

## Promoting Student Success at FAU: Infusing a Culture of Writing Through Tailored Curricular Change

Principal Contacts: Jeffrey R. Galin, Associate Professor English  
Sharon Dormire, Assistant Dean Undergraduate Programs, Nursing  
Patricia Patterson, Associate Professor, School of Public Administration

### 1. FOCUS

The Culture of Writing Initiative (CWI) provides a roadmap for ensuring that FAU's students will be among the strongest writers in the Florida State University System (SUS). By building on the best practices of a thriving Writing Across the Curriculum program, this QEP plan would extend writing vertically through the 4-year departmental curriculum of at least half of the university undergraduate departments. Teams of Faculty Writing Fellows will review where writing occurs in their curricula, how writing is being taught, and where it might be fruitfully enhanced. Graduate Writing Fellows will support several sections of writing as graders and serve as raters for assessment procedures. **Such curricular changes and other support services will ensure that up to 70% of FAU students actively engage in the kinds of writing projects that improve their fundamental abilities to write, think, and research in their majors.**

While considerable progress has been made toward this goal, significantly more work must be done to transform the abilities of FAU graduates to write effectively and with critical reflection. Both the 2011 FAU Faculty<sup>1</sup> and Employer Surveys<sup>2</sup> rank the abilities to write clearly and logically and to critically evaluate information for decision making as two of the most desired skills of FAU students. Since its initial workshop in 2003, the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program has worked to meet these expectations by training over 270 faculty to better support student writing and by ensuring that the 250 WAC class sections each term meet the high expectations of WAC course syllabus guidelines. The present proposal builds on these achievements, but it extends well beyond them. The primary objective of the WAC program is to strengthen the quality of teaching writing at FAU by augmenting the minimal state requirements of four Gordon Rule writing based courses in the undergraduate curriculum, including College English. A significant reason why the WAC program has not had as broad an impact on undergraduate student writing across the university as desired is that 59%<sup>3</sup> of our enrolled undergraduate students are transfers from other institutions and likely have not taken any WAC courses at FAU by the time they enter their majors. Furthermore, only about 65 courses are currently WAC certified university-wide. The only way to support writing for this substantial population of students is to integrate it throughout departmental curricula.

In Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, 78% of undergraduate course sections, excluding ENC 1101 and ENC 1102, had enrollments of 30 students or fewer. This figure suggests that some writing assignments could be effectively integrated into curricula across the university if sufficient support, training, and attention were paid to writing embedded in the disciplines. Recent surveys of both WAC<sup>4</sup> and non-WAC faculty<sup>5</sup> have confirmed weaknesses in student writing. Although most instructors who responded to the survey are incorporating writing assignments into their curriculum in classes of fewer than 50 students, many are unsatisfied with the quality of the writing and are unsure how to help students.

John Bean explains this phenomenon noting that the 40-year WAC movement has changed the ways that faculty think about teaching writing, but has had a limited impact on what goes on in most classrooms (Bean, p. xviii). As a result, instructors' greatest concerns involve grammar, inability to think critically and engage with a text, lack of organizational skills, and inability to properly cite material, which leads to another area of particular concern, plagiarism. The emphasis of this QEP is not only on writing skills, but also on writing-to-learn beyond the currently designated WAC courses at Florida Atlantic University. Writing-to-learn "identifies a process whereby writing itself leads to greater understanding" of course content as opposed to memorizing facts or passively listening to lectures (Bean, 2001). According to some theorists, "Writing is one of the most effective ways to develop thinking" (Forsman, 1985).

While support for writing and effective teaching of writing has increased substantially since the WAC programs began, and the WAC assessment process has demonstrated that student writing in WAC courses improves from the first year to the upper division, these data reveal that serious concerns remain about the quality of writing and analytical thinking at FAU. **In order to address these concerns, this QEP proposes to enrich the quality of student writing and thinking through tailored curricular change in the disciplines, additional faculty training and support, student mentors, and a culture of writing that will be infused throughout the university curriculum.** As faculty across the university raise the expectations for student work, students will recognize that

<sup>1</sup> FAU QEP Faculty Survey, February 2011 <http://www.fau.edu/qep/QEP%20faculty%20survey%20tab%20results%20Feb%202011.doc>.

<sup>2</sup> FAU QEP Employer Survey, February 2011 <http://www.fau.edu/QEP/index.php>.

