



FACULTY SENATE

Minutes
March 11, 2013

Senators in Attendance: 54

Absent: Anesthesiology (Schapiro), BSAD (Dempsey), Education (Salambier), Family Medicine (Nicholas), FPPC (Ross), Libraries (Spitzform), Neuroscience (Hehir), Nutrition & Food Science (Pritchard), Orthopaedic Rehabilitation (Zweber), Pathology (Wilcox), Pediatrics (D'Amico) (Wittpenn), Physics (Headrick), PSC (Rodgers), Psychiatry (Naylor), Radiology (Green), RSCA (Galbraith), SAC (Prue), Sociology (Macias), Surgery (Adams) (Trotter)

- 1. Approval of the Minutes.** The minutes of February 11, 2013 were approved as written.
- 2. Senate President's Remarks.** President Roberts addressed the senate with welcoming remarks. She also announced the outcome of the referendum ballot to change the name of the Research, Scholarship, & Graduate Education Committee to Research, Scholarship, & the Creative Arts. The Faculty Senate voted in favor of this change that will reflect the inclusion of the creative arts in the business of this Senate committee. It is important to note that the charge of the committee has not changed.
- 3. UVM President's Remarks.** President Sullivan commented on four items of University business while speaking to the Faculty Senate. The first item he wanted to update the Senate on was the proposal for a tobacco free environment at UVM. A memo will be sent out shortly to collect feedback from the university community.

Second, President Sullivan wanted to thank the Budget Advisory Committee and Don Ross for their hard work this semester. The committee has reviewed the budget self-study document as well as gathered input from faculty, staff, and students. The goal of this exercise is to gain a clear understanding of the current budget model, and identify opportunities to change for future success.

The next update was regarding the announcement of Vice President of Research, and Dean of the Graduate College leaving UVM to step into the Provost position at the University of Delaware. The administration plans to look into the role and associated responsibilities of the VPR position before beginning a search to replace Dean Grasso. It was questioned whether or not it would be possible for the University community to have input into the evaluation of the VPR position as well as the role of the Graduate College. Sullivan responded that he is open to receiving input on this matter and will continue to communicate with the Faculty Senate Executive Council as work on this progresses.

Finally, the President wanted to inform the Faculty Senate of an upcoming policy change. UVM will be changing their policy for same sex benefits so that it is not a taxable benefit making it more similar to the benefits heterosexual couples have access to. UVM will make a tax adjustment for homosexual couples (relationship defined via Vermont State law) of up to \$1000. Sullivan acknowledged that this does not provide the *same* benefit as heterosexual couples; however, it was as close to a parallel policy as the administration could get without infringing on other rights such as personal privacy. The figure of \$1000 was decided upon after an analysis and review of industry best practices and assessing similar benefits at peer institutions.

4. **FY14 Budget Update – Interim Provost Bob Low.** Provost Low gave a brief update on the progress of the FY14 budget. Budget hearings are currently underway within the academic units. There has been a request that the administration become more proactive in budget planning by generating forecasted budgets for the next 3-5 years. It is hoped that this will not only minimize the reactive nature of the budget planning process here at UVM but it will also put FY14 into context. Provost Low acknowledged that there needs to be a focus on raising revenue over the next few years to support University initiatives. It is important to note that some initiatives such as writing in the disciplines have already had funding committed. Some discussions that are taking place that may result in increased revenue include but are not limited to, distance education, the role of the Graduate College, and the institution of a summer semester.

It was questioned whether or not UVM would be changing budget models in the near future. Provost Low responded that changing models was a possibility. The current goal however, is to make sure that the FY14 makes sense and aligns with future goals.

5. **Curricular Affairs.** Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee, Cathy Paris, presented two items of business to the Faculty Senate. The first was a proposed change of delivery mode for a portion of the RN-BS program. Currently, a portion of this program had been delivered via Interactive Television. This requires students in those courses to located an Interactive Television studio to attend class at a specific time. It is being proposed that the material covered via this technology be transitioned to an online format. Not only will this be more accessible to students, it will also provide more flexibility for those students to review this coursework on their own schedule. It was also noted that transitioning this delivery mode will not change the material, and will provide a small cost savings to the University. When put to a vote, the proposal was approved.

The second proposal to come from the CAC is to have UVM move back to a previous, more liberal version of the “walk” policy. The previous version of the policy stated that students could participate in commencement if they were within six credits of completing their degree requirements. The current policy states that only students who have completed their degree requirements may participate in commencement. This policy coupled with the changing December’s ceremony to a formal commencement has proven problematic given the inability to identify students who will receive a degree in January after the Faculty Senate confers degrees. This issue arises as a result of a strange timeline regarding the last day of exams, grade submission deadlines, the ceremony itself, and the date the degrees are conferred. The CAC explored the student, family, faculty, and

administrative perspectives when considering this proposal. Arguments were made in support of the proposal as it allows students to celebrate with their initial cohort which is an important part of the college experience (especially in professional programs). It was also noted that some programs that require service outside of UVM such as student teaching hours, will not receive credit for these until after they are completed. This is often on public school calendars which run later in the year than the UVM calendar. One argument that did not support the proposal was that the definition of commencement is that the student has met all degree requirements, and therefore only those who have should be able to participate. It was also mentioned that by allowing students who weren't done with their program to participate it could diminish the meaning of the event for those who were done.

Discussion brought up interest in how many students who participated under the old policy (and December ceremonies in recent years) actually went on to complete their degree. This data is not readily available. It was suggested that the proposal be approved with the addition of a phrase that students must be in good academic standing to participate in graduation under this new policy. This discussion went past the allotted time, and it was decided to continue it at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

- 6. First Year Writing Pilot Report.** The report on the First Year Writing Pilot had been circulated previously with the Faculty Senate meeting materials. Nancy Welch, gave an overview of the pilot and the report, and then opened the presentation up for questions and discussion. Feedback that came from the Senate included adding more data (beyond self-reporting) in the document to support findings, explain why certain faculty groups didn't want to participate, and a section showing if these outcomes could be repeated in other courses. Nancy thanked the Senators for their input and encouraged them to contact her with additional feedback or questions. The discussion also produced questions about general education in overall especially related to the timeline for implementation. The Senate was reminded that the First Year Writing pilot was used to develop a method for the remaining outcomes to build off of.
- 7. Envisioning Environment.** This item of business was postponed.
- 8. Fossil Fuel Divestment.** The student group working to raise awareness and gain support in their effort to get UVM to divest from fossil fuels brought a motion for Faculty Senate Support. The group presented many reasons for divestment, one of which is that it is central to the mission and vision of the University of Vermont to be a leader in environmental initiatives. Divestment is a short term action UVM can take to show it's commitment to the environment. Currently there are approximately 250 similar campaigns at universities across the US. The risk associated with divesting from the accounts outlined in the proposal is minimal. Any costs associated with the actual divestment process could be taken out of the gift account the students have established with the Foundation. This account was set up after interest in supporting the initiative was expressed by current students, local businesses, and alumni. The vote resulted in the Faculty Senate supporting the resolution to divest from fossil fuels.
- 9. New Business.** There was no new business at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:33 pm.

**Findings and Initial Recommendations from the
First-Year Writing and Information Literacy Pilot and Assessment
February 27, 2013**

Prepared by Nancy Welch, interim director of first-year writing, in consultation with the First-Year Writing Working Group: Daisy Benson, Bailey Howe; Deborah Blom, Anthropology; Bill Mierse, Art History; Becky Miller, Biology; Deb Noel, English; Thomas Patterson, CDAE; Alison Pechenik, Computer Science; Lisa Schnell, Honors College; Cynthia Reyes, Education; Taylor Sacco, English; Peter VonDoepp, Political Science; and Jackie Weinstock, Leadership and Development Science

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Findings and Initial Recommendations	
Background	3
Promoting Foundational Goals in ENGS 1, TAP, and HCOL 85	3
Assessing the Pilot Semester	5
Initial Findings and Recommendations	14
Appendix A: Relationship between High School and College Writing	17
Appendix B: Foundational Writing and Information Literacy Goals	19
Appendix C: Student Survey Summary	21
Appendix D: January Assessment Retreat Scoring Sheet	26

Executive Summary

To learn whether the three writing-intensive courses most UVM first-year students currently take—ENGS 1, HCOL 85, and TAP—can work toward shared foundational writing and information literacy goals, the first-year writing group, headed by the interim director of first-year writing, conducted a Fall 2012 pilot of twelve sections.

- Six of the ten instructors responsible for these sections (one teaching two sections of ENGS 1; one teaching one section of HCOL 85; and all four TAP instructors) met regularly to determine the shared goals, revise their courses to work toward these goals, and participate in a modest program of faculty development.
- Four of the nine instructors (one teaching two sections of ENGS 1 and three teaching one section each of HCOL 85) had limited participation in pilot workshops and discussions, instead following the syllabus and assignment sequence developed by two instructors who were full participants.
- Through the pilot semester, the Writing in the Disciplines program provided staff assistance in collecting and redacting randomly selected writing collections from all sections. John Ryan and the Office of Institutional Studies assisted in the design and dissemination of a beginning- and end-of-semester student survey. A total of 17 faculty from Bailey Howe, BSAD, CALS, CAS, CEMS, CESS, and HCOL met for a one-day assessment retreat in January, with three faculty meeting for an additional half day.

