QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Curriculum Committee
Subcommittee on WIDWAC

Annual Report 2004-2005

To: Lorena Ellis, Chair, Curriculum Committee

From: Peter Gray, Chairperson

Date: May 6, 2005

Subject: Annual Report of the WID WAC Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee for 2004-2005

_____

Members:

The members for the committee for 2004-2005 are:
> Peter Gray, Humanities
> Lorena Ellis, Chairperson Curriculum Committee
> Dion Pincus, ISSC
> Sylvia Svitak, Mathematics
> Marvin Gayle, ECET
> Maryann Magaldi, Nursing
> Michael Roggow, CUE Director, Office of Academic Affairs
> Linda Stanley, ex officio (WAC Program Co-coordinator)

> The members will change per the Academic Senate Resolution establishing a WAC Committee of the Academic Senate beginning Fall 2005.

The QCC/WID WAC Subcommittee met 4 times this academic year to discuss the ongoing development of QCC WID/WAC Program and to certify WI classes.

Bylaws Charge:
> The work of the WID WAC Subcommittee includes the following:

6. The Sub Committee shall make an annual report on the condition of the QCC WID WAC PROGRAM, its activities and problems to the Curriculum Committee to be forwarded to the Academic Senate with any recommendations as the Curriculum Committee may deem appropriate and necessary to insure the proper functioning of the program and the completion. Such reports will include:
   a. analysis of the impact of the WI Program on CPE performance
   b. analysis of the impact of the WI Program on retention
   c. annual report required of the Director of the WID WAC Program.

Curriculum Committee Resolution:

   Additionally, the Curriculum Committee approved a resolution concerning the WID WAC Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee in November 11, 2003:

- Be it resolved that, it is the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate to the Academic Senate, the WID WAC subcommittee should be changed to a Standing Committee of the Academic Senate by the end of the 2003-2004 academic year

- Be it further resolved that, the WID WAC Standing Committee of the Academic Senate, when formed, should report and make recommendations to the Curriculum Committee on all matters concerning curriculum.

- Be it further resolved that the Committee on Bylaws, the Committee on Committees and the WID WAC Subcommittee should work together on this change from subcommittee to standing committee of the Academic Senate.

Responses to Bylaws Charges:

6a. Impact of the WID WAC Program on CPE Performance

The specific impact of taking WI classes on CPE performance is difficult to determine as there are many variables involved. In time, as the data amasses, such analyses may be performed if the rate of passing becomes a concern. In the meantime, every effort is made to integrate the CPE exam structure and CPE model assignments into WI faculty development to ensure that WI faculty members are aware of, and incorporate into their classes, the kinds of reading and writing tasks that the CPE assesses. The University has not decided how student results on the CPE will be tied to WI courses and locally we will follow the University's lead; as final decisions are made regarding the status of the WID/WAC Subcommittee and the WI criteria, the Subcommittee will most likely recommend eliminating assessment of the impact of the WAC Program on CPE performance.

6b. Impact of the WID WAC Program on Retention

It is too soon to make an accurate or even a reasonable appraisal of the WI impact on retention as there are too few students involved in WI classes. Over the next several years, the Office of Institutional Research may be asked to perform such analysis. Because the issues that contribute to retention are many, the WID/WAC Program regularly utilizes questionnaires to gather data from students and faculty regarding "satisfaction" and "relevance" of WI classes.

During the current Spring 2005 semester, the WID/WAC Program analyzed the data from the end of Spring 2004 semester questionnaire given to all students in WI classes. As of today's date, only the analysis of part of a larger and more comprehensive assessment is available (Please see ATTACHMENT B: 2004 STUDENT SURVEY ANALYSIS). Summarizing this intial analysis, Julian Brash, CUNY Writing Fellow, writes:

Overall, there is self-reported improvement in writing, as 87% of students believe they have improved in at least one area of writing. However, this improvement seems limited to a few areas of writing, particularly planning, and secondarily in using examples/details, the identification of main ideas, revision, and following directions.

Women were more likely than men to report improvement in at least one area of writing. They were much more likely to report improvement in a particular area of writing than men. In addition, women reported improvement in larger numbers of writing areas than men. Generally, ESL students in WI courses were less likely than their non-ESL counterparts to report improvements in their writing, and in general reported improvements in fewer writing areas, though there were some exceptions to this. Remedial students were more likely than non-remedial students to report improvement in at least one area of writing; however, there were no major differences between these

two types of students in terms of the number of writing areas in which improvement was reported or in terms of which areas improvement was reported in.

As final decisions are made regarding the status of the WID/WAC Subcommittee and the WI criteria, the Subcommittee will most likely recommend eliminating assessment of the impact of the WAC Program on retention.

6c. Annual Report of the Co-Directors of the WID WAC Program
SEE ATTACHMENT A.

Curriculum Committee Resolution of November 11, 2003 Response:
On February 8, 2005 the Academic Senate "made, seconded, and approved to accept a resolution on the WID WAC program, but not including any action of the formation of a Standing Committee on WID WAC" (MINUTES of the February 8, 2005 meeting of the
Academic Senate).

