

ANNUAL REPORT
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT
ENGLISH (AY 2021-2022)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROGRAM OVERVIEW & STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	2
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT: PROCESS & ANALYSIS.....	3
COURSE ASSESSMENT: PROCESS & ANALYSIS	6
ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT & PILOT PROGRAMS.....	9
INNOVATIONS IN FACULTY TEACHING & STUDENT SUCCESS STORIES	12

PROGRAM OVERVIEW & STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The English program encompasses two main components: Composition, consisting of lower-division WRTG courses 090, 110, 111, 211, and 212, and the upper division ENGL course 311; and the Bachelor of Arts in English, consisting of a core of required ENGL courses on the 200 level, and advanced ENGL courses on the 300 and 400 levels in Literature, Literature and the Environment, and Creative Writing. Assessments of student learning outcomes in each of these components serve different goals and embrace separate criteria. The GER-oriented service component of Composition is not an element of the BA in English, though it is delivered by English faculty, one term hire, and adjuncts.

English B.A. Program Student Learning Outcomes:

- **Apply various theoretical approaches and methodologies to the analysis of literature or the craft of writing.**
- **Critically analyze or explicate literature and writing from diverse, marginalized perspectives.**
- **Demonstrate advanced reading and writing skills specific to their literary or creative disciplines.**
- **Reflect on their own writing, demonstrating an awareness of technique, audience, and purpose.**
- **Demonstrate professional skills through a capstone experience, internship, or senior thesis.**

The English faculty assesses our work in three primary categories:

- **Program Assessment:** B.A. in English degree with three emphasis areas (literature, creative writing, and literature and the environment)
- **Course Assessment:** composition, literature, creative writing courses
- **Additional Assessment:** 110 portfolios
 - Note: This assessment is done for our most vulnerable students as a way to help ensure their success moving forward.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT: PROCESS & ANALYSIS

All English B.A. graduates are required to take either the Humanities Capstone course or complete a thesis or internship. In each of these options students typically present their final work through community presentations, thesis defenses, etc. Starting in Fall 18, at least two English faculty members have attended each of these events or presentations, and using the above outcomes as a rubric, they create a “scorecard” to evaluate each student in those areas. We use these “scorecards” to assess the program outcomes. Most of our students choose an internship.

Internships Students

In AY 19/20 we had four students complete internships, two with *Tidal Echoes*: Emily Bowman and Shaelene Moeler, one as a TA for Emily’s summer classes: Brittni Wisner, and one with the Writing Center: Jurny Hinz. Professor Emily Wall was the faculty advisor for all three internships, and Jessy Goodman (Writing Center Specialist) was the supervisor for Jurny Hinz with Emily Wall acting as faculty member.

- **Faculty/Supervisor Scorecard:**

- **Professor Emily Wall**

- **Emily Bowman:** As the senior editor this year, Emily stepped up into the role with confidence and ability. One thing in particular that impressed me was her leadership. I always ask the senior editor to run the weekly meetings, assign tasks, be in charge of the master list of work to do, etc. With some editors I’ve had to do a lot of prodding, but with Emily, I was able to support her as she took leadership. She did a great job of mentoring Shaelene as well, walking her through the editing process and making sure she understood each step.
 - **Shaelene Moeler:** Shaelene was an outstanding intern and editor this year. She brought two new first to the journal for us: she was our first-even Indigenous editor and also the first student to complete both the fall intern job *and* the bigger, two-semester editing internship. This was her idea, and it brought excellent continuity to the project. As a junior editor this year, she is learning under Emily, but also able to bring in expertise from her work on the journal this past fall. Shaelene also brought us our featured artist, Jill Meserve this year—she was her idea and the art editors loved it. Her passion for young Indigenous writers and artists has greatly strengthened the journal.
 - **Brittni Wisner:** Brittni was a student of mine who graded several years ago. She approached me last spring about doing a TA internship as she’s planning to apply to graduate schools and wanted some hands-on experience in teaching. We arranged that she would intern with me in the summer of ’21 in 2 of my 3 summer classes (110 and 211) and observe online teaching. She did a fantastic job. We spent the weeks leading up to the classes bringing her up to speed on class design, how we offer feedback, student support, grammar work, etc. Then a week into the class, after she had observed my feedback, she was able to start offering students help on their papers. She also held weekend office hours (her idea) which the students loved. She demonstrated mastery in all the tasks I set her: designing slides for online lectures, commenting on student papers, and joining the online discussion board.

