWASC. He asserts that “The writing workshop was, and continues to be, seen fairly widely as the most effective way” to encourage frequent writing, feedback, and revision as well as to allow students to be more personally engaged in their own learning (p. 103). Sandra M. Lawrence and Elizabeth Sommers, in their study, also found that with “...substantial training and ample opportunities for peer collaboration,” peer response groups became a successful classroom practice (qtd. in Trupiano, 2008, p. 179).

Common Rubric

The NCWASC also recommends the development of documents outlining “common expectations for writing across disciplines” (p. 23). Williams emphasizes this point, noting that students’ performance improves when teachers articulate and convey appropriate, challenging, and manageable expectations and standards to students, and offer the support to meet those expectations and standards (p. 130). The creation, dissemination (to faculty and students), and use of a rubric that aligns with student learning outcomes in composition courses has the potential to improve their written products. Vicki Spandel (2003), author of *Creating Writers Through 6-Trait Writing Assessment and Instruction*, strongly advocates the thoughtful development and use of rubrics not only to assess but to teach writing. She very persuasively makes the case for supplying students with a grading rubric *before* writing assignments are due and teaching them how to use the rubric by reading and grading both sample essays and their own writing. She comments, “When we define our expectations (as in a rubric), we dramatically increase the chances that students will perform better just by virtue of the fact that we have made clear what we want; we have held the target still” (p. 16).

Portfolio Assessment

When it comes to assessing the writing students do in composition classes, the emerging best practice seems to be portfolio assessment. There are a variety of reasons portfolios (repositories of student work, both “published” and process pieces) collected over time and across assignments are an effective means of assessment. Most important, it seems self-evident that “Single assessments are unlikely to be able to show the range of a student’s abilities—and cannot conceivably measure growth—a writing assessment, ideally, should rest on several pieces of writing, written for different audiences and on different occasions” (NCWASC, p. 21). The NCWASC further states, “No single piece of writing, even generated under ideal conditions, can serve as an adequate indicator of overall proficiency” (p. 21). Over the past few years, many educators have called for the switch from final paper assessment to portfolio assessment so that students can see their own writing processes and their own writing progress through the course of the semester or over a multi-semester period (Trupiano, 2008). Citing Liz Hamp-Lyons and William Condon, Trupiano asserts that effective writing portfolios in composition class must include three “basic, but essential components—collection, reflection, selection” (pp. 188-189). Alan Purves’ (1992) extended and international study of writing instruction found “To make any assessment of students’ [overall] writing ability, one at least needs multiple samples across the domain” (qtd. in Spandell, 2003, p. 23).

Conclusion

The “best practices” discussed above are echoed by countless educators and researchers who recommend similar pedagogical practices (Williams, 2003; Milner and Milner, 2003; Smith, 2000; Murray, 1999; Elbow, 1998; Atwell 1998; Kutz and Roskelly, 1991). Piedmont Virginia Community College has identified several ways to change the current English 111 and English 112 courses that are consistent with these best practices in composition instruction. These activities include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) offering consistent instruction in writing process in all composition classes, (2) offering written and/or oral instructor feedback on at least two drafts in process, (3)

conducting writing workshops in all composition classes, (4) revising the writing rubric such that it is consistent with our student learning outcomes and ensuring that this rubric is used by all English faculty and distributed to all students early in the semester, and (5) developing student writing portfolios. A more detailed list of changes to English 111 and English 112 can be found in Section VII of this document.

Further, the “best practices” for improving discipline-specific writing and overall writing ability post-college composition includes infusing writing activities, both formal and informal, across college classes. The creation of writing enhanced ITE and CSC classes and the creation of required Writing Intensive courses will ensure that PVCC students write throughout their college experience.

The College Board’s National Commission on Writing in America’s Schools and Colleges’ 2003 report calls for a “cultural sea change that would provide writing with sufficient time and resources in the classroom” to enable high school and college graduates to meet the “writing demand of the workplace” and/or “advanced courses requiring fluent command of language,” including any postsecondary educational opportunities (p. 17). Piedmont Virginia Community College’s Quality Enhancement Plan offers a solid strategy grounded in composition theory and writing improvement research that will answer the Commission’s “Writing Challenge to the Nation.” PVCC’s new culture of writing will indeed be a “sea change” for faculty, students, and for the community served by the College.

Please refer to Appendix I, References, for works cited.

VII. Actions to be Implemented

Introduction

In order to achieve the desired Student Learning Outcomes, PVCC will engage students in writing process and practice activities that are purposeful and literature-supported. Curricular and instructional changes and expanded Writing Center services will (1) lay the foundation for college-level writing improvement by introducing writing process and writing-to-learn skills and setting shared expectations for the quality of student writing; (2) reinforce these skills; and (3) provide expanded, focused opportunities for students to write and receive feedback on their writing. Faculty will be supported in the implementation of the QEP through timely professional development and a Faculty Resource Team.

Actions and supporting activities will be phased in by cohorts of associate degree programs over the five years of the QEP (see Section VIII), supported with appropriate human and financial resources (see Sections IX and X), and their effectiveness evaluated with a rigorous program of formative and summative assessment (see Section XI).

Laying the Foundation: Changes to English 111

Rationale for Changes to ENG 111

The overarching purpose of the PVCC English department (and the QEP) is to improve student writing ability. As part of its culture of writing, PVCC must ensure that students have a cohesive sequence of writing experiences as they move through their curricular programs. This sequence begins with ENG III (College Composition I). This course (as well as ENG 112) will be revised by the English faculty to reflect key writing concepts as articulated in this QEP and as determined by the needs of PVCC's student population. English 111 will introduce these concepts, and English 112 will reinforce them.

English 111 and English 112 currently introduce students to college-level writing by requiring multiple papers, including a research essay in MLA format. The English department has common syllabi for these courses that are used by all writing instructors. Currently, these syllabi focus mainly on student learning outcomes and paper requirements without addressing the means by which these outcomes are achieved. With the implementation of Writing Intensive courses (see below) that require students to understand their own writing processes, the PVCC ENG 111 and 112 courses must ensure that students are introduced to writing process activities, are familiar with the PVCC Writing Rubric, understand how to utilize instructor feedback, and are comfortable working in workshop groups. Further, English instructors want to make intentional linkages to other classes. Revisions to the syllabi will make writing process and peer group activities essential to these courses.

The English faculty has identified several ways to change the current English 111 and English 112 (College Composition I and II) courses that are consistent with best practices in composition instruction. Changes to English 111 and English 112 are crafted to ensure that:

1. English department instructional practices and pedagogical philosophies are aligned with the “best practices” in English education (as determined by the academics, practitioners, and the National Council for Teachers of English).
2. Instructional practices and Student Learning Outcomes for ENG 111 and 112 are aligned with the Student Learning Outcomes enumerated in PVCC's Quality Enhancement Plan.
3. Students are introduced to and practiced in the activities they will be asked to engage in when taking their Writing Intensive course. Though English 111/112 are not designated Writing Intensive, these courses, by their very nature, will meet and/or exceed the requirements designated for Writing Intensive courses in order to best prepare students for future writing experiences.

Specific Changes to ENG 111 (College Composition I)

Changes to ENG 111 include expanded writing requirements, incorporation of specific instruction in grammar and punctuation, inclusion of prewriting and writing process activities, and use of a new PVCC Writing Rubric. ENG 111 students will build portfolios that contain, at a minimum, the beginning- and end-of-course essays in ENG 111. (Students will add to these portfolios in ENG 112 by including the ENG 112 end-of-course essay). These changes, effective in all ENG 111 courses beginning in Year 1 of the QEP, are specified below. Items *italicized in red* indicate modifications to curriculum and instruction.

Writing Requirements and Grammar and Punctuation Objectives:

- I. *All PVCC English 111 instructors will require a minimum of 5,000 words in the form of formal and informal writing activities to be done over the course of the semester:*
 - a. *Formal writing MUST include:*
 - i. One essay based on personal experience (500 words)
 - ii. One essay that incorporates one or more secondary sources (500-750 words) *and that is written in one of the following rhetorical modes:*
 1. *Persuasion/Argument*
 2. *Comparison/Contrast*
 3. *Process analysis*
 4. *Project proposal*
 5. *Division/Classification*
 6. *Definition*
 7. *Cause/Effect*
 8. *Exemplification*
 - iii. One *persuasive/argument* essay that incorporates two or more sources (750-850 words)
 - iv. One researched essay based on four or more sources (1,500 words)
 - v. *One reflective essay on individual writing process (300-500 words)*
 - vi. Common final exam (500 words)
 - b. *Formal writing MAY ALSO include:*

- i. Paper outlines
 - ii. Annotated bibliographies
 - iii. Practice final exam essays
 - iv. Abstracts
 - c. Informal writing-to-learn activities MAY include (among other options):
 - i. Reader response journals
 - ii. Exploratory (Prewriting) writing activities
 - iii. Micro essays
 - iv. Focused freewriting
 - v. Reflective writing
 - vi. Personal journals
- II. All PVCC English 111 instructors will teach the following grammar and punctuation concepts:
- a. Simple sentences
 - b. Compound sentences
 - c. Complex sentences
 - d. Compound-complex sentences
 - e. Independent and dependent clauses and phrases
 - f. Subject/Verb agreement
 - g. Commonly confused word usage

NEW Instructional Practices:

- I. All PVCC English 111 instructors will include direct instruction about and engage students in writing process activities:
 - a. Prewriting (Exploratory Writing) activities
 - b. Drafting
 - c. Revising
 - d. Editing
 - e. Proofreading
 - f. Publishing
- II. All PVCC English 111 instructors will teach students to use prewriting (invention and exploratory writing) activities including, but not limited to, the following:
 - a. Freewriting and focused freewriting
 - b. Listing/brainstorming
 - c. Clustering
- III. All PVCC English 111 instructors will include direct instruction on the PVCC Writing Rubric, using the new rubric as an instructional tool for essay writing assignments.
- IV. All PVCC English 111 instructors will use the PVCC Writing Rubric to assess student writing.
- V. All PVCC English 111 instructors will reinforce concepts related to and engage students in writing workshops for four of the required formal essays.

- a. *Writing workshop can be defined as follows: Students, divided into small groups (typically 3-5 students), read their written drafts aloud. After each individual reading, responders in the group offer formative feedback (written, oral, or both) to aid in the writer's revision process.*
- VI. *All PVCC English 111 instructors will provide direct instruction on how to craft formative feedback for peers' writing based on the college-wide rubric domains.*
- VII. *All PVCC English 111 instructors will provide feedback to drafts of at least two papers in process based on the college-wide rubric domains. This feedback could be written or oral (in one-on-one conference sessions).*
- VIII. *All PVCC English 111 instructors will require revision for at least two essays.*
- IX. *All PVCC English 111 instructors will teach revision strategies.*

Laying the Foundation: Develop and Disseminate a New PVCC Writing Rubric

Rationale for the Rubric

The PVCC English department first developed and adopted a writing rubric in Fall 2005. This rubric offers some uniformity and consistency in how English faculty evaluate student writing. This rubric was developed, however, for use only in English composition courses. Since the first faculty meetings to discuss the QEP, faculty from across disciplines have expressed interest in acquiring, discussing, and using the English department rubric. A culture of writing requires consistent language and method of feedback to students. A revised college-wide writing rubric that is aligned with desired student learning outcomes will enable PVCC's students to know what is expected in their writing and will allow PVCC's faculty to consistently assess and provide feedback to students about the quality of their writing and how to improve. In March 2009, PVCC's English department faculty revised their rubric to more specifically address student learning outcomes and to be a more effective tool for faculty in other disciplines to use and build on as the QEP is implemented (See Appendix II: PVCC Writing Rubric).

Structure of the Rubric

The PVCC Writing Rubric assesses student writing in five domains: (1) Controlling Idea (Purpose and Thesis); (2) Idea Development; (3) Organization; (4) Grammar, Punctuation, and Mechanics; and (5) Presentation and Documentation. For each domain, a student may receive a rating of Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor. The criteria for each rating are provided in the rubric so that faculty can assess writing with greater consistency, and students may better understand the basis on which their work has been assessed. The rating categories are not equated with grades in order to allow the tool to be used for both formative and summative assessment. Assignment of grades based on the rubric is left to the discretion of individual faculty. The rubric also has two checkboxes at the bottom by which an instructor can indicate that assistance from the Writing Center is either recommended or required. Thus the rubric also serves

as a diagnostic for Writing Center services and can easily show a tutor which aspects of writing are in need of improvement.

Dissemination and Adaptation of the Rubric

The rubric will be made available online to all college faculty. General professional development will be provided on the use of the rubric for any faculty member who wishes to utilize the rubric in instruction. Use of the rubric will be mandatory in all ENG 111, ENG 112, ITE 119, ITE 120, CSC 110, and Writing Intensive courses (see below). As associate degree program cohorts cycle into the QEP implementation, instructional faculty from those programs will be provided specific instruction in how to use the rubric and receive assistance in adapting/adding to the rubric to assess discipline-specific components of student writing.