On March 8, 2005, the Academic Senate debated then tabled any action on creating a WAC Committee. On April 12, 2005 the Academic Senate voted to establish a standing WAC Committee of the Academic Senate.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:

With continued funding from the CUNY Administration and what appears to be a plan to fund the QCC WID WAC Program for an additional five years, we recommend that

- With the establishment of a WAC Committee of the Academic Senate, the Curriculum Committee establish a close working relationship with the WAC Committee;

- The Curriculum Committee continue to work with the Administration, specifically the Academic Vice President and the Director of CUE, the WID/WAC Co-Directors and the WID/WAC Committee to ensure a productive discussion about how best to embed writing within each curriculum to ensure that, as the Board of Trustees' resolution states, students have the opportunity for "extensive writing experience" in all aspects of their college education;

- The Curriculum Committee continue to work with the Academic Vice President and the Director of CUE to ensure that enough WI sections are distributed across disciplines, and throughout summer, and day and evening class schedules (most of the WI classes are still offered fall during day or afternoon class schedules).

ATTACHMENT A

Annual Report of the WID/WAC Program 2004-2005
Dr. Peter Gray & Dr. Linda Stanley, Co-Directors, WID/WAC Program

INTRODUCTION

The University's new Master Plan continues to recognize the importance of the QCC WID/WAC program in Queensborough's efforts to strengthen undergraduate education through the Coordinated Undergraduate Education initiative:

> The Writing-Across-the-Curriculum (WAC) program is central to the implementation of the CUE Initiative, and, most significantly, is a key component in the development of academic literacies across the curriculum for all CUNY students. Ideally, and in accordance with the 1999 Board of Trustees Resolution, writing should be embedded within curricula, throughout the disciplines and professional/ technical programs, so that students have the opportunity for 'extensive writing experience' in all aspects of their college education. The Board mandate called for WAC to be a common responsibility— among colleges, departments, disciplines, and programs—and for the development of writing proficiency to become a focus of the entire undergraduate curriculum. (51)

The Writing Across the Curriculum Program at Queensborough Community College, CUNY, as part of the CUNY WAC Initiative, aims to make the development of writing proficiency a focus of the entire undergraduate curriculum by embedding writing within curricula and throughout the disciplines and career and technical programs. The program intends, by giving students extensive writing experience in all aspects of their college education, to deliberately link the practices of writing (which are always contextual, contested, negotiated) with learning (itself a contextual, contested and negotiated process of development). Such an undertaking has been embraced at QCC as a collective effort, and in the collaborations among faculty, between faculty members and Writing Fellows, and between faculty and the administration, the Queensborough WAC program has become an incredibly dynamic, complex, inspiring, knowledge-producing initiative. It has become an important site for revitalizing undergraduate education.

The Queensborough WAC program operates on multiple institutional levels: leading faculty development initiatives to redesign individual courses; assisting departments in rethinking their curricular offerings to meet their own disciplinary goals, the college's writing requirements, and the general education goals of the college and the University; and contributing to enriching the college's culture of teaching and learning by asserting that reflective pedagogy and pedagogical innovation should guide our teaching practice. Queensborough's WAC program has become a locus of intensive inquiry by faculty members and Writing Fellows into the role of writing in teaching disciplinary knowledge, into the theories of development faculty members hold, into the place of international Englishes within disciplinary work, into how students whose first language isn't English can both be supported and challenged.

As we look to the next year within CUE, and as Fall 2005 will be the inaugural semester for the WI requirement for incoming students, we will continue to press for institutionalizing ways to make WAC work, including working closely with Advisement to identify how best to enroll students in WI classes at the most appropriate times. A goal that we will investigate, under the auspices of CUE, is how to create a deliberate, intentional, and logical developmental structure of WI classes (e.g. triple exempt students could be encouraged to enroll in WI classes immediately; those enrolled in Basic Skills courses would wait until after EN-101; etc.).

As the one mandated Board of Trustees initiative in the CUNY Master Plan, we appreciate the support and encouragement offered by the President and his Administration for the WID/WAC program;

- We appreciate how, as a faculty run initiative it has been placed by both the University and the College as central to the Coordinated Undergraduate Education proposal;

- We recognize and appreciate that the Administration has put the WID/WAC program on the agenda of the Kitchen Cabinet so that debate over the shape of the program occurs not only among faculty developing WI classes but also at higher levels of the administration;

- We recognize and appreciate the hard work that Dr. Mark McColloch and Dr. Karen Steele accomplished this academic year in working with chairs and faculty members to ensure a good faith implementation of the Academic Senate bylaws concerning WI classes and the WID/WAC program;

- We recognize and appreciate the leadership that President Marti, Vice President McColloch and Dean Steele offered to pass a revision of the WID/WAC bylaws before the Academic Senate, and we appreciate the collegial exchange among the Senate Steering Committee and the Bylaws Committee in drafting the bylaws to establish a WAC Committee of the Academic Senate.

PROGRAM REPORT

Since its inception, the QCC WID/WAC program has sought to assist faculty, departments, and the college in finding appropriate ways to embed writing within each curriculum and throughout each course of study so that QCC students will have extensive writing experience by the time they graduate or transfer. With the date for requiring WI classes for graduation approaching (Fall 2005), the WID/WAC program this past year has focused on a broad range of efforts in support of the standing bylaws of the Faculty Senate, and to support a revision of the standing bylaws to account for how the program has changed and grown since its inception.