The attached report details the First-Year Writing Group's findings that it is indeed possible for these three kinds of courses to work toward shared foundational goals with each course still retaining its unique characteristics. As the full report shows, students taking these pilot courses, faculty teaching them, and additional faculty assessing the resulting writing also all expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the work and the learning that resulted.

At the same time, the assessment of the pilot, also detailed in this report, finds four challenges that would need to be addressed should UVM move toward a foundational requirement for all UVM undergraduates via English 1, HCOL 85, and TAP:

1. Writing collections from the ENGS 1 and HCOL 85 sections taught by faculty who did not participate in most course development activities received noticeably lower scores in both the post-semester assessment and student surveys than those taught by faculty who did participate. *Shared syllabi and assignment handouts are not enough; active participation in course development and ongoing faculty support—both training and time—are needed for all faculty as they learn to teach first-year courses to meet shared writing and information literacy goals.*
2. The ENGS 1 pilot instructor who did not participate in course development activities was unable to do so because of her part-time, short-term appointment (in contrast with a second ENGS 1 pilot instructor who, as an English graduate teaching assistant, came to the pilot from a year of professional development and mentoring in teaching the course

and was able to participate in most pilot activities and discussions). *Foundational writing instructors need full-time appointments to allow them to participate in course development activities and so that UVM's investment in developing faculty to teach these courses pays off in subsequent semesters.*

3. Writing collections from a TAP seminar that also aimed to meet a major requirement received the lowest scores in all categories among the four TAP seminars. *Although it can't be concluded from one section that TAP seminars cannot do "double duty" in meeting both major and general education requirements, a shift in emphasis will be necessary and will likely also take more than one iteration of a course to figure out how to achieve: from seminars that use writing assignments in service to introducing students to a body of disciplinary knowledge to using a disciplinary realm of inquiry in service to fostering students' writing, critical reading, and research skills.*
4. The pilot instructor for another TAP section, which received high ratings for its writing collections and from students reflecting on their learning in the four foundational areas, reported that students also found the work very challenging, frequently complained that the course was not what they were expecting, and on the department course evaluation scored the course a point lower than is typical for her introductory courses. *If UVM adopts a foundational writing and information literacy requirement via TAP, HCOL 85, and ENGS 1, it should be made visible to students that these three different kinds of courses are part of a common program devoted to students' development as critical readers, writers, and researchers.*

There is plenty of cause to be optimistic that these challenges can be met:

- It is only over the past decade that UVM has seen a shift in English 1 teaching from full-time to part-time staffing—a shift that can be corrected.
- The Honors College is already re-envisioning its first-year two-semester seminar sequence to make writing central to its long-standing goal of promoting critical thinking.
- A recent survey of all TAP seminars by the CAS Dean's office and the Writing in the Disciplines program found that (1) virtually all TAP seminars are already writing-intensive; and (2) TAP faculty are requesting direction about what aspects of writing they should focus on in their seminars. The articulation of foundational goals thus meets a need being voiced by TAP faculty.

Pilot faculty stress, however, the importance of—and need for more—administrative investment in faculty development as well as protection of non-tenured faculty teaching these time-intensive courses. In anticipation of a fuller set of recommendations that the interim director of first-year writing will bring to the Senate for consideration in April, this report concludes with specific examples of course- and faculty-development supports the pilot faculty recommend.

Background

In December 2011 the Faculty Senate called for the continuation of General Education work through

- the crafting of a Fall 2012 pilot project, involving faculty across campus, to test the hypothesis that English 1, Honors College 85, and TAP seminars can work toward shared foundational writing and information literacy goals; and
- the creation of a faculty-designed writing assessment to judge the effectiveness of pilot courses in integrating and working toward shared writing and information literacy goals.

As many Senators are already aware, the University of Vermont stands virtually alone among state universities in not having a universal first-year writing requirement. Especially given the growing emphasis on literacy and college readiness in secondary education, this means that students arrive at UVM primed for what is still a sizable leap from high school to university occasions, genres, audiences, and research tools for writing—but then not encounter a class in their first four semesters providing context, support, and challenge to do so. The charge of this pilot was to learn if through ENGS 1, HCOL 85, and TAP, UVM can adopt a coordinated approach for ensuring that all undergraduates have a foundation in college-level writing and information literacy expectations, moving them beyond high-school writing expectations and resources. (See **Appendix A** for a short treatment of the differences between high-school and college writing and research). The Senate also requested that a pilot director report back to the Senate by the end of Spring 2013 with results and recommendations.

This report aims to fulfill the first part of that request—providing a summary of and snapshots from the pilot and its results—with more detailed recommendations and any proposal regarding the adoption of a foundational writing and information literacy requirement to be submitted in time for April’s Senate meeting.

Promoting Foundational Goals in ENGS 1, TAP, and HCOL 85

Four faculty teaching the College of Arts and Sciences’ Teaching and Advising Program (TAP) seminars, four faculty teaching the first semester of the Honors College’s The Pursuit of Knowledge seminar (HCOL 85), and one faculty member plus one GTA teaching two sections each of the English department’s Written Expression first-year composition course (ENGS 1) designed their Fall 2012 courses to help students work toward four foundational goals:

1. **Rhetorical discernment**, giving students practice in composing for varying purposes and/or audiences, developing their texts with the detail, organization, and documentation, diction, and style suited to these varying purposes.
2. **Substantive revision**, challenging students to revise, through persistent inquiry and informed by peer and/or instructor feedback, so that their texts and ideas grow in effectiveness and complexity.

3. **Critical reading**, moving students beyond reading for information or a main idea and into critically engaging with ideas and texts, learning practices of summarizing, paraphrasing, and quotation to effectively integrate others' texts into one's own writing.
4. **Information literacy**, introducing students to ways of accessing, and working effectively and ethically with print and digital sources, including learning to discern searchable key words within a complex research question; distinguish between primary and secondary and scholarly and popular resources; critically evaluate sources for relevance, currency, authority, and bias; and manage and appropriately document information sources.

Appendix B presents these four foundational goals with examples of assignments and assignments from the pilot courses.

Of all pilot-section instructors, four—one part-time faculty member teaching ENGS 1 and three full-time faculty teaching HCOL 85—did not participate in any or most pilot-planning discussions and workshops but followed a syllabus and assignment sequence created by those that did. The remaining six instructors—one from ENGS 1, one from HCOL, and four from TAP—participated in a modest program of course development and ongoing discussions about course planning and experiences. Course development activities included a full-day workshop in May 2012 on crafting assignments that draw on foundational skills to advance course objectives plus afternoon workshops through the Fall 2012 on designing innovative research assignments, responding to student writing, reflecting on and adjusting from midterm results, and promoting substantive revision.

These six pilot faculty members plus additional members of the First-Year Writing Working Group (composed of faculty from CALS, CAS, CESS, CEMS, and the Libraries) also met during the late Fall 2012 semester to make plans for assessing the pilot, with a focus on three questions:

- Is it possible for these three first-year courses to work toward shared writing and information literacy goals?
- Should the shared goals remain, or remain with refinement, the four articulated for this pilot?
- What do pilot results and pilot faculty experiences tell us about the resources and supports needed for these courses to work or work more effectively toward shared goals?

As the next sections of this report will show, student experience, pilot faculty experience, and assessment of randomly selected writing collections from the pilot sections strongly suggest answers of “Yes” to the first two questions. We also present in this report some detail about the process and the results of the pilot assessment both to provide a possible model for faculty-driven assessment of a general education course and to make visible the areas where, in response to the third question, further work and greater support are needed for greater effectiveness within courses and consistency across courses.

Assessing the Pilot Semester: Can Three First-Year Courses Work Toward Shared Goals?

To gauge the degree to which each pilot course was able to emphasize each foundational goal, the First-Year Writing Working Group decided to collect three forms of data over the semester:

- With the help of John Ryan and the Office of Institutional Studies, beginning- and end-of-semester **student surveys** (**Appendix C**) on their sense of preparation for and improvement in each of the four foundational areas;
- Compiled by the four pilot faculty for TAP plus one faculty member and one GTA from HCOL 85 and ENGS 1 respectively, **instructor portfolios** with all course assignments, selected student work, and end-of-semester reflection on successes and challenges in implementing the foundational goals;
- With the help of the Writing in the Disciplines Program staff and research assistants, complete and redacted **student writing collections** from three to four students on the course roster, selected by their (fifth, tenth, fifteenth ...) place on the roster.

While future assessments can take up more ambitious questions about the quality of, improvement in, and portability of student work and can also draw conclusions from more student writing collections per class, the assessment of this pilot was limited

- **by time:** a one-day winter-break retreat of 17 faculty to comb through and reflect on the collected materials, with three faculty meeting a second time to follow up on questions generated in the assessment retreat, and
- **by scope:** to the questions of whether the student surveys, instructor experience, and writing collections suggest it is possible for TAP, ENGS 1, and HCOL 85, to work toward foundational writing and information literacy goals, and with what challenges and further needs or goal refinements that should be addressed.

Below are brief summaries and snapshots from the three assessment vantage points—student surveys, instructor reflections, and writing collection ratings—followed by the overall assessment of the First-Year Writing Working Group.

