Background and Justification

In recent years, Senate committees and task forces have called for strengthening and diversifying students’ options for satisfying the campus’s writing requirement. There has been strong Senate support for maintaining a three-quarter requirement. At the same time, the Senate has urged that the third quarter of instruction be diversified so that students are able to satisfy the requirement in a variety of courses and disciplines, not only by taking ENGL 1C or 1SC. One of the reasons the new University Writing Program was created in 2008 was to develop options for writing across the curriculum.

Senate Chair Martins-Green, reporting in 2005 on comprehensive Senate discussions regarding the UCR writing requirement, outlined the following recommendations resulting from that review:

All committees (including the Executive Council) agreed that the first two quarters should be standard Freshman English Composition. However, for the third quarter, several alternatives were offered. Among the possibilities are:

- The existing courses, ENGL 1C, ENGL 1SC, ENGL 1HC;
- New or existing College-based courses approved by each of the respective Executive Committees with subsequent Senate approval;
- Adoption of “Writing Across the Curriculum” by identifying a specific set of courses, from which students of a given College can choose. If this is adopted the appropriate resources have to be put in place to assist the faculty teaching the courses targeted to fulfill “Writing Across the Curriculum.” (Senate Chair’s Memo, 2/17/05)

Following these consultations, a joint faculty and administrative Implementation Committee was formed to create the University Writing Program. According to the Charter of the new writing program, which became an independent unit in July, 2008, “[T]he development of the UWP acknowledges the continued growth” of the campus’s responsibility for “writing and composition instruction . . . as well as the need for the

---

1 The Implementation Committee consisted of faculty and administrators: Steve Cullenberg (Senate Representative and then CHASS Dean), Katherine Kinney (English Chair), Theda Shapiro (Senate Representative), Melanie Sperling (Senate Representative), Andrew Grosovsky (Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education), Gretchen Bolar (VP, Academic Planning and Budget), Betty Lord (Academic Personnel), Susan Hunter Hancock (CHASS Dean’s Office), Carolyn Stark (EVC Office), Dave Fairris (CHASS Dean’s Office) and Jim Sandoval (VP-Student Affairs).
campus as a whole to be engaged in the composition and writing instruction of its students.” The University Writing Program was charged with developing various options and ideas for implementing alternatives to English 1C.

There is widespread faculty interest in writing instruction that is closely related to the subject matters and methodologies of the disciplines. When students are writing in a variety of classes, the competencies they have developed in freshman writing courses are more likely to carry over into their writing and learning in the disciplines. An effective, targeted diversification of responsibilities for the writing requirement can thus strengthen the overall curriculum. Students are more likely to use writing as inquiry and communication in the upper division as well as the lower. They are more likely to achieve an articulate grasp of what they are studying, both in breadth courses and the required courses of their majors. They are more likely to master forms of written communication that are characteristic of particular disciplines. As a result they are likely to become more engaged, and more able to meet the faculty’s expectations in all their courses.

This proposal responds to the Senate recommendations and follows the charter of the University Writing Program. It proposes policies and strategies to involve and support faculty members across the campus in writing across the curriculum. It invites each college to allow its students to participate. It urges each college to offer WAC courses. It encourages, but does not require, the participation of all UCR colleges. Following the Senate recommendation to focus on the third quarter of the requirement, it sets out a template for alternatives to English 1C. English 1C would continue to be offered. Students in participating colleges would have the choice of taking a Senate-approved “W” course in place of English 1C to satisfy the third quarter of the writing requirement.²

This plan addresses the practical challenges of mounting such a program, particularly with regard to TA-training and workshop/tutorial services. It makes use of tutoring and workshop support that the UWP has been developing over the past year. It also provides logistical and advisory support to faculty developing and teaching writing-intensive courses. It will open the opportunity for the UWP to provide supplemental support for additional TA costs.³

² Departments so far expressing strong interest in offering one or more full-replacement courses are History, Religious Studies (RLST 7W and 12W), Comparative Literature (CPLT 40W), Political Science (POSC 5W), English (ENGL 102W), and BCOE (ENGR 180W). We are working with other departments that are in various stages of developing or experimenting with courses that might be full or partial alternatives to 1C: these include Philosophy History, Anthropology, and Psychology. SoBA is looking into the feasibility of a “W” version of Business 100, its course in business communication. Some of the courses under discussion are restricted to majors. Some are not. We anticipate hearing about additional courses as we contact more departments and as other departments hear about the program.

³ Although exact savings are difficult to estimate, the enrollment of approximately one thousand students per year in an alternative courses would save the campus approximately $225,000 per year, over 50% of the cost of 1C instruction for those WAC students.
In addition to its academic advantages, the proposal would reduce the campus’s costs of teaching the third-quarter writing requirement to students in participating colleges. The UWP would provide supplemental support in the form of workshops, tutorials, TA-training and financial support for additional TAs. But savings would be realized in the overall program because students could fulfill the third-quarter writing requirement while taking a course offered by a variety of departments.