- Faculty Development & WI Classes

Beginning AY2004 and with a newly passed 2 WI graduation requirement to begin with the incoming class of 2005, the QCC Office of Academic Affairs asked the WAC Program to offer more workshops in order to prepare more faculty members to teach WI classes. In addition to the above structure (we currently have 15 faculty in the Saturday workshops), we've added a Thursday evening "thread" of workshops. These Thursday-Faculty (evenly split between full time and adjuncts) participated in 3 Spring '05 semester workshops and three Fall '05 semester workshops. However, we've split them into discipline-based groups run with the help of "turnkey" faculty members who has previously developed a WI class through the professional development workshops and assisted (or in some cases, guided) by a Fellow. We have three groups - Sciences (physics, biology, chemistry); Social Sciences (history, history of dance, sociology); Business. We have one group in Mathematics that began to individually mentor their own adjuncts, meeting weekly to help develop and teach WI classes. For those faculty members who couldn't do the Thursdays this semester, we have a WI summer institute – three days in a row in early June, followed by three Fall semester follow-ups as those faculty members teach a WI for the first time. All told, by the beginning of Fall '05 we will have somewhere near 120 faculty "certified" (those who have participated in the workshops and who have submitted a WI class portfolio to the WAC Committee of our Academic Senate) to teach WI classes.

We describe these ongoing efforts because they indicate the direction we will take the QCC WAC professional development program during the 05-06 academic year. Because we will be working intensively with adjuncts, we will need to allow for multiple possible structures of workshops in order to accommodate the disparate hours that adjuncts work on campus – a complicated process of planning and administration that is still underway. We intend to continue offering a longitudinal scope of professional development workshops in which faculty have time to examine what WI classes are and might be, and then time and support to pilot their own WI classes. This is a process that takes at least two semesters. We will most likely continue with two threads of workshops, distributing Writing Fellows among the various faculty members involved. Our goal is to have an additional 25 faculty members WI certified by the end of the 2006 academic year, bringing to around 150 the total number of faculty members able to teach WI classes.

Please see the lists of WI classes below for Fall 2004, Spring 2005 and Fall 2005 (as of 5/6/05)

- Support for WI Faculty

The CUNY Graduate Writing Fellows will continue to be mentored by the Co-Directors and will continue to support the development and piloting of WI classes. However, their work will be broadened to include not only working with specific departments, the QC/QCC Bridge to Transfer Pilot, and in helping run new strands of workshops aimed to include adjuncts in teaching WI classes.

The Co-Directors and the CUNY Writing Fellows have continued to work with the ISS to share knowledge and practices in order to more closely align the Writing Center to faculty teaching WI classes, including helping to prepare tutors for the kinds of assignments given in WI classes.

- Summer Institute
  The Co-Directors continue to organize, plan, and support the Summer Institute. This year, because of the need to prepare for the first semester of the WI graduation requirement, the Summer Institute will be almost exclusively directed at supporting the development of WI classes. In the future, our intention is to change the nature of the Summer Institute so that it can become an important hub in which faculty participating in a variety of similar programs can be brought in a coordinated way to share their knowledge. Ultimately the Summer Institute will be constituted at the CUE Summer Institute and involve many different faculty members involved across the curriculum in professional development.

- Program Co-Directors
  The Co-Directors divided the workload of administering and implementing the many facets of the WID/WAC program. The Co-Director for Program Development focused on four areas: 1) point person to the administration and departments for the organization and registration of WI classes; 2) liaison to departments for the recruitment of faculty to teach WI classes and in learning communities; 3) supervising and mentoring the CUNY Writing Fellows and their professional development; 4) participating as a member of the University-wide WAC Committee & as a member of the CUNY WAC Assessment and Community Colleges subcommittees. The Co-Director for Faculty Development focused on four areas: 1) designing and running the WI and Learning Community faculty development workshops; 2) supervising and mentoring the CUNY Writing Fellows and their professional development; 3) participating as a member of the University-wide WAC Committee, as chair of the University-wide Fellows Professional Education subcommittee, and as chair of the Policy Subcommittee; 4) Chairing the WAC Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee.

- WID/WAC Assessment
  Assessment continued to be refined this year. Two CUNY Writing Fellows in educational psychology and one in Anthropology worked closely with Anna Mae Jagoda in Institutional Research to develop and pilot a student questionnaire that helps the program determine the success of the WI model of instruction. Please see **Attachment B: 2004 STUDENT SURVEY ANALYSIS** for the questionnaire findings, which are a part of a larger assessment project to be distributed in Fall 2005. The University has not decided how student results on the CPE will be tied to WI courses and locally we will follow the University's lead. The Program continues to gather a wealth of data in the WI Faculty Teaching Portfolios.

- CPE Oriented Efforts
  The Program is constantly sharing strategies with the CPE Liaison who is also in the English Department. In particular, we have encouraged that he seek advice from department chairs and request time during department meetings to talk with faculty about their responsibilities for developing reading and writing assignments that will better prepare students for passing the CPE.
  Additionally, several of the professional development workshops that we offered this year directly address the CPE. During the workshops that discussed designing writing assignments, we included an analysis of the CPE assignment for Task 1. During the workshops that highlight strategies for responding to student writing, the CPE rubric was examined and offered as one possible model among many to use in classes. That rubric, though it is offered as one of many possible options, has become very much admired by our faculty teaching WI classes as a starting point for a rational and comprehensive approach to grading, and many adapt it for use in their own WI classes.