Student Surveys

We asked students at semester's end to rate, on a five-point scale ranging from "very unconfident" to "very confident," their sense of improvement in writing, in reading challenging texts, and in their ability to locate, assess, and attribute source material. **Table A** shows the percentage students from all pilot sections self-reporting that they are "confident" or "very confident" of improvement:

Table A
Student Perception of Improvement through the Semester

	ENGs 1	HCOL 85	TAP
<i>Your writing has improved</i>	87%	55%	73%
<i>Your ability to comprehend challenging texts has improved</i>	65%	76%	67%
<i>Your ability to locate, assess, and attribute sources has improved</i>	69%	n/a	78%

*In HCOL 85, students work almost exclusively with instructor-provided texts; assignments promoting locating, evaluating, and writing from additional source materials are deferred until spring when students enroll in HCOL 86.

Student perception of improvement largely mirrors what the faculty assessment teams (presented in the next section) observed: the three kinds of courses provide opportunity for students to work at least to some extent on all foundational goals and create significant space for work on one goal in particular.

Remarkable, however, is HCOL 85's noticeably lower score for writing improvement, which also mirrors the findings of the faculty assessment teams, discussed below, and which appears to have two primary causes:

1. More students had a high degree of writing confidence to begin with (48% *confident* or *very confident* about their writing abilities at the semester's start compared with 23% of ENGs 1 students); and
2. Only one of the four HCOL sections was taught by a faculty member who not only followed a common syllabus designed to promote foundational goals but also *participated* in and *contributed* to course development workshops and pilot-planning discussions. In that section 78% of students reported feeling *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved, compared with 57%, 45%, and 46% of students in the three sections taught by faculty who did not participate directly in pilot-related activities.

We also asked all students at semester's end if the writing, reading, and research skills they developed in this class proved useful for other classes they took that semester. Although this pilot did not aim to assess the extent to which students benefit from a foundational writing and information literacy course (e.g., does such a course benefit even those students with high Advanced Placement scores?) or students' ability to transfer skills to new classes and contexts, pilot instructors were keen to know what efficacy their teaching might have beyond their course and the first-year working group felt that student responses could help inform Senate and administrative decision-making about whether UVM's students need the formal space of a course to develop and practice their writing, reading, and research skills in the first year. **Table**

B, presenting students' responses by course type, is followed by outtakes from students' accompanying comments.

Table B:
Student Perception of Usefulness of Foundational Skills in Other Classes

	ENGS 1	HCOL 85	TAP
Applied new writing, reading, or research skills to other classes	74%	62%	84%
Did not apply new writing, reading, or research skills to other classes	6%	17%	3%
Did not have other classes calling for significant writing, reading, or research	20%	21%	13%

Students who responded *yes* mentioned specific classes for which the foundational learning proved useful—from writing weekly Environmental Studies papers and biology lab reports to digesting lengthy electrical engineering articles and conducting research for a psychology term paper—as well as heightened awareness of rhetorical contexts and effective writing processes:

- “Learning to write research papers and finding sources helped me do my business papers on countries and industries. Also, for any paper I had to do in business, I was able to express my ideas better.” (ENGS 1 student)
- “It helped me in my comparative religion class because I was better able to contrast different ideas, something that I mastered in HCOL (like comparing Hume and Descartes).” (HCOL 85 student)
- “I think the *major* thing I took with me from the course is *how* important adapting to different writing styles is.” (TAP student)

Of students who responded *no*, fewer than 1% remarked that skills covered repeated what they had learned in high school. Instead, especially in the surveys of ENGS 1 and HCOL 85 students, most students who responded *no* and provided explanation expressed a belief that, as one Honors College student put it, “My writing style in this class is not relevant to my writing style for other science-related classes.”

Students in pilot sections whose instructors engaged students in direct discussion about the course's potential applicability to their other courses, majors, and occasions for writing, however, appear to have found it easier to make connections across the humanities-science divide:

- One HCOL 85 student, in a section whose instructor prompted discussion about the questions before handing the survey out, emphasized that “Playing around with using different voices for the papers was really valuable,” an “applicable skill for writing assignments for other classes.”
- An ENGS 1 student, whose instructor also preceded the survey with reflective discussion, observed, “As engineering majors, we can’t just be creative and make a building upside down—but I’m going to take away a new way of learning This class forced me to build a paper rather than scramble to write it the night before.”

Of students who responded that the question was *not applicable* because they had few or no writing, reading, and research assignments for their other courses, common remarks included expressions of optimism that course learning would prove useful “in the future” and observations that this course, with its emphasis on foundational writing and information literacy skills, “seemed somewhat standalone” (HCOL 85 student) and was “kind of an island in that it stands alone” (ENGS 1 student).

Writing Collection Assessment

The 17 faculty who participated in a one-day pilot assessment broke into groups of four or five to read, score, and assess two randomly selected complete student writing collections from each (TAP, ENGS 1, and HCOL 85) pilot section. Faculty teams also flagged some sections for further examination. For these, interim first-year writing director Nancy Welch, library instruction coordinator Daisy Benson, and writing center director Sue Dinitz met for an additional afternoon to read and score two additional writing collections from each section.

- Although faculty made observations about the quality of and changes in students’ writing, critical reading, and research skills, the assessment focus was on *the extent to which the student writing collection showed evidence of opportunities over the semester to work on foundational goals*.
- After finding on initial reading that writing collections from all pilot sections showed at least some evidence of all four foundational goals, faculty settled on a three-point assessment scale (**Appendix D**) to weigh the degree to which work on each goal was apparent in a student writing collection: *A Great Deal (3 points)*, *Somewhat (2 points)*, and *Minimal/Scant (1 point)*.

Overall, the faculty assessment teams found that (with one exception, discussed below) all pilot sections provided opportunity for students to work at least to some extent on foundational writing and information literacy goals with most creating significant space for work on one or two goals in particular. **Table C** presents the average rating for each goal by course type.

**Table C:
Faculty Ratings of Student Writing Collections**

	ENGS 1	HCOL 85	TAP
Rhetorical Discernment	2.3	2.1	2.5
Critical Reading	2.0	3.0	2.2
Substantive Revision	2.2	2.6	2.3
Information Literacy	2.2	1.7*	2.3

**Focus on and instruction in foundational information literacy and research-based writing beyond instructor-provided texts is largely reserved for HCOL 86, which students take in the spring semester. Hence while many HCOL papers reflected work on and awareness of academic citation conventions, source material was largely provided by the instructor.*

As examples of how pilot instructors had created space, in concert with course objectives, for significant work on at least one—and sometimes several—foundational goals, faculty raters especially made note of assignments and activities such as these:

- Students in a science TAP designed experiments of consumer products, composing their results first in a lab report and next as a *Consumer Report*'s style presentation for a non-scientific audience. For the latter, they also read an article on the problems of pseudoscience and considered how to avoid false and overstated claims about their products.
- Students in a social science TAP conducted a lab exercise followed by a two-part writing exercise asking them to write up their findings in a lab report, then reflect critically on the assumptions of the lab through the lens of a reading problematizing constructions of sex and gender in this field.
- Students in another social science TAP worked in class to complete a table accounting for the differences between U.S. and European welfare systems, drawing on three scholarly articles all had read to do so. They then read on their own two additional scholarly articles, updating their tables, which then prepared them to write papers on the topic, drawing on all five articles to advance their discussion of differences rather than merely summarizing each article.
- Each student in a humanities TAP created a wiki-based “casebook” for the rest of the class about a literary text. The casebook included their introduction to a collection of (print and digital, popular and scholarly, alphabetic and visual/audio) resources for understanding the cultural implications and critical reception of their chosen text.

- Students in HCOL 85 contributed to an "annotation wiki" in which a long passage from a primary text for the course is uploaded onto Blackboard with students all writing their comments (in different colors) into the text itself, resulting in a richly annotated text.
- For an in-class final exam, students in one HCOL 85 section were asked to write a letter to the Honors College Council defending the inclusion or calling for the removal of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* from the seminar's readings.
- Students in ENGS 1 worked at becoming more conscious of how they are integrating outside sources with their own experiences and perspectives through three-part annotation exercise: annotating first to identify how they are drawing on, working with, acknowledging others' ideas and influences; next to identify and reflect on how they're drawing on, working with, and acknowledging their own experience, and perspective; and finally where and how they may be coming to a new insight or understanding that is the result of this research project and that they might highlight and develop more.

While faculty raters found overall success across course types, the assessment resulted in some significant variation of scores between sections of the same course that became the focus of the follow-up assessment meeting. In this assessment we sought to understand

- whether writing collections from the ENGS 1 and HCOL 85 sections taught by instructors who were able to participate fully in pilot course development and planning activities scored consistently and significantly higher than those taught by instructors who did not participate beyond following a common syllabus. (The initial assessment was instructor-blind, so for the follow-up assessment we removed the blind as well as pulled additional writing collections for review.)
- why one TAP section may have scored lower in all categories than the other three TAP sections.

As shown in **Table D**, ENGS 1 and HCOL 85 writing collections drawn from sections taught by instructors who were able to participate in course development workshops and pilot planning meetings ("P" in the table below) scored higher in "rhetorical discernment" and "substantive revision" than those from sections whose instructors followed a syllabus and assignment sequence designed to promote pilot goals but did not participate much further in pilot activities ("NP" in the table below).