Reinforcing the Foundation: Writing in Required ITE/CSC Courses

Each associate degree program at PVCC requires completion of either ITE 119 (Information Literacy), ITE 120 (Principles of Information Systems), or CSC 110 (Introduction to Computing). These courses are recommended as “first year, fall semester” courses and are typically taken concurrently with (or in close proximity to) ENG 111, which is also a “first year, fall semester” course, making them ideal places to reinforce the writing skills and concepts introduced in ENG 111.

The ITE 119 course, Information Literacy, was developed in the Summer of 2007 and deployed in the Fall 2007 semester. It is designed to provide instruction in the information literacy objectives for higher education that are prescribed by the American Library Association. It is required in most of the degree and certificate programs of the College except for those degrees and certificates that require ITE 120 or CSC 110 (see below). The topics presented include: research method; information evaluation; social, ethical and legal aspects of information gathering and handling; computer concepts; and the Microsoft Office Suite© applications of Word, Excel, and PowerPoint. Students are tested using a standardized test bank which includes a comprehensive final exam. Currently, students are also required to create an argumentative essay on current information/computer issues and to create a final research project which includes a research paper in MLA format, an analytical spreadsheet and a presentation (using MS PowerPoint). The research assignment for all students is to explore prospective four-year transfer universities. The final project is graded with a rubric provided by the ITE Program Coordinator. All sections of ITE 119 employ a standardized syllabus and final assignment.

The ITE 120 course, Principles of Information Systems, was developed in the Spring and Summer of 2006 and deployed in the Fall 2006 semester. It is designed to provide instruction in business information systems and was developed in response to the requirements of the major four-year universities to which PVCC sends most of its business administration graduates. It is a required course in the AS Business Administration degree, the AAS Business Management degree, and the AAS Accounting degree. The topics presented include information literacy¹; computer and networking concepts; business information system concepts; information security concepts; and the

¹ The information literacy content is provided in a concentrated module that is derived from the ITE 119 course content. This module is included in the ITE 120 and CSC 110 courses.

Microsoft Office Suite© applications of Word, Excel, Access, and PowerPoint. Students are tested using a standardized test bank which includes a comprehensive final exam. Students also create various projects from the Microsoft Office Suite© applications and are required to complete a research project based upon a current business information systems topic. The final project requires the students to produce a research report in MLA format, an analytical spreadsheet, an Access database and a presentation (using MS PowerPoint). All sections of ITE 120 employ the standardized syllabus. The final project is required in all sections, but there is no standardized grading rubric employed at the present time.

The CSC 110 course, Introduction to Computing, was first offered at PVCC in Fall 2004. It is designed to provide a broad introduction to computer hardware and software concepts that are necessary for students who are pursuing computer/engineering related degrees. The course is required in the AS Computer Science degree, AS Engineering degree, AAS Computer and Electronics Technology degree, and the AAS Information Systems Technology degree. The topics presented include information literacy; computer hardware concepts; computer software concepts; number systems; computer programming algorithms and languages; and the Microsoft Office Suite© applications of Word, Excel, and PowerPoint. Students are tested using a standardized test bank which includes a comprehensive final exam. Students develop a research project and a Java© programming project. The research project requires the students to produce a research paper in MLA format based upon a computer science/ engineering topic. The programming project requires students to develop a Java© computer program to implement an algorithm that is designed to solve a challenge. All sections of CSC 110 employ the standardized syllabus. The research project and programming project are required and standardized across all sections.

Research and writing has become a significant part of the information technology and computer science courses in order to support the information literacy component of the Virginia Community College System general education requirements. Furthermore, the information literacy components of these courses are intended to complement and support the English 111 course. This strategy will be extended and enhanced within the context of the QEP by implementing the following strategies:

- Information Systems Technology and Computer Science faculty will participate in professional development to implement writing-to-learn activities for students and to employ the PVCC Writing Rubric in the assessment of writing assignments within the designated courses.
- Standardized writing assignments and assessment will be required across all sections of each course beginning in Year 1 of the QEP. There will be at least one writing assignment per course that will require revision and resubmission by the students.
- The ITE Coordinator, English Coordinator, and Reference/Instructional Librarian will review and revise the existing course-specific library instructional sessions on the topic of information literacy to ensure that these sessions complement the ITE/CSC and ENG 111 course instruction.

Program coordinators will record and review assessment results, evaluate the progress of students in consultation with the faculty teaching these courses, and report the

findings to the department deans by the end of May for each academic year. Faculty will also review the writing assignments each year to ensure their effectiveness in reinforcing and improving students' writing skills.

Reinforcing the Foundation: Changes to English 112

English 112 is currently taught as an introduction to literature course, which, like ENG 111, also requires students to write multiple papers. Changes to ENG 112 include expanded writing requirements, incorporation of specific instruction in grammar and punctuation, reinforcement of prewriting and writing process activities, and use of the new PVCC Writing Rubric. These changes, effective in all ENG 112 courses beginning in Year 1 of the QEP, are specified below. Items *italicized in red* indicate modifications to curriculum and instruction.

Writing Requirements and Grammar and Punctuation Objectives:

- I. All PVCC English 112 instructors will require a minimum of 5,000 words in the form of formal and informal writing activities to be done over the course of the semester:*
 - a. Formal writing MUST include the following:*
 - i. One creative writing project (poetry; short story; memoir)*
 - ii. Two **literary argument** essays that incorporate quotations and paraphrases from at least one literary work each (poetry, short story, drama, essay) (500-750 words; 750-850 words)*
 - iii. One literary research essay based on four or more sources*
 - iv. **One reflective essay on individual writing process (300-500 words)***
 - v. **Common final exam***
 - b. Formal writing MAY ALSO include (but is not limited to) the following:*
 - i. **Essay outlines***
 - ii. **Annotated bibliography***
 - iii. **Practice final exam essays***
 - c. Informal writing-to-learn activities MAY include, among other activities) the following:*
 - i. **Reader response journals***
 - ii. **Exploratory writing activities***
 - iii. **Micro essays***
 - iv. **Focused freewriting***
 - v. **Reflective writing***
 - vi. **Personal journals***
- II. All PVCC English 112 instructors will review the following grammar and punctuation concepts:*
 - a. **Simple sentences***
 - b. **Compound sentences***
 - c. **Complex sentences***
 - d. **Compound-complex sentences***
 - e. **Independent and dependent clauses and phrases***

- f. *Issues of subject/verb agreement*
 - g. *Commonly confused word usage*
- III. *All PVCC English 112 instructors will teach the following grammar and punctuation concepts:*
- a. *Comma placement*
 - b. *Semicolon and colon use*
 - c. *Pronoun agreement and reference*
 - d. *Apostrophe use*

Change #2: NEW Instructional Practices:

- I. *All PVCC English 112 instructors will reinforce concepts of and engage students in writing process activities, including:*
- a. *Exploring and inventing*
 - b. *Prewriting*
 - c. *Drafting*
 - d. *Revising*
 - e. *Editing*
 - f. *Proofreading*
 - g. *Publishing*
- II. *All PVCC English 112 instructors will reinforce concepts of and engage students in prewriting (invention and exploratory writing) activities including, but not limited to, the following:*
- a. *Focused freewriting*
 - b. *Listing/brainstorming*
 - c. *Clustering*
 - d. *Looping*
 - e. *Cubing*
 - f. *Journalist questions*
- III. *All PVCC English 112 instructors will include direct instruction on the new PVCC Writing Rubric, using the new rubric as an instructional tool for specific essay writing assignments.*
- IV. *All PVCC English 112 instructors will use the PVCC Writing Rubric to assess student writing.*
- V. *All PVCC English 112 instructors will reinforce concepts related to writing and engage students in writing workshops for each required formal essay.*
- a. *Writing workshop can be defined as follows: Students, divided into small groups (typically 3-5 students), read their written drafts aloud. After each individual reading, responders in the group offer formative feedback (written, oral, or both) to aid in the writer's revision process.*

- VI. All PVCC English 112 instructors will reinforce concepts related to crafting formative feedback based on the college-wide rubric domains for peers' writing.*
- VII. All PVCC English 112 instructors will provide feedback to drafts of at least two papers in process based on the college-wide rubric domains. This feedback could be written or oral (in one-on-one conference sessions).*
- VIII. All PVCC English 112 instructors will require revision for at least two essays.*
- IX. All PVCC English 112 instructors will teach revision strategies.*

Integrating Knowledge with Skills: Writing Intensive Courses

Rationale

Based on the review of the literature and input from faculty, the QEP Planning Team concluded that a Writing Intensive (WI) course requirement in each associate degree program would be an appropriate means through which students can practice writing process and writing-to-learn activities and apply these activities to program and/or discipline-specific writing assignments. For writing to improve, students must continue to write over an extended period of time, in a variety of situations, for various purposes and various audiences. The requirement of a Writing Intensive course will give students the opportunity to engage in these activities beyond their English composition and ITE/CSC courses. ENG 111, ENG 112, and ITE 119 or 120 or CSC 110 will be prerequisites for all Writing Intensive courses.

Criteria for Writing Intensive Courses

WI courses will meet the following criteria:

- The student/instructor ratio in WI courses will not exceed 24:1.
- WI courses will require a total of 4,000 words (or 20 pages).
- Writing activities will be divided between formal and informal writing activities.
- Writing activities will be distributed throughout the semester and not concentrated at the end.
- Writing-to-learn and writing process activities will be an integral part of the writing done for this course.
- At least one writing assignment will require student revision and resubmission.
- At least one writing assignment will be given feedback from the instructor and from peers. This feedback could be written or given as part of an instructor/student conference and, for peers, during a workshoping session.
- Some class time will be devoted to writing instruction.
- Formal writing assignments will be evaluated using the PVCC Writing Rubric.

- Students receiving below a C on a formal writing assignment in a Writing Intensive course will be required to work with a tutor in the Writing Center before re-submission of revised paper.
- Writing assignments will account for at least 30% of the grade.
- A student must earn a passing grade in the course in order for it to meet program requirements for graduation.
- One formal writing assignment will be identified for submission as part of QEP assessment (see Section XI Assessment Plan). Clean copies of this assignment with instructor-completed rubric for each student will be submitted by the faculty member to the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness.

Implementation

WI courses will be identified, developed, and implemented by the respective associate degree program faculty (see Appendices III, IV). During the fall semester prior to the year a program becomes a *Write Here, Write Now!* curriculum, program faculty will identify the WI course(s) and any necessary curriculum changes and seek any needed approvals from the College's Curriculum and Instruction Committee by submitting a Writing Intensive Course Proposal (see Appendix V). The proposal will be reviewed by the Program Coordinator, QEP Director (and Implementation Team), and Curriculum and Instruction Committee

During the spring semester prior to the year of implementation, program faculty will complete the *Write Here, Write Now!* workshop during planning week, complete the *Write Here, Write Now!* professional development sessions by the end of the semester, and complete course planning to implement *Write Here, Write Now!* strategies.

The program requirement for students to complete a WI course will be effective for students entering the degree program in the year that the program cycles into full QEP implementation (i.e., becomes a *Write Here, Write Now!* curriculum) as shown below (See Section VIII for additional information about timeline):

Program Cohort	Associate Degree Programs	Planning Year	Implementation Year
A	Nursing, Information Technology, Computer Science	2009-10	2010-11
B	Liberal Arts, Science, Accounting	2010-11	2011-12
C	Emergency Medical Services, Electronics, Business Administration, Fine Arts	2011-12	2012-13
D	General Studies, Engineering, Police Science, Radiography Technician	2012-13	2013-14
E	Education, Management, Technical Studies, Sonography Technician	2013-14	2014-15

Writing Center Support

The PVCC Writing Center, established in Fall 2006, will play an important supporting role in the QEP. Since 2006, the Writing Center has offered individual tutoring and supplemental instruction in writing from writing instructors and peer and community tutors trained to National Tutoring Association standards. Though often viewed as a center for remediation of writing skills, the Writing Center at PVCC is being cultivated as a hub of writing activity at PVCC, serving not only as a source of assistance for struggling student writers, but also as a resource center where students and faculty of all disciplines come to engage with others and with available materials in order to strengthen student writing at PVCC.

As part of the QEP, students' engagement with the Writing Center will become more intentional. The Writing Center's mission statement has been revised to more closely align with the Student Learning Outcomes of the QEP. The Writing Center helps students: increase their awareness of the writing process; create texts that are appropriate to purpose and audience; produce written products that are rich in content, well-organized, and grammatically correct. As stated above, the PVCC Writing Rubric also will serve as the basis to refer students to the Writing Center. Students receiving a C on a writing assignment in English 111, English 112, ITE/CSC, and/or Writing Intensive courses will be recommended to visit the Writing Center to revise the assignment. Students receiving below a C on a writing assignment in these courses will be required to work with a tutor in the Writing Center to revise the assignment for a better grade.

To support the goals of the QEP, the Writing Center will do the following. Items *italicized in red* indicate additions/modifications to services.