Listing of WI Classes: Fall 2004, Spring 2005, Fall 2005

Writing Intensive Courses For Fall 2004

SEMESTER	COURSE	CODE	INSTRUCTOR	COMMENTS
Fall 2004	**ARD310 LC**	**0485**	**WEIN**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	BUD509 M24	1121	EGAN	
Fall 2004	BUD859 FNET1	1068	PACE	
Fall 2004	BUD859 FNET2	1069	PACE	
Fall 2004	BUD509 F134	1019	FRIEDMAN	
Fall 2004	BUD509 J134	1021	FRIEDMAN	
Fall 2004	CHD101D24	0048	Rutenburg	
Fall 2004	CHD102 E4	0049	Rutenburg	
Fall 2004	CHD110 D13	0305	Rutenburg	
Fall 2004	CHD111E3	0351	Rutenburg	
Fall 2004	**EDD110-D24LC**	**1416**	**FERDENZI**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	EDD110-F24	1424	FERDENZI	
Fall 2004	ET230-VERF	0818	STARK	
Fall 2004	ETD350-D123	0823	EMANUEL	
Fall 2004	ET504-C5	0840	SITBON	
Fall 2004	ET560-C234	1921	BIRCHFIELD	
Fall 2004	ETD710-C2	1928	KUEPER	
Fall 2004	HID111 F24	0403	VISONI	
Fall 2004	HID127 G124	0428	ELIAS	
Fall 2004	**HED102-LC**	**1560**	**ICONIS**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	**LFD401PNET**	**1763**	**AVENS**	**Partly Online**
Fall 2004	**MAD114 LC**	**0085**	**SPORN**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	MAD128-GX245	0123	SVITAK	
Fall 2004	MAD240 E23	0126	ALLAIRE	
Fall 2004	MAD303-E124	1978	FELICETTI	
Fall 2004	MAD321FNET	0170	WALLACH	
Fall 2004	MAD471-D234	0216	BERTORELLI	
Fall 2004	MUD110 F5	1175	SCHONBRUN	
Fall 2004	**MUD140-LC**	**1180**	**KUTNOWSKI**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	NUD102X23B	1363	BODDEN & MENENDEZ	
Fall 2004	NUD102 34A	1340	TITTMAN & ROYCE	
Fall 2004	NUD203 D3A	1408	WALLACE	
Fall 2004	NUD203 D3B	1413	REILLY	
Fall 2004	**PHD201 LC**	**0565**	**LIEBERMAN**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	**PHD201 /LC**	**0562**	**LIEBERMAN**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	**SPD531-LC**	**1311**	**McGILL**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	SSD211 D13	1479	DOWLAH	
Fall 2004	SSD212-B24	1516	AZRAK	
Fall 2004	SSD212-C24	1849	AZRAK	
Fall 2004	SSD211-FNET1	1486	AZRAK	**Fully Online**
Fall 2004	SSD211-FNET2	1487	AZRAK	**Fully Online**
Fall 2004	SSD310-H1	1666	MULLIN	
Fall 2004	SSD310-D124	1614	TRICARICO	
Fall 2004	SSD310-E124	1641	TRICARICO	
Fall 2004	SSD310-F124	1661	TRICARICO	

Fall 2004	SSD310-G124		TRICARICO	
Fall 2004	SSD330-H124	1673	TRICARICO	
Fall 2004	**SSD410LC**	**1695**	**BALES**	**} Learning Comminities**
Fall 2004	**SSD510-LC1**	**1733**	**BLUESTONE**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	**SSD510-LC3**	**1735**	**BLUESTONE**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	**SSD310 LC1**	**0688**	**TRACHMAN**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	**SSD510-LC2**	**1734**	**CULKIN**	**} Learning Communities**
Fall 2004	SSD510-D13	1708	CULKIN	
Fall 2004	SSD510-E134	1715	PELLER	
Fall 2004	**SSD520-F14**	**1741**	**BLUESTONE**	**Honors Section**
Fall 2004	SSD610-C124	1772	KINCAID	
Fall 2004	SSD610-D124	1775	KINCAID	
Fall 2004	SSD610-PNET1	1777	PECORINO	Partly Online
Fall 2004	SSD610-PNET2	1784	PECORINO	Partly Online
Fall 2004	SSD610-FNET	1786	PECORINO	Fully Online
Fall 2004	SSD620-PNET	1787	PECORINO	Partly Online
Fall 2004	SSD640-FNET	1790	PECORINO	Fully Online
Fall 2004	SSD770-FNET	1791	PECORINO	Fully Online
Fall 2004	SSD630-E124	1789	KINCAID	

6/3/2004

Writing Intensive Courses
Spring 2005

Art

AR-310	H2	Polistena
AR-320	H1	Wein

Business

BU-110	F125	Kelly
BU 509	B135	Friedman
BU 509	M24	Egan
BU 701	B124	Mooney
BU 701	C124	Mooney
BU 701	E124	Mooney
BU 701	F124	Mooney
BU 701	G124	Mooney
BU 701	H245	DiSena
BU 701	J13	DiSena
BU 701	J245	DiSena
BU 701	M1	Kebalo
BU 701	M2	Kebalo
BU 701	M13	Rosen
BU 701	Q24	TBA
BU 701	C6	Kebalo
BU 859	B24	Pace
BU 859	B3	Pace
BU 859	Q13	Glinert

Chemistry

CH 101		Rutenberg
CH 102		Rutenberg
CH 110		Rutenberg
CH 111		Rutenberg

Electrical and Computer Engineering Technology

ET 710	C1	Kueper
ET 710	C3	Gayle
ET 230	E234	Stark
ET 320	F235	Emanuel
ET 504	C5	Sitbon
ET 504	D5	TBA
ET 560	G124	Birchfield

Health, Physical Education & Dance

HA 100	C3	Barrett
HE 102	E3	Iconis

History

HI 112	E135	Pearl
HI 112	H4	Clingan

| HI 127 | G124 | Elias |
| HI 128 | F134 | Van Ells |

Mathematics and Computer Science

MAD 336	D134	Bertorelli
MAD 250	H24	Ren
MAD 303	DX0	Felicetti
MAD 321	FNET	Wallach
MAD 128	E234	Svitak

Nursing

NU 102 (all sections)
NU 203 (all sections)