- In the case of ENGS 1, the instructor who did not participate in most course development and pilot discussions is a part-time faculty member with limited time and institutional support. The faculty rating teams found in the four writing collections read and discussed from these sections that students did a substantial amount of writing, but, with the focus (reflecting an earlier iteration of English 1) on personal voice and expressiveness, that there was limited range of purpose across writings and little development and revision of ideas within each. Student confidence of learning in these two sections remained high overall (82% of students in both sections reporting feeling *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved) but markedly lower when compare with student learning

confidence in sections taught by a GTA able to participate in pilot workshops and discussions (90% and 100% of students in the two sections reporting feeling *confident* or *very confident* of writing improvement).

- For HCOL, institutional support for more faculty to participate in course/faculty development activities may help not only to prepare faculty to promote foundational writing and information literacy goals in their sections but to shift the “culture” of the Honors College first-year experience from one that promotes learning through discussion to one that also promotes learning through writing.

Table D:
Comparison of Writing Collection Ratings by Instructor Participation in Pilot Activities

	ENGS 1 P/NP	HCOL 85 P/NP
Rhetorical Discernment	2.5/2.1	2.9/1.7
Substantive Revision	2.5/1.5	3.0/2.3

In TAP, the writing collections receiving the lowest scores for each of the foundational goals came from a section that also served as a major requirement. Its ratings ranged from 1 to 2 compared with a range of 2.3 to 3 for the other three TAP sections, with the faculty team assessing these collections observing more “right answer” exam-type writing assignments with limited expectations for revision beyond correcting a fact or adjusting the use of a specialized term.

Notable, however, is that while student perception of writing and critical reading improvement in this section was also somewhat lower than the other three TAP sections (65% students reported feeling *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved compared with an average of 77% for the other three sections), student confidence in learning was on par with or above the other sections in critical reading and substantially higher for information literacy (89% compared with 75%, 77%, and 72%).

- The difference in student perception of learning in the area of information literacy versus faculty ratings of outcomes visible in the student writing collections seems attributable to the assignment design: Students completed two extensive research exercises but were not asked to integrate their findings into a paper or other composition—a missed opportunity the instructor plans to take up in the future.
- To create more opportunities for student writing development in a course also needing to provide some coverage of major material, assignment-design ideas may be found in the approach of another TAP faculty member. This faculty member was likewise concerned with covering a body of material and ensuring that students were completing the reading—but replaced the course’s usual short-answer reading quizzes with short *daily* writing assignments, lightly commented and scored as she would have scored quizzes. Because these writing assignments were highly varied—some asking for reading summaries, others asking students to contrast two or more readings or to try writing in the style or with the concerns of a given writer—these provided students with a range of

ways to work with their readings. Students from this course emphasized the “sheer amount of writing,” “practice integrating course terms” into their writing, and “variety of writing” as key to their sense of improvement over the semester and ability to tackle the bigger, higher-stakes writing assignments.

Faculty raters further observed:

- Virtually all of the HCOL 85 writing collections given a top score (3) for “critical reading” with student writing moving beyond demonstrating comprehension of challenging texts to extending, applying, and countering key issues and ideas.
- Some of the highest scores for “rhetorical discernment” and “substantive revision”—2.7 to 3—were given to writing collections from science and social science TAP seminars with faculty raters remarking on how one course was “packed with activities and ideas” and how revision in both courses worked hand-in-hand with critical reading as students revisited and revised an earlier writing in light of the new perspective or challenge of a later reading.
- There is a need for greater guidance regarding what constitutes “foundational” information literacy—whether, for instance, students at an introductory level need to work with peer-reviewed sources for their research-based writing and whether they need to show mastery of an academic citation system such as MLA or APA. Writing collections from two English 1 sections were praised by faculty raters for a series of “scaffolding” assignments that showed students’ complex search strategies and helped them document their research process but were still given a low-end score of 1.7 for “information literacy” because the formal writing that resulted—magazine-style pieces written for a non-specialist audience—did not include academic citation.
- The criteria for “critical reading” should also be adjusted to reflect practices across the sciences and social sciences as well as the humanities for integrating and citing source material in one’s own text. For instance, four student writing collections from two TAP science and social science seminars rated very high for rhetorical discernment, substantive revision, and information literacy (2.7 to 3) but received much lower scores for critical reading (2) because, faculty raters pointed out, the writers effectively summarized and provided citation for source material but did not (as is common in the humanities and less so in the sciences and some social sciences) incorporate extensive paraphrase and direct quotations into their text.

Instructor Portfolio Reflections

Instructors began their portfolios with an account of how they had worked toward the foundational goals, examination of particular lessons and challenges, and reflection on the

questions of whether it seemed *possible* and *beneficial* to work toward such goals in a course such as theirs. In these reflections, instructors

... attested to the feasibility and value of all four foundational goals for their courses:

HCOL 85 instructor: “Critical reading has always taken center stage in HCOL 85, but the evolution of this content-rich course into a writing course (as opposed to a content-rich course in which a lot of writing was done) has allowed us to expand our sense of what critical reading means, and to incorporate it more thoughtfully and deliberately into paper assignments as well as into class work, fusing writing and reading in a course that speaks more directly than it did before to the intellectual development of a first-year college student.”

Humanities TAP instructor: “In my effort to achieve the foundational goals for the FYWP pilot program, this version of the course included a lot more targeted writing in a variety of modes and an increased emphasis on research in two of the major projects If I were to teach this class again with the FYWP goals in place, I would maintain the amount of reading and writing per text/topic, but I might eliminate a few of the primary texts to leave more room for revision of the longer projects. I don’t see this as a move toward ‘less content,’ necessarily, but more of a shift in emphasis onto the writing instruction content. In the end, I do not feel we accomplished as much **substantive revision** as we might have, and I’m hoping to build on the FYWP’s research to enhance this aspect of this course.” (Emphasis in original)

*... but also stressed the need for more **faculty development**:*

Social Science TAP instructor: “The key insights I took from this were that I needed to learn how to teach revisions and that I needed to take more time teaching revision to students Upshot of all this: It was possible to pursue the four pilot goals in the context of the seminar, but these could have been more effectively pursued if more time were devoted in advance to instructor skill development and, more fundamentally, more time was devoted in class to teaching students basic skills to help them realize competencies with respect to these goals.”

Science TAP Instructor: “When reading the student writings, I hope it is clear that the assignments MISSING WORD? toward the four writing [and information literacy] goals. However ... what is missing are more specific assignments or activities that teach the students ‘how’ to meet the various aspects of [the foundational goals]. This particular concern, concrete activities or ideas for how to teach writing, is where I believe faculty would need development of support.”

*... as well as the need to **articulate to students** the four foundational goals and the course’s primary aim in fostering college-level writing, reading, and information literacy practices:*

ENGS 1 instructor: “While all students succeeded in handing in sufficiently different pieces than their original, I often felt that the *reasons* for these revisions still fell by the way-side. I feared, at some points, that these changes were being made because they had been asked to make changes, but without sufficient consideration toward why the original needed to be changed and what the changes accomplished. In the future, I think that [asking students to undertake] a more

focused analysis of weak points in an earlier paper, and more specified remedies for such problems, could bring more focus and intentionality to the revision process.”

Social Science TAP instructor: “Overall I found the biggest issue to be the disconnect between how TAP is billed to students and what this class needed to do to meet the four foundational goals ... [Students] seemed to agree that the foundational skills they were learning were important to their success in college. The students also adored the advising and learning skills (e.g., time management) information they received ... Nevertheless, they were expecting the class to be on [Course Title], and they did not feel they were getting enough of that material.”

That last instructor emphasized that once she presented to students the foundational goals her course was designed to promote and explained the connection of course assignments and activities to those goals, students’ understanding and performance improved. Another TAP instructor, while observing that he “felt better about this TAP course than any TAP course taught—more conscious, more deliberative about basic skills I wanted students to come out with,” likewise found that his students were adrift about the purpose and importance of various class assignments until he made explicit that the course was designed to promote a set of writing, critical reading, and research goals. While ongoing work to foreground the foundational goals to students is the responsibility of individual instructors, TAP pilot faculty believe students will be better prepared for the work and expectations of these seminars if they understand at the start that these courses aim to enhance their writing, reading, and research abilities.

Initial Findings and Recommendations

Student surveys, faculty assessment of writing collections, and instructor experience all strongly suggest that it is possible for these three kinds of courses to work toward shared foundational goals and that each course can still retain its unique characteristics. Moreover:

- Students taking these pilot courses, faculty teaching them, and additional faculty assessing the resulting writing all expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the work and the learning that resulted.
- Pilot faculty able to participate in course development activities and pilot-planning discussions also underscored that these activities and discussions were immensely valuable. As one pilot instructor put it during discussions around the drafting of this report: “It was really helpful to be part of this group working out our issues of how to teach these courses, to be really invested in this pilot.”