<sup>3</sup> Board of Governors Enrollment Files, 2010 <http://iea.fau.edu/Reports/Headcount.aspx>

<sup>4</sup> WAC Faculty Survey on Writing Across the Curriculum, Fall 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Survey of Faculty Teaching Non-WAC Certified Courses, Fall 2010.

writing does not belong to any one discipline. Rather, writing provides the framework for acquiring disciplinary knowledge in every field and undergirds work in nearly every workplace. Specifically, the following statements define Culture of Writing Initiative outcomes. FAU graduates will better be able to:

1. **Demonstrate effective critical thinking by developing written arguments appropriate to their disciplines and in response to given tasks.**
2. **Formulate research questions, pose disciplinary problems, and use disciplinary knowledge and methods to enter disciplinary debates.**
3. **Demonstrate proficiency in information literacy skills by locating, screening, evaluating, using, and citing sources of information properly.**
4. **Apply computer skills by using writing and communication technologies to learn, extend, and communicate knowledge acquired in their disciplines.**
5. **Revise, proofread, and edit their own work and the work of others.**

Through tailored curricular revision at the departmental level, FAU students will be immersed in the academic culture of writing. Building a solid foundation of general composition, FAU students will mature as writers through well-defined, discipline specific writing. **This vertical infusion of writing through the FAU curriculum will serve to enhance critical thinking, communication, and information technology skills of graduates.** The outcomes of this program directly support the FAU strategic goals: 2) Meeting statewide professional and workforce needs; 3) Building world-class academic programs and research capacity, and 7) Increasing the University's visibility. Graduates of this tailored, discipline-specific curriculum will be more thoroughly prepared to serve the workforce needs of the state.

## **2: THE PLAN IS DERIVED FROM DATA**

**There is widespread agreement regarding the significance of writing (and cognates including critical reading and thinking, and information literacy). However, there is an escalating need for curricular transformation related to writing.** Most promising in this regard is the potential for FAU to address this call. It is worth noting that of the five "highest performing benchmark items" for FAU's first year students, three are directly related to a culture of writing.<sup>6</sup> FAU's students score well compared to students at similar public institutions with regard to: courses emphasizing judgment of information for a variety of purposes (77% versus 70%), writing more than 4 papers over 5 pages long (64%, versus 29%), and prompt written or oral feedback from faculty (63% versus 54%). These markers signal strengths on which FAU could build. By examining the data from faculty, employers, and students, we can better understand the need for additional emphasis on writing in the majors.

Faculty: Without question, FAU's faculty place great importance on student abilities to "write clearly and logically." In a February 2011 survey conducted expressly to inform the QEP process, 95% of the 489 faculty respondents rated student writing as "very important." By far, writing outstripped every other academic skill evaluated in the survey. Having already rated writing "very important," survey respondents went on to emphasize it still further. In a subsequent open-ended question, faculty members were asked to identify which areas "should receive more emphasis in undergraduate education at FAU." A committee analysis of the number of responses mentioning specific concerns reveals that the emphases most desired by FAU's faculty were, in descending order: Student Writing (36 responses); Critical Thinking (27 responses); Decorum Issues (25); Engagement (15); Information Skills (14 responses); and Reasoning (also 14 responses).<sup>7</sup> A close look at the faculty responses themselves, and at the overlaps among them, shows that faculty intend an emphasis on writing to include not only the "mechanics" of written communication, but also critical thinking, logical reasoning, information literacy, intellectual engagement, and problem structuring. These are exactly the cognate skills encompassed within the writing-to-learn framework proposed here. It is also worth noting that faculty emphasis on writing is reflected in the three, distinct "pre-proposals" received by the FAU QEP Committee on the subject, and in the well rounded constituency engaged in the creation of the proposal at hand (see Section 6).

Employers: Employers<sup>8</sup> also place great importance on the ability of our graduates to "write clearly and logically" (2.91 on a scale of 1 to 3, n=331). Equally, those employers are concerned that FAU's graduates be able to "critically evaluate information for decision making" (2.85). A 2009 study by Peter Hart and Associates for the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU)<sup>9</sup> shows the consistency of FAU's findings with the needs and wishes of employers

---

<sup>6</sup> NSSE *Executive Snapshot*, 2010.