Social Sciences

EDD 110	B24	Spradley, P.
EDD 110	E13	Ferdenzi, A.
EDD 110	F24	Spradley, P.
SSD 211	FNET1	Azrak, P.
SSD 211	FNET2	Azrak, P.
SSD 212	B13	Azrak, P.
SSD 212	C13	Azrak, P.
SSD 212	FNET	Dowlah, C.
SSD 310	D124	Tricario, D.
SSD 310	D245	Poulsen, J.
SSD 310	E124	Tricarico, D.
SSD 310	G124	Tricarico, D.
SSD 310	LC1	Trachman, M.
SSD 330	F124	Tricarico, D.
SSD 410	G124	Bales, P.
SSD 510	E134	Peller, M.
SSD 510	FNET	Bluestone, C.
SSD 510	G124	Jankowski, J.
SSD 510	LC3	Bluestone, C.
SSD 610	C134	Kincaid, S.
SSD 610	LC	Kincaid, S.
SSD 610	G124	Kincaid, S.
SSD 610	FNET	Pecorino, P.
SSD 620	FNET	Pecorino, P.
SSD 630	D134	Kincaid, S.
SSD 640	PNET	Pecorino, P.

Speech Commuication and Theatre Arts

| SP 434 | D5 | Campolo |
| SP 531 | LC | McGill |

FALL 2005 – WRITING INTENSIVE SECTIONS

Biology
1298 BID 140 /F1   Dwight Meyer
1299 BID 140 /F4   Dwight Meyer
1309 BID 201 /E1   Regina Sullivan
1311 BID 201 /F4   Regina Sullivan
1318 BID 202 /D2   Roland Scal
1374 BID 202 /J2   Roland Scal

Business
1681 BUD 110 F125   Kevin Kelly
1747 BUD 509 B245   Stephen Friedman*
1748 BUD 509 J13   Stephen Friedman
1838 BUE 509 M24   Lawrence Egan*
1760 BUD 701 B124   Christine Mooney
1761 BUD 701 C124   Christine Mooney
1762 BUD 701 C6   David McAuley
1763 BUD 701 D124   Christine Mooney
1764 BUD 701 F124   Christine Mooney
1765 BUD 701 F35   Nina Sarkar
1766 BUD 701 G124   Christine Mooney
1767 BUD 701 K13   Stephanie Saucier
1768 BUD 701 K24   Stephanie Saucier
1844 BUE 701 M1   Orest Kebalo
1845 BUE 701 M2   Orest Kebalo
1846 BUE 701 M13   Ted Rosen
1847 BUE 701 Q24   Stuart Radin
1779 BUD 859 PNET   Phyllis Pace*
1780 BUD 859 PNET2   Phyllis Pace*
1854 BUE 859 Q13   TBA

Chemistry
0029 CHD 101 D24   Lall-Ramanarine, Rutenberg*- doesn't know who teaches
0030 CHD 101 G13   which yet
0031 CHD 102 D1
0032 CHD 102 E4
0038 CHD 110 S13
0039 CHD 110 H24
0040 CHD 111 E3
0041 CHD 111 J4

ECET
ET210G124/D3   Gerson*
ET350F234/J3   Emanuel*
ET504C5/D5   Sitbon*
ET560G124/H1   Birchfield*
ET710C2/C4   Kueper*
AR473D1   Kueper*/Golden*

Foreign Language
LS-401 LC   J. Ortiz-Griffin

Health & Phys Ed
1286 HED 102 C2B   Andrea Eder
0878 HED 102 E2B   Andrea Eder
0880 HED 102 C3A   Aaron Krac
0883 HED 102 E3A   Aaron Krac
0897 HED 103 D2   Paul Weiss
0922 IS 151 PNET   Lana Zinger
1952 HED 102 E2A   Rosemary Iconis*

History
0655 HID 110 J4   Visoni*
0660 HID 111 F24   Visoni*
0663 HID 111 H14   Tai*
0670 HID 112 E135   Pearl*
0675 HID 112 H2   Clingan*
0678 HID 127 F124   Elias*
0684 HID 128 F134   Van Ellis*
0697 HIE 112 M1   Katz

Math & CS
0395 MAD 301 PNET   Patrick Wallach*
0438 MAD 336 C6   Robert Weiss
0441 MAD 336 H124A   Margot Small
0446 MAD 336 H124B   Patrick O'Neill
0577 MAD 471 D234   Mary Felicetti*

Music
0468 MUD 110 C1   Camus
0469 MUD 110 C2   Camus
0470 MUD 110 F4   Montgomery
0471 MUD 110 F5   Schonbrun*
0472 MUD 110 D3   Staff
0473 MUD 110 J4   Staff
0474 MUD 110 J1   Staff
0529 MUE 110 M2   Staff

Nursing
0857 NUD 102X34A   Maryann Magaldi*, Georgina Colalillo*, Debbie Fitzgerald-Royce
0858 NUD 102X23B   Camille Bodden*, Margaret Reilly*, Karin Gapper,*
0850 NUD 203D3A   Maureen Wallace*
0851 NUD 203D3B
0852 NUD 203F4A
0853 NUD 203F4B

Physics
0778 PHD 110 C124   Paul Marchese, David Lieberman*, Charles Neuman,
0781 PHD 110 D134   Irene Tufano, Tak Cheung, Alex Flamholz,
0784 PHD 110 E13   George Tremberger