At the same time, pilot faculty and the assessment teams note four challenges that would need to be addressed should UVM move toward a foundational requirement for all UVM undergraduates via English 1, HCOL 85, and TAP:

1. Writing collections from the ENGS 1 and HCOL 85 sections taught by faculty who did not participate in most pilot planning course development activities (which would have, not including the time of creating and revising course materials and assignments, involved an additional 40+ hours of time) received noticeably lower scores in both the

post-semester assessment and student surveys than those taught by faculty who did participate. *Assignment handouts are not enough; course-development support and time to participate are needed for all faculty learning to teach first-year courses to meet shared writing and information literacy goals.*

2. The ENGS 1 pilot instructor who did not participate in course development activities was unable to do so because of her part-time, short-term appointment. *Full-time faculty appointments are needed so that instructors can participate in course development activities and so that UVM's investment in developing faculty to teach these courses pays off in subsequent semesters.*
3. Writing collections from a TAP seminar that was also taught to meet a major requirement received the lowest scores in all categories among the four TAP seminars. *Although it can't be concluded from one section that TAP seminars cannot do "double duty" in meeting both a major and general education requirement, if TAP and HCOL 85 become two of three means through which students may satisfy a foundational writing and information literacy requirement, a shift in emphasis will be necessary and will likely also take more than one iteration of a course to figure out how to achieve: from seminars that use writing assignments in service to introducing students to a body of disciplinary knowledge to using a disciplinary realm of inquiry in service to fostering students' writing, critical reading, and research skills.*
4. The pilot instructor for another TAP section, which received high ratings for its writing collections and from students reflecting on their learning in the four foundational areas, reported that students also found the work very challenging, frequently complained that the course was not what they were expecting, and on the department course evaluation scored the course a point lower than is typical for her introductory courses. *If UVM adopts a foundational writing and information literacy requirement via TAP, HCOL 85, and ENGS 1, it should be made visible to students that these three different kinds of courses are part of a common program devoted to students' development as critical readers, writers, and researchers.*

There is plenty of cause to be optimistic that these challenges can be met:

- It is only over the past decade that UVM has seen a shift in English 1 teaching from full-time to part-time staffing—a shift that can be corrected.
- The Honors College is already re-envisioning its first-year two-semester seminar sequence to make writing central to its long-standing goal of promoting critical thinking.
- A recent survey of all TAP seminars by the CAS Dean's office and the Writing in the Disciplines program found that (1) virtually all TAP seminars are already writing-intensive; and (2) TAP faculty are actively seeking more advice about what aspects of writing they should be focusing on and support for teaching writing in their seminars. A move toward articulating and providing support for meeting shared foundational goals thus answers a need voiced by TAP faculty.

While more detailed recommendations are not part of this report—deferred until the April Faculty Senate meeting to allow more time for reflection on the pilot results and feedback on this report—pilot faculty Deborah Blom of Anthropology, Becky Miller of Biology, Deb Noel of English, Lisa Schnell of Honors College, and Peter VonDoepp of Political Science offer these recommendations regarding support for course and faculty development:

1. Following the model of the annual four-day Writing in the Disciplines Institute, launch a First-Year Writing Institute to bring together up to a dozen faculty each year for intensive work on creating or revising their ENGS 1, TAP, or HCOL course to emphasize the foundational goals.
2. Because faculty time is so scarce, make it more possible for faculty to participate in such an institute with compensation in the form of a direct stipend that might be used to offset other time commitments (for instance, to make it possible to hire house cleaning or childcare services) rather than through the current practice of compensation in the form of professional development funds.
3. Because most faculty do not have academic backgrounds in composition and rhetoric, they often require one-on-one and small-group consultations throughout the semester they are teaching a writing-intensive course. This can be accommodated by creating a First-Year Writing Faculty Fellows program, which might include those trained in writing instruction but also faculty beyond the English department who are beginning to develop rich perspectives and approaches they can share. Two (eventually expanding to four) faculty each year would be released from half of their regular teaching commitment to meet regularly with and provide mentoring and workshops for faculty teaching ENGS 1, TAP, or HCOL 85, as well as to help plan and guide annual program assessments.

While implementing a coordinated, campus-wide approach to first-year writing and information literacy at UVM will take resources, and would be coming online at a time of declining revenues and difficult budget decisions, pilot faculty also observe that UVM is moving toward doing something so unique and likely attractive to faculty and administrators at other institutions, we might also look toward launching an annual summer institute for interested faculty throughout the Northeast. Such an institute could begin to generate some of the revenue needed to support first-year writing program activities such as a faculty fellows program. Such an institute would also spotlight and allows us to share with audiences beyond campus what we believe will be distinctive program, one in which many faculty—not just those in English and the libraries—are involved and invested in students' literacy educations.

APPENDIX A:

Relationships between High School and College Writing, and Some Thoughts on the Role of College Writing Instruction

Susanmarie Harrington, Director, Writing in the Disciplines

Faculty in any university can expect that students entering college have varied high school experiences with writing (varied because of the curriculum in the high schools, because of the particular teachers they have had, because of the particular interests of individual students, because of the things that come easily, or not so easily, for individual students). Some students will have done a lot of writing; other students may have done very little. In addition, some students will have done a lot of writing outside of school, and others very little. Wherever and how much writing has been done, it's likely, across the board, to vary in quality.

Every time students change educational levels, there are new expectations and new challenges. Faculty at every level build on those prior levels, but we always have a sense that what worked at a lower level is no longer sufficient. College writing poses new challenges for students, and it is the responsibility of college professors to teach college writing.

High school literacy curricula often concentrate writing instruction in literature courses, which means that students leave high school with more experience writing about literature than any other topic. Depending on their schools, they may have had experience doing persuasive pieces; they may have had experience with personal essays; they may have had structured research experiences in small libraries (or in college libraries in or near their hometowns). Students are admitted to college because of a mix of factors, and faculty across the university meet students where they are, with varied past experiences and past levels of performance in writing, quantitative thinking, social analysis, lab experiences etc.

As college faculty, we must help students see that every course offers new opportunities for writing and thinking; foundational experiences help prepare students for the array of new opportunities they will encounter. College writing requires students to produce longer, careful, close readings of text and data; it requires students to complete more independent research tasks and to juxtapose more sources of information with more conflicting points of view. Foundational writing courses—which, in the national model, may be conceived as first-year composition courses or as first-year seminars located in a department or program—help students with strategies for identifying and developing ideas; researching open-ended questions; presenting their work (in progress and when completed) to different sorts of audiences.

Foundational writing courses can address the challenges of writing from sources and data, as well as the messy nature of writing processes. Both ideas and processes are best engaged in the production of whole texts. There is no evidence that courses or experiences that drill students in the editing or production of correct sentences or isolated vocabulary development increase students' ability to understand and produce texts that use effective formal language in a particular context.

College students will encounter a range of writing expectations across disciplines, and foundational writing courses prepare them to think about writing in flexible ways. Students and faculty must understand that:

- Writing strategies must be fluid and flexible: what works for one writer, or one writing task, or one writing environment, may not work for another. Students may be successful in some places and unsuccessful in others
- Writing development is messy and nonlinear. Writers need practice and supported guidance at a variety of tasks over time. Even though students' texts may not always reflect polished performance, they may be developing new insights about their writing processes and habits that will lead to more polished performance in the future. Writers need the chance to try things, and to address progressively more challenging assignments that are read by encouraging audiences who can give meaningful, timely responses.
- Writing in real life—writing in the community, writing on the job, writing at home—involves many contexts and time frames. Successful writers can produce texts on varied timelines: sometimes using extensive reflection and revision strategies, and sometimes producing appropriate prose more quickly. Successful writers can work with groups or teams, and can work on their own.
- Writing students need to see the ways in which writing is handled in the real world. Formal published writing masks the drafting and research processes that preceded finished drafts; faculty do not often talk with students about the roles of proofreaders, copyeditors, and student assistants' in the production of polished texts.

APPENDIX B

Foundational Writing and Information Literacy Goals and Illustrations

A course meeting foundational writing and information literacy goals is one in which students through a variety of course assignments and activities develop these abilities:

1. **Rhetorical discernment:** For varying writing purposes and audiences, develop texts with sufficient detail, astute organization, and appropriate documentation, diction, and style.

- For a social science TAP seminar, students conduct a laboratory exercise, then complete a two-part writing assignment. The first aims at helping them write a lab report, the second encourages them to reflect critically on their lab findings and the lab report genre in light of a class reading examining sex and gender as social constructs.
- For another social science TAP seminar, students are asked to write four thesis synopses of articles or chapters that are assigned in the course of the semester. Students are required to write at least two of these as a “Letter to the Editor” in response to an editorial that takes a position different from that articulated in article or chapter, giving students the experience of composing an academically informed and grounded argument for a nonacademic audience.
- For a science TAP course, the students work in groups to design and perform a scientific experiment. To illustrate how to write an appropriate methods section, they were asked to write an explanation for how to make a cup of tea using loose-leaf tea. One paragraph was selected and displayed on the doc cam; this led to a discussion of what pieces of information are necessary and which ones are not.

2. **Critical reading:** Read critically by engaging with ideas and texts, properly summarizing, paraphrasing, and quoting others’ ideas while effectively integrating them with and developing one’s own ideas.

- For a humanities TAP seinar, students are asked to annotate a scholarly article about a course text and write a one-page summary. In class, students compare their work to identify key passages (such as thesis statements, topic sentences, important critical terms, good evidence, transitions) and difficult passages to puzzle through together. Students submit both the annotated article and their summaries as homework to insure that they do interact with the scholarly text effectively and thoroughly.
- In HCOL 85, students contribute to an "annotation wiki" in which a long passage from a primary text for the course is uploaded onto Blackboard and students all write their comments (in different colors) into the text itself, resulting in a richly annotated text.
- For a social science TAP seminar, students are to draw on five scholarly articles for an analytic paper discussing the social-welfare experiences of two countries. To ensure that students have a solid comprehension of the articles and ways of working with them in their own texts, they bring brief summaries and notes from three of the articles to class. Then in class, students and the instructor work through these three articles together, identifying key insights to incorporate into scaffolding for the paper. Students are then equipped to use this same process on their own for the remaining two articles.
- To help ENGS 1 students become more conscious of how/where/to what extent in a research-

based essay they are orchestrating a conversation among others' ideas and their own, they do a three-part in-class annotation exercise, using three different colors of ink, with their drafts in tracking influences: first to identify and reflect on how they are drawing on, working with, acknowledging others' ideas and influences; next to identify and reflect on how they're drawing on, working with, and acknowledging their own experience, expertise, and perspective; and finally where and how they may be coming to a new insight or understanding that is the result of this research project and that they might highlight and develop more.