The plan would be implemented as a five-year pilot program for students in colleges that chose to permit them to use WAC courses in place of English 1C. It would be evaluated by the Senate in its fourth year for its effectiveness in comparison to ENGL 001C for students who were eligible to take WAC courses but did not enroll in them. On the basis of that evaluation, the Senate would determine whether the program should continue.
Resolutions to be Voted on By the Academic Senate

1. The Senate approves the creation of a five-year pilot program in Writing Across the Curriculum, to be implemented by the University Writing Program according to Senate-approved policies and guidelines. The program will offer alternatives to ENGL 001C to students in participating colleges. During the pilot period, the University Writing Program will be responsible for continually evaluating 1C-alternative courses for their effectiveness in comparison to ENGL 001C results for WAC-eligible students (that is, by comparing 1C/WAC results within colleges that permit their student to participate in the WAC program). On the basis of that evaluation, and its own independent or cooperative study, the Senate will determine whether the program should continue.

2. The pilot program allows students in participating colleges to fulfill the third-quarter composition requirement by taking ENGL 001C (or with college approval, ENGL 001SC)\(^4\), or by taking a designated alternative course in another department or program. Departments and colleges will choose whether to propose such courses. Once proposed, such courses must be submitted for discretionary approval to the appropriate College executive committee as well as to the Academic Senate committee on Courses.

3. Designation and renewal of alternatives to ENGL 001C will be based on the kinds of writing assigned, the amount of writing, the feedback being provided, and other criteria listed in Appendix A. Appendix A shall serve as a checklist for Executive Committees and for the Committee on Courses. The University Writing Program will be responsible for establishing and publicizing these criteria.

4. If they permit their students to participate in the WAC program, College executive committees will have the option of setting eligibility standards (e.g. a “B” average in English 1A and 1B) for their own students’ access to alternatives to English 1C. The UWP will be responsible for implementing any eligibility rules, with the cooperation of faculty and advisors.

5. In order to implement these new writing-across-the-curriculum options, the following UCR Catalog and Divisional and College Regulations must be implemented.

\(^4\) The ‘S’ in English 001SC indicates “Science”. Thus English 001SC teaches English writing using science topics.
### Proposed Changes in General Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 50, UCR 2010 Catalog: College Breadth Requirements</td>
<td>College Breadth Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses taken in a student’s major discipline (including courses cross-listed with the major discipline) may not be applied toward satisfaction of the Humanities, Social Sciences, Ethnicity or the Natural Sciences and Mathematics requirements except for Biology majors in connection with the Biological Sciences requirement, English majors in connection with the English Composition requirement, History majors in connection with the World History requirement, Ethnic Studies majors in connection with the Ethnicity requirement, and Foreign Language majors in connection with language requirements. However, courses outside the major discipline, but required for the major, may be applied toward satisfaction of these requirements.

Courses taken in a student’s major discipline (including courses cross-listed with the major discipline) may not be applied toward satisfaction of the Humanities, Social Sciences, Ethnicity or the Natural Sciences and Mathematics requirements except for Biology majors in connection with the Biological Sciences requirement, English majors in connection with the English Composition requirement, History majors in connection with the World History requirement, Ethnic Studies majors in connection with the Ethnicity requirement, and Foreign Language majors in connection with language requirements, and students permitted by their college to take a Senate-approved alternative to English 1C in order to satisfy the third-quarter writing requirement. However, courses outside the major discipline, but required for the major, may be applied toward satisfaction of these requirements.
CHASS English Composition Requirements

Page 61: English Composition

Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English Composition by completing a one-year sequence of college level instruction in English Composition with no grade lower than “C.”

Students should enroll in an English composition course each quarter they are registered at UCR until the sequence of preliminary Entry-Level Writing courses, if needed, and ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, ENGL 001C is completed with satisfactory GPA.

Courses that the Academic Senate designates as alternatives to English 1C may be applied toward satisfaction of the third quarter of the writing requirement if students earn a “C” or higher.

Students should enroll in an English composition course each quarter they are registered at UCR until the sequence of preliminary Entry-Level Writing courses, if needed, and ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, ENGL 001C (or an alternative designated by the Academic Senate) is completed with satisfactory GPA.

CNAS English Composition Requirements

Page 67: Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English Composition by completing a one-year sequence of college-level instruction in English Composition with no grade lower than “C.” UCR’s sequence is ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, and ENGL 001C.

ENGL 01HC or ENGL 01SC may be substituted for ENGL 001C, but only one of these courses can be taken for credit. Transfer students who have credit for one semester of English Composition from another institution must take two additional quarters (i.e. ENGL 001B and ENGL 001C).