0786 PHD 110 G124
0788 PHD 110 K13
0810 PHE 110 M13A
0811 PHE 110 M13B

Social Sciences
0268 EDD110 C13   A. Ferdenzi*
0269 EDD110 G24   A. Ferdenzi*
0270 EDD110 LC   P. Spradley
0271 EDD110 J13(Phantom)   V. Daley
0281 SDD211 D13   C. Dowlah*
0286 SDD211 FNET 1   P. Azrak*
0287 SDD211 FNET 2   P. Azrak*
0289 SDD211 LATE   P. Connelly
0440 SSE 211 Q24   C. Germain
0290 SSD212 B24   P. Azrak*
0291 SSD212 E24   P. Azrak*
0295 SSD235 C24   P. Azrak*
0296 SSD FNET   C. Dowlah*
0303 SSD 310 C245   J. Poulsen
0307 SSD 310 C6   E. Yarru
0308 SSD 310 D124   D. Tricarico *
0311 SSD 310 E124   D. Tricarico*
0312 SSD 310 F124   D. Tricarico*
0316 SSD 310 G124A   D. Tricarico*
0318 SSD310 H1   J. Mullin*
0321 SSD310 J2   J. Mullin*
0322 SSD 310 J4   J. Mullin*
0324 SSD310 LC   M. Trachman*
0440 SSE 211 Q24   C. Germain
0445 SSE 310 M1   M. Coulton-Morrison
0452 SSE 310 M4   T. Gorman*
0326 SSD 330 H124   D. Tricarico*
0328 SSD 375 D124   M. Trachman*
0331 SSD410 LC   P. Bales*
0333 SSD480 F124   P. Bales*
0342 SSD 510 C13   J. Culkin*
0352 SSD 510 E134   M. Peller*
0354 SSD FNET   C. Bluestone*
0457 SSE 510 M24   D. Kaplan
0559 SSE 510 M3   E. Goldhammer
0372 SSD510 LC2   J. Jankowski
0374 SSD510 LC4   C. Bluestone*
0377 SSD 520 D13   C. Bluestone*
0400 SSD 520 PNET   C. Bluestone*
0411 SSD 610 C13   S. Kincaid *
0412 SSD 610 C24   S. Kincaid*
0415 SSD 610 D13   S. Kincaid*
0419 SSD 610 FNET   P. Pecorino*
0420 SSD 610 G1   T. Gerald
0421 SSD 610 G2 (PHANTOM)   T. Gerald

0422 SSD 610 PNET 1(Phantom)   P. Pecorino*
0423 SSD 610 PNET2   P. Pecorino*
0424 SSD 610 PNET3   P. Pecorino*
0425 SSD 630 D24   S. Kincaid*
0427 SSD 640 FNET   P. Pecorino*
0466 SSE 610 M2   C. Anyanwu
1951 SSD 510 E134   C. Bluestone*

Speech
0737 SPD 433 E5   Robert Campolo
1918 SPD 532 C3   Robert Sweetnam
0743 SPD 536 D24   Michele Cuomo
531 SPD LC/WI   Georgia McGill *

* = certified as of Spring 05

Attachment B: 2004 STUDENT SURVEY ANALYSIS

Julian Brash
Writing Across the Curriculum Program
Queensborough Community College
March 16, 2005

**WAC Assessment:
2004 Student Survey Analysis**

As part of the effort to assess the WAC program at QCC, this memo analyzes responses to a survey of students in Writing Intensive classes. This survey, responded to by 436 students, including ESL and remedial students, was administered to all students in Writing Intensive courses in the spring of 2004. As part of the survey, students were asked to evaluatethe impact that Writing Intensive courses had on 13 different areas of their writing. The answers provided to these questions are used to assess the self-reported impact of WI courses on students' writing. These impacts are also be assessed for different subgroups of students, including subgroups determined by gender, ESL status, and remedial status.

SUMMARY:

Overall, there is self-reported improvement in writing, as 87% of students believe they have improved in at least one area of writing. However, this improvement seems limited to a few areas of writing, particularly planning, and secondarily in using examples/details, the identification of main ideas, revision, and following directions.

Women were more likely than men to report improvement in at least one area of writing. They were much more likely to report improvement in a particular area of writing than men. In addition, women reported improvement in larger numbers of writing areas than men. Generally, ESL students in WI courses were less likely than their non-ESL counterparts to report improvements in their writing, and in general reported improvements in fewer writing areas, though there were some exceptions to this. Remedial students were more likely than non-remedial students to report improvement in at least one area of writing; however, there were no major differences between these two types of students in terms of the number of writing areas in which improvement was reported or in terms of which areas improvement was reported in.

See the discussion below for more details.

I. Basic Frequencies

The following two tables contain basic frequencies of the number of writing areas different students felt they improved in, and the percentage of students which felt they improved in each particular area.

Number of Areas in Which Improvement is Reporting

As Table 1 shows, 87% percent of students believed that they had experienced improvement in at least one of the 13 areas of writing they were asked about in the survey. However, only 15.8% of students believed their writing had improved in more than half (seven or more) of these areas; and the majority (62%) believed their writing had improved in only three or fewer of these areas. The mean number of writing areas in which students reported improvement was 3.4; the median was 3.0.

In Which Areas Did Students Report Improvement?

As Table 2 shows, about half (48%) of students believed they had improved the planning of their writing; this was the area in which the greatest percentage of students felt they had improved.

37% believed they had gotten better at using specific examples/details; 36% thought they had improved in the identification of main ideas; 34% reported that they had improved at revising rough drafts; and 31% reported that they had improved at following the professor's directions. In no other area did more than a quarter (25%) of the students report improvements.

