**Mission Statement for FAU WAC Program:**

The University’s Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program supports faculty to strengthen teaching and learning writing across all levels and disciplines in undergraduate education. We collaborate with individual faculty and departments to instill in their students critical thinking and complex problem solving through the complementary processes of reading and writing.

**Goals:**

(1) **Support the Teaching of Writing:** Assist colleges, departments, and individual faculty members with specific strategies to support student writing (e.g. designing and sequencing of assignments, providing feedback on and evaluation of student work)

(2) **Maintain WAC Courses:** Ensure consistency and quality of WAC courses over time across the university (e.g. maintaining WAC guidelines through previewing, approving, and reviewing syllabi)

(3) **Assess Outcomes:** Collect and assess student writing to provide feedback to departments so they can set benchmarks for improving student outcomes

(4) **Enrich Departmental Curriculum:** Lead departments, schools, and colleges through the processes of integrating writing systematically throughout their majors and concentrations (e.g. facilitating department-wide discussions to identify desired student outcomes, mapping departmental curricula, creating assessment plans, and designing departmental proposals for revising curricula in majors and concentrations)

(5) **Recognize Excellence:** Recognize and promote student and faculty success in writing through campus-wide events (e.g. National Day on Writing, student publication awards, and creative presentations)

**On a scale of 0-6, what are the levels of Sustainability Indicators (SIs) for each goal and the program overall? NOTE: 1 is the lowest range of sustainability and 5 is the highest range of sustainability; 1-5 = band of equilibrium (BOE); 0 and 6 are outside the BOE and are typically not sustainable.**

**SIs are graphed in radar charts to obtain a snapshot of program viability at a given time. If data is collected annually, trends emerge in the data that help anticipate signs of distress and convert them into signs of success.**

**Goal 1 - Support the Teaching of Writing:**

1. Identify level of reading and writing strategies and techniques provided in WAC training that faculty have implemented in their WAC classes, including the following. Each level is cumulative of the previous levels.

0. **Not participating:** Not fulfilling any WAC criteria listed below

1. **Below required minimum:** not providing one or two of

1. revision (beyond editing and paragraph-level changes),
2. thesis-driven writing (evidence-based analysis and conclusions), or
3. provide formative written feedback on at least one thesis-driven paper.

2. **Required minimum:**

1. revision (beyond editing and paragraph-level changes),
2. thesis-driven writing (evidence-based analysis and conclusions), and
3. provide formative written feedback on at least one thesis-driven paper.

3. **Above required minimum**: In addition to previous criteria,

1. assign a range of informal to formal writing assignments that engage students in the intellectual work of the class,
2. discuss strategies for improving student writing in class,
3. discuss organizational strategies, and
4. utilize a formal system for style and citation.

4. **Average**: In addition to all previous criteria,

1. incorporate disciplinary-based reading strategies (how to read an academic argument),
2. revise assignment prompts to incorporate at least five elements of effective assignment design,
3. utilize a system for students to track their patterns of error,
4. and utilize peer review.

5. **Above Average:** In addition to all previous criteria,

1. assign and grade at least three formal writing assignments (of 4-5 pages) with formal revisions or a semester-long research project with at least three stages of writing all revised.

6. **High range**: In addition to all previous criteria,

1. assign a fourth formal writing assignment with formal revision or 1 short paper with revision and a semester-long research project with at least three stages of writing assignments revised, incorporate all seven elements of effective assignment design, and use primary and secondary sources effectively.
2. Identify level of reading and writing strategies and techniques provided in WAC training that faculty have implemented in their non-WAC classes.

0. **Not Participating:** Providing none of the criteria listed below

1. **Below required minimum:** not providing one or two of

1. revision (beyond editing and paragraph-level changes),
2. thesis-driven writing (evidence-based analysis and conclusions), or
3. provide formative written feedback on at least one thesis-driven paper.

2. **Required minimum:**

1. revision (beyond editing and paragraph-level changes),
2. thesis-driven writing (evidence-based analysis and conclusions), and
3. provide formative written feedback on at least one thesis-driven paper.

3. **Above required minimum**: In addition to previous criteria,

1. assign a range of informal to formal writing assignments that engage students in the intellectual work of the class,
2. discuss strategies for improving student writing in class,
3. discuss organizational strategies, and
4. utilize a formal system for style and citation.

4. **Average**: In addition to all previous criteria,

1. incorporate disciplinary-based reading strategies (how to read an academic argument),
2. revise assignment prompts to incorporate at least five elements of effective assignment design,
3. utilize a system for students to track their patterns of error,
4. and utilize peer review.

5. **Above Average:** In addition to all previous criteria,

1. assign and grade at least three formal writing assignments (of 4-5 pages) with formal revisions or a semester-long research project with at least three stages of writing all revised.