Writing Center Specialist Jessy Goodman

- **Jurny Hinz:** Jurny was integral to running the WC this semester, helping me prepare for our first in-person students in nearly a year and get the WC in shape. She adapted to the dynamic nature of the Writing Center and was always willing to help fill in any gaps, whether in our schedule or our offerings. I was able to get a lot more done by delegating tasks to her. Jurny was self-motivated and often came up with ideas to implement without my prompting. She is still learning the art of tutoring, though she grew a lot during her time at the WC. I know she is considering being an English instructor one day, so worked on a balance of helping students enough but not too much. I understand the instinct--she really wants to students to do well, which is a great quality--but we talked often about keeping ownership of an assignment in the students' hands. Overall, it was a delight to have her as my right-hand woman, with her eagerness to do good work and learn.
- **Student Self-Reflection on SLOs:**

- **Emily Bowman:**

Being senior editor in 2022 has definitely been different than it was in 2021. For one thing, I now have the privilege of meeting in person with my fellow editors - Shaelene Moeler and Professor Emily Wall. Due to this, we were able to put the manuscript together in person as well as spending half an hour every week in the conference room discussing what needs to be done for the next week of Tidal Echoes.

There are definitely a unique set of challenges this year, we're able to do some meetings in person, but the launch is going to be a virtual event this year. I'm glad that that will be familiar to me going forward. Additionally, I was significantly more involved in selecting pieces to discuss with the board this year and doing all the math and percentages myself. Then, with the board's choices, Shaelene and I put together a physical copy of the manuscript we'll be sending to Litho.

Overall, being senior editor this year has proven to be a challenge, but the knowledge of the semantics of putting together a journal is invaluable.

- **Shaelene Moeler:**

Having done the fall internship, and currently am completing the spring internship for Tidal Echoes, I feel like seeing the production of Tidal Echoes from start to finish has, and will greatly benefit me, especially as a creative writing emphasis. Seeing how different each internship is (the fall one focusing on advertising and organizing, and the spring one focusing on the publication process), it is easy to say that a student can gather a wide variety of skills regarding written and oral communication, organization and planning, critical thinking, design, and more. I look forward to everything else I will continue to learn as the semester progresses.

- **Brittini Wisner:**

Interning as a teaching assistant was an invaluable experience for me. Working with students, reading drafts, and breaking down lectures into "teachable" moments taught me to think critically and find creative ways to explain concepts to other students. I learned to demonstrate professional behavior with students by having office hours, emailing and meeting with students about concepts and concerns, and learning how to use Blackboard. Most importantly, this internship has given me the skills to pursue graduate study and secure a teaching assistantship (and I have indeed been offered a teaching assistantship for Fall 2022!). I highly recommend this opportunity for students desiring graduate study and teaching assistantships.

- **Jurny Hinz:**

My Writing Center interning experience has prepared me to successfully tutor individuals, regardless of how early or late they have sent their work to me prior. Before, my tutoring experience came from creative writing workshops which, though helpful, was a bit too involved to help the average student seeking help from the Writing Center during a typical half-hour appointment. However, I now understand how to tutor people in a timely but helpful manner, highlighting areas which need revision without making those revisions for them. Additionally, due to the administration side of my Writing Center internship, I have a better understanding of the inner workings of the University and how to generate campus outreach efficiently to publicize the Writing Centers services.