II. Subgroup Analysis

In this section, the survey data is analyzed for various subgroups, including ESL Status, Remedial Status, Gender and Age.

Gender

On average, women reported an improvement in 3.9 writing areas, while men reported improvements in only 2.8 areas of writing. As Table 3 shows, almost double the percentage of men as women reported no improvement (15.8 v. 7.9 percent; statistically significant at the .05 level) in their writing at all. Likewise, almost half (45%) of all women reported improvement in more than three writing areas, while only about a quarter (28%) of men reported improvement in more than three writing areas.

Table 4 illustrates that in all writing areas, women were more likely to report improvement than men. These differences were statistically significant in eight different writing areas: planning, using specific examples, understanding audience, revising, proofreading, stating the main idea, using appropriate vocabulary, and grades. The largest gaps between women and men were in the area of using specific examples, revising, and stating the main idea.

Overall, we can see that women in WI courses were more likely to report some improvement in their writing and reported improvement in more areas of their writing than men.

ESL Status

As Table 5 shows, ESL students were slightly less likely to report any writing improvement than were non-ESL students, 88.4% for the former and 86.5% for the latter; this difference was not statistically significant. In addition, ESL students on average reported improvement in fewer areas (3.16) than non-ESL students (3.47). Close to 40% of non-ESL students reported improvements in 3 or more areas, compared to just 26% of ESL students.

However, as Table 6 shows, there were two writing areas in which ESL students were more likely to report improvement than non-ESL students. First, ESL students were much more likely than non-ESL students to report improvement in the identification of main ideas (49% v. 34%); this difference is statistically significance. ESL students were also more likely to improve their fluency than non-ESL students (16.3 v. 10.7); this difference was not, however, statistically significant.

In most writing areas, non-ESL students were more likely to report improvements than were ESL students. This difference was statistically significant in only one writing area, however; this was in the area of revision, where only 21% of ESL students reported improvement, as compared with 35% of non-ESL students. Large,

but statistically insignificant differences were also seen in the writing areas of including appropriate content, proofreading, and grades.

Remedial Status

Remedial students were more likely to report some improvement in their writing than non-remedial students (92% v. 84%; this difference is statistically significant at the .05 level). However, remedial (3.6.) and non-remedial students (3.4) on average reported improvement in roughly the same number of writing areas. Also, as Table 7 shows, the distribution of the number of writing areas in which improvement was reported did not differ markedly between remedial and non-remedial students.

As Table 8 demonstrates, remedial students were more likely to report improvement in seven of the thirteen writing areas: identification of main ideas; planning; using specific examples; grammar, spelling, and punctuation; proofreading; stating the main idea; and fluency. The reverse was true in the writing areas of including appropriate content, understanding audience, using appropriate vocabulary, and grades. In the writing areas of following the professor's direction and revision there was virtually no difference between the percentages of remedial and non-remedial students reporting improvement. The differences between the two types of students were not statistically significant in any area of writing.

Table 1
Number of Areas of Improved Writing

Number of Areas in Which Writing Improved	No.	Pct.	Cumulative Pct.
0	58	13.3	13.3
1	91	20.9	34.2
2	59	13.5	47.7
3	64	14.7	62.4
4	29	6.7	69.0
5	43	9.9	78.9
6	23	5.3	84.2
7	25	5.7	89.9
8	10	2.3	92.2
9	9	2.1	94.3
10	6	1.4	95.6
11	4	0.9	96.6
12	5	1.1	97.7
13	10	2.3	100.0
Total	436	100.0	

Table 2
Percentage Reporting Improvement in Each Area of Writing

Area of Writing	No Improvement		Improvement	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Planning my writing	227	52.1	209	47.9
Using specific examples/details	275	63.1	161	36.9
Identification of main ideas	280	64.2	156	35.8
Revising the rough draft	290	66.5	146	33.5
Following the professor's directions	300	68.8	136	31.2
Grammar, spelling and punctuation	328	75.2	108	24.8
Stating the main idea	329	75.5	107	24.5
Including appropriate content	330	75.7	106	24.3
Proofreading	332	76.1	104	23.9
Using appropriate vocabulary	352	80.7	84	19.3
Grades on written assignments	364	83.5	72	16.5
Understanding audience	374	85.8	62	14.2
Fluency	387	88.8	49	11.2

Table 3
Number of Areas of Writing Improvement:
By Gender

| Number of Areas in Which Writing Improved | Percentage Reporting Number of Areas of Improvement | | | | | |
| | Female | | Male | | All Students | |
	Pct.	Cum. Pct.	Pct.	Cum. Pct.	Pct.	Cum. Pct.
0	7.9	7.9	15.8	15.8	10.3	10.3
1	18.3	26.2	26.7	42.5	20.8	31.1
2	14.7	40.9	14.2	56.7	14.5	45.6
3	14.3	55.2	15.8	72.5	14.8	60.4
4	7.9	63.1	5.8	78.3	7.3	67.7
5	12.9	76.0	5.8	84.1	10.8	78.5
6	5.0	81.0	5.0	89.1	5.0	83.5
7	6.8	87.8	3.3	92.4	5.8	89.3
8	2.2	90.0	3.3	95.7	2.5	91.8
9	2.5	92.5	0.8	96.5	2.0	93.8
10	1.8	94.3	0.8	97.3	1.5	95.3
11	1.4	95.7	0.0	97.3	1.4	96.7
12	1.8	97.5	0.0	97.3	1.3	98.0
13	2.5	100.0	2.5	99.8	2.5	100.5
N	279		120		399	