No Change.
BCOE English Composition Requirements

Page 73: English Composition

UCR’s sequence is ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, and either ENGL 001C or ENGL 01SC.

UCR’s sequence is ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, and either one of ENGL 001C or ENGL 01SC, or an alternative to English 1C that is approved by the Academic Senate and recommended or required in place of 1C by the student’s major in BCOE.

SoBA English Composition Requirements

Page 77: English Composition

Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English Composition by completing a one-year sequence of college level instruction in English Composition with no grade lower than “C.” Students should enroll in an English composition course each quarter they are registered at UCR until the sequence of preliminary Entry Level Writing courses, if needed, and ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, ENGL 001C is completed with satisfactory GPA.

No change
Regulations of the Riverside Division

R6.1  *English composition.* Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English composition by completing a one-year sequence of college-level instruction in English composition with no grade lower than C, (Am 16 Nov 2004)

R6.1.1 Transfer students who have taken one semester of English composition at another college or university are required to take English 1B and English 1C, (Am 24 May 84)

*English composition.* Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English composition by completing a one-year sequence of college-level instruction in English composition with no grade lower than C. Courses that the Academic Senate designates as alternatives to the sequence’s third-quarter course, English 1C, may be applied toward satisfaction of the third-quarter requirement if a student’s college permits its majors to substitute such a course for 1C, and if students have first passed English 1B with a “C” or higher. The grade in the alternative course must be no lower than a “C.” Individual colleges may set a higher GPA requirement in English 1A and/or 1B as a prerequisite to take Senate-approved alternatives to English 1C. (Am 16 Nov 2004)

Transfer students who have taken one semester of English composition at another college or university are required to take English 1B and English 1C, with the option of taking an alternative to English 1C approved by the Academic Senate if a student’s college permits its majors to substitute such a course for 1C. (Am 24 May 84)
APPENDIX A

Checklist of Criteria for Certification and Renewal of Alternatives to English 1C

The Academic Senate will designate alternatives to English 1C on the basis of the following criteria. Appendix A should be used as a checklist.

____ a) Writing is one major focus of the course. Writing is used as a method of inquiry as well as communication, for example by

- assigning written explanations of complex concepts, texts, or data sets;
- requiring writers to discover, assemble, and explain competing ideas or explanations;
- encouraging writers to weigh and evaluate competing ideas.

____ b) The course assigns an amount of writing roughly comparable to the amount assigned, graded, and returned to students in composition courses, adjusting for the fact that written communication in various disciplines takes a number of forms, and that assignments and exercises preliminary to formal assignments might qualify as part of that total.5

____ c) The course provides feedback to students on their writing in each assignment;

____ d) The course responds to students’ writing in terms of ideas, reasoning, development, and clarity in paragraphs and sentences as well as the assignment as a whole, in terms of

- commenting on the students’ subject matter by paying close attention to fact, reasoning, development, and clarity;
- commenting on representative passages in terms of grammatical correctness, the clarity of assertions and the logic of paragraphs, and the use of evidence;
- offering advice on these matters for the sake of revision or the writing of later assignments.

5 The volume of writing in Composition courses is based on word totals required by IGETC transfer agreements with the CSU and CC systems. The amount of writing in English 1C is 5000 words: 4-6 papers (none shorter than 750 words, and at least one paper of 1250 words or more), plus a final.
The course’s TAs participate in the required UWP training course, which focuses on writing instruction — including attention to the process of writing as well as the intensive evaluation of student writing;\(^6\)

Materials relevant to these criteria have been provided by the proposing department for UWP and COC review.

The department offering the course commits to monitoring and evaluating the course’s conformity to these requirements in cooperation with the University Writing Program.

APPENDIX B

Methods of Implementation

1. Training TAs

TAs in the alternative courses will continue to be the responsibility of the faculty-in-charge of the alternative course – faculty in their home departments. TA-training will continue to be the primary responsibility of the home departments. Participation in the WAC program will require additional training conducted by the University Writing Program, which will coordinate with the home department to ensure that overall TA loads do not exceed an average of twenty hours per week. This additional instruction will focus on productive ways of responding to student writing (for example, by means of conferences, drafting, comments, and forms of evaluation that focus on methods of development and patterns of effective communication) and effective ways of embedding writing instruction in discussion sections.

2. Class size and ratio TAs to students

The UWP will work closely with departments and colleges to ensure that TA/student ratios permit adequate attention to students’ writing with the terms of the TA contract. Supplementary financial support from the UWP for additional TAs will be designed to address this priority.