- Promote Writing Center services through classroom presentations with a special emphasis on SDV courses (which introduce new students to college resources); English composition courses (ENG 1, 3, 12, 13, 111, and 112); *and Writing Intensive courses.*
- *Work with students in Writing Intensive courses around topics related to writing selected by the instructor.*
- *Build a resource library, with the assistance of the QEP Implementation Team (online and in the Center), for student use to include materials such as: faculty-written manuals to serve as guides for writing in specific disciplines, handbooks, model student papers, and software for writing practice.*
- *Expand workshops for students on selected areas of weakness including:*
 - *Writer's block and writing anxiety*
 - *Write Now: Overcoming procrastination in writing assignments*
 - *Effective essay organization*
 - Research documentation (MLA and APA style)
 - *Avoiding plagiarism*
 - *Paraphrasing, summarizing, and quoting*

Tutor Training

Beginning in Fall 2009, the goals and outcomes of the QEP and its major initiatives will be included in training materials, reviewed as part of training, and incorporated in training exercises. *Write Here, Write Now!* faculty will discuss with Writing Center tutors the specific writing assignments in their Writing Intensive courses and expectations for those assignments. Activities related to goals of the QEP will be included in tutor training. Writing tutors will be trained to:

- *Use the language of the PVCC Writing Rubric in tutoring sessions*
- Discuss the writing process in tutoring sessions—from generating ideas to creating focused, developed, coherent texts
- *Apply writing process activities in tutoring sessions to explore, articulate, and develop ideas in writing*
- *Inquire about discipline-specific conventions*
- *Discuss major grammatical errors identified by the PVCC English department, including major sentence errors (fragments, run-ons, comma splice), comma usage, consistent use of verb tense, pronoun-antecedent agreement, and apostrophe usage*
- Promote/represent Writing Center services to the college community

Writing Center Promotion

The Writing Center will continue to actively promote on-campus and online resources in a variety of ways:

- Through PVCC's Tutoring and Learning Web site
- Through presentations to classes, with particular emphasis on student development classes (as these reach all first-year, first-time college students), composition courses, *and Writing Intensive courses*
- *Through promotional materials such as bookmarks, fliers, YouTube videos, and through the student newspaper, The Forum*

Facilitating Communication

To facilitate communication between students, instructors, and the Writing Center, each tutor or instructor writes a brief descriptive report of the tutoring session immediately following the session. The report is then emailed to the Center Coordinator and to the classroom instructor. These emails serve several purposes:

- The instructor knows the student has sought additional assistance
- The instructor knows what the tutor discussed with the student

- The Center Coordinator can monitor session content
- Most importantly, the instructor can, if s/he wishes, inquire about the student's sessions and address any questions or difficulty the student may have with course content

Such communication seeks to close the gap between the classroom instruction and the individual student, so that instructors know students have sought additional support outside of class. These tutor reports also have the added benefit of keeping the Writing Center visible to instructors. Because instructors hear back from the Center on their students' sessions, they have a heightened awareness of, and trust in, Writing Center services. This feedback reminds instructors of the Center's resources and encourages additional referrals, placing an important emphasis on the role of writing at the College. Because the instructor often responds positively to students seeking additional assistance, students are more likely to utilize the Center again, thus emphasizing the culture of writing at the College.

Students referred to the Writing Center who seek assistance for a Writing Intensive course through Smarthinking, PVCC's online tutoring partner, will be required to print out transcripts of their tutoring sessions. Transcripts of Smarthinking tutoring sessions can be printed by the student and/or Smarthinking administrator so that the instructor knows the content of the session, and the Center Coordinator can monitor the effectiveness of this service. However, Smarthinking transcripts are not automatically sent to classroom instructors. Instructors must request this information from the student or, retroactively, from the Center Coordinator.

Professional Development

In keeping with the spirit of a culture of writing, the act of writing must be valued by all at the College. To that end, faculty play an important part, not only for instructional purposes, but also serving as role models. The opportunity to set a good example for students must not be wasted. Therefore, one of the aims of the QEP is to involve as many faculty members as possible. For this reason, professional development is a key component of the QEP. In addition, certain faculty (i.e, ENG 111 and 112, ITE 119 and 120, CSC 110, and WI course faculty), will require more targeted professional development in order to implement appropriate curricular, instructional, and support strategies. The QEP Implementation Team, in collaboration with the College's Center for Excellence in Instruction and the College's Professional Development Committee, will seek out and develop, as appropriate, professional development experiences in support of the QEP activities.

General Professional Development

The College reserves one week at the beginning of each fall and spring semester for information sharing, planning, and professional development activities. *Write Here, Write Now!* will provide the focus of college planning weeks for the next six years. In each of these weeks, for the first three years, the College will bring in a keynote speaker for a general session on a writing-related topic. To kick off the QEP, Fall 2009 will feature Dr. Terry Myers Zawacki, Associate Professor of English and Director of Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing Center at George Mason University. Dr. Zawacki will

deliver a keynote address for all PVCC faculty titled, "Building a Culture of Writing at Piedmont Virginia Community College: Where Writing Happens and Why It Helps Students Learn." Dr. Zawacki will also hold a mandatory "Teaching With Writing" workshop for Cohort A, the QEP Implementation Team, and full-time English faculty.

Professional Development for English Faculty

Beginning in Fall 2009, full-time English faculty who led the development of the PVCC Writing Rubric and are most familiar with the QEP will facilitate a *Write Here, Write Now!* workshop for all other full-time and part-time faculty who teach college composition courses. This workshop will:

- Provide information regarding changes to ENG 111 and 112 courses
- Provide training in writing process strategies
- Clarify use of formal vs. informal writing activities
- Ensure consistency in teaching strategies related to writing process
- Introduce the new PVCC Writing Rubric and provide instruction on its use
- Ensure consistency in evaluation and provision of feedback for writing exercises
- Familiarize faculty with other instruments being used to assess writing of graduates

Professional Development for ITE and CSC Faculty

Beginning in Spring 2010, full-time English and IT faculty from the QEP Planning and Implementation Teams will facilitate a *Write Here, Write Now!* workshop for faculty who teach ITE 119 and 120 and CSC 110 courses. This workshop will train ITE/CSC faculty in the use of the PVCC Writing Rubric and assist faculty in refining the research/writing assignment to maximize reinforcement of writing skills and concepts introduced in ENG 111.

Professional Development for Program Faculty and WI Course Instructors

Ongoing professional development and support for faculty who will be teaching Writing Intensive courses is integral to the success of the QEP. *Write Here, Write Now!* workshops led by outside consultants or by in-house faculty members will be designed for faculty teaching WI courses but will be open to all interested faculty. A substantive workshop held at the beginning of each semester will be followed by shorter sessions throughout the subsequent months. Faculty will participate in workshops as a cohort group associated with the degree programs being phased in to the QEP each year. To ensure adequate training for the teaching of Writing Intensive courses, topics for these sessions will include, but will not be limited to:

- Working toward the QEP Student Learning Outcomes
- Using writing-to-learn activities as a pedagogical tool
- Composing effective writing assignments
- Giving feedback to student writing

- Facilitating peer workshop sessions
- Instruction in the use of a common rubric for assessment
- Overview of QEP assessment, including course-embedded and exit assessments

Instructional Resources

It is imperative that faculty be provided the opportunity not only to learn or upgrade desired skills, but also to collaborate with other instructors on matters common to all courses. This vital exchange of ideas may take place in the form of more informal gatherings such as brown bag lunches or individual consultation with another faculty member.

In order for the mission of the QEP to be far-reaching, there must be a convenient avenue for the dissemination and discussion of information about writing and writing instruction. The Center for Excellence in Instruction, the college unit responsible for enhancing teaching and learning through ongoing support and development of the faculty, in collaboration with the Writing Center, Professional Development Committee, and QEP Implementation Team, will establish and maintain a Web site dedicated to the QEP topic. This site will house information regarding the details of the QEP, as well as announcements about upcoming workshops, a faculty-written newsletter, applicable documents such as sample assignments and model student papers, instructional materials related to using writing in the classroom, and useful external links. A discussion board may be set up to offer another means of dialogue for all those involved in the QEP. In addition, the Center for Excellence in Instruction, in conjunction with the Library, will maintain a collection of publications pertaining to writing that will be available for reference and check-out.

Faculty Resource Team

A Faculty Resource Team will be available to assist faculty in development and implementation of Writing Intensive courses. The Faculty Resource Team for Year 1 of *Write Here, Write Now* will consist of designated English faculty members. As each cohort of program/discipline faculty complete the planning and implementation phases of the QEP, these faculty will become mentors to the next faculty cohort.

The QEP Implementation Team will be responsible for ongoing management of this Faculty Resource Team component to include planning and providing of both formal and informal opportunities for faculty support to take place:

- The initial formation of resource pairs will be communicated at the beginning of the semester; resource team members will be assigned to members of the new cohort
- The first one-on-one meeting of resource pairs will be held either before classes start or some time during the first three weeks of class; this will be followed by meetings as needed to discuss progress
- Assigned resource team member will serve as an “as-needed” resource throughout the semester

Marketing Plan

Most of the above actions, especially revisions to ENG and ITE/CSC courses and the implementation of the WI courses, are designed to provide increased and deliberate opportunities for students to expand the breadth and depth of their writing experiences. These experiences will also promote the value of writing as a tool for learning and communicating as students are exposed to more writing process and writing-to-learn strategies, and as the College holds students to consistent standards for the quality of written products. In addition, the College will promote the value of writing as a tool for learning and communicating through a marketing campaign.

The goal of the QEP Marketing Plan is, initially, to raise awareness of PVCC's QEP in the college community. After the first year, the goal of the plan is to maintain awareness, but also to improve student writing and positively influence students' perceptions of the value of writing.

Faculty representatives from the QEP Planning Team developed a marketing plan for the QEP in conjunction with PVCC's Marketing and Media Relations Manager and PVCC's Art Department Chair. Input for the plan was solicited from stakeholders including the Student Government Association, the Faculty Professional Association, and the Professional Association of Support Staff. Members of the Marketing and Media Relations department helped to devise an overall plan and create messages appropriate for the college community, while the Art Department, with its graphic expertise, provided design support (see posters in Appendix VI for examples). A representative from the Art Department will also serve on the QEP Implementation Team in order to effectively execute the plan. Details of the plan are summarized below.

1. Timeline:
 - a. 2009-2010: Focus on increasing awareness
 - b. 2010-2015: Focus on improvement in student writing and students' perception of the value of writing
2. Budget:
 - a. 2009-2010: \$5,000 for year 0
 - b. 2010-2012: \$3,000 for year 1
 - c. 2012-2015: \$1,000 for each year 2-5
3. Messaging/Positioning
 - a. 2009-2010, Year 0: What is the QEP? Why does PVCC have a QEP? Broad concepts about its value to students.
 - b. 2010-2015, Years 1-5: More detailed information about the QEP with student testimonials. What does PVCC want students to *know* or *do* after their awareness of QEP has increased?

4. Strategies:

Strategy	Responsible Party	Timeline
QEP information printed in PVCC class schedules	Marketing	Each semester
Word-of-mouth/Face-to-face <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Hold information sessions with selected clubs b. Presentations to SDV classes c. Activities during College Hour d. Regular column in <u>The Forum</u> [student newspaper] e. Presentation at all-college meeting 	QEP Implementation Team	Fall 2009-Spring 2010 and all future semesters, if strategy is successful
Develop a paragraph about the QEP for all college syllabi	QEP Director and/or designee	Spring 2010, revised as needed in subsequent semesters
Develop a QEP Web site. See http://www.pvcc.edu/QEP	QEP Director, Marketing & Media Relations, CEI, and Webmaster	July 31, 2009 and update as needed
QEP Logo on all PVCC computer lab desktops	QEP Implementation Team, IT	August 2009
Axis-TV advertisements	QEP Director and Marketing	August 2009 and change as needed
Posters & Fliers	QEP Implementation Team and Art Department	August 2009 and update as needed
Specialty advertising items [i.e. pens, t-shirts, table tents, etc. with QEP logo]	QEP Implementation Team with Marketing & Media Relations	First items, August 2009

5. Evaluation

- a. Marketing plan assessment meetings in late September and November and in February and April of year 0 and as needed in other years
- b. Modify plan as desirable and deemed necessary through evaluation

VIII. Timeline for Implementation

PVCC's timeline for implementation of the actions described in the preceding section spans from 2009-2010 (Year 0) to 2014-2015 (Year 5). During Year 0, PVCC will undertake strategies that are preparatory in nature: piloting revisions to ENG 111 and 112 and the ITE/CSC courses, further refining the PVCC Writing Rubric, planning implementation of WI courses in the first cohort of associate degree programs (Cohort A) and training faculty associated with those programs. In fall of Year 1 (2010-2011, following approval of the QEP by the Commission on Colleges), PVCC will begin full implementation of the QEP, including implementation of the revised ENG, ITE, and CSC courses; piloting the first year of WI courses in Cohort A programs; and professional development. By Fall 2014, all of PVCC's associate degree programs will be implementing WI courses and all associate degree students entering those programs will be required to complete the full complement of QEP-related "interventions" (ENG 111 and 112, ITE/CSC, and WI course) in order to graduate. By phasing in degree programs, continuously assessing the effectiveness of strategies, and making appropriate modifications as needed, PVCC maximizes its impact on improving student writing and positions its programs to sustain the effort beyond Year 5. The table below provides an overview of the implementation timeline. The chart on the following pages shows in greater detail the QEP actions (strategies) and implementation.