Note: 37 respondents did not report gender

Table 4
Areas of Writing Improvement:
By Gender

Area of Writing	Percentage Reporting Improvement			
	Female	**Male**	**Stat. Sig**	**All Students**
Identification of main ideas	39.8	32.5		37.6
Planning my writing	53.0	42.5	**	49.9
Using specific examples/details	43.7	27.5	***	38.8
Including appropriate content	25.4	23.3		24.8
Grammar, spelling and punctuation	26.5	25.8		26.3
Understanding audience	16.5	10.0	*	14.5
Revising the rough draft	39.4	24.2	***	34.8
Following the professor's directions	33.7	29.2		32.3
Proofreading	28.0	18.3	**	25.1
Stating the main idea	30.5	15.0	***	25.8
Using appropriate vocabulary	23.3	14.2	**	20.6
Grades on written assignments	19.7	10.8	**	17.0
Fluency	12.5	10.0		11.8
N	279	120		399

Note: 37 respondents did not report gender

Statistical Significance: * at .10 level; ** at .05 level; *** at .01 level

Table 5
Number of Areas of Writing Improvement:
By ESL Status

| | **Percentage Reporting Number of Areas of Improvement** | | | | | |
| | **Non-ESL** | | **ESL** | | **All Students** | |
Number of Areas in Which Writing Improved	**Pct.**	**Cum. Pct.**	**Pct.**	**Cum. Pct.**	**Pct.**	**Cum. Pct.**
0	13.5	13.5	11.6	11.6	13.3	13.3
1	21.1	34.6	18.6	30.2	20.9	34.2
2	13.0	47.6	18.6	48.8	13.5	47.7
3	13.5	61.1	25.6	74.4	14.7	62.4
4	7.1	68.2	2.3	76.7	6.7	69.1
5	10.2	78.4	7.0	83.7	9.9	79.0
6	5.3	83.7	4.7	88.4	5.3	84.3
7	5.9	89.6	4.7	93.1	5.7	90.0
8	2.3	91.9	2.3	95.4	2.3	92.3
9	2.3	94.2	0.0	95.4	2.1	94.4
10	1.5	95.7	0.0	95.4	1.4	95.8
11	1.0	96.7	0.0	95.4	0.9	96.7
12	1.3	98.0	0.0	95.4	1.1	97.8
13	2.0	100.0	4.7	100.1	2.3	100.1
N	393		43		436	

84

Table 6
Areas of Writing Improvement:
By ESL Status

Area of Writing	Percentage Reporting Improvement			
	ESL	Non-Esl	Stat. Sig	All Students
Identification of main ideas	48.8	34.4	*	35.8
Planning my writing	48.8	47.8		47.9
Using specific examples/details	34.9	37.2		36.9
Including appropriate content	18.6	24.9		24.3
Grammar, spelling and punctuation	20.9	25.2		24.8
Understanding audience	11.6	14.5		14.2
Revising the rough draft	20.9	34.9	*	33.5
Following the professor's directions	30.2	31.3		31.2
Proofreading	18.6	24.4		23.9
Stating the main idea	20.9	24.9		24.5
Using appropriate vocabulary	16.3	19.6		19.3
Grades on written assignments	9.3	17.3		16.5
Fluency	16.3	10.7		11.2
N	43	393		436

Statistical Significance: * at .10 level; ** at .05 level; *** at .01 level

Table 7
Number of Areas of Writing Improvement:
By Remedial Status

| Number of Areas in Which Writing Improved | Percentage Reporting Number of Areas of Improvement | | | | | |
| | Non-Remedial | | Remedial | | All Students | |
	Pct.	Cum. Pct.	Pct.	Cum. Pct.	Pct.	Cum. Pct.
0	15.5	15.5	7.9	7.9	13.3	13.3
1	20.6	36.1	21.4	29.3	20.9	34.2
2	13.2	49.3	14.3	43.6	13.5	47.7
3	14.2	63.5	15.9	59.5	14.7	62.4
4	5.5	69.0	9.5	69.0	6.7	69.1
5	8.7	77.7	12.7	81.7	9.9	79.0
6	6.1	83.8	3.2	84.9	5.3	84.3
7	5.2	89.0	7.1	92.0	5.7	90.0
8	2.9	91.9	0.8	92.8	2.3	92.3
9	2.6	94.5	0.8	93.6	2.1	94.4
10	1.0	95.5	2.4	96.0	1.4	95.8
11	1.0	96.5	0.8	96.8	0.9	96.7
12	1.6	98.1	0.0	96.8	1.1	97.8
13	1.9	100.0	3.2	100.0	2.3	100.1
N		310		126		436

Table 8
Areas of Writing Improvement:
By Remedial Status

| | **Percentage Reporting Improvement** | | | |
| | | Non- | Stat. | |
Area of Writing	**Remedial**	**Rem.**	**Sig**	**All Students**
Identification of main ideas	40.5	33.9		35.8
Planning my writing	50.0	47.1		47.9
Using specific examples/details	39.7	35.8		36.9
Including appropriate content	19.8	26.1		24.3
Grammar, spelling and punctuation	27.8	23.5		24.8
Understanding audience	12.7	14.8		14.2
Revising the rough draft	34.1	33.2		33.5
Following the professor's directions	31.0	31.3		31.2
Proofreading	28.6	21.9		23.9
Stating the main idea	27.0	23.5		24.5
Using appropriate vocabulary	17.5	20.0		19.3
Grades on written assignments	14.3	17.4		16.5
Fluency	12.7	10.6		11.2
N	126	310		436

Statistical Significance: * at .10 level; ** at .05 level; *** at .01 level