6. **High range**: In addition to all previous criteria,

1. assign a fourth formal writing assignment with formal revision or 1 short paper with revision and a semester-long research project with at least three stages of writing assignments revised, incorporate all seven elements of effective assignment design, and use primary and secondary sources effectively.
2. The number of WAC courses WAC faculty teach annually?
	1. 0
	2. 1 – 2
	3. 3 - 4
	4. 5 - 6
	5. 7 - 8
	6. 9 -10
	7. 11 or more
3. The number of departments actively teaching WAC classes per academic year. C
4. 0
5. 1- 5
6. 6 - 10
7. 11 - 15
8. 16 - 20
9. 21 - 25
10. 26 or more

**Goal 2 - Maintain WAC Courses:**

1. Percentage of WAC courses that meet all of WAC criteria posted on WAC website. C
	1. 50 or less
	2. 51 - 60%
	3. 61 - 70%
	4. 71 - 80%
	5. 81 - 90%
	6. 91 - 95%
	7. 96 - 100%
2. What percentage of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ teach WAC courses?

*Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty*?

* 1. 0%
	2. 1 - 15%
	3. 16 - 30%
	4. 31 - 45%
	5. 46 - 60%
	6. 61 - 75%
	7. 76% or more

*Non-Tenure Track faculty*?

1. 0%
2. 1 - 15%
3. 16 - 30%
4. 31 - 45%
5. 46 - 60%
6. 61 - 75%
7. 76% or more

 *Graduate Students*

1. 0%
2. 1 - 15%
3. 16 - 30%
4. 31 - 45%
5. 46 - 60%
6. 61 - 75%
7. 76% or more
8. Percentage of the same faculty teaching the same WAC courses every year.
	1. 0
	2. 1 - 15%
	3. 16 - 30%
	4. 31 - 45%
	5. 46 - 60%
	6. 61 - 75%
	7. 76% or more
9. Quality of student writing in participating departments upon graduation:
	1. Does not meet expectations
	2. Barely meets expectations
	3. Partially meets expectations
	4. Meets expectations
	5. Minimally exceeds expectations
	6. Moderately exceeds expectations
	7. Fully exceeds expectations
10. Degree to which WAC courses are improving student writing
	1. Not at all
	2. Minor degree
	3. Nearly acceptable degree
	4. Acceptable degree
	5. Above-acceptable degree
	6. Strong degree
	7. Extraordinary degree
11. Number of departments that have WAC courses and/or WEC initiative C
	1. 1 - 4 departments
	2. 5 - 8 departments
	3. 9 - 12 departments
	4. 13 - 17 departments
	5. 18 - 22 departments
	6. 23 - 27 departments
	7. 28 or more departments
12. Percentage of WAC sections being taught per academic year university-wide. C
	1. 0%
	2. 1 - 5%
	3. 6 - 10%
	4. 11 - 15%
	5. 16 - 20%
	6. 21 - 25%
	7. More than 26%

**Goal 3 - Assess Outcomes:**

1. Percentage of student participation in the WAC assessment process, by college and department J
	1. 0 - 39%
	2. 40 - 50%
	3. 51 - 60%
	4. 61 - 70%
	5. 71 - 80%
	6. 81 - 90%
	7. 91 - 100%
2. Demographic distribution of raters in the annual WAC assessment from one department J
	1. 0 - 5%
	2. 5 - 20%
	3. 21 - 40%
	4. 41 - 60%
	5. 61 - 80%
	6. 81 - 95%
	7. 96 - 100%
3. Quality of student writing across the university over time on a WAC rating scale of 1-4 J
	1. 0 – 1 (Does not meet expectations)
	2. 1.1 - 1.5 (Barely meets expectations)
	3. 1.6 - 2.0 (Partially meets expectations)
	4. 2.1 - 2.5 (Meets expectations)
	5. 2.6 - 3.0 (Slightly exceeds expectations)
	6. 3.1 - 3.5 (Significantly exceeds expectations)
	7. 3.6 - 4.0 (Fully exceeds expectations)
4. Number of departments using the benchmarking system to identify interventions to improve the teaching of writing. J
	1. 0
	2. 1 - 2
	3. 3 - 4
	4. 5 - 6
	5. 7 - 8
	6. 9 -10
	7. 11 or more
5. Student writing improving as a result of departmental interventions targeted in the benchmarking system (departments meeting or exceeding their benchmark goals) J
	1. 0 departments reaching targets
	2. 1 - 2
	3. 3 - 4
	4. 5 - 6
	5. 7 - 8
	6. 9 -10
	7. 11 or more

