OSU Oregon State University

Calendar   Library   Maps   Online Services   ■ Make a Gift

Find people and pages   [Search ▾]

Teaching With Writing

Spring 2013

Teaching With Writing: The WIC Newsletter

Body

Pre/Views

By Vicki Tolar Burton, WIC Director

This issue of *Teaching with Writing* is rich with ideas for teaching, learning, and improving writing:

--Looking for a new twist on peer review? Wood Science and Engineering professor Lech Muszynski shares his in-class experiments using peer review *after* writing is graded.

--We asked winners of the WIC Culture of Writing awards to share advice about writing. "Minimize your ink-to-information ratio. Simply say what needs to be said," advises undergrad Anthony Amsberry, winner of the Culture of Writing award in Bioengineering. Read more student words of wisdom and more about the awards.

--Check out the interview with Political Science professor Sarah Henderson to learn her architectural approach to teaching writing.

--Looking for a primer on improving accessibility to your course documents for students with disabilities? Michele Bromley's article helps us get started.

--Librarian Laurie Bridges assures us that library help is at hand for INTO Pathways students in our classes and for other international students as well. A great article to save for future reference.

All-in-all, this issue looks like a keeper. Many thanks to all the faculty and student contributors and to the WIC team for their work on this issue.

The WIC program is saying goodbye to two members of the WIC team, Zach Pajak and Allen Sprague. Zach, who has served as Assistant WIC Coordinator this year, is leaving to become involved in applied theater, the use of performance and education to promote mental health and address social issues. Zach has brought a can-do attitude, expertise in visual rhetoric, and a gift for working with faculty. Allen, the WIC GTA, has contributed his talent for assessment, ability to see the patterns in the data, and amazing work ethic to all WIC activities. He has helped me look at assessment and program improvement in new ways. Allen is completing his MA in Rhetoric and Writing this term and is hoping to continue working at OSU.

Thanks also to three WIC interns: Michele Bromley, who raised our consciousness about disabilities issues for WIC teachers and audited the WIC website for accessibility; Gail Cole, who brought a reporter's eye to writing for WIC; and Kayleen Kondrack, whose expertise in constructing surveys helped us greatly with the Writing Guide project. These highly competent interns have made possible projects that will benefit WIC student writers in the future.

All the best to the departing WIC Team members and a great summer to you all!

Peer Review in Renewable Materials Courses

By Lech Muszynski, Associate Professor in the Department of Wood Science and Engineering

When I first heard about the idea of peer review exercises for students involved in undergraduate courses I was intrigued, but at the same time firmly convinced that it would never work in my classes. To begin with, the idea was presented by Vicki Tolar Burton in one of WIC's workshops and all the examples and comments related to peer review as a tool to be used in the WIC course context. My courses were definitely not WIC. I was teaching two 3xx-level courses on Physical and Mechanical Properties of Renewable Materials and Renewable Materials Laboratory. The only form of written assignment in the first course was a weekly homework: a set of computational problems with minimal explanatory narrative. Even this skimpy narrative had to be literally squeezed out of the students using a range of *tricks and threats* available to the instructor on the *tactical level*. In the lab course, on the other hand, the students returned weekly reports, which were quite structured documents covering the objectives, background, specific lab activities, results, discussion, conclusions and related data files. Altogether the reports were five to ten pages including tables and graphs.

The assignments are typically graded for completeness, clarity, accuracy and professional format. While grading the assignments I offer ample feedback (both *do's* and "constructive" *don'ts-next-time-try-this*), however by design the students do not return the next iteration of the improved report but are expected to use the feedback to do better in the next assignment. It is fair to say that this had been the weak spot in the procedure. Judging from the inquiries from students coming to my office with questions regarding the rationale for certain grading decisions, I quickly came to the conclusion that hardly anyone actually read the feedback. Frequent references and appeals to the importance of scientific/technical communication did not stick either. A classic case of a *failure to communicate*.