<sup>7</sup> QEP, Faculty Survey, February 2011, analysis of Question 2: "Areas which should receive more emphasis in undergraduate education at FAU," as coded by the committee, March 2011.

<sup>8</sup> FAU QEP Employer Survey, Spring 2011 <http://iea.fau.edu/Reports/gss.aspx>.

<sup>9</sup> Hart Research Associates. (2009). "Raising the bar: Employers' views on college learning in the wake of the economic downturn." Accessed April 5, 2011.

across the country. In Hart's national survey of 302 employers, 89% expressed the belief that colleges and universities should place greater emphasis on "the ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing." This top ranked emphasis was succeeded by a belief that "critical thinking and analytical reasoning skills" (81%) should be more emphasized.

Students: Most importantly, FAU students themselves recognize how critical writing is to their educations and their futures. When graduating seniors<sup>10</sup> were asked which of 19 skills were most important to them, the ability to "write clearly and logically" was the most frequently selected item. In that same survey, over 78% of the graduating students reported that their FAU education had contributed at least somewhat (33%) or a great deal (45%) to their ability to "write clearly and logically." About the same percentage reported that their education at FAU contributed to their ability to "locate, screen, and organize information," and an even higher percentage (81%) said their FAU education helped them to "critically evaluate information for decision making." On the whole, students, want opportunities: to write about things that matter to them; for new thinking and learning; to dig deeply and make connections; and to understand explicitly assignments' relationships to course material.<sup>11</sup>

The premium placed by faculty, employers, and students alike on writing and other strongly associated higher order thinking skills indicates that significant work remains. In placing emphasis on writing, faculty members do not suggest that their expectations are met; to the contrary, their comments indicate some urgency regarding the need for improvement (see Section 2). Similarly, FAU senior year respondents report considerable emphasis on rote memorization in their courses, though not as much as first year respondents, who might more reasonably be expected to memorize fundamentals (59 % versus 71% reporting "quite a bit" or "very much," respectively). Further supporting the need for improvement in our writing outcomes, the 194 employers who rated the abilities of FAU students to write clearly and logically also suggest renewed efforts are needed. On a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 is the most desired response, employers<sup>12</sup> rated the writing performance of FAU graduates at 3.12, the equivalent of a B.

### 3. Scope of Plan

The Culture of Writing Initiative emerges from successful Writing Across the Curriculum Departmental Grants as represented by current efforts in Civil Engineering, the School of Nursing, and the School of Social Work. Anthropology, and Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry. These programs serve as the inspiration for this QEP. Additional departments have committed to participate in this proposed Culture of Writing Initiative: English, History, Criminology, Chemistry, Communications, Political Science, and Language, Linguistics & Comparative Literature. Also, The Department of Teaching and Learning has agreed to deliver writing enriched applied learning courses to all undergraduate education majors. Furthermore, all undergraduate students in the School of Business would participate through a series of writing enriched courses in the core Business curriculum. The Department of English has also committed to restructuring College English II, provide additional training for Graduate Teaching Assistants, and develop additional writing classes for incoming students. In addition to reviewing and enhancing its own curriculum, English will work with other departments participating in this QEP to design discipline-specific sections of College Writing II that reflect the unique needs of students entering in that major.

Based on current commitments alone, we will be able to reach 56% (12,317/22,418)<sup>13</sup> of undergraduate students in the university. If the QEP is selected, additional departments will be contacted to participate to reach the target of 70%. As more departments commit to teaching writing effectively and students are held to Culture of Writing outcomes in their courses, the quality of student writing and analytical thinking will rise correspondingly.

### Implementation Timetable

- **Summer of 2011:** Three departments of the nine that have already committed to participate will identify Faculty Writing Fellows. Administrators will be hired—half-time Director and half-time Associate Director, Coordinator, and half-time administrative support.
- **Fall 2011:** Faculty Writing Fellows will receive stipends to: inventory departmental curricula; develop proposals to identify writing enriched courses that will be implemented in their departments; attend workshops; collaborate with research librarians and the Director of Writing Programs; collaborate with departmental colleagues to implement the approved proposal; and help establish departmental assessment plans to evaluate the outcomes of planned curricular changes. Two 2-hour workshops will be scheduled for all Writing Fellows over the course of the term to introduce writing-to-learn pedagogies and to workshop departmental proposals.