	Fall	Spring
Year 0	<p style="text-align: center;">QEP Kick-off</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot revisions to ENG 111 ▪ Pilot PVCC Writing Rubric ▪ Planning for Cohort A (Nursing, Information Technology, Computer Science) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot revisions to ENG 111, 112 ▪ Professional development and training for Cohort A ▪ Implementation of PVCC Writing Rubric in ENG 111, 112
Year 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation for Cohort A ▪ Planning for Cohort B (Liberal Arts, Science*, Accounting) ▪ Implementation of curricular revisions to ENG 111 and ENG 112. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Professional development and training for Cohort B
Year 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation for Cohort B ▪ Planning for Cohort C (EMS, Electronics, Business Administration, Fine Arts) ▪ Identification of Resource Team members from Cohort A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Professional development and training for Cohort C ▪ Assessment of Cohort A student outcomes
Year 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation for Cohort C ▪ Planning for Cohort D (General Studies, Engineering, Police Science, Radiography Technician**) ▪ Identification of Resource Team members from Cohort B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Professional development and training for Cohort D ▪ Assessment of Cohort B student outcomes
Year 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation for Cohort D ▪ Planning for Cohort E (Education, Management, Tech Studies, Sonography**) ▪ Identification of Resource Team members from Cohort C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Professional development and training for Cohort E ▪ Assessment of Cohort C student outcomes
Year 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation for Cohort E; ▪ Identification of Resource Team members from Cohort D 	<p>Overall Assessment and report to SACS</p>

*All specializations within a degree are included

**PVCC plans to implement Radiography Technician and Sonography programs in 2010.

PVCC QEP Implementation Plan: Strategies and Timeline Summary

	Year 0		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Laying the Foundation: Writing Process and Writing-to-Learn in English 111 and 112												
ENG faculty pilot PVCC Writing Rubric	✓											
ENG faculty revise PVCC Writing Rubric	✓											
ENG faculty implement PVCC Writing Rubric in all ENG 111 and 112 classes		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reinforcing the Writing Process: Required Information Systems Technology/Computer Science Courses (ITE 119, ITE 120 and CSC 110)												
ITE/CSC faculty revise ITE 119, ITE 120, and CSC 110 courses to enhance writing instruction and reinforce writing process and writing-to-learn strategies. PVCC Writing Rubric piloted in some ITE/CSC courses. Rubric refined.	✓	✓										
ITE/CSC faculty oriented and trained to employ rubric for grading the course research assignment. Common writing rubric revised and piloted in additional classes.		✓										
Fully implement PVCC Writing Rubric to score course research assignments in all ITE 119, ITE 120, and CSC 110 courses.			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
ITE Program Coordinator assesses effectiveness of courses reinforcing writing process and product. Results presented and discussed with QEP Implementation Team and ITE/CSC faculty in consultation with IRPIE Director. Results used to inform adjustments to instruction and support services.				✓		✓		✓		✓		✓

PVCC QEP Implementation Plan: Strategies and Timeline Summary

Year 0		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015	
Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring

Writing Intensive Courses: Faculty Planning, Orientation, and Implementation

e.g., Cohort A: Nursing, Information Technology, Computer Science

Program Coordinators and Faculty, Dean, and QEP Implementation Team identify curricular modifications needed to accommodate ENG 111, 112, ITE/CSC, and Writing Intensive sequence.	✓											
Curricular changes submitted to QEP Implementation Team and Curriculum and Instruction Committee for approval	✓	✓										
Faculty attend <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> workshop	✓	✓										
Faculty complete <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> training		✓										
WI Course requirement effective for students entering Cohort A programs			✓									
WI courses piloted and revised			✓	✓								
WI courses provided to cohort students in second year of program					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Faculty assisted by Faculty Resource Team			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
First students graduate under new requirements						✓						

Cohorts B, C, D, and E will complete these same tasks in subsequent years of implementation. All program changes, curricular requirements, and strategies will be fully implemented for all cohorts by Year 5 of the QEP. It is anticipated that students in Cohort E programs will first graduate under the new Writing Intensive requirements in the 2015-2016 academic year.

PVCC QEP Implementation Plan: Strategies and Timeline Summary

	Year 0		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Creating and Sustaining Our Culture of Writing												
Fall Planning Week <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> speaker series	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓	
New and Adjunct Faculty <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> Orientations (also, English faculty in 2009-2010)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Writing Center Workshops for students and faculty			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Marketing Campaign (awareness)	✓	✓	✓									
Internal and external marketing as program cohorts implement new requirements			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Assessment (see Assessment Plan Detail in Section XI for additional information)												
Student learning in ENG 111 and 112 (Writing Rubric)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Student learning in required ITE/CSC (Writing Rubric)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Student writing competency at completion of WI (Writing Rubric)			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Student writing competency at graduation (e-Write)	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Student writing-related behaviors/perceptions (CCSSE)		✓		✓				✓				✓
Graduates' writing-related behaviors/perceptions (Graduate Exit Survey)		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓
Student use of and satisfaction with Writing Center services, and writing-related behaviors/perceptions (SSS)	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓	
Student use of Writing Center Services (TutorTrac and SMARTTHINKING)		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓

PVCC QEP Implementation Plan: Strategies and Timeline Summary

	Year 0		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Impact of Writing Center services on student outcomes (TutorTrac)		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓
Effectiveness of Professional Development (Workshop Evaluations)	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓
Faculty use of writing process/writing-to-learn strategies (Faculty Survey)	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓	
Consistent expectations for writing quality (Curriculum Review Checklist)		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓
Sufficient number of ENG, ITE/CSC, and WI courses		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓

IX. Organizational Structure

PVCC has created an Implementation Team to ensure full implementation of the QEP. The Implementation Team consists of eight standing members, three to nine program coordinators (depending on the implementation year), two to three at-large faculty members, and two students. The eight standing members are:

- QEP Director
- Writing Center Coordinator
- One English faculty member
- One Librarian
- Coordinator of Professional Development
- Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness
- One academic dean
- One information technology faculty member

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Director will provide leadership and oversight for all aspects of the QEP implementation process. The Director will be compensated at 50% release time (15 credits/academic year) and with a summer stipend of \$1,000 per year. Jessica Kingsley, a full-time faculty member in English, will serve as PVCC's QEP Director and will be responsible for the following:

- Schedule and lead regular QEP Implementation Team meetings
- Ensure faculty in program cohorts receive sufficient planning assistance
- Ensure efficient and timely faculty professional development as outlined in the QEP, in collaboration with the Coordinator of the Center for Excellence in Instruction, PVCC's Professional Development Committee, and the Vice President for Instruction and Student Services (VPISS)
- Manage QEP budget in collaboration with the VPISS
- Coordinate and schedule faculty mentoring activities
- Coordinate QEP data collection and analysis in collaboration with the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (DIRPIE)
- Continually evaluate and improve the QEP initiative, in collaboration with faculty
- Ensure dissemination of QEP outcomes to all college constituents
- Co-author, with DIRPIE, the QEP five-year report

The QEP Director will lead the QEP Implementation Team and report to the Vice President of Instruction and Student Services (VPISS). The Director will also serve as a member of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee (which also reports to the VPISS).

Program coordinators are full-time teaching faculty members who provide program curricular leadership and assume some program-related administrative duties. Program coordinators are members of the Implementation Team during their cohort's orientation year and years one and two of implementation. Program coordinators' service on the Implementation Team will be credited as service to the College, and these faculty members will be relieved of all other committee service responsibilities during the time

that they are on the team. This rotation will allow ample time for the eight standing members to provide guidance and assistance during implementation. In addition, the eventual overlap of three cohorts of program coordinators will provide additional support for new coordinators rotating on to the Implementation Team.

Initial at-large faculty members were identified by the QEP Planning Team and invited to serve. At-large members will serve two-year terms, and like program coordinators, will be relieved of all other committee service responsibilities during the time that they are on the team. In Years 2-5 of the QEP, at-large faculty members will be elected by the faculty.

Student representatives are selected by the Student Government Association and will serve two-year terms.

PVCC's 2009-2010 QEP Implementation Team

Standing Members

Jessica Kingsley, QEP Director, English Faculty
Jenny Koster, Writing Center Coordinator, English Faculty
Justin Wert, English Faculty
Jim Jewett, Information Technology Faculty
Judy Carey Nevin, Librarian
Colleen Bishop, Coordinator of Professional Development
Tara Atkins-Brady, Director of Inst. Research, Planning, and Inst. Effectiveness
Cliff Haury, Dean of Humanities, Fine Arts, and Social Sciences

Program Coordinators (Cohort Representatives)

Amy Gillespie, Nursing Faculty
Bruce Robinson, Information Technology Faculty
David DuVall-Early, Computer Science Faculty
Ben Sloan, English Faculty

At-large Faculty Representatives

Colum Leckey, History Faculty
Joanna Vondrasek, Biology/Biotechnology Faculty
Beryl Solla, Art Faculty

Student Representatives

(2 representatives to be selected Fall 2009)

X. Resources

PVCC is committed to providing sufficient human and financial resources for accomplishing the QEP. In total, approximately \$673,000 will be devoted to QEP-related activities over the next six years, with 49% of the necessary resources being provided by existing departmental budgets, grants, and personnel. The remainder will be reallocated from the College's operating budget and anticipated increases in state funding resulting from increased enrollment. The budget includes expenses for the Director and other personnel, professional development, advertising, and assessment. The most significant expense is the hiring of adjunct faculty for the additional classes needed to offset the reduction in class size for Writing Intensive courses.

The detailed budget on the following pages shows all resources committed to the implementation and assessment of PVCC's QEP over the next six years. The budget also shows the new funds committed above what can be accommodated by PVCC's current operating budget for personnel, professional development, and assessment. This budget was reviewed and approved by the President and President's Staff on May 4, 2009.

Resource	Planning/ Piloting		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015	
Personnel	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP
Implementation team: release from all other committee assignments												
QEP Director:												
15 credits release time		\$12,000		\$ 12,000		\$ 12,000		\$ 12,000		\$ 12,000		\$12,000
Summer stipend		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$1,000
DIRPIE (PT staff to assist with evaluation)	\$ 13,000	\$ 2,000	\$13,000	\$ 2,000	\$13,000	\$ 2,000	\$13,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 2,000	\$13,000	\$2,000
Faculty stipends for WI course sample assessment						\$ 3,000		\$ 3,000		\$ 3,000		\$3,000
Testing center proctor(s) for writing assessment		\$ 500		\$ 500		\$ 500		\$ 500		\$ 500		\$500
Writing Center Tutors												
40 hrs/wk X \$10/hr X 50 wks	\$ 20,000		\$20,000		\$20,000		\$20,000		\$ 20,000		\$20,000	
10hrs/wk X \$16/hr X 50 wks (adj fac)	\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 3,000	\$5,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 3,000	\$5,000	\$3,000

Resource	Planning/ Piloting		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015	
Personnel contd.	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP
12hrs/sem X \$10/hr X 15 (tutor training)	\$ 4,800		\$ 4,800	\$ 600	\$ 4,800	\$ 600	\$4,800	\$ 600	\$ 4,800	\$ 600	\$4,800	\$ 600
Adjunct faculty for additional course sections												
ENG 111		\$ 2,250		\$13,100		\$ 13,100		\$ 13,100		\$ 11,750		\$ 11,750
ENG 112		\$ 2,250		\$ 9,000		\$ 9,000		\$ 9,000		\$ 11,250		\$ 11,250
ITE 119/ITE 120 /CSC 110		\$ 2,250		\$ 6,750		\$ 6,750		\$ 6,750		\$ 6,750		\$ 6,750
Designated WI courses								\$ 6,750		\$ 13,500		\$ 22,500
Total Additional Personnel	\$42,800	\$22,250	\$42,800	\$47,950	\$42,800	\$50,950	\$42,800	\$57,700	\$42,800	\$65,350	\$42,800	\$74,350
Professional Development												
English faculty stipends to develop seminars for discipline faculty	\$ 4,500											
External speaker for Fall & Spring Planning Weeks	\$ 3,000		\$ 3,000		\$ 3,000			Cohort A&B faculty lead		Cohort B&C faculty lead		Cohort C&D faculty
Adjunct faculty writing PD												
Start-up	ENG & Cohort A \$ 4,100		Cohort B \$ 2,500		Cohort C \$ 2,500		Cohort D \$ 2,500		Cohort E \$ 1,500			

Resource	Planning/ Piloting		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015	
Professional Development contd.	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP
New adjunct faculty (previous cohorts)			\$ 2,000		\$ 2,500		\$ 3,000		\$ 4,000		\$5,000	
On-line PD												
Software purchase	\$ 3,000											
Annual upgrades/licensing			\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000	
Total Professional Development	\$ 14,600		\$ 8,500		\$ 9,000		\$ 6,500		\$ 6,500		\$ 6,000	
Advertising												
Communication media	\$ 3,000		\$ 1,500									
Give-a-ways		\$ 2,000		\$ 1,500		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000
Total Advertising	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000
Assessment												
CCSSE	\$ 6,400			\$ 6,400				\$ 6,400				\$ 6,400
e-Write (entering students)			\$ 1,350		\$ 225		\$ 225		\$ 225		\$ 225	
e-Write (graduating students)	\$ 270		\$ 675		\$ 1,500		\$ 1,500		\$ 1,500		\$ 1,500	
WI courses (see personnel above)												
Assessment Total	\$ 6,670		\$ 2,025	\$ 6,400	\$ 1,725		\$ 1,725	\$ 6,400	\$ 1,725		\$ 1,725	\$ 6,400

Resource	Planning/ Piloting		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015	
Totals	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP	Existing Budget	New for QEP
QEP Budget	\$67,070	\$24,250	\$54,825	\$55,850	\$53,525	\$51,950	\$51,025	\$65,100	\$51,025	\$66,350	\$50,525	\$81,750
QEP Budget by Year	\$ 91,320		\$110,675		\$105,475		\$116,125		\$117,375		\$132,275	
Total QEP Budget	\$673,245											

XI. Assessment Plan

Introduction

PVCC recognizes the importance of assessment and evaluation in providing formative data to examine the effectiveness of identified strategies, as well as summative data for determining whether students have achieved the Student Learning Outcomes. PVCC will be responsive to findings and flexible in making appropriate adjustments to strategies without compromising the overall goal of the QEP to improve students' writing.