This continued until at one time we engaged in a data pooling exercise in class. The idea was that teams performing their lab tests on various materials could appreciate the scale of variation of the measured properties. The exercise went quickly aground. We started a class discussion to analyze the issues, and with not much guidance from my side they were identified by the class as lack of completeness, clarity, accuracy or professional format. It took some effort to play *surprised* with a straight face. At this point I got a revelation: as long as the instructor is seen as the addressee, the written assignments are not considered genuine communication, but a clump of items to be checked off in the required format list. The instructor (the demiurge of the course) is

Body

supposed to know, read the intents between the lines, catch hints thrown in thin air… Writing for peers is a different story. They do need to be informed. Clearly, completely, and accurately. And one may actually *like* to impress a peer with professional format.

Suddenly, the WIC workshops on peer reviews made much more sense to me. I helped the discussion to move towards the fundamentals of effective technical communication and after a while asked if the class would agree to sacrifice one lecture unit for an impromptu in-class peer review in the following week to assess the lab reports from such perspective. And the class agreed.

Since this fell on the seventh week of the term, the students were invited to select and submit for peer-review two copies of one of the past reports they considered their best in the term. This meant that all the reports submitted to the peer-review would already be reviewed, commented on and graded. Naturally, for the peer-review the students produced clean copies (without my comments and scores). In all communication I was careful to avoid wording that would suggest *grading*. I thought grading might unnecessarily put everyone somewhat on the edge and constrain the free expression.

In the instruction to this exercise (oral and written) I referred to the class discussion on professional communication:

"*The objective of this class exercise is to help you appreciate the communicative aspect of reports.*

Assignments and lab reports are used to summarize and communicate your work on the assignment, test/research outcomes to people with some knowledge in the field, but not directly involved in the specific activity. As discussed in the Data Exchange Summary class, communicating raw result numbers may be very confusing to readers. You have proposed that in a meaningful data exchange the data should be reported: a) accurately, b) completely, c) clearly (with explanatory description) and d) in a professional format."

I also provided them with copies of the required class report format and with the rubrics intended to help them assess the completeness of the reports.

In class the students were asked to read quickly through the content, fill in the completeness rubric and to: 1) write a one-paragraph comment on the overall completeness and clarity of the report as a communication form; 2) assign a bonus for an outstanding aspect of the reviewed report (with proper justification); 3) write a brief memo addressed to the author with a friendly and constructive advice on a single aspect of the report that in the reviewer's opinion called for improvement and then pass the note to the author. The author's task was to write a brief response to the reviews and return the notes back to the reviewers. This last element was originally thought as a safeguard to make the exchange civil.

One thing that may need some explanation at this point is the bonus. The class is already familiar with the idea. I routinely do assign bonus points for outstanding features in assignments and for responding to additional/optional questions in weekly quizzes. In practice the system of bonuses allows me to give more frank and realistic feedback for individual questions without stretching the scale.

I timed the motions with a kitchen timer to make sure everyone was done by the end of the class unit, and anxiously collected all reviews.

The exercise went surprisingly well. The class was engaged and, I dare say, genuinely excited. This sentiment was confirmed in a brief discussion regarding the idea and experience of peer review upon collection of the forms. One thing that came up was that throughout their education they did not have much opportunity to see the works of their peers, let alone doing reviews or reading peer feedback. The nicest surprise was however the content of the reviews. They were friendly, mature and insightful. Almost all participants selected to assign bonus for some outstanding aspect of the works of others, and they had no problems with logical justification of their choices. The critical notes were equally good. Even the response notes were quite thoughtful. No usual horseplay I used to witness regularly in this all male class.

Next time in class I asked if it would be OK if I posted the reviews in the class BlackBoard folders, and the class agreed. This was not the end to the benefits. The last lab reports for the term were due in the week following the peer review exercise. The quality of the submissions had substantially improved. I could sense the conscious effort to communicate in place of the usual checking off the required items. It worked! It looked like we all learned a lot from the experience.