---

<sup>10</sup> Graduating Seniors Survey, Results for Academic Year 2009-2010. <http://iea.fau.edu/Reports/gss.aspx>.

<sup>11</sup> D. Bartholomae and B. Matway. "The Pittsburgh Study of Writing." *Across the Disciplines* Vol. 7 Online. [http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/bartholomae\\_matway2010/part\\_two.cfm](http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/bartholomae_matway2010/part_two.cfm).

<sup>12</sup> FAU QEP Employer survey, Spring 2011.

<sup>13</sup> Board of Governors Enrollment Files, Fall 2010. <http://iea.fau.edu/Reports/Headcount.aspx>.

- **Spring 2012:** Finalized tailored plans will be approved and formalized. Faculty Fellows will attend two additional workshops, *Responding to Student Writing* and *Assessing Outcomes*. Initial departmental implementation will include: revising syllabi, assignments, developing rubrics for student work, and assessment procedures. Training programs will be developed in collaboration between CWI staff and Faculty Fellows for Graduate Writing Fellows, most likely in the form of a pedagogy course that would rotate each year through participating departments in their respective colleges. Some departments may be able to implement changes in Spring and Summer 2012 courses. Four additional department teams will be identified.
- **Summer 2012:** Baseline writing samples will be collected using departmental rubrics. Departmental teams will meet as available. Graduate Teaching Fellows (GTFs) will be hired and assigned to departments based on department proposals. These GTFs will support up to three courses of 25-30 students.
- **Fall 2012:** Full implementation of the first three department team plans. Two additional Writing Center Consultants will be hired to better support increased demand. Faculty Writing Best Practices Symposium and National Day on Writing events for students will be hosted. The next four departments selected will repeat the implementation schedule of the previous year.
- **Spring 2013:** Spring Student Showcases will be held in addition to the Undergraduate Research Symposium. The four additional departments will continue with their implementation schedule.
- **Summer 2013:** Graduate Writing Fellows will be paid to evaluate departmental writing samples with the support of a Faculty Writing Fellow from each college and the CWI administrative team.
- **Fall 2013-2016:** The department plan cycle will be repeated for a total of five years until 19 departments have implemented their action plans. The final year will serve primarily as an assessment year to evaluate and disseminate the outcomes of departmental proposals.

#### 4. Clear Plan for Assessment

The primary goals for assessment of this QEP proposal are grounded in the student outcomes from the project overall. There will be two parallel assessment procedures using student writing. One of these will be a department-level assessment and the other will be a university-wide assessment. In addition, a set of quantitative measures will be collected that will provide programmatic results and impacts. Finally, these measures will also be compared to the existing university-wide WAC assessment data.

Departmental Assessments: Each participating team of Faculty Writing Fellows will inventory its own departmental curriculum and determine where writing that satisfies the student outcomes criteria will be infused into its courses. Not every class will need to account for all five outcomes, but each Culture of Writing course must at least draw upon three of the five outcomes. Department personnel will work with the QEP administrators to tailor a departmental rubric for measuring the student learning outcomes that they have chosen to assess. This rubric may be limited exclusively to student learning outcomes, or it may also include elements borrowed from the university-wide WAC rubric<sup>14</sup>. If teams include additional traits from the WAC rubric, they may be able to partially satisfy the Academic Learning Compact assessment requirements for the university. During each year of participation in the Culture of Writing Initiative (CWI), student writing samples will be collected from classes that are writing enriched and comparable classes that are not. These papers will be submitted through a modified version of the existing WAC assessment Web interface, which will simplify data collection, norming, and rating. The comparison of writing enriched and non-enriched courses will allow for direct evaluation of the impact of departmental participation in the Culture of Writing Initiative.

University-Wide Culture of Writing Initiative Assessment: The same papers collected for the departmental assessment process will also be rated at the university level for textual traits, using a modified version of the WAC rubric. The WAC interface will enable assessment coordinators in the departments and at the university level to select the specific pool of papers desired for each assessment procedure. In addition to these two assessment procedures, the ongoing WAC assessment process will continue from a separate pool of papers collected from WAC courses.<sup>15</sup> We can also determine if those who take both kinds of courses score higher than either pool taking only one or the other. Finally, we can target transfer students who major in disciplines that do not sponsor either WAC or CWI courses and collect papers from them for additional comparisons. Such a rich set of assessment data will give us a clear picture of which programs seem to produce the best writers and which need additional support to help their students improve.