3. Substantive revision: Through persistent inquiry and informed by feedback from peers and/or the instructor, compose and revise so that texts and ideas grow in effectiveness and complexity.

- For a humanities TAP, students draft a two-page imitation of an author on the reading list and a three-page "rationale" in which they describe the primary author's style, offering support from scholarly articles, and then discuss their intentions and the process by which they composed their imitations. Both imitation and rationale are submitted online in a wiki space with a small group of peers and the instructor together offering feedback, either within the text on the wiki in an alternate color and/or in the comment space. From this feedback, students revise and re-submit their projects.
- For HCOL 85, students do an after-the-fact outline of their papers, producing a map of what their first draft was actually doing in order to be able to discern for themselves the problems in logic and flow that need to be revised in the subsequent draft.
- For ENGS 1, students used scissors to cut apart a paper that they had previously handed in as a finished assignment. Then, choosing a sentence or paragraph from that paper and taping it to the top of a blank page, students brainstormed/free-wrote, using this sentence or paragraph as a starting point, in order to begin the process of substantially revising their work.

4. Information literacy. Access and work effectively and ethically with print and digital sources, including learning to discern searchable key words within a complex research question; distinguish between primary and secondary and scholarly and popular resources; critically evaluate sources for relevance, currency, authority, and bias; and manage and appropriately document information sources.

- For a science TAP seminar, students submit an Annotated Bibliography in an advance of a research-based writing assignment (a letter to an interested nonspecialist explaining a particular scientific phenomenon). For each entry, students identify the type of source, the goal/purpose of the source, and their reason(s) for choosing it. The process engages students in tracking and critically evaluated each source and the product makes visible to the instructor what kind of work and thinking went into research and source selection for the longer paper.
- For a science TAP seminar, students work in groups to design and perform a scientific experiment testing the claims of a commercial project. Prior to writing their hypotheses, designing the methods, and performing the experiment, students research the commercial product and brands that they will compare in their group project. This gives them practice finding source information, documenting the sources, and providing justification for the educated guess (hypothesis) they create.
- For ENGS 1, students keep "research journals" where they record the date, key words, database, number of hits, and a summary of any useful articles found as a result of those searches. Students have 1.5 weeks to complete the assignment, with six distinct sessions of research.

APPENDIX C
First-Year Writing Pilot
Student Survey Summary

Rhetorical Discernment, Revision, and Critical Reading

How confident are you that your writing has improved over the course of this semester?

	Very Unconfident	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Engs 001	3.2%	1.6%	8.1%	45.2%	41.9%
Honors Col	0.0%	6.0%	38.8%	37.3%	17.9%
TAP	4.7%	0.0%	21.9%	53.1%	20.3%

How confident are you that your ability to locate, evaluate, and attribute sources has improved ...?

	Very Unconfident	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Engs 001	1.6%	3.2%	25.8%	45.2%	24.2%
Honors Col	0.0%	9.0%	38.8%	35.8%	16.4%
TAP	0.0%	0.0%	21.9%	60.9%	17.2%

How confident are you that your ability to read challenging texts has improved ...?

	Very Unconfident	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Engs 001	0.0%	6.5%	29.0%	48.4%	16.1%
Honors Col	0.0%	3.0%	20.9%	53.7%	22.4%
TAP	3.1%	0.0%	29.7%	45.3%	21.9%

Impact of this course on your practice of brainstorming and exploring ideas before a draft is due

	No change	Somewhat increased	Substantially increased
Engs 001	1.6%	41.0%	57.4%
Honors Col	22.4%	56.7%	20.9%
TAP	10.9%	53.1%	35.9%

Impact on this course with your experience with revising a paper based on feedback from instructor/peers

	No change	Somewhat increased	Substantially increased
Engs 001	3.2%	43.5%	53.2%
Honors Col	10.4%	40.3%	49.3%
TAP	4.7%	46.9%	48.4%

Impact of this course on your experience with varying your writing style for a specific audience/occasion

	No change	Somewhat increased	Substantially increased
Engs 001	14.5%	35.5%	50.0%
Honors Col	46.3%	41.8%	11.9%
TAP	7.8%	53.1%	39.1%

Impact of this course on your experience with summarizing and paraphrasing key ideas and arguments

	No change	Somewhat increased	Substantially increased
Engs 001	21.0%	59.7%	19.4%
Honors Col	11.9%	52.2%	35.8%
TAP	9.4%	50.0%	40.6%

Impact of this course on your experience with analyzing and applying ideas from reading

	No change	Somewhat increased	Substantially increased
Engs 001	25.8%	54.8%	19.4%

Honors Col	3.0%	55.2%	41.8%
TAP	3.1%	51.6%	45.3%

Information Literacy

Impact of this course on your experience with using academic databases

	Not applicable	No change	Somewhat increased	Substantially increased
Engs 001	1.6%	6.5%	45.2%	46.8%
Honors Col	14.9%	59.7%	20.9%	4.5%
TAP	0.0%	3.1%	43.8%	53.1%

Impact of this course on your experience with discerning relevant sources

	No change	Somewhat increased	Substantially increased
Engs 001	9.8%	49.2%	41.0%
Honors Col	44.8%	49.3%	6.0%
TAP	7.9%	53.1%	39.1%

Which of the following did you do this semester for one or more of your assignments in this course

Used an online library database to locate articles

ENGs 001	98.4%
Honors Col	47.8%
TAP	98.4%

Used an online library database to locate books or other materials

ENGs 001	59.7%
Honors Col	20.9%
TAP	56.3%

Used a peer-reviewed source in a paper

ENGs 001	43.5%
Honors Col	32.8%
TAP	67.2%

Evaluated a source for reliability and accuracy

ENGs 001	77.4%
Honors Col	68.7%
TAP	82.8%

Included a bibliography of sources cited with a paper

ENGs 001	88.7%
Honors Col	73.1%
TAP	95.3%

First-Year Writing Project Student Survey Semester Start/End Comparison

ENGS 001

Perception of writing improvement

- Overall, at semester's end 87% of ENGS 001 students report being *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved over the semester.
- Of the 23% of all ENGS 001 students who reported being *unconfident* about their writing at the semester's start, 20% report being *somewhat confident* and 80% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved at semester's end.
- Of the 54% of all ENGS 001 students who reported being *somewhat confident* about their writing at the semester's start, 88% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved at semester's end.

Perception of improvement in information literacy

- Overall, at semester's end 69% of ENGS 001 students report being *confident* or *very confident* that their ability to locate, evaluate, and attribute writing sources had improved.
- Of the 18% of all ENGS 001 students who reported being *unconfident* in their ability to locate, evaluate, and attribute writing sources at the semester's start, 67% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.
- Of the 49% of all ENGS 001 students who reported being *somewhat confident* in their ability to locate, evaluate, and attribute writing sources at the semester's start, 72% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.

Perception of improvement in critical reading

- Overall, at semester's end 65% of ENGS 001 students report being *confident* or *very confident* that their ability to read challenging texts had improved.
- Of the 30% of all ENGS 001 students who reported being *unconfident* in their ability to comprehend challenging texts at the semester's start, 23% report being *somewhat confident* and 62% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.
- Of 41% of all ENGS 001 students who reported being *somewhat confident* in their ability to comprehend challenging texts at the semester's start, 65% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.

First-Year Writing Project Student Survey Semester Start/End Comparison

HCOL

Perception of writing improvement

- Overall, at semester's end 55% of HCOL students report being *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved over the semester.
- Of the 10% of all HCOL students who reported being *unconfident* about their writing at the semester's start, 100% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved at semester's end.
- Of the 42% of all HCOL students who reported being *confident* about their writing at the semester's start, 55% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved at semester's end.

**Perception of improvement in information literacy*

- Overall, at semester's end 52% of HCOL students report being *confident* or *very confident* that their ability to locate, evaluate, and attribute writing sources had improved.
- Of the 8% of all HCOL students who reported being *unconfident* in their ability to locate, evaluate, and attribute writing sources at the semester's start, 50% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.
- Of the 49% of all HCOL students who reported being *confident* or *very confident* in their ability to locate, evaluate, and attribute writing sources at the semester's start, 46% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.

*HCOL 85 does not emphasize research and writing beyond instructor-provided sources; information literacy is instead a focus of the spring-semester HCOL 86.

Perception of improvement in critical reading

- Overall, at semester's end 76% of HCOL students report being *confident* or *very confident* that their ability to read challenging texts had improved.
- Of the 13% of all HCOL students who reported being *unconfident* in their ability to comprehend challenging texts at the semester's start, 20% report being *unconfident*, 60% report being *somewhat confident*, and 20% report being *confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.
- Of 36% of all HCOL students who reported being *confident* in their ability to comprehend challenging texts at the semester's start, 20% report being *somewhat confident*, 60% report being *confident*, and 20% report being *very confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.