There were a couple lessons I had learned. The first and most important was that the peer review would work all right in my classes. Peer pressure can work wonders! The second was that I would like to offer it much earlier in the term to see the effects in the quality of the submitted assignments. With the weekly assignments I thought that the ideal timing would be after the third week of the classes, with two assignments already reviewed and graded, so that the class had some feeling for the specific requirements regarding the required format and the quality.

I also saw lots of space for improvements. One thing that did not work was the extensive completeness rubric. Most reviewers misunderstood this part or skipped it altogether. For the next iterations (and I tried the exercise twice more since), I simplified the rubric to the four major aspects: completeness, accuracy, clarity and professional format. When I did a statistical summary of the simplified rubric it reflected quite well my general assessment of the weak and strong areas in the submissions.

The second time I offered this peer-review exercise (to a different class) I was considering showing the reviews from the first round as an example. In the end however I did not do it. I was not sure the sample reviews from the past exercise would be really helpful. I thought I wanted the class to approach the task with fresh minds, free from specific conventions, more creative, more open-minded, more friendly and personal. And yes, I wanted them to struggle just a bit.

Another issue to consider was whether this exercise should be graded or not and whether the reviews should be taken into account when I was grading the assignments. On one hand, I want the class to approach this exercise seriously. I wanted them to feel that their reviews do matter. On the other hand, however, I did not want the exercise to be too stressful and damped by second guessing what is the *right*, the *expected* assessment. So in the end I settled on the rule that, as in the first iteration, all assignments subjected to peer review would be previously graded. This has a limited effect on the peer review, because the grades were not public. While all students will know their own grades and read feedback to their own work they do not see the grades or comments addressed to others, because only clean copies are submitted to the peer review.

I also did not think the reviews should be actually used or weigh in any way on my grading of the reviewed assignments. The task of sorting through good and misguided reviews seemed an unnecessary burden to me. It seemed that the experience was rewarding enough.

In contrast to the first peer-review, which was an impromptu reaction to the situation in the data pooling class, for the next two iterations I have announced the peer review at the beginning of the class and put a specific date for it in the class schedule. I do not have any metrics to prove it, but I would say that even the perspective of peer review affected the quality of the submitted assignments.

I still experiment some with the timing. In the last iteration, earlier this term, I gave everyone 15 minutes per review. I timed it

Body

prompting the switch from one task to another as follows: 3-5 minutes for fast reading through, 2 minutes for the rubric, 1-2 minutes for the Bonus comment (requires another scan of the content), 5 minutes for the critical advice comment (requires another scan of the content. When everyone is done the sheets were to be passed to the Authors, who were given 5 minutes to write the response. At the end of the exercise I allocate some 5-10 minutes for discussion on the challenges and learning points from the peer review process. It always turns out quite insightful. I keep reminding myself to bring a voice recorder to the class the next time. One interesting insight from such discussions was something I missed completely. Someone in the group noted an odd correlation that the areas statistically assessed as weaker by most reviewers attracted larger number of bonuses. The conclusion we arrived to after some more discussion was that the good or even decent job made in these areas was immediately recognized as a positive exception, while it was more difficult to find such distinction in areas where most submissions were good.

Finally the most recent twist on the process was team-review of team reports. This class has already been exposed to the individual peer review exercise in the preceding term, so they generally knew the rules. This time, the class was divided into four teams (of four), in which they perform their lab exercises, each charged with reviewing the submissions of the other three. The process began with the timed individual reviews, and the team review was added as a final layer at the end of the process. Once the individual reviews were complete the teams were instructed to discuss each of the reviewed works with the task to put forth one bonus and one critical comment that would best represent the assessment of the entire team. Then the individual and the team reviews were passed to the author teams. This also worked quite well.

The student feedback from all three iterations was very positive. It is definitely time well spent. Every time I offered peer review I could sense the infectious excitement and lots of positive energy being released in the classroom. Students who might otherwise be prone to horseplay and mischief engage in this exercise with surprising maturity and honesty. And, at the end I cannot wait to get to read the output. I am definitely not bored. Can one wish for more?