I worked directly with the UAS Writing Specialist, Jessy Goodman, daily to establish goals for each day and divvy up tutoring sessions amongst Writing Center staff. Not only that, but I amplified campus outreach by going into classrooms towards the beginning of the semester to do presentations on what the Writing Center offers so that students feel more inclined to come to us for help later. I created additional outreach through the many Writing Center posters I created and placed throughout the campus, from Writing Center employment fliers to writing contest opportunities.

By listening to what my fellow peers and mentors needed, I was able to craft additional Writing Center resources such as a how-to on writing thesis statements and taping a Writing Center PowerPoint presentation so that remote educators, students, and campuses can learn about the Writing Centers capabilities. In my own time, I developed a Writing Center Interning Manual so that those wishing to intern at the Writing Center after me have a guide on how to do so successfully. I demonstrated my ability to work independently and operate the Writing Center well, as seen when my boss—Jessy Goodman—had to leave work due to unforeseen personal circumstances. The Writing Center did not burn down in her absence, and I was able to balance tutoring students, managing the Writing Center student tutors, and take care of any classroom meetings she had while she was gone.

Thesis Students

In AY 20/21 We had no thesis students.

COURSE ASSESSMENT: PROCESS & ANALYSIS

On a two-year cycle, we assess every WRTG and ENGL course being taught on all three campuses. In 2020, we assessed all the WRTGL courses (Literature and Creative Writing), and in 2021, we assessed all ENGL courses.

Our typical process is to bring all ENGL and WRTG faculty from all three campuses together. We've done this in person in the past, but this year we were able to use zoom.

Note: we had a very small pool of faculty working together this year. Kevin Mair was on sabbatical, Richard Simpson was on leave, and Teague Whalen declined to participate in the assessment work.

For each course, we create "assessment groups." For example, this year we a literature group and a creative writing group. Each group has a faculty chair, one who has taught the course a number of times. Faculty let the Director of Writing know which group they'd like to participate in.

Prior to the meeting, faculty members send the Director of Writing paper samples with instructor comments and a copy of their syllabi. In the past we've compiled and distributed. This year The Director created a shared Google Drive for assessment. We started this back in September, with a folder for each class we teach (both ENGL and WRTG). This way senior faculty can share syllabi and sample papers, and any adjunct or new faculty has access to those materials. We added an "assessment folder" to that drive to share the materials for this assessment activity.

Before meeting, each group reads through the artifacts and compares them to the SLOs for that particular course. Then during the meeting, each group makes a list of observations and/or recommendations. The faculty have found the open conversation during these meetings to be the most valuable aspect of this assessment work. Ideas are shared about assignments, problems are discussed, and new approaches are tried.

After the meeting, the chair of each group is responsible for producing a 1-3-page report on the group findings. Emily Wall, as Director of Writing, compiles all the reports and creates a comprehensive assessment report that is then shared with all faculty who teach these courses (including adjunct faculty).

Note: We invite all adjunct faculty to be part of these conversations and find this time to be a good mentoring opportunity.

Literature Courses Assessment Report, Spring 2021

Literature Group:

Stephen Florian (chair)

Jay Szczepanski

Jessy Goodman (Writing Center Specialist)

Our group met for one hour to discuss documents related to an ENG 226 Survey of American Literature class. Our task was to answer the following questions about the documents provided for the class: syllabus and three essays with various grades represented.

Questions to answer:

- a. What is working well?
- b. How are we meeting outcomes?
- c. What is not working well?
- d. What changes should we make?

Findings:

We are noticing a gap in the abilities of the student ability

- Levels of student's abilities various (Problems with course sequence offerings)
- Students are lacking basic knowledge of history

The group appreciated the varied reading list, but there was also a request to address the want for further diversity in the readings. The instructor noted that there was a varied student level in the class which made it difficult to address the multiple ability levels of students because they ranged from Sophomores to Seniors taking the class. This should be a Sophomore level class.

What is working well?