---

<sup>14</sup> Writing Across the Curriculum rubric <http://www.fau.edu/wac>.

<sup>15</sup> This rich set of assessment results could be used to compare the quality of writing in WAC classes with papers from CWI classes. We could determine whether students who take only CWI courses at FAU achieve consistent outcomes with those who take predominantly WAC courses.

Additional Quantitative Outcomes: In addition to these direct measures of student outcomes, we will also collect data that includes: 1) how many courses are CWI certified; 2) how many students are impacted by these courses; and 3) how many faculty are trained either directly through the Culture of Writing initiative or by Faculty Writing Fellows from their own departments. In addition, we can survey students, faculty, and community business partners to monitor perceptions of writing quality from each set of stakeholders. Furthermore, benchmarks will be set for the quality of each outcome that all students should meet. Each year of the assessment process, we would expect to increase the number of students meeting or exceeded the determined goals.

## 5. Resources Needed for Implementation

The Culture of Writing QEP development team estimates that the resources required to implement and administer the plan would be as follows (Please see attached budget worksheet for additional details):

- The total salary and benefits package for the **Director and Associate Director** \$729,440 over the 6 year period from 20011-2016. One half-time Director would manage all department and faculty contact, setting schedules, overseeing budgets, assessment processes, and all managerial elements of the program. The Associate Director would be responsible for managing all training for faculty, collaborating on training design for Graduate Writing Fellows, participating in assessment design and university-wide assessments of the program. And both Director and Associate Director would review all proposals with the **Director of Scholarship of Teaching** before they went before the Culture of Writing Board of Advisors.
- An additional \$345,600 would cover a **Coordinator** and half time **Administrative Support**. The Coordinator would be responsible for planning all student and faculty events, Faculty Writing Best Practices Fall Symposium, National Day on Writing, Spring Student Showcases, as well as supporting departmental proposals, weekly meetings with team members, and most correspondence. The ½ time administrative assistant would provide administrative support for all three administrators.
- Up to five additional **Writing Center Consultants** added incrementally over the five years would support increased demand. \$54,000 would cover two additional consultants the first year, two additional the fourth year and one more the final year, for a total of five at 10 hours a week.
- The 3 **Faculty Writing Fellows** (FWF) from each of 19 departments (totaling 57) would receive one-time, \$5000 stipends totaling \$285,000 over the five years. These departmental teams of three Faculty Fellows will be compensated for a one year commitment to inventory departmental curricula for writing; propose implementation of writing enriched courses that insure quality teaching of small amounts of writing; and develop discipline- or course-specific rubrics for the collection and assessment of student writing. Fellows will also consult with research librarians to incorporate information literacy strategies where appropriate.
- The 3 **Graduate Writing Fellows** (GWF) from each of 19 departments (57) would cost about \$1,711,000.00 for the five years. After the first year with nine fellows, twelve would be added each year for four years. These GWFs would provide support for up to 3 sections of CWI courses a term in sections of no more than 30 students. GWFs each would be expected to respond carefully to one set of 4-6 page papers with revisions for each of two to three course sections. They would also serve as normed raters at the end of the school year to evaluate a stratified random sample of student papers from writing enriched courses within each college. They would receive \$100 a day for three days of assessment additional stipend for assessments each year. One Faculty Fellow from each college would be asked to help facilitate the assessment processes each year.
- Four **Faculty Development Seminars** for five years, at a total of \$10,000, would provide the Faculty Writing Fellows training and support for developing and implementing departmental Culture of Writing plans and rubrics. They also provide materials and strategies for FWFs to train and support other faculty in their own departments and help learning to manage the department assessment processes.
- **Faculty Writing Best Practices Fall Symposium** provides a forum for all FWFs and GWFs to learn from the experience of FWFs and GWFs that have implemented Culture of Writing Plans in their departments. During the first year, recipients of previous WAC Departmental Grants would present. Then each year, participants from each department team would be expected present best practices from their own programs. The annual \$750 covers symposium costs and awards. An additional \$3000 a year covers keynote speaker costs for travel and lodging. Total cost is \$19,500 for six years.
- **The National Day on Writing** is an annual event recognized nationally by hundreds of writing programs across the country. This event sponsors writing contests and a day of writing activities in public locations on campus to invite students to explore what makes writing enjoyable and interesting. Activities range from word games to flash fiction. The activities are designed to raise awareness of writing in a carnival-like atmosphere and to provide a forum for authors to share their work and meet student writers. \$5000 covers expenses, prizes, and honorariums for invited speakers.