First-Year Writing Project Student Survey

Semester Start/End Comparison

TAP

Perception of writing improvement

- Overall, at semester's end 73% of TAP students report being *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved over the semester.
- Of the 43% of all TAP students who reported being *somewhat confident* about their writing at the semester's start, 86% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved at semester's end.
- Of the 43% of all TAP students who reported being *confident* about their writing at the semester's start, 81% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their writing had improved at semester's end.

Perception of improvement in information literacy

- Overall, at semester's end 78% of TAP students report being *confident* or *very confident* that their ability to locate, evaluate, and attribute writing sources had improved.
- Of the 46% of all TAP students who reported being *somewhat confident* in their ability to locate, evaluate, and attribute writing sources at the semester's start, 100% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.
- Of the 42% of all TAP students who reported being *confident* or *very confident* in their ability to locate, evaluate, and attribute writing sources at the semester's start, 75% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.

Perception of improvement in critical reading

- Overall, at semester's end 67% of TAP students report being *confident* or *very confident* that their ability to read challenging texts had improved.
- Of the 11% of all TAP students who reported being *unconfident* in their ability to comprehend challenging texts at the semester's start, 20% report being *somewhat confident*, 20% report being *confident*, and 20% report being very confident that their abilities had improved at semester's end.
- Of 33% of all TAP students who reported being *confident* in their ability to comprehend challenging texts at the semester's start, 75% report being *confident* or *very confident* that their abilities had improved at semester's end.

APPENDIX D

First-Year Writing Pilot
January 2013 Assessment Retreat
Questionnaire
Portfolio No. _____

<i>This writing collection shows student work toward</i>	<i>A great deal</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
<i>Rhetorical Discernment:</i> Writing for varying purposes and audiences			
<i>Rhetorical Discernment:</i> Developing texts with sufficient detail and astute organization for a given purpose/ audience			
<i>Rhetorical Discernment:</i> Use of appropriate documentation, diction, and style for each purpose and audience			
<i>Critical Reading:</i> Critical engagement with ideas and texts			
<i>Critical Reading:</i> Effectively integrating others' ideas (including by summarizing, paraphrasing, and quoting) with one's own ideas			
<i>Substantive Revision:</i> Revision guided by both instructor/peer feedback and her/his own spirit of inquiry			
<i>Substantive Revision:</i> Revising so texts grow in effectiveness and complexity			
<i>Information Literacy:</i> Accessing digital and print resources, discerning searchable key words within a complex research question			
<i>Information Literacy:</i> Critically evaluating sources for relevance, currency, authority, and bias and to distinguish between primary and secondary, scholarly and popular sources			
<i>Information Literacy:</i> Managing and appropriately documenting information sources			

Notes for Discussion. You might consider the extent to which this portfolio suggests repeated practice and/or growth in writing and information literacy; any assignment or activity that seems especially effective or potentially effective in working toward one or more foundational goals; and what else you see happening in this collection that seems valuable or instructive.

*** Amended at the assessment retreat to "scant" or "minimal"**

Faculty Senate Executive Summary for Divestment

Student Climate Culture, VSTEP, the UVM Student Senate & President, and a multitude of other voices encourage the Faculty Senate to endorse fossil fuel divestment for many reasons, including those outlined below.

Requests to the Faculty Senate:

1. Endorse the divestment movement in principle and in practice
2. Endorse the following requests to the Board of Trustees in order to divest UVM's endowment from fossil fuels over a 4-year period:
 - That the Board of Trustees divest from the account most heavily invested in fossil fuels: the Blackrock All-Cap Energy and Resources Portfolio.
 - That the Board of Trustees build and enact a comprehensive plan to eliminate all stock holdings in the top 200 fossil fuel companies (as measured by carbon reserves*) by February 2017. If any accounts remain invested in these companies at the end of the four-year period, the Board must fully divest from them.

*List of companies assembled by the Carbon Tracker Initiative - [Link found here](#)

 - That the Board of Trustees reinvest, to the extent feasible, in local, socially- and/or environmentally-responsible firms.

Reasons for Divestment

- Divestment has a precedent at UVM; successful campaigns have divested from Apartheid, Tobacco and Sudan without harming the portfolio.
- An international network for divestment is in place and growing, creating the potential for UVM's actions to have significant political influence.
- UVM is a brand within the brand of Vermont and an icon of forward thinking.
- The divestment process encourages activism, critical thinking, and civic involvement.
- Divestment is a necessary means to diversify and expand efforts to adapt to and mitigate climate change.

Economic Arguments:

Risks of Inaction:

- Fossil fuels are becoming increasingly volatile investments.

"The more we can shift to alternative fuels, and use energy efficiently, the more we can ensure that our economy does not become hostage to far-flung events and to the volatility of market forces."ⁱ
- Fossil fuel investments make UVM vulnerable to the Carbon Bubble and Systemic Risk. [Forbes Carbon Bubble](#)

"Coal firms and oil and gas firms are currently valued on their proven reserves, but when the carbon limit bites and these proven reserves cannot be extracted, the value of these companies will tumble."ⁱⁱ
- Climate non-disclosure risks make high-carbon companies and the insurance industry vulnerable.

"With the world still reeling from the devastating impacts of an economic crisis triggered by hidden risks in the banking sector, we can ill afford a new problem triggered by hidden risks in another."ⁱⁱⁱ –Ceres Report, Disclosing Climate Risks
- Climate change will divert global economic output.

"Unabated climate change could cost the world at least 5% of GDP each year; if more dramatic predictions come to pass, the cost could be more than 20% of GDP."^{iv}
- A changing climate and increasingly extreme weather have serious economic costs. The Northeast has recently experienced two back-to-back "100-year storms" costing \$15 billion and \$60 respectively.

Impacts of Action:

- Divestment is revenue neutral, with minimal additional risks.

This point is outlined in greater detail in our formal proposal. Fossil fuel companies rarely outperform the market average, so divestment should not slow endowment growth. Furthermore, full carbon divestment will add minimal risk to the portfolio.
- Reinvestment in alternative energy, green technology, and efficiency increases opportunity for long-term growth.

"Listed equity companies that recognize the opportunities and costs associated with de-carbonization and resource scarcity will deliver strong shareholder returns over time. Our thematic approach, modeled after findings such as the Stern Review and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, invests across commercially viable leading technologies that increase the efficient use of scarce resources." - Bill Page, Essex Investment Management, *The Energy Equation*

Social and Environmental Arguments:

Risks of Inaction:

-Climate change threatens global food production.

Every 1-degree-Celsius rise in average temperature lowers wheat, rice, and corn yields by 10%. - Earth Policy Institute

-Extreme weather events will cause increased famine, civil unrest, and an influx of climate refugees.

Reductions in yields and freshwater will deal significant harm to human health in arid regions, often sparking violent conflicts. Yale Environment 360 has reported extensively on this. [Yale Link](#)

-Climate change disproportionately affects the global poor, who are least responsible.

According to the Human Impact Report, over 300,000 are killed annually by climate change-related increases in natural phenomena (including droughts, floods, malaria, and malnutrition). As climate change worsens, so will this.^v All countries will be affected by climate change, but the poorest countries will suffer earliest and most.

-Climate change decimates biodiversity and will exacerbate the ongoing mass-extinction event.

“Warming of 2C could leave 15-40% species facing extinction.”^{vi}

-Marine and coral reef degradation threatens fisheries worldwide, jeopardizing the livelihood of millions.

Impacts of Action:

-Divestment will reduce fossil fuel consumption and strengthen the alternative energy industry.

“Climate change may present both risks and opportunities. . . the enactment of laws regulating emissions may create financial risks for an energy firm that relies on fossil fuels, but may create important opportunities for . . . [a] company’s wind power division.”^{vii}

-Divestment will increase the likelihood that proven carbon reserves are left in the ground.

-UVM’s divestment will give momentum to other necessary environmental campaigns.

-Divestment will begin to strip fossil fuel companies of their political power.

The primary aim of the divestment campaign is political. This industry repeatedly corrupts governments across the world, preventing necessary regulations. A drastic reduction in political power is imperative if these companies are to leave their reserves in the ground.

Hundreds of educational and faith-based endowments, as well as many pension plans (including the Vermont State Pension) are working toward divestment. UVM’s leadership would greatly strengthen this unified voice for political change.

University Arguments:

Risks of Inaction:

-Potential donors may be discouraged from making charitable gifts to the University.

-Not divesting compromises UVM’s adherence to its *Mission, Vision*, and to *Our Common Ground*.

-Not investing puts the University behind on forward-thinking environmental policy.

-Inaction could cost UVM its competitive edge. [Shumlin Report Link](#)

Impacts of Action:

-Successfully divesting will attract more, better students, by giving UVM a pioneering image.

-An immediate media hit, transferred through an existing network, will follow divestment.

-Divestment is collaborative, requiring specialization in areas of expertise and cross-disciplinary action.

-A new gift fund and fundraising source is being created to incentivize divestment.

-Divestment aligns with UVM’s environmental image and gives the University a competitive and reputational advantage on the national scale.