- Well organized class, based on the design of the syllabus
- Syllabus is easy to process
- We liked that the SLO's are connected to the assignments in the syllabus
- Test at the end of class connected to SLO's
- Readings are appropriate for a 200-level class

How are we meeting outcomes?

- SLO's are directly connected to the assignments in the syllabus
- The A rated paper meets all of the SLO's

What is not working well?

- External issues: (Problems with course sequence offerings)
- Wide variety of student levels in class (sophomore to seniors) need more coherent cohort

What changes should we make?

- Further diversity of the canon would be a suggestion. This reading list is pretty diverse but could use a bit more scope.

Creative Writing Group:

Math Trafton (chair)

Emily Wall

Geoff Kirsch (adjunct)

We determined that there were several **successes** in the samples assessed. The pieces selected for this process represented the middle range of student work for ENGL261, Introduction to Creative Writing—that is, they were neither the highest ranked or the lowest ranked pieces from the semester. The review process determined that these selected pieces exhibited proficiency in both their creative engagement and their technical abilities. In general the samples expressed some interesting thematic undercurrents and reflected some deeper thoughts. The samples were mostly able to avoid overused patterns and clichés by working with alternative structures and developing specific and concrete imagery. These samples also all exhibited some degree of what the assessment group called the “spark” of creative inquiry.

In addition to the strengths found in the writing samples, the group also noted a number of benefits of the assessment process itself as well as in the arrangement of Creative Writing courses at UAS overall. First, the assessment process put the university’s Creative Writing faculty into the same space in a time when schedules often feel too busy to otherwise allow such conversations to exist. The group applauded the opportunity to discuss pedagogical approach and share perspectives and techniques in the classroom and also in syllabus and assignment design. This sharing is especially useful for instructors who take on new courses in their teaching workload. In looking at the structure of course offerings, the assessment group also applauded the ability to rotate faculty teaching Creative Writing courses in order to ensure that our students get a variety of teaching experiences—even given the decimation of WRTG and ENGL faculty through the past few years.

Through the review process, the workgroup did also note some **challenges and difficulties** in the sample work and in the experience of teaching Creative Writing overall. In some samples, the workgroup noted that while there is some spark of creative inquiry, there does need to be a stronger push for students to fan their spark in order to help it “burn brighter.” In other words, students continue to require more direction and support in finding their own investment in their work, determining what’s at stake and developing an idea or theme all the way through. Whereas the reviewed samples do exhibit great potential in terms of their own creative abilities, it was noted that some other students have struggled in class to find topics that are significant enough to write about, topics that they are personally invested in and courageous enough to pursue. In a perhaps related note, there was some discussion about the difficulty in getting some students to show up to class—either literally (attending class) or figuratively (committing to the laborious process of working a project through its various stages). In the case that some students are not fully experienced, either technically or psychologically, the workgroup does note the fact that within the past few years, the prerequisite for ENGL261 was lowered from WRTG211 down to WRTG111, which may in some part account for some students feeling unprepared and/or less invested. Nevertheless, with the change in prerequisites, the ENGL261 course focus has shifted to be more supportive of beginning writers, so the issue is not as pronounced as in previous years.

Through this assessment, the workgroup identified a few **proposed changes** for future application. In the first place, the group determined that the process itself greatly benefited from having present the instructor who assigned and graded the samples and also worked directly with the students who wrote the samples. This presence allowed for additional insight into the students’ personal growth, the stage of the writing, and other details that provided members of the workgroup with more context. Without the instructor’s presence, it would be more difficult to accurately assess students’ abilities and, more importantly, their development as writers. In the future, the workgroup recommends instructors include brief written notes for each sample to help provide readers with any additional context that may be relevant when reviewing the sample. Additionally, to help ensure students are directly engaging with course SLOs, it is recommended

that those teaching Creative Writing try to explicitly identify specific SLOs in course assignments or exercises so that students can see more directly how their work is helping to achieve specific outcomes. Finally, in a different conversation, the workgroup determined that it would be useful to connect with the Writing Center to hear what staff there are hearing about our Creative Writing courses (though feedback for any writing course would of course be valuable). Students may feel more comfortable expressing frustrations—or praise—with Writing Center staff, and we may gain additional perspective if the Writing Center staff is comfortable sharing what they hear.

ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT & PILOT PROGRAMS

WRTG 110

With WRTG 110, we undergo more rigorous assessment. In addition to the above practices, we also assess assignments, SLOs, and student success four times a year, at each portfolio reading. Students in WRTG 110 submit a portfolio of papers at mid-term and at finals time.

Students must pass the portfolio to pass the class. Portfolios are read by the Director of Writing (Emily Wall) and a panel of faculty, both part-time and tenure-track. Each reading session begins with a “norming” session where everyone participating rates several papers and then compares scores and notes. After the reading, we have an assessment session where we compare assignments, discuss problems, and share ideas. This is a particularly valuable exercise for adjuncts who benefit from the mentoring of more senior faculty.

After each of the four reading sessions Professor Wall collects data on pass rates, and create a mini report of questions, ideas, problems, analysis of SLOs, etc. and share with all English faculty. We take particular note of any section that has a higher-than-normal no-pass number, and of any students who are taking the class more than once. This conversation often centers around student barriers to success and we brainstorm ways to solve any of the issues we can address. (Note: we did not include last year’s reports here but would be happy to share them with anyone interested.)

The Directors of Writing have kept meticulous records of the lower-division composition assessment for over two decades. This portfolio requirement for WRTG 110 (used to be ENGL110), which has been singled out more than once by accreditors as a model for programmatic assessment, is regional in scope. Until 2008 all three campuses participated; after which Juneau and Ketchikan continued to offer the WRTG 110 class and gather department faculty to perform formative and summative writing portfolio assessments. Eventually budget constraints made associated travel costs too high, and for the past five years Juneau and Ketchikan have held separate evaluation sessions twice a semester. However, there has always been a document that reports the regional performance of students in this university-wide composition course. This year Ketchikan and Juneau once again joined together to do assessment, using Zoom and Google Drive.

The following are the stats for AY 2021-2022. We can provide stats for the past 10 years if anyone would like to see them.

Fall 21 Stats for All WRTG 110 Sections:

Total students enrolled: 80

Total portfolios submitted: 55

Total portfolios passing: 47 (85%)

Total portfolios failing: 8 (15%)

Spring 22 Stats for Juneau WRTG 110 Section (Ketchikan declined to participate)

Total students enrolled: 16

Total portfolios submitted: 11

Total portfolios passing: 11 (100%)

Total portfolios failing: (0%)

Summer 22 Stats (1 Juneau section)

Total students enrolled: 7

Total portfolios submitted: 6

Total portfolios passing: 6 (100%)

Total portfolios failing: 0 (0%)

This year brought some additional challenges to our process.

First, we invited a non-English faculty member, Andrea Dewees, to teach WRTG, as our faculty has been greatly depleted with the loss of Sol, Ernestine, Will, and then both Richard and Kevin on leave this year. As someone not trained in writing, Dr. Dewees worked hard but struggled as she was on her own very large learning curve. However, norming with her, then working through the midterm portfolios, provided opportunities for her to be mentored by more senior faculty. Even though 100% of her students failed at midterm, thanks to this mentoring and her own very hard work, 100% of those who submitted portfolios in the final assessment, passed. This reaffirms one of the real values of this process: our ability to “look over the shoulder” of new or adjunct faculty and mentor them as needed.

The additional challenge came in Steve Florian’s sections. Steve notes that: Writing 110 needs a rubric for grading that is available to the students, instructors, as well as the portfolio committee so everyone involved is working toward the same expectations. There should also be a rationale for the structure and expectations for the class that shows a direct connection to the student learning outcomes as well as the expectations for the department. The grading scheme of the class needs to be addressed. Is it a pass/fail class? If so, this should be changed.