- **Spring Student Showcases** provide opportunities for students who are not participating in the research symposium to read from their work written in CWI courses. This forum provides a real reason for students to revise and share their thoughts on disciplinary issues that are addressed in their classes. \$5000 covers promotional costs and awards for five years.
- **Best Practices Conferences** for QEP Director and Associate Director provide opportunities for professional development and the ability to stay current with SACs and WAC research. \$14,000 will cover costs over six years at \$2,800 a year.
- **Assessment Software** has been developed by IRM over the course of the past three years. This assessment interface will have to be adapted substantially to accommodate the additional student paper assessment procedures. We will need to hire a programmer to make these modifications. Estimated cost is \$10,000 per year, totaling \$60,000.
- Both **Department and University-wide rating processes** will be undertaken during the 5 years of the official QEP. All GWFs will participate in the rating processes using departmentally developed rubrics. Raters will be normed and will rate for 3 days at a cost of \$100 per day. An additional crew of three raters each year up to twenty raters for five days, eight hours a day, at \$100 a day will amount to \$34,840 over the five years. These raters will use a university-wide rubric developed by the WAC Committee over the course of the past five years.
- **Faculty Travel Stipends** will provide FWFs and GWFs opportunities to attend WAC and other disciplinary specific conferences to share the interesting innovations they have developed in their programs. Each year five participants will receive \$500 to allay costs. These stipends will rotate annually. Total cost for five years will be \$12,500.
- **Office supplies**, two laptop computers, an LCD projector, one phone line, and copy services will cost a total of \$38,000 over six years.

## 6. Institutional Constituencies

The Culture of Writing Initiative will have a broad impact across a wide range of institutional constituencies and has required significant, broad-based collaboration in its creation.

Impact of the Initiative on Institutional Constituencies: Over half of the departments at FAU will participate in the Culture of Writing Initiative (including five departments that are serving as models as part of the WAC Departmental Grants). The group of 24 departments/schools impact at least 70% of our student body. Even though fifty-seven faculty members will be participating officially, each of those faculty members will be working with other departmental colleagues to ensure wide dissemination of Culture of Writing ideas and practices.

Students are, of course, the greatest beneficiaries of this program. Furthermore, a substantial number of graduate students will be trained and mentored as effective teachers of writing in their disciplines (57). As they enroll in higher degrees and beyond, they will take these skills with them to continue this work outside of FAU. As the culture of writing grows at FAU, our institution will become known as the writing university of the SUS in Florida. This designation will distinguish us from all other state universities and help to make FAU a destination of choice for future students.

Collaborative Creation and Implementation of the Initiative: Preparation of this proposal has required, and will continue to require, the collaboration of many colleges, colleagues, and constituencies. In addition, it has successfully folded together three distinct pre-proposals, both expert and non-expert, from three distinct perspectives and colleges. As evidenced by the Initiative's implementation details (sections 3 & 5), and by its Board of Advisors, involvement is both in-depth and broad-based.

### Members of the Culture of Writing Initiative Board of Advisors:

WAC Program and UCEW:	Jeffrey R. Galin
College of Nursing:	Sharon Dormire, Kelly White, and Shirley Gordon
College of Design & Social Inquiry	School of Public Administration: Patricia Patterson
	School of Social Work: Michelle Hawkins, Naelys Diaz, and Gail Horton
College of Education:	Department of Curriculum, Culture, & Educational Inquiry, James McLaughlin
College of Science:	Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry: Jerry Haky, Donna Chameley Wiik, and Evonne Rezler
	Director of Scholarship of Teaching and Director for Program Assessment, Charles E. Schmidt College of Science: Jennifer Peluso
College of Arts & Letters:	Department of English: Wenying Xu and Barclay Barrios
	Department of History: Patty Kollander
College of Engineering & Computer Science:	Department of Civil, Environmental, & Geomatics Engineering: Dan Meerooff and Pete Scarlatos
Instructional Librarian:	Lyn LaVigne
Undergraduate Studies	Director, Center for Learning & Student Success: Jennifer Bebergal