ⁱ Mann, N. (2012, May 18). Climate change policies ‘could halve energy price shock impact’ The Actuary Retrieved from [Link](#)

ⁱⁱ Burston, J. (2011, August 17). Carbon: Forever blowing bubbles? Ethical Corporation. Retrieved from [Link](#)

ⁱⁱⁱ Jayanti, S. (2011, February). Disclosing Climate Risks & Opportunities in SEC Filings (Ceres, Comp.). Ceres. Retrieved from [Link](#)

^{iv} Osborne, H. (2007, October 30). Stern report: the key points. The Guardian. Retrieved from [Link](#)

^v U.N.. (2009). *The Anatomy of A Silent Crisis* (W. Fust & K. Annan, Authors). Retrieved from [Link](#)

^{vi} Osborne, H. (2007, October 30). Stern report: the key points. The Guardian. Retrieved from [Link](#)

^{vii} Jayanti, S. (2011, February). Disclosing Climate Risks & Opportunities in SEC Filings (Ceres, Comp.). Ceres. Retrieved from [Link](#)

**Resolution Requesting That the Faculty Senate of the University Of Vermont
Support the Divestment of Major Fossil Fuel Holdings from the Endowment**

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate acknowledges that the University of Vermont values integrity in the members of its community. In being “honest and ethical in all responsibilities entrusted to us,” it is essential that we act as leaders and innovators willing to take on our responsibility to be “forward looking and break new ground in addressing important community and societal needs.”

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate acknowledges that our *Vision* at the University of Vermont is “to be among the nation’s premier small research universities, preeminent in our comprehensive commitment to liberal education, environment, health, and public service,” and that the school must use this statement to guide decision making.

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate acknowledges that socially and environmentally responsible investments will be imperative in the future economy.

WHEREAS, UVM students have shown through various forms of expression that they wish the University to align its investments with its mission, vision, and values.

BE IT RESOLVED, the Faculty Senate supports Student Climate Culture’s request that the Board of Trustees divest from the account most heavily invested in fossil fuels: the Blackrock All-Cap Energy and Resources Portfolio.

BE IT RESOLVED, the Faculty Senate supports Student Climate Culture’s request that the Board of Trustees build and enact a comprehensive plan to eliminate all stock holdings in the top 200 fossil fuel companies (as measured by carbon reserves) by February 2017. If any accounts remain invested in these companies at the end of the four-year period, the Board must fully divest from them.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Faculty Senate supports Student Climate Culture in encouraging the Board of Trustees to reinvest in local, socially- and/or environmentally-responsible firms.

1. The Mission of The University of Vermont
http://www.uvm.edu/about_uvm/?Page=history/mission.html&SM=historysubmenu.html
2. The Common Ground Statement of The University of Vermont
<http://www.uvm.edu/~president/?Page=miscellaneous/commonground.html>

Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate

Memo To: The Faculty Senate
From: The Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, Cathy Paris, Chair
Date: February 24, 2014
Subject: Approval of a proposal for a revised RN-BS degree program in the Department of Nursing, College of Nursing and Health Sciences

The Curricular Affairs Committee at its meeting of February 13, 2014 unanimously approved the action recommended in the following memo.

The Department of Nursing, College of Nursing and Health Sciences, has submitted a proposal to revise its existing Registered Nurse-to-Bachelor of Science in Nursing program. This is a program designed for the working professional nurse, likely prepared at the associates' degree level, who wants to complete a baccalaureate degree program as a part-time student.

Rationale for the Program: The RN-BS in Nursing program seeks to remove barriers for registered nurses so that they may achieve higher levels of education to ensure the delivery of safe, patient-centered care across a diversity of health care settings. Patient care needs have become more complex in recent years, and nurses need to attain requisite competencies to meet the resultant challenges. Education should include opportunities for seamless transition into higher degree programs from all level of initial preparation, including from the associate's to the bachelor's degree.

Proposed Changes: The RN-BS program has been operating successfully for more than 20 years. Much of the program will remain unchanged. Recently, a set of six courses that had previously been offered via Vermont Interactive Television was converted to an online delivery mode. This change has proven popular with current and prospective students, as it offers greater scheduling flexibility and reduced travel time.

A second proposed change relates to the description of the program in the UVM catalog. In the current catalog it is described as "... an RN-BS-MS accelerated program, with an option for students to 'step out' after completion of the baccalaureate requirements with a B.S. degree." Henceforth the program will no longer present itself as an accelerated master's, but rather as a terminal bachelor's degree program.

Because the program will no longer provide accelerated entry into a master's degree program, a modest change in required courses is also proposed. Previously, students in the program took two Graduate Nursing courses, GRNU 310 and GRNU 315, which counted towards the requirements for a master's degree. However, as of this academic year, undergraduate students are no longer allowed to count graduate courses towards both a baccalaureate and a graduate degree, thus eliminating the benefit of taking graduate courses as part of an undergraduate program. Under the new plan, the two previously required Graduate Nursing

courses will be replaced by two undergraduate courses, PRNU 265 and PRNU 266, newly created for the program.

Program Structure: The RN-BS program requires 121 hours of study, including courses in professional nursing, statistics, natural and social sciences, and the humanities. Most applicants will enter the program with about half the required number of credits. A student with an associate's degree, taking two courses per semester, could expect to complete the program in three years including summers.

Advising: All students are assigned an academic advisor when admitted to the program. Faculty members are available in person, on-line, and by email. In addition to the assigned academic advisor, students have access to mentoring relationships with their clinical faculty as well. This remains unchanged with the proposed revision.

Program Costs: The budget that funds the current RN-BS program will support the revised program. There are no changes to the current budget associated with this revision.

Program Assessment: The RN-BS program will be reviewed and approved by the Vermont State Board of Nursing (VSBON) as well as accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education, a national accrediting body. The program will also be reviewed internally through the University's academic program review process.

Proposal Review Process: A subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee was, on January 10, 2014, charged with the review of the RN-BS proposal. The review subcommittee met on January 29, 2014 to discuss the proposal and recommended its approval to the full CAC at its meeting of February 13, 2014. The CAC voted unanimously to approve the proposal.

Proposed Revision to the Commencement “Walk” Policy

“Walking” is the participation in Commencement ceremonies by students who have almost but not quite completed their degree requirements. Students within six credits of completion may under some conditions petition their dean’s office for permission to “walk” at commencement. Faculty sentiment on the question of “walking” has changed several times through the years. Whereas the practice was common enough, say, ten years ago, in 2009, the Associate Deans group proposed revision to the walk policy, disallowing the practice except in unusual cases, e.g., personal tragedy or the call to military service.

More recently, the Senate Curricular Affairs Committee was asked to consider a more lenient walk policy, one that would permit *any* student who was within six credits of degree completion to walk at commencement. Several arguments for the more liberal approach were advanced:

- Because UVM now holds a December commencement ceremony and it is not possible to screen degree candidates for successful completion of their last requirements, December graduates are thus held to a less rigorous standard for degree completion than May graduates. Liberalizing the walk policy would address this inequity.
- Students express that it is very important to them to graduate with their class. Because reasonable circumstances sometimes prevent a student from completing all degree requirements on schedule (e.g., change in major, required summer internship), some of our students who have nearly made the grade are, under the current policy, unable to participate in the commencement ceremony with their friends. It would be meaningful to these students – and their families – if they were allowed to cross the stage with the other members of their cohort.

Further, it is understood that participation in UVM’s commencement exercises does not in itself signify degree completion. No student will receive his or her diploma until all degree requirements are complete. Students whose degree requirements are incomplete will not have their names printed in the Commencement program.

In consideration of all of these, the Senate Curricular Affairs Committee recommends adopting a more liberal approach to the walk policy:

Undergraduate students who are in good academic standing and within six credits of completing all degree requirements may, pending verification from their dean’s office, participate in the UVM and College/School Commencement ceremonies. It is understood that participation in commencement exercises does not in itself signify degree completion. No student will receive his or her diploma until all degree requirements are complete. Students whose degree requirements are incomplete will not have their names printed in the Commencement program.

Graduate students will not be permitted to participate in Commencement ceremonies until they have completed all their degree requirements, passed their defense examination, and submitted the final copy of their thesis or dissertation to the Graduate College.

The revised walk policy was approved by the Senate Curricular Affairs Committee at its meeting of February 14, 2013.

2009 “Walk” Policy

Commencement celebrates the accomplishments of students who have successfully completed all the requirements necessary for their degrees. In acknowledgement of both the importance and integrity of that considerable achievement, exceptions are made only in truly exigent circumstances to the University’s “walk policy” which states that only students who have successfully completed all degree requirements will be allowed to walk at Commencement.

Those students who are within 6 credits of completion of all degree requirements may petition their college or school for permission to participate in their Commencement ceremony. The petition must contain evidence and/or documentation demonstrating that the degree requirement deficit resulted from circumstances beyond the student’s control and that allowing them to walk at the graduation ceremony would be a humane and compassionate response to those circumstances.

A student wishing to petition for an exception to the walk policy must first present a petition to the Dean’s Office of his or her college or school. Only those circumstances deemed exigent (e.g., illness, family emergency, Dean-approved academic waiver, or other circumstance beyond the student’s control) will be considered. Final decisions will be made by the Associate Provost for Curricular Affairs.

Permission to participate in Commencement ceremonies in accordance with this policy does not constitute the granting of the degree or a guarantee thereof. No degree will be granted until all requirements are completed. The student’s name will not appear in the Commencement program.

Approved by the Associate Deans Group, January 13, 2009