Directed Self Placement

In our second year of directed self-placement we are confident it's working well. Doing an informal survey of faculty, we found only two students who could have been placed in a higher level. Interestingly, it appears students tend to place "down" rather than place "up."

This year when organizing PCOs we ensured that each composition class was in a timeslot with an "up" class and a "down" class to ensure students could easily be moved if necessary.

In addition, Jay Szczepanski applied for and received an FIF grant. This Faculty Initiative Fund Grant is entitled "Strengthening the Statewide Community of Placement into First Year Writing: A Tier I Faculty Initiative Fund Proposal to Increase Student Success and Close Equity Gaps." This collaboration is taking place with Dr. Carrie Aldrich and Prof. Sarah Kirk from the UAA campus and Profs. Dana Greci and Jennifer Tilbury from the UAF campus. The goal of this project is to connect faculty members involved in placing students into first year writing across the University of Alaska system in order to interrogate the stability and equity of our placement practices in first year and developmental writing courses. The goals of our analysis are several: improving student success and retention; addressing equity gaps; considering the challenges of remediation and its relationship to student persistence; accelerating student progress within the composition continuum (WRTG 080-090-110-111-211/212); determining the best placement scheme for each MAU and satellite campus geography; and listening to concerns and suggestions from students, faculty, staff, and administrators across the UA System. The results will be analyzed and proposed as a panel session at the 2023 Conference on College Composition and Communication, which is the preeminent organization for college writing studies. A further step will be to refine the research and submit a co-authored article for publication in *WPA: Writing Program Administration*. This research has the potential to reach a nationwide audience.

INNOVATIONS IN FACULTY TEACHING & STUDENT SUCCESS STORIES

Innovations in Faculty Teaching

Hybrid Classes:

When we put the BA in English online, we agreed to put all the survey courses into a hybrid model, to ensure students could complete the degree outside of Juneau. Jay Szczepanski and Andrea Dewees taught the first two hybrid classes.

Jay shared this: ENGL 226 Hybrid: Survey of American Lit, 1800-present, was taught as a synchronous hybrid course in the fall of 2021 by Jay Szczepanski. This particular modality was not without its challenges, foremost among them the insufficient classroom technology that would otherwise be required to deliver a seamless instructional experience. In particular, the classroom where the course was taught (Egan 224) had no installed computer, overhead projector, speaker system, or microphones. Even more, the experience required the use of a laptop, which was itself connected to the television, a speaker set, a microphone set, a power cord, and a slide advancer. Aside from the monotony of setting up and tearing down this setup for every class session, the number of cords and extensions required to initiate Zoom and include the registered distance student caused an actual physical hazard. The instructor tripped over the cords on numerous occasions. The remote student also had difficulty seeing the whiteboard, and that limited the effectiveness of instruction. The microphone set up was also problematic. In order to capture everyone's voices in the room, the microphone sensitivity had to be set fairly high, but this also raised the volume of the remote student when she spoke. This arrangement also did not lend itself well to group work—breakout sessions required a complete reconfiguration of the microphone-speaker system, resulting in significant and unnecessary reductions in usable class time.

That said, the remote student was active in the class, offering numerous observations and insights; her being a highly self-motivated student had a great deal to do with the eventual success of this modality, but students who are less confident (either in general, or with tech) might find the format intimidating. Future hybrid courses would benefit from a more robust classroom technology architecture, to include a ceiling-mounted projector, a dedicated classroom computer, installed webcams that can capture at least two angles (classroom and instructor/whiteboard), and omnidirectional, ceiling-mounted microphones. Frankly, these are the minimum components required to teach hybrid classes. The risk we run in delivering hybrid courses in the current ad hoc manner is to reduce their appeal to students (and faculty), and this is especially problematic given current enrollment declines.