Summative Assessment of Student Learning

The overall goal of PVCC's QEP is to *improve students' writing*. The College will have met this goal when assessment results show that prospective graduates are achieving the target results established for each of the seven QEP Student Learning Outcomes. Assessment of these outcomes is focused on three key questions: (1) To what extent do PVCC's completers of *Write Here, Write Now!* interventions demonstrate writing proficiency?, (2) What is the value-added of PVCC's QEP?, and (3) To what extent has PVCC's focus on writing changed students' writing-related behaviors and perceptions?

Multiple measures will be used to assess students' writing proficiency and writing-related behaviors and perceptions. Writing proficiency will be assessed with the PVCC Writing Rubric and a standardized writing assessment, the COMPASS e-Write. Behaviors and perceptions will be assessed with an internally developed survey as well as the widely used Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). The IRPIE Director will maintain a database for tracking students entering each program cohort in the fall semester that the cohort begins the QEP. This will enable the College to assess learning of associate degree program students and graduates who have completed the full set of *Write Here, Write Now!* interventions: ENG 111, ITE/CSC, ENG 112, and Writing Intensive course(s) in their program of study. Assessment instruments and methods are further described below. The plan for assessing Student Learning Outcomes is presented in detail in the table beginning on page 5.

PVCC Writing Rubric

The PVCC Writing Rubric assesses writing in five domains: (1) Purpose and Audience; (2) Idea Development and Support; (3) Organization; (4) Grammar, Punctuation, and Mechanics; and (5) Presentation and Documentation. For each domain, a student may receive a rating of Novice, Developing, Proficient, and Masterful. The criteria for each rating are provided in the rubric so that writing can be assessed with greater consistency, and students may better understand the basis on which their work has been assessed.

The PVCC Writing Rubric will be used to assess student writing proficiency at the completion of associate degree programs. All Writing Intensive courses will identify a writing assignment appropriate for analysis. Each semester, WI instructors will submit a clean copy of this completed assignment for each student enrolled. A stratified random sample of these writing products will be assessed independently by faculty (not the course instructors) using the PVCC Writing Rubric. PVCC has established a target of 90% of all *Write Here, Write Now!* associate degree program completers scoring "Proficient" or above on all domains by Year 5.

Also each year, in Years 2-5 of the QEP, writing sample results of entering students will be compared with writing sample results for WI students. Specifically, mean and mode ratings and frequency distribution of ratings for entering students on each of the five rubric domains will be compared with ratings for WI students. The table below identifies the Student Learning Outcomes to be assessed by each domain in the PVCC Writing Rubric.

Student Learning Outcome	PVCC Writing Rubric Domain(s)
SLO 1: Students will compose texts that are appropriate for purpose and audience.	Purpose and Audience Presentation and Documentation
SLO 2: Students will compose texts in which ideas are supported in well-developed, logical paragraphs.	Idea Development and Support
SLO 3: Students will compose texts that demonstrate unity and coherence.	Organization
SLO 4: Students will compose grammatically and mechanically correct sentences that convey the writer's message in a clear, precise, and readable way.	Grammar, Punctuation, Mechanics

COMPASS e-Write

The COMPASS e-Write is an electronically scored assessment of a student's written response to a standardized prompt. The assessment yields both a holistic score and secondary sub-scores. The holistic score (ranging from 2 to 8) reflects how well a student "formulates a clear and focused position on the issue defined in the prompt, supports that position with reasons and evidence appropriate to the position taken and the specified concerns of the audience, develops the argument in a coherent and logical manner, and expresses ideas using clear, effective language" (*Answers to Frequently Asked Questions About COMPASS e-Write & ESL e-Write*, ACT, June 2008). Sub-scores (ranging from 1 to 4) are generated for the following areas (COMPASS Web site: <http://www.act.org/compass/tests/writingessay.html>):

- Focus: consistency and clarity in identifying and maintaining the main idea or point of view
- Content: extent to which the topic is addressed by the development of ideas and the specificity of details and examples
- Organization: unity and coherence achieved through logical sequence of ideas
- Style: how effectively the chosen language enhances the writer's purpose
- Conventions: control of mechanics in grammar, usage, spelling, and punctuation

The College collected baseline data on the e-Write as part of the Spring 2009 graduate exit assessments and has established targets above the baseline for completers of *Write*

Here, Write Now! associate degree programs. The e-Write will be administered as part of the College's exit assessment process to students graduating from QEP program cohorts in Years 2-5 of the QEP. The mean and mode e-Write sub-scores for cohort graduates will be compared with graduate baseline data and with the scores of students graduating in programs that have not yet phased-in to the QEP in Years 1-4. PVCC has established a target of 90% of all *Write Here, Write Now!* associate degree program completers scoring "3" or better in focus, content, organization, style and conventions by Year 5.

The e-Write will also be used in a cross-sectional, value-added assessment of student learning, comparing entering student writing with student writing at the time of graduation. In order to establish baseline data, the College will administer the e-Write to a large random sample of entering students in Year 1 as part of the College's Compass placement testing process. Smaller random samples of entering students will be assessed in Years 2-5. Mean and mode sub-scores, and frequency distribution of sub-scores for entering students, will be compared with results for *Write Here, Write Now!* graduates.

The table below identifies the Student Learning Outcomes to be assessed by each e-Write sub-score area.

Student Learning Outcome	COMPASS e-Write Sub-Score Area(s)
SLO 1: Students will compose texts that are appropriate for purpose and audience.	Focus, Style
SLO 2: Students will compose texts in which ideas are supported in well-developed, logical paragraphs.	Content
SLO 3: Students will compose texts that demonstrate unity and coherence.	Organization
SLO 4: Students will compose grammatically and mechanically correct sentences that convey the writer's message in a clear, precise, and readable way.	Conventions

Community College Survey of Student Engagement

PVCC has been using the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) since 2004 to assess and improve Title III grant-funded programs for student retention and success. The CCSSE contains several items pertinent to the writing-related behaviors that PVCC intends to impact with the QEP, including preparation of two or more drafts of a paper and the number of writing assignments completed during the academic year, as well as students' perceptions of how much PVCC has contributed to their ability to write clearly and effectively. These items on the CCSSE will be used to assess Student Learning Outcome 5 (students will use writing-to-learn and writing process activities on their own as a means to explore and articulate ideas) and Student Learning Outcome 6 (students will perceive themselves as "improved writers" as a result of their PVCC experience). Administration of the CCSSE to a stratified random sample

of course sections as specified by CCSSE protocol in Years 0, 1, 3, and 5 of the QEP will be coordinated by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. CCSSE results (frequency analysis) on identified items, disaggregated by total credit hours completed, will be compared to baseline and established targets.

PVCC Graduate Exit Survey

The PVCC Graduate Exit Survey is a mandatory Web-based survey completed by all students in the semester in which they have applied to graduate from the College. Administration of the Graduate Exit Survey is coordinated by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. Results can be disaggregated and reviewed by program of study. The Graduate Exit Survey has been modified to include items regarding the frequency with which students have engaged in writing process and writing-to-learn activities (to assess SLO 5), a self assessment of pre- and post-PVCC writing ability (to assess SLO 6), and students' confidence in their writing ability (to assess SLO 7 (i.e., students will express confidence in their ability to write effectively). Graduate Exit Survey results (frequency analysis) for identified items will be compared to baseline and established targets.

The Assessment Plan Detail on the following pages shows the assessment that will be conducted; how, when, and by whom it will be conducted; how assessment data will be analyzed and the specific SLOs being assessed; baseline data (where available); and expected (i.e., target) results. Abbreviations used in the detail include:

SLO:	Student Learning Outcome
QEPIT:	QEP Implementation Team
DIRPIE:	Director, Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness
TBD:	To be developed/determined
WI:	Writing Intensive
CCSSE:	Community College Survey of Student Engagement
(D):	Direct Measure
(I):	Indirect Measure

Outcomes Assessed: SLO 1: Students will compose texts that are appropriate for purpose and audience. SLO 2: Students will compose texts in which ideas are supported in well-developed, logical paragraphs. SLO 3: Students will compose texts that demonstrate unity and coherence. SLO 4: Students will compose grammatically and mechanically correct sentences that convey the writer's message in a clear, precise, and readable way.					
Assessment Question	Assessment Instrument	When, Where, and How	Analysis	Baseline Data	Target
[1] To what extent do completers of <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> interventions demonstrate writing proficiency? and [2] What is the "value added" of PVCC's QEP?	PVCC Writing Rubric (D)	Years 2-5. Pre-ENG 111 writing assessment from random sample of ENG 111 classes. Data collection coordinated by QEPIT English faculty member. Random sample of students' written work from all WI course sections. Data collection coordinated by QEPIT Director. Analysis coordinated by DIRPIE. WI samples assessed independently using the PVCC Writing Rubric.	Percentage of cohort graduates demonstrating Proficient or above on all five rubric domains: Purpose and Audience, Idea Development and Support, Organization, Grammar, Punctuation, and Mechanics, and Presentation and Documentation. Writing sample results for entering students will be compared with results for WI students on each of the five rubric domains.	No baseline data. No baseline data.	By Year 5, at least 90% of PVCC graduates will score "Proficient" or above in all domains. Evidence of value added, based on difference in the percentage of students scoring at or above "Proficient" in each domain.
	COMPASS e-Write (D)	Administered in Years 1-5 to random sample of entering students during college's placement testing process. Administered in Years 2-5 during general education exit assessment process to random sample of students in QEP program cohorts. Data collection coordinated by Testing Specialist in collaboration with DIRPIE.	Percentage of cohort graduates scoring 3 or above in <i>focus</i> (SLO 1), <i>content</i> (SLO 2), <i>organization</i> (SLO 3), <i>style</i> (SLO 1), and <i>conventions</i> (SLO 4). Comparison of entering and exiting student holistic scores, and comparison of graduates of QEP program cohorts with baseline data and graduates from cohorts before they are phased in to plan (SLO 1, 2, 3).	In 2009, 89% of graduates scored a 3 or better in <i>focus</i> , 61% in <i>content</i> , 60% in <i>organization</i> , 64% in <i>style</i> , and 60% in <i>conventions</i> . Baseline for entering students to be collected in Fall 2010 In 2009, graduates' average holistic score = 5.8.	By Year 5, at least 90% of PVCC graduates will score a 3 or better in each domain. Evidence of value added, based on difference in average holistic scores between groups.