3. Appendix A will serve as a checklist for Executive Committees and for the Committee on Courses in determining whether a proposed course should have a “W” designation. In its work with faculty proposing and teaching WAC courses, the University Writing Program’s initial priority is to work out a productive schedule of assignments, effective designs for those assignments, and arrangements for workshop

---

\(^6\) TA-training will take place in English 302 (meeting one hour per week) during the quarter the course is taught, or by alternative means approved by the UWP Director. TAs will remain under the charge of faculty in their home departments, and UWP training will take account of the 20-hour per week limit on TA activity. UWP instruction will focus on productive ways of responding to student writing (through, for example, conferences, drafting, comments, and evaluation that focus on methods of development and patterns of error) and effective ways of embedding writing instruction in discussion sections.
and tutorial support. The long-range priority of consultation with WAC faculty is to strengthen instruction and learning with the help of more rigorous and frequent writing assignments in the disciplines; more intensive interaction among faculty, TAs, and undergraduates about writing; and more focus on deepening and facilitating written communication not as an adjunct pursuit but as an activity at the core of what we do.

4. **Ensuring that students transferring to other UC’s are not disadvantaged**

Approximately 150 UCR students transfer to other UC’s each year, most of them to UCSD, UCLA, and UCI. Most would have no difficulty since many UC campuses do not require a third quarter of writing. Other UC campuses require a writing course in the upper division – a course that current UCR transfers to those campuses must take even after fulfilling UCR’s existing composition requirement. UCR’s new WAC legislation would not create a new inconvenience for most transfer students going to other UC’s. Only at Berkeley, where just 5% (7 students) go each year would the question of a UCR WAC course’s transferability be an issue. In that case, UCR could make a strong case that the WAC alternative to ENGL 1C should satisfy the requirement based on the criteria in Appendix A.

5. **Accepting other campuses’ WAC courses for transfer to UCR**

Associate deans and advisors, with reference to Appendix A and the UWP’s assistance, if needed, will be able to decide whether a WAC course taken on another campus satisfies the third-quarter writing requirement at UCR. As with other transferability questions, a body of precedents will develop.

6. **Course Labeling for new “W” courses**

The suffix “W” will be added to the course number of ENGL 1C alternative courses. The official course description of the “W” must also contain a statement to this effect: “Fulfills the third-quarter writing requirement.”

7. **Course labeling for new “W” courses and the original non-W version of those courses, if there is one**

The official course description of the “W” course – and the description of the original non-W version, if one exists – must contain a statement to this effect: “Only one version of this course can receive credit.”
October 29, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
    ACADEMIC SENATE

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

During its October 28 meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the revised Writing Across the Curriculum proposal and the responses which Professor Briggs provided to us this Fall. The Committee voted to approve the proposal by a vote count of 8 Yes, 0 No, and 0 Abstentions.

In addition:

- The Committee approved this program with the assumption that it will maintain the workable student-TA ratio stated in the proposal. CEP is very concerned that lack of funding might put this in jeopardy and will request periodic information on this point.

- The CEP believes that WAC can enhance the learning experience for participating students and would like to encourage CNAS participate. It is understood (as clearly started in the proposal) that allowing CNAS students to participate in no way requires the College to create WAC courses.
November 3, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: GERHARD GIERZ, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

RE: WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

At its October 27 meeting, once again, the Committee on Preparatory Education discussed the Writing Across the Curriculum proposal with CPE member and Director of the Writing Program, Professor John Briggs. We appreciated his thoughtful response this Fall to questions posed by the committee last Spring, and the revisions he made to the proposal based on these questions. We support the revised proposal. (8 Yes votes, 0 No votes, 1 *Abstention).

Committee members expressed concern regarding the availability of English 1C seats for students whose majors do not have an alternative, particularly non-seniors. We hope the senior Administration will recognize the pedagogical benefits of offering English 1C and WAC courses to students early in their academic careers at UCR. Satisfaction of the English composition requirement through English 1C produces a positive impact on students’ ability to write well in their upper division coursework. It leads to better performance, not only on papers and test essays, but on more challenging projects, such as research papers and senior theses, that come later in the undergraduate academic career. In particular, the CNAS curricula assume English 1C completion in the lower division. Committee members supported the CNAS position that English 1C (or its WAC equivalent) should be completed well before senior year.

*Professor Briggs refrained from voting since he is the author of the proposal.
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: April 8, 2009
Approved by the Committee on Preparatory Education: April 14, 2009
Approved by the Bourns College of Engineering Executive Committee: March 31, 2009
Approved by the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences: April 10, 2009
Reviewed by the Executive Committee of AGSM: Not approved May 26, 2009
Reviewed by the Executive Committee of CNAS: Not approved October 15, 2009

*Revised (11/4/09) to include Executive Council amendments approved June 22, 2009.
** Revised (11/16/09) to include clarifications of implementation from COC and CEP

Writing Across the Curriculum Approvals:
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: 10-29-2010
Approved by the Committee on Preparatory Education: 10-27-2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: 10-13-2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of BCOE: 10-14-2010
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to
be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 11-05-2010
Endorsed by the Executive Council: 11-08-2010