Andrea shared this: English 217, Introduction to Film Studies, is being taught synchronously with online students joining face-to-face students in a hybrid model. We are using open educational resources and making full use of the screening classroom, Egan Library 104, as well as our library subscription to Kanopy. Critical analysis of film is one of the primary learning outcomes for the class and guided student discussion is working well. I'd note that this is successful in part because there are at least three students registered for the online section. This is a minimum, in my opinion, for adequate student participation in small discussion groups. We also make regular use of audio equipment delivered by classroom support that allows online and face-to-student to hear one another during large classroom discussions.

They have not yet submitted their first essay and, in light of the varied writing level (some students may only have completed Writing 111), I have provided scaffolding for this assignment in the following ways: 1) writing instruction, 2) guided film analysis for each film, 3) a required Writing Center visit, and 4) database instruction from one of our librarians. My impression is that students are engaged, have ample opportunity for peer analysis, and that the class' success partly depends on 1) adequate classroom support (audio equipment and screening room) and 2) minimum enrollment online to ensure a sufficiently sized discussion group.

Title III Grant

Math shared this: The UAS Sitka campus is currently just over one year into a five-year Title III grant titled SUPPORT (Strengthening Unique Potential for Progress through Opportunities, Relationships, and Transitions). The grant has two interrelated goals targeting in particular the campus's nontraditional, first-generation, and/or traditionally undersupported students: to enhance the way campus faculty and staff engage students and to more intentionally promote skills, habits, and mindsets relevant to the 21st century. Through the grant work, the Sitka campus's WRTG 111 and WRTG 211 course offerings have undergone substantial revision to further empower students by learning from and catering to their individual needs. These grant efforts aim to make writing/composition coursework more relevant and more engaging to students in order to help them achieve greater academic, career, and personal success.

Reviving and Revising the WRTG 104 Class

Jay shared this: As originally conceived, WRTG 104 served only those students concurrently enrolled in WRTG 111. The idea is that students who test into 110 but are "borderline" close to 111, could jump up a level with an additional 1 credit "studio" course, thus saving that student having to take a 4-credit course. The co-requisite lab, or studio model, is a best practice, especially when working with writers at the developmental level.

In conversations during assessment sessions, the faculty noted the success of this studio for those students, and particularly the nearly one-on-one help they were receiving. Jay Szczepanski floated the idea of making such a model available to a wider range of students—not just "borderline" 111 students. What if we used it to capture any struggling student?

We are attempting an experiment during the spring and fall 2022 terms. Rather than scheduling WRTG 104 to begin in January or August with the rest of the term's classes, we have scheduled WRTG 104 for the second half of each term (March 1 and October 17, respectively). The course will meet for two hours per week, rather than one, and enrollment will be targeted, meaning that students who are struggling in WRTG 110, 111, 211, or even 212 will be encouraged by their instructors to add the course. The hope is that seeing a D or F midterm grade might provide the necessary motivation to add the course and perform competently in it, especially if success in that course works as a force multiplier to ensure success in their other writing course. WRTG 104 is graded on the A/F scale, which should provide further motivation to (a) complete the course, and (b) increase term and cumulative GPAs. Within the course, students will practice and refine those writing behaviors and tasks that have been shown to increase writing competence and fluency: writing talk, peer workshop, error journaling, self-editing, and community building.

Writing Center & Tutor Pool

Jessy shared this: Although we populate the UAS Writing Center with tutors from across the disciplines, the English department has been invaluable in referring a steady stream of qualified English majors and helping to hone their writing skills before they even get to the WC. Having the English department as a resource in that way means we always have leads on potential new tutors, who then learn from their peer tutors in other disciplines, making both sets of students stronger in multiple modes of writing they may not have otherwise been exposed to.

Student Success Stories

Brittni Wisner who graduated a few years ago with her BA in English has been accepted into OSU's graduate program and offered a teaching assistantship.

Emily Bowman, this year's senior *Tidal Echoes* editor and a Junior English major, won a URECA grant to attend the AWP Creative Writing conference in Philadelphia.

Lily Pothier, a creative writing student in Emily and Math's classes, won this year's Mac Behrend's Award (a grant from the Juneau Arts & Humanities council for the best creative writing at UAS each year).