1. Validity and reliability of WAC assessment process

(Consistency and sufficiency of inter-rater reliability during the assessment process) (depends on how inter-rater reliability is determined…)

1. Percentage of departments university-wide submitting WEC assessment results and using the results to improve departmental support for writing. J
	1. 0 - 10%
	2. 11 - 25%
	3. 26 - 40%
	4. 41 - 55%
	5. 56 - 70%
	6. 71 - 85%
	7. 86 - 100%

**Goal 4 - Enrich Departmental Curriculum:**

1. Number of departments expressing interest in participating in the WEC process in the next 4 years J
	1. 0
	2. 1 - 2
	3. 3 - 4
	4. 5 - 6
	5. 7 - 8
	6. 9 - 10
	7. 11 or more
2. Percentage of departments (out of x number) with assessment results that demonstrate student improvement in their writing over time. J
	1. 0 - 9%
	2. 10 - 24%
	3. 25 - 39%
	4. 40 - 54%
	5. 55 - 69%
	6. 70 - 84%
	7. 85 - 100%
3. Degree to which WEC initiative enables departments to improve teaching of writing as demonstrated by faculty perceptions and student outcomes.
	1. Not at all
	2. Minor degree
	3. Nearly acceptable degree
	4. Acceptable degree
	5. Above-acceptable degree
	6. Strong degree
	7. Extraordinary degree
4. Percentage of departments (out of x number) meet the goals they set in their proposals/revisions (within a semester leeway) on the schedule that they established J
	1. 0 - 9%
	2. 10 - 24%
	3. 25 - 39%
	4. 40 - 54%
	5. 55 - 69%
	6. 70 - 84%
	7. 85 - 100%
5. Estimated average number of available administrative hours per semester to manage the WEC program J C
	1. over 41 hours available
	2. 31-40 hours available
	3. 10-30 hours available
	4. 9 or less hours available or deficit (this semester, in my opinion)
	5. 10-30 hours deficit
	6. 31-40 hours deficit
	7. over 41 hours deficit
6. Percent of funds available that are needed to support the WEC program per year. J
	1. Over 15% more needed
	2. about 10% more needed
	3. about 5% more needed
	4. no additional needed
	5. about 5% surplus
	6. about 10% surplus
	7. about 15 % surplus

**Goal 5 - Recognize Excellence**

1. Number of students participating in the Provost’s recognition of student publication process C
	1. > 10 or less
	2. 11 - 20
	3. 21 - 30
	4. 31 - 40
	5. 41 - 50
	6. 51 - 60
	7. 61 or more
2. Number of faculty recognized annually for their work in WEC program C
	1. 0
	2. 1 – 5 (5)
	3. 6 - 10
	4. 11 - 15
	5. 16 - 20
	6. 21 - 25
	7. 26 or more
3. Number of annual submissions to the Arnold H Kossoff Pen to Paper essay contest. C
	1. 0 - 40
	2. 41 - 80
	3. 81 - 100
	4. 101 - 140
	5. 141 - 180
	6. 181 - 220
	7. 221 or more
4. Number of events annually for faculty writing, recognition, or support J
	1. 0 events
	2. 1 - 2 events
	3. 3 - 4 events
	4. 5 - 6 events
	5. 7 - 8 events
	6. 9 - 10 events
	7. 11 or more

**Program Overall:**

WAC Program contribution to transformational change of the curricular ecology of the university

1. Number of WAC committee members attending committee meetings. C

0 - 39%

40 - 49%

50 - 60%

61 - 70%

71 - 80%

81 - 90%

91 - 100%

1. Percentage of additional administrative time needed to manage the WAC program per semester C J
	1. Over 41 hours available
	2. 31-40 hours available
	3. 10-30 hours available
	4. 9 or less hours surplus or deficit
	5. 10-30 hours deficit (in my opinion, if working on WEC initiative)
	6. 31-40 hours deficit
	7. Over 41 hours deficit

1. Level of University support for the WAC program J
	1. No policies
	2. Faculty senate approved WAC courses
	3. Faculty senate approved WAC courses and required faculty training for WAC
	4. Faculty senate approved WAC courses, required faculty training for WAC, WEC program, and university-wide assessment model
	5. Faculty senate approved WAC courses, required WAC faculty training, WEC program, university-wide assessment model, and verbal support from upper administration.
	6. Faculty senate approved WAC courses, required faculty WAC training, WEC program, university-wide assessment model, recognition for teaching WAC courses for promotion and tenure, written support from upper administration
	7. Faculty senate approved WAC courses, required faculty WAC training, WEC program, university-wide assessment model, and recognition for teaching WAC courses for promotion and tenure, written support from upper administration, and fully funded permanent budget