Outcomes Assessed: SLO 5: Students will use writing-to-learn and writing process activities <i>on their own</i> as a means to explore and articulate ideas. SLO 6: Students will perceive themselves as “improved writers” as a result of their PVCC experience. SLO 7: Students will express confidence in their ability to write effectively					
Assessment Question	Assessment Instrument	When, Where, and How	Analysis	Baseline Data	Target
[2] To what extent has PVCC’s focus on writing changed students’ writing-related behaviors and perceptions?	CCSSE (I)	Administered to stratified random sample of course sections as specified by CCSSE protocol in Years 1, 3, and 5. Data collection and analysis coordinated by DIRPIE.	Frequency analysis of Items regarding preparation of two or more drafts of a paper (SLO 5), number of reports or papers written during the year (SLO 5), and contribution of PVCC to their ability to write clearly and effectively (SLO 6); total and disaggregated by total credit hours completed (e.g., fewer than 12, 12-30, and more than 30).	25% of students <i>never</i> prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in. 20% said they do so <i>very often</i> . 50% of students had written 4 or fewer papers or reports of any length during the current school year. 20% of students said that PVCC has contributed “very much” to their ability to write clearly and effectively; 20% said that PVCC has contributed “very little” to these abilities.	By Year 5, at least 90% of curricular students will report having prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in, and 65% of students will report having written 5 or more papers of any length during the current school year. By Year 5, at least 40% of curricular students will say that PVCC has contributed “very much” to their ability to write clearly and effectively, and no more than 10% will say “very little.”
	PVCC Graduate Exit Survey (I)	Mandatory survey of all graduates, all terms, Years 0-5. Will be disaggregated by program to review results by QEP program cohort. Data collection and analysis coordinated by DIRPIE.	Frequency analysis of: [1] Contribution of PVCC experience (SLO 6)	45% of graduates say PVCC “very much” contributed to their ability to write clearly and effectively; 40% say somewhat.	By Year 5, 65% of PVCC graduates will report that PVCC “very much” contributed to their ability to write clearly and effectively.

Assessment Question	Assessment Instrument	When, Where, and How	Analysis	Baseline Data	Target
Continued... [2] To what extent has PVCC's focus on writing changed students' writing-related behaviors and perceptions?	Continued... PVCC Graduate Exit Survey		<p>[2] Self assessment of change in writing ability from when they began their PVCC program to graduation (SLO 6)</p> <p>[3] Confidence in writing ability (SLO 7)</p> <p>[4] Frequency with which graduates engage in writing process and writing-to-learn activities (SLO 5)</p>	<p>34% of graduates "strongly agree" that they are a better writer now than when they started their PVCC program; 18% disagree.</p> <p>49% of graduates "strongly agree" that they are confident they can write effectively about a topic assigned in their field of study; 2% disagree.</p> <p>Nearly three of four graduates say they "always" review their writing for grammar, mechanics, and content before turning it in. Use of exploratory writing activities such as brainstorming, outlining, journaling, mapping, is less frequent, e.g., fewer than 15% of graduates reported "often" using journaling, freewriting, clustering and mapping.</p>	<p>By Year 5, 55% of graduates will "strongly agree" that they are better writers now and <5% will disagree.</p> <p>By Year 5, 70% of graduates will "strongly agree."</p> <p>By Year 5, at least 40% of graduates will report "often" using exploratory writing activities.</p>

Formative Evaluation of *Write Here, Write Now!*

Subtitled “Creating a Culture of Writing,” PVCC’s *Write Here, Write Now!* QEP seeks to improve students’ writing by providing increased and deliberate opportunities for students to expand the breadth and depth of their writing experiences and promoting the value of writing as a tool for learning and communicating. Creating a culture of writing is not the end goal, but rather a vision for the process and activities the College will undertake to achieve the Student Learning Outcomes, i.e., implementing a set of increased and deliberate writing experiences and support for students, a shared language (rubric) for assessing student writing, professional development for faculty, and writing awareness/messaging campaign. A culture of writing will be evidenced by successful QEP activities (e.g., course revisions, WI requirement, Writing Center support), widespread use of the PVCC Writing Rubric by faculty, student awareness and use of writing process and writing-to-learn strategies, and of course, student attainment of the Learning Outcomes.

Multiple methods will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of QEP-related actions, and the College will use the results to make appropriate adjustments and improvements to instruction, professional development, and supporting activities. Formative evaluation questions include:

1. How effective is ENG 111 in teaching and improving student writing?
2. How effective is required ITE/CSC in reinforcing writing process and product?
3. How effective is ENG 112 in reinforcing writing process and improving student writing?
4. How effective is the Writing Center in
 - a. supporting institutional focus on student writing?
 - b. promoting student success in writing?
5. How effective is faculty professional development and support in
 - a. preparing faculty to incorporate writing process and writing-to-learn strategies in their classes?
 - b. training faculty to use the PVCC Writing Rubric?
 - c. providing faculty with a language and tools for giving students feedback on their writing?
 - d. promoting consistent expectations for the quality of student writing?
 - e. prompting faculty to emphasize and encourage writing by incorporating writing assignments, and writing process and writing-to-learn strategies in their classes?

The PVCC Writing Rubric, CCSSE, and Graduate Exit Survey described above also have a role in formative evaluation. The PVCC Writing Rubric will be used in pre-post assessment of the effectiveness of revised ENG 111, and in assessing student writing in ITE/CSC and ENG 112 courses. Ongoing analysis of final writing assignment scores in ENG 111, ITE/CSC, and ENG 112 will be used to identify areas in which PVCC students may need additional instruction and/or reinforcement, and courses will be modified accordingly. CCSSE and Graduate Exit Survey results will be reviewed at multiple points in the implementation timeline to determine whether PVCC is “on track” toward meeting established targets and whether the College needs to focus more closely on activities for any particular degree program or group of students.

In addition, the following evaluation tools and methods will be used:

PVCC Student Satisfaction Survey

The PVCC Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS) is a Web-based survey administered annually to currently enrolled students to assess student use of, and satisfaction with, student services. Administration of the SSS is coordinated by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. Use of and satisfaction with Writing Center services will continue to be assessed with the SSS, which will include additional items about the perceived emphasis on writing at PVCC beginning in Year 0 of the QEP. Student Satisfaction Survey results for identified items will be compared to baseline and established targets.

TutorTrac Reports

TutorTrac is a Web-based system used by the College to manage Learning, Math, and Writing Center appointments. TutorTrac's reporting features include usage statistics as well as the capability to upload and utilize student, course, and grade information for outcomes analyses. PVCC's Writing Center Coordinator will use TutorTrac to report on Writing Center service volume and course outcomes for students using Writing Center services in Years 0-5 of the QEP.

SMARTTHINKING Reports

In addition to the tutoring available in PVCC's Writing Center, students have access to SMARTTHINKING, an online tutoring service providing "anytime" access to qualified and trained online tutors. PVCC's Writing Center Coordinator will also track service volume on SMARTTHINKING for students who use it for writing and monitor outcomes for students using the service in Years 0-5 of the QEP.

Professional Development Workshop Evaluations

Write Here, Write Now! workshop evaluations will assess workshop content, faculty satisfaction, and faculty perceptions of preparedness to implement course- and program-specific writing strategies including writing process and writing-to-learn strategies and adaptation and use of the PVCC Writing Rubric. Evaluations developed by the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness in collaboration with the QEP Implementation Team will be completed by workshop participants following completion of face-to-face and online workshop components in Years 0-5 of the QEP. The QEP Director will administer evaluations, compile the results, and discuss with the Implementation Team implications for improvements to future workshops.

Faculty Survey

The *Write Here, Write Now!* Annual Faculty Survey will assess faculty perceptions of student writing strengths and weaknesses, faculty needs for professional development, faculty use of writing process and writing-to-learn strategies in instruction, and faculty use of the PVCC Writing Rubric. All faculty will be invited to take the Web-based survey in the spring semester, Years 0-5 of the QEP. The QEP Director will issue the invitation

to complete the survey. Director of IRPIE will analyze the survey results and provide a report to the QEP Implementation Team.

Curriculum Checklists, Outlines, and Approvals

Course/WI checklists with course syllabi and records of Curriculum and Instruction Committee approvals provide documentation of courses that have been modified to reinforce writing or meet the College's criteria for Writing Intensive courses. The QEP Director will conduct an annual review of this documentation to ensure that (1) the College is promoting consistent expectations for writing quality, and (2) there are a sufficient number of ENG, ITE/CSC, and Writing Intensive courses to accommodate the needs of all program cohort students in each year of the QEP.

The Evaluation Plan Detail on the following pages shows for each formative evaluation question: the data that will be collected; how, when, and by whom it will be collected; how data will be analyzed; baseline data (where available); and expected (i.e., target) results.

Evaluation Question	Instrument	When, Where, and How	Analysis	Baseline Data	Target
[1] How effective is ENG 111 in teaching and improving student writing?	PVCC Writing Rubric (D)	<p>Years 1-5. Post-ENG 111 writing assessments from random sample of ENG 111 sections.</p> <p>Success in subsequent coursework (ENG 112)</p> <p>Data collection and analysis coordinated by QEPIT English faculty member.</p>	<p>Analysis of final ENG 111 timed essay exam, scored with the PVCC Writing Rubric on each domain.</p> <p>Percentage of Fall ENG 111 students successfully completing ENG 112 in the subsequent Spring semester.</p>	<p>To be collected in pilot sample Spring 2010, using revised PVCC Writing Rubric.</p> <p>83% of Fall 2008 ENG 111 students who took ENG 112 in Spring 2009, successfully completed ENG 112 with a grade of "C" or better.</p>	<p>Analyses used to identify skills for which students need additional instruction and/or reinforcement. Target: 85% of students score above "novice" in each rubric domain at conclusion of ENG 111.</p> <p>90% of ENG 111 completers will also successfully complete ENG 112.</p>
[2] How effective is the required ITE/CSC in reinforcing writing process and product?	PVCC Writing Rubric for ITE/CSC (D)	<p>Years 0-5. Random sample of completed writing projects from ITE 119/120 and CSC 110 sections.</p> <p>Data collection and analysis coordinated by QEPIT Information Technology faculty member.</p>	<p>Mean and mode ratings and frequency analysis of scores in each domain on final research assignment.</p>	<p>To be collected in pilot sample Spring 2010, using revised PVCC Writing Rubric.</p>	<p>Analyses used to identify skills for which students need additional instruction and/or reinforcement. Target: 90% of students score above "novice" in each rubric domain on final research assignment.</p>
[3] How effective is ENG 112 in reinforcing and improving student writing?	PVCC Writing Rubric (D)	<p>Years 1-5. Final ENG 112 writing assignments from random sample of ENG portfolios. Data collection and analysis coordinated by QEPIT English faculty member.</p>	<p>Analysis of final ENG 112 timed essay exam, scored with the PVCC Writing Rubric on each domain.</p>	<p>To be collected 2010-2011.</p>	<p>Analyses will identify skills for which students need additional instruction and/or reinforcement. Targets: At the conclusion of ENG 112...Fewer than 5% of students will score "novice" in any of the domains. 95% of students will score "developing" or higher in all domains. At least 75% will score "proficient" or higher in all domains.</p>

Evaluation Question	Instrument	When, Where, and How	Analysis	Baseline Data	Target
[4a] How effective is the Writing Center in supporting institutional focus on student writing?	<p>PVCC Student Satisfaction Survey (I)</p> <p>TutorTrac Report and SmartThinking reports (I)</p>	<p>Online survey sent to all students in Fall, Years 0-5. Data collection and analysis coordinated by DIRPIE.</p> <p>Annually, Years 0-5, by Writing Center Coordinator.</p>	<p>Student use of, and satisfaction with, Writing Assistance Services</p> <p>Annual analysis of Writing Center service volume based on TutorTrac and SmartThinking data.</p>	<p>Utilization 10% Satisfaction 96% (2008 survey)</p> <p>In 2008-2009: 615 student visits and 511 hours of assistance.</p>	<p>Trend increase in utilization of WC services Years 2-5, such that by Year 5, 20% of PVCC students use Writing Assistance Services, and student satisfaction with services remains above 95%.</p>
[4b] How effective is the Writing Center in promoting student success in writing?	TutorTrac Report (D)	Annually, years 0-5, by Writing Center Coordinator.	Analysis of course outcomes for students receiving Writing Center services.	N/AV [Historically, 81% of ENG 111 students and 96% of ENG 112 students who visited the Writing Center two or more times were more successful in their course than students who didn't use the Writing Center. However, under the QEP, students in some courses will now be required to seek Writing Center assistance.]	80% of students required to seek Writing Center assistance will successfully complete the course/assignment for which they were referred.

Evaluation Question	Instrument	When, Where, and How	Analysis	Baseline Data	Target
<p>[5] How effective is faculty professional development and support in:</p> <p>[a] preparing faculty to incorporate writing process and writing-to-learn strategies in their classes,</p>	<p><i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> Workshop Evaluations to assess workshop content, faculty satisfaction & perceptions of preparedness (I: Q 5 a,b,c)</p>	<p>Evaluation surveys to be completed by workshop participants following completion of professional development activities, all faculty cohorts, Years 0-5. Evaluations developed by DIRPIE in collaboration with QEPIT. Data collection coordinated by QEPIT Director and Coordinator of Professional Development.</p>	<p>Analysis of satisfaction and perceptions of preparedness to implement course/program-specific QEP strategies.</p> <p>Results and faculty feedback will be used to make improvements to future workshops.</p>	<p>Survey to be developed and baseline data collected Spring 2010.</p>	<p>100% of Cohort faculty are satisfied with training and are prepared to implement course/program-specific QEP strategies.</p>
<p>[b] training faculty to use the PVCC Writing Rubric,</p> <p>[c] providing faculty with a language and tools for giving students feedback on their writing, and</p> <p>[d] promoting consistent expectations for the quality of student writing?</p>	<p><i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> Annual Faculty Survey (I: Q 5 a,b,c,d, e)</p>	<p>Annual survey of all FT and PT faculty, spring semester, Years 0-5. Disaggregated by cohort and non-cohort faculty. Survey developed by DIRPIE in collaboration with QEPIT. Data collection and analysis coordinated by DIRPIE in collaboration with QEPIT Director.</p>	<p>Analysis of:</p> <p>[1] Faculty perceptions of student writing strengths and weaknesses [2] Faculty needs for professional development [3] Faculty use of writing-to-learn strategies in instruction [4] Faculty use of rubric(s) [5] Faculty perceptions of success of Write Here, Write Now!</p> <p>Results and faculty feedback will be used to make improvements to professional development.</p>	<p>Survey to be developed and baseline data collected Spring 2010.</p>	<p>Year 1-5: All ENG 111, 112, ITE/CSC and Writing Intensive Course instructors using Writing Rubric.</p> <p>Percent of other faculty using rubric and/or writing to learn strategies in classes...</p> <p>Year 1: 10% Year 2: 20% Year 3: 30% Year 4: 40% Year 5: 50%</p> <p>By Year 5, 75% of faculty will "agree" that Write Here, Write Now! has provided improved language and tools for giving feedback on writing, and promoted consistent expectations for quality of student writing.</p>

[e] prompting faculty to emphasize and encourage writing by incorporating writing assignments, and writing process and writing-to-learn strategies in their classes?	Curriculum Review Checklists w/ course outlines and C&I approvals (D: Q5d)	Annual review of checklists, outlines, and subsequent C&I approvals.	Number and percentage of courses meeting Writing Intensive criteria.	N/A	Sufficient number of courses within each cohort program to accommodate all students who need ENG, ITE/CSC, and Writing Intensive courses.
	PVCC Student Satisfaction Survey (I: Q5e)	Online survey sent to all students in Fall, Years 0-5. Data collection and analysis coordinated by DIRPIE.	Perception of emphasis on writing at PVCC.	Percentage of students saying that classes and instructors "often" encourage writing as a way to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Come up with and develop ideas: 53% ▫ Organize thoughts and information: 60% ▫ Communicate with others: 46% 	By Year 5, 70% of students will say that classes and instructors "often" encourage writing for each of these purposes. Fewer than 10% will respond "rarely" or "never."

Dissemination and Utilization of Assessment Findings

Disseminating, discussing, and acting on assessment findings is essential to the successful implementation of the QEP. Oversight of QEP assessment is the responsibility of the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (IRPIE). The IRPIE Director, who will serve on the QEP Implementation Team, will work collaboratively with the QEP Director to coordinate regular and timely reporting of assessment findings. The QEP Implementation Team bears primary responsibility for responding to assessment findings, including involving appropriate stakeholders outside the team and initiating any processes necessary for improvements in response to findings. The Formative and Summative Assessment Plan Details identify the person(s) responsible for data collection and analysis. These individuals are also responsible for regular, timely reporting of assessment findings to the QEP Implementation Team. Presentation and discussion of assessment results will be a regular agenda item at QEP Implementation Team meetings. The QEP Implementation Team meets twice monthly, and minutes of these meetings are maintained in Blackboard, the college's content management system for courses and committee work. In addition, findings will be disseminated as follows:

- The Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness is a member of President's Staff, which meets weekly. The Director will keep President's Staff informed of assessment activities and results as part of her regular updates presented at each meeting.
- The Vice President for Instruction and Student Services (VPISS) is a member of President's Staff, supervises the QEP Director, and leads the Instruction and Student Services Council (ISS) which meets bi-monthly. The VPISS (or QEP Director, at invitation of VPISS) will provide regular QEP progress reports to ISS.
- Assessment results bearing on curricular or instructional issues will be presented to the Curriculum and Instruction Committee (C&I) by the QEP Director who also serves as a member of the committee. C&I meets monthly.
- During Fall and Spring planning weeks, all college faculty, staff, and administrators convene for an informational meeting. This is an ideal time for stakeholders to receive an update on the progress and success of the QEP, to hear how the QEP Implementation Team is responding to assessment findings, and learn about next steps. The QEP Director will report out on the QEP at these meetings for the duration of its implementation.
- Summaries of key assessment results will be posted on the QEP web site.

Appendix I

References

- Ahrenhoerster, G. (2006). Will they still respect us in the morning? *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, v34 n1, 20-31.
- Ambron, Joanna (1991). History of WAC and its role in community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 73 3-8.
- Anderson, R. et al (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading*. Champaign: University of Illinois.
- Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Bangert-Drowns, R. Hurley, M., Wilkinson, B. (2004). The effects of school-based writing-to-learn interventions on academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, v74 n1, 29-58.
- Barnes, M. (1999). Writing-across-the-curriculum at Union County College. ERIC Document ED 437110.
- Berkenkotter, C. & Huckin, T. (1993). Rethinking genre from a sociocognitive perspective. *Written Communication*, v10 n4, 475-509.
- Britton, J., and others. (1975). *The development of writing abilities*. London: Macmillan.
- Carroll, L.A. (2002). *Rehearsing new roles: How college students develop as writers*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Carter (2007). Ways of knowing, doing, and writing in the disciplines. *College Composition and Communication*, 58(3), 385-418.
- Cisero, C. (2006). Does reflective journal writing improve course performance? *College Teaching*, 54(2), 231-236.

- Cline, K. (2008). A writing-intensive statistics course. *Primus: Problems, Resources, & Issues in Mathematics Undergraduate Studies*. XVIII(5): 399–410.
- Coker, F.H. & Scarboro, A. [Writing to learn in upper-division sociology courses: Two case studies](#). *Teaching Sociology*, 18(2), 218-22.
- College/University Writing Policy Development (2003). National Council for Teachers of English. Retrieved June 10, 2008, from <http://www.ncte.org/prog/writing/policy>.
- Collins, J. (1992). [Developing writing and thinking skills across the curriculum: A practical program for schools](#). ERIC Digest (ED364897).
- Connor-Greene, (2000). Making connections: Evaluating the effectiveness of journal writing in enhancing student learning. *Teaching of Psychology*, v27 n1, 44-46.
- Dobie, A. and Poirrier, G.P. Nurses writing and not writing. *Nursing and Health Care Perspectives*, 21(4), 162-163.
- Downs, D. & Wardle, E. (2007). Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions: (Re)Envisioning First-Year Composition as Introduction to Writing Studies. *College Composition and Communication*, 58(4), 552-584.
- Dyson, A. & Freedman, S. (2003). *Writing*. In *Handbook of Research on Teaching the English Language Arts*. Ed. Flood, et al. Mahwah: LEA Publishers, 967-992.
- Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing processes of twelfth graders*. Research Report no. 13, Urbana: NCTE.
- Emig, J. (1983). *The web of meaning: Essays on writing, teaching, learning, and thinking*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Farris, C. & Smith, R. (2000). Writing intensive courses: Tools for curricular change. In *Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs*. Ed. Margot

- Soven and Susan Mcleod. WAC Clearinghouse.
http://wac.colostate.edu/books/mcleod_soven/chapter6.pdf.
- Fulwiler, T. (1989). Journals across the disciplines. In *To compose: Teaching writing in high school*. Ed. Newkirk Thomas, Washington: National Institute of Education, 186-197.
- Fulwiler, Toby, and Art Young (1990). *Programs that work, models and methods for writing across the curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Goldstein, A.A. & Carr, P.G. (1996) Can students benefit from Process Writing? National Center for Education Statistics *The Nation's Report Card: NAEP Facts* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved June 25, 2008 from ERIC ED 395320.
- Gottschalk, K. & Hjortshoj, K. (2004). *The elements of teaching writing: A resource for instructors in all disciplines*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins.
- Hall, S. & Tiggeman, T. (1995). [Getting the big picture: Writing to learn in a finance class](#). *Business Communication Quarterly*, 58(1), 12-15.
- Hennessy, D. & Evans, R. (2005). Reforming writing among students in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29 (4), 261–275.
- Hill, M. (1992). [Writing to learn: Process writing moves into the curriculum](#). *Electronic Learning*, 12(3), 20-23,26-27.
- Hillocks, G. & Smith, M.W. (2003). Grammars and literacy learning. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, J.R. Squire, and J.M. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (pp. 721-737). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hohenshell, L., & Hand, B. (2006). Writing-to-learn strategies in secondary school cell biology: A mixed method study. *International Journal of Science Education*, 28, 261-289.
- Howard, V.H. & Barton, J.A. (1986). *Thinking on paper*. NY: William Morrow.

- Jerde, C. & Taper, M. (2004). Preparing undergraduates for professional writing: Evidence supporting the benefits of scientific writing within the science curriculum. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, v33 n7, 34-37.
- Johanning, (2000). Writing in pre-algebra. *Social Science and Mathematics* 100(3), 151-160.
- Jones, L.L. (1995). [Writing and self-discovery: Journals encourage fluency in both.](#) *Schools in the Middle*, 5(1), 13-15.
- Kaufert, D. & Young, R. (1993). Writing in the Content Areas: Some Theoretical Complexities. In *Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing: Re-thinking the Discipline*, edited by Lee Odell, (pp. 71-104). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP.
- Kutz, E. & Roskelly, H. (1991). *An unquiet pedagogy: Transforming practice in the English classroom*. Portsmouth: Boynton.
- Lester, N., Bertram, C., & Erickson, G. (2003). Writing across the curriculum: A college snapshot. *Urban Education*, v38 n1, 5-34.
- Mahan, J., Jayasumana, A.P., Lile, D., Palmquist, M. (2000). Bringing an Emphasis on Technical Writing to a Freshman Course in Electrical Engineering. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, Vol. 43, No. 1, 36-42.
- Marra and Marra (2000). Investigating the effects of prewriting activities on performance and anxiety of at risk students. *Reading Psychology*, v21 n2, 99-114.
- McLeod, S. (1989). Writing across the curriculum: The second stage, and beyond. *College Composition and Communication* 40.3:337-343.
- McLeod, S., Miraglia, E.; Soven, M., Thaiss, C. (2001). *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the curriculum programs*. Urbana: NCTE.
- McLeod, S. and Elaine Maimon (2000). Clearing the air: WAC myths and realities. *College English* 62: 573-583.

- Milner, J. & Milner, L. (2003). *Bridging English*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Murphy, K. (2001). The impact of a series of writing-intensive courses on success on the writing proficiency requirement. In *Institutional research: Leadership through excellence. North East Association for Institutional Research Annual Conference Proceedings (28th, Cambridge, Massachusetts)*.
- Murray, D. (2002). *Write to Learn*. Boston: Thomson.
- National Council for Teachers of English (2004) "Beliefs about the teaching of writing." National Council for Teachers of English. Retrieved June 10, 2008, from [http://www.ncte.org/prog/writing initiatives](http://www.ncte.org/prog/writing_initiatives).
- National Center for Educational Statistics (1996). Can students benefit from writing process? Vol. 1, No. 3 (NAES findings) <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs96/web/96845.asp>.
- National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges. The Neglected 'R': The need for a writing revolution. 2004. College Board. http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/writingcom/writing-school-reform-natl-comm-writing.pdf
- Oliver, P.V. (1995). Learning to write, writing to learn: A study on process-oriented writing in graduate education. ERIC ED 401 850. Retrieved. June 1, 2008.
- Patthey-Chavez, G., Matsumura, L., Valdes, R. (2004). Investigating the process approach to writing instruction in urban middle schools. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 47:6, 462-477.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing process of unskilled college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 18(4), 317-336.
- Purdue University Online Writing Lab. <http://www.owl.english.purdue.edu/>
- Russell, David R. (1991) *Writing in the Academic Disciplines, 1870-1990: A Curricular History*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.

- Schreiner, S. (1997). A portrait of the student as a young writer: Re-evaluating Emig and the process movement. CCC 48.1 (Feb), 86-104.
- Shankle, N. (2001). Creating a discourse community with writing intensive instructors. Paper presented a WAC Conference, Bloomington, IN.
- Sinclair, A. (2002). The use of biglan categories in assessing general education courses. Paper presented at the Annual Forum for the Association for Institutional Research.
- Smagorinsky, Peter. (1991). The writer's knowledge and the writing process: A protocol analysis. Research in the Teaching of English, v25 n3, 339-64.
- Smithson, I. (1995). Assessment of Writing-Across-The-Curriculum Projects. Paper, Conference on College Composition and Communication. 1-16.
- Sorenson, S. (1991). [Encouraging writing achievement: Writing across the curriculum. ERIC Digest. 3 \(ED327879\).](#)
- Spandel, V. (2005). *Creating writers through 6-trait writing assessment and instruction*. Boston: Pearson.
- Stafford, W. (1970). "A Way of Writing." In *Landmark Essays on Writing Process*. Ed. Sondra Perl. Hermagoras Press, 1994, 231.
- Strunk, W. & White, E.B. (1972). *The Elements of Style*. New York: Longman.
- Sunstein, B.S. (1994). *Composing a culture*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook.
- Townsend, M. (2001). Writing intensive courses and WAC. *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Programs*. Ed. McLeod, et al. Urbana: NCTE, 233-258.
- Tripiano, C. (2008). Best classroom practices. *WAC Clearinghouse*.
- VanDeWeghe, R. (2005). What are the effects of writing-to-learn programs? *English Journal*, 95(2), 97-100.

Well, S. (1997) Navigating troubles in paradise: A new freshman writing curriculum in a small liberal arts college. *College Teaching* v. 45, 55-59.

Williams, J. (2003). *Preparing to teach writing: Research, theory, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Weaver, C. (1996). *Teaching grammar in context*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook.

Wilcox, K.J. & Jensen, M.S. (2000). [Writing to learn in anatomy and physiology](#).

Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 16(2), 55-71.

Writes of passage: Writing across the curriculum at Southwestern Community College (2006). Quality Enhancement Plan.

Appendix II
PVCC Writing Rubric

PVCC Writing Rubric

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Controlling Idea (Purpose and Thesis)	Controlling idea/ thesis is engaging, clear, fully developed, appropriate to assignment purpose, and consistently maintained throughout the writing. The focus shows an exceptional understanding of assigned topic <input type="checkbox"/>	Controlling idea/thesis is competent, clear, though perhaps not as specific as necessary. It represents a sound understanding of assigned topic and is well maintained throughout the writing. <input type="checkbox"/>	Controlling idea/ thesis is mostly intelligible, though may lack complexity, be unclear, too broad, too vague. There may be minor digressions throughout the paper that eventually lead back to the stated position. The focus shows a moderate understanding of the assigned topic. <input type="checkbox"/>	Controlling idea/thesis not only lacks complexity but seems unfocused, there is little or no sense of purpose or control of thesis. A broad focus may be minimally maintained, but there are several digressions that do eventually lead back to the stated position. The focus shows a minimal understanding of the assigned topic. <input type="checkbox"/>	Controlling idea, if present at all, lacks complexity and shows signs of confusion and/or misunderstanding of the assignment. The thesis is essentially missing or not discernable. Even a general focus is difficult to judge due to the response being too short to provide sufficient evidence of focus; digressions do not lead back to the stated position. <input type="checkbox"/>
Idea Development	Ideas are extensively elaborated in well-developed and logically precise paragraphs; Main points are sufficiently supported with relevant, valid, thoughtful, and specific details and varied examples are used. Writing shows depth of thought; The writing gives a sense of completeness because the topic is quite thoroughly covered. Writing consistently anticipates readers' informational needs. Language use is interesting and engages the reader; word choice is varied, specific and precise. <input type="checkbox"/>	Ideas are moderately elaborated in well-developed paragraphs; Main points supported sufficiently with relevant specific details and varied examples that are sound, valid, and logical. Development is clear, precise and thorough, and writing shows moderate depth of thought; Writing usually anticipates readers' informational needs. Language and word choice is appropriate, varied, specific, and precise, even, at times, engaging. <input type="checkbox"/>	Ideas are somewhat elaborated and detailed in paragraphs; Main points are only indirectly supported; specific examples may be given, but they are sometimes not well selected, and are not sufficient or specific, but are loosely relevant to main points. Development may be a bit repetitious; the writer may have some questions after reading the text. Language and word choice, though mostly appropriate, may be imprecise and/or only moderately engaging. <input type="checkbox"/>	Only a little elaboration is provided for ideas; Only a few reasons to support points are offered, but these are non-specific, and/or insufficient, and/or irrelevant, and/or not explained in any detail; a main impression may be one of rather simple or general writing. Language and word choice, though it may be appropriate, seems repetitive and/or uninteresting; a few words may be inaccurate or missing; phrasing may be vague or repetitive. <input type="checkbox"/>	Minimal, if any, elaboration of ideas is present; paper may contain unsupported assertions; details are lacking or not relevant; the writer does not adequately engage with the topic and frequent illogical and unsupported generalizations may be present; Language and word choices may be un-engaging, incorrect, imprecise, vague; words may be missing. <input type="checkbox"/>
Organization	The organization is unified and coherent, with well-developed and appropriate introduction, body, and conclusion; sentences within paragraphs flow logically, ideas show a clear progression, and effective topic sentences and transitions are used consistently and appropriately, clearly showing relationships among idea. <input type="checkbox"/>	Competent organization is unified and coherent, though without sophistication; introduction and conclusion are clear and developed; ideas show a progression and appropriate topic sentences and transitions generally show relationships among ideas. <input type="checkbox"/>	Organization is generally clear, though paragraphs may not be completely unified; introduction and conclusion are present and appropriate, though perhaps lack elaboration; topic sentences are imprecise; some transitions show relationships among ideas and are usually appropriate, but some ideas seem disconnected. <input type="checkbox"/>	Organization is a bit difficult to follow; the introduction and conclusion, if present, may be undeveloped; topic sentences and transitions may be lacking, confusing, or predictable, resulting in paragraphs that feel disconnected; the overall effect may be one of "listing." <input type="checkbox"/>	Organization, if evident at all, is confusing and disjointed. There is a lack of clear movement or connectedness; paragraphs may not be used; transitional words or phrases are used rarely, inappropriately, or illogically, if at all. <input type="checkbox"/>
Grammar, Punctuation, Mechanics	An outstanding command of language is apparent; Each sentence is structured correctly (no fragments, and/or run-ons, and/or comma splices, and/ or subject verb agreement errors and/or awkward sentences), effectively, powerfully; sentences are varied in structure. Virtually free of punctuation, spelling, capitalization errors. <input type="checkbox"/>	A command of language is apparent; Sentences are effective and varied and structured correctly (no fragments, and/or run-ons, and/or comma splices, and/or subject verb agreement errors and/or awkward sentences); errors (if any) due to lack of careful proofreading; Contains only occasional punctuation, spelling, and/or capitalization errors. <input type="checkbox"/>	A competency with language is apparent; sentences are clear for the most part, though there may be some sentence structure errors (fragments, and/or run-ons, and/or comma splices, and/or subject-verb agreement errors and/or awkward sentences) and non-standard sentence constructions. Formulaic or tedious sentence patterns. May contain some (mostly common) punctuation, spelling, and/or capitalization errors. <input type="checkbox"/>	A control of language is apparent at points; more than one sentence may be confusing; Several sentences show structural errors (fragments, and/or run-ons, and/or comma splices, and/or subject-verb agreement errors, and/or awkward sentences); little or not variety; no grasp of sentence flow. Contains many errors of punctuation, spelling, and/or capitalization. Errors interfere with meaning in places. <input type="checkbox"/>	Weak or poor control of language is apparent; sentences are often confusing; Simple sentences used excessively (and these are often incorrect), almost exclusively; contains multiple and serious errors of sentence structure: i.e. fragments, run-ons, comma splices, subject verb agreement errors, and/or awkward sentences). Frequent errors in spelling and capitalization; intrusive and/or inaccurate punctuation throughout, hindering communication. <input type="checkbox"/>
Presentation and Documentation	Close to perfect format and presentation for assignment as specified by instructor. Paper is typed in 12 point font, double-spaced. When necessary, paper includes internal citations and a perfectly formatted Works Cited page. <input type="checkbox"/>	Appropriate format and presentation for assignment as specified by instructor. Few formatting errors. Most errors likely careless. Paper is typed in 12 point font, double-spaced. When necessary, paper includes internal citations and a formatted Works Cited page. <input type="checkbox"/>	Several errors in formatting or formatting is inconsistent. When necessary, paper includes internal citations and a formatted, though imperfect, Works Cited page. <input type="checkbox"/>	Formatting incorrect in many places. Use of internal citations and Works Cited documentation (if needed) are inconsistent. <input type="checkbox"/>	Formatting weak, or no formatting present. Internal Citations and/or Works Cited page (if needed) may be missing. <input type="checkbox"/>

Writing Center Recommended

Writing Center Required

Appendix III

***Write Here, Write Now!* Writing Intensive Course Criteria**

Writing Intensive (WI) courses at PVCC will:

- Be capped at a maximum of 24 students
- Require a total of 4,000 words (or 20 pages), including both graded and ungraded writing activities
- Include formal and informal writing activities distributed throughout the semester and not concentrated at the end
- Include writing-to-learn and writing process activities
- Require student revision and resubmission of at least one writing assignment
- Include feedback from the instructor and from peers for at least one writing assignment. Feedback will be written or given as part of an instructor/student conference and, for peers, during a workshoping session.
- Refer students to the PVCC Writing Center as needed
- Devote some class time to writing instruction
- Evaluate formal writing assignments using the PVCC Writing Rubric
- Require that students receiving below a C on a formal writing assignment work with a tutor in the Writing Center before re-submission of revised paper
- Structure grading such that writing assignments account for at least 30% of the final grade
- Have a syllabus statement that communicates the Writing Intensive requirement that a student must earn a passing grade in the course in order for it to meet program requirements for graduation
- Identify one formal writing assignment to be submitted for QEP assessment (see Section XI Assessment Plan)

Appendix IV

Write Here, Write Now! Cohort Activity Checklist

During the fall semester prior to the year a program becomes a *Write Here, Write Now!* curriculum, the cohort faculty in conjunction with the QEP Implementation Team will complete the following:

ACTIVITIES	Date Completed	Comments
Identify courses within curriculum that will be designated as Writing Intensive		
Identify any changes that must be made to the curriculum to accommodate inclusion of the <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> guidelines		
Develop revised courses or revised Curriculum Plan		
Submit a WI Course Proposal for each WI course in the program and schedule a curriculum review by the Curriculum and Instruction Committee (if needed)		
Identify and schedule cohort of faculty for <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> orientation		

During the spring semester prior to the year of implementation, cohort faculty will:

ACTIVITIES	Date Completed	Comments
Complete <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> professional development and orientation during planning week		
Complete <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> professional development session(s) by the end of the semester		
Complete course planning to implement <i>Write Here, Write Now!</i> strategies including syllabus revision, etc.		

Appendix V

Writing Intensive Course Proposal Form

Writing Intensive Course Proposal

This section to be completed by course faculty

- This is a new Writing Intensive course
- This is a revision to a previous proposal
- This is a renewal of an existing WI course

Name of Degree Program: _____

Faculty member submitting proposal: _____

Proposed Course: _____

Date WI Course will be implemented: Semester _____ Year _____

Course Description:

Brief description of writing assignments, practices, etc., by which this course will meet WI criteria (see criteria on last page):

Attach the proposed course syllabus and forward to Program Coordinator for comment and approval

This section to be completed by Program Coordinator

Names of faculty likely to teach this course in coming year:

Is this course required of all students in this degree program? Yes No

If no, what other courses in the program may students take to meet the WI requirement?

Comments:

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Approved: Yes No

*If approved, forward to QEP Director
If not approved, return to faculty member for revision*

This section to be completed by QEP Director

Comments:

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Approved: Yes No

*If approved, forward to Chair, C&I
If not approved, return to Program Coordinator*

This section to be completed by Chair, Curriculum and Instruction Committee

Comments:

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Approved: Yes No

Approval Valid Through: Semester _____ Year _____

Return to QEP Director

Writing Intensive Criteria

- Be capped at a maximum of 24 students
- Require a total of 4,000 words (or 20 pages), including both graded and ungraded writing activities
- Include formal and informal writing activities distributed throughout the semester and not concentrated at the end
- Include writing-to-learn and writing process activities
- Require student revision and resubmission of at least one writing assignment
- Include feedback from the instructor and from peers for at least one writing assignment. Feedback will be written or given as part of an instructor/student conference and, for peers, during a workshoping session.
- Refer students to the PVCC Writing Center as needed
- Devote some class time to writing instruction
- Evaluate formal writing assignments using the PVCC Writing Rubric
- Require that students receiving below a C on a formal writing assignment work with a tutor in the Writing Center before re-submission of revised paper
- Structure grading such that writing assignments account for at least 30% of the final grade
- Have a syllabus statement that communicates the Writing Intensive requirement that a student must earn a passing grade in the course in order for it to meet program requirements for graduation
- Identify one formal writing assignment to be submitted for QEP assessment (see Section XI Assessment Plan).

Appendix VI

Awareness Campaign Logo and Posters



**WRITE HERE,
WRITE NOW!**

“i look 4wrd 2 Cing u”

**“I look forward to
seeing you.”**

Which one would you hire?



Write here, Write Now!

The Quality Enhancement Plan@PVCC

Creating a Culture of Writing

Make the write impression.

Got something to say?

Be heard.



Write here, Write Now!

The Quality Enhancement Plan@PVCC

Creating a Culture of Writing

Write on.

What do you think?

Find out.

The Quality Enhancement Plan@PVCC

Creating a Culture of Writing

Express yourself.



Write here, Write Now!