Building Upon Teaching: An Interview with Sarah Henderson

By Zach Pajak

Professor of Political Science Sarah Henderson has the distinction of thus far being one of the few instructors at Oregon State University to have taken the Fall WIC Faculty Seminar twice. The first time took place when she was fresh out of graduate school, during her very first term as a professor in 2000. She enrolled in the seminar for the second time in fall 2012. "As a teacher," Sarah explains, "you're interested in students' mental agility. I want students to be intellectually curious for the rest of their lives. And after 10 or 12 years, you can get stale in your teaching. If I care, then I should think to myself after those 10 or 12 years, 'Now is the time to sit and discuss with colleagues again.' There are so many things in life you get licensed for, but you have to get re-licensed sometimes; it's important to maintain awareness of teaching. And there is something so valuable about having solidarity with other faculty."

Sarah Henderson

WIC Seminar Alum, '00, '12

WIC Courses Taught ~ Revolution and Political Violence, International Policy

Some favorite writers and books ~ Leo Tolstoy, Russian literature, and British mysteries

When asked what inspired her to become a political science professor, Sarah does not hesitate: "It was very much a product of where I was living at the time I was growing up. From 1988-89, my parents, also professors, had an IREX grant to do research in East Germany. And so daily, I would have to cross the Berlin Wall to go to school. Soon after moving to the United States—and during my freshman year at Oberlin College—the wall fell. This in part sparked my desire to study politics." Sarah went on to earn her M.A. and Ph.D. in Political Science at University of Colorado, where she also took part in interdisciplinary workshop-based programs for preparing future faculty. Upon graduating in 2000, she became a professor at OSU and an alum of the WIC Faculty Seminar that same fall. "And after taking the seminar a second time in 2012," says Sarah, "you see your career arc. The longer that you teach, you can either still go in to class with the same notes from 20 years ago, or you can adapt. You're not the young, enthusiastic teacher anymore. You've realized your character as a teacher."

Sarah recalls from the first time she took the seminar the dynamism of writing-to-learn strategies and how they help students keep up their "mental calisthenics": "Writing is just hard. As a teacher, you have to be very intentional about everything, and help students who may not be used to planning their writing in advance. From the first time I took the seminar in 2000, I remember really liking write-and-pass. It keeps up [students'] mental calisthenics, their mental agility. I also began asking students a lot of questions in my written feedback in the margins to help them take their writing further, like, 'What is the theme of this paragraph? What point do you want this quote to make? What do you want the reader to think?'" Taking the seminar a second time allowed Sarah to further her writing intensive practices: "I got to talk about teaching and writing again. Although not all classes are classified as writing intensive, all our classes are writing intensive. I have a better sense of what my strengths and limitations are, and this always needs to be addressed when you adapt and grow as an instructor. I feel that teaching is a craft, and the longer one teaches, the more they can learn new things. The seminar keeps things alive in this way."

As Sarah values the craft of teaching, she certainly helps students value and understand the craft of a well-structured piece of writing. Sarah observes the many ways that students of political science will use writing as professionals in the field: "Maybe it's not about students learning to write as political scientists, but using writing to do something. My approach now begins with the question of what I want students to be able to do. Writing they might do after graduating includes policy briefs, memos, analytical reports; they go to law school, non-profits, graduate school, and for-profits. They need to be able to write in all of these formats. It always comes back to teaching writing as architecture. No matter what you do, you have to be able to write a

Body

good introductory paragraph." Sarah often guides students to fit ideas and thoughts together into such architectural coherence by identifying creative and often playful metaphors:

"I tell my grad students that writing is like a piece of Baroque music: it's all about structure, and out of this structure comes beauty. And I tell all students that it's all about structure: you have to think about everything you're going to say ahead of time—the architecture of the paper."

To guide students to achieve such architectural clarity and coherence, Sarah sometimes brings out a pile of Lincoln Logs to demonstrate to students the structure of sentences and paragraphs. "I believe that if you can build and master the five-to-seven-page paper, you can do anything. Lincoln Logs are a perfect metaphor for structure and building it all together, which students always need to think about. What students like about playing with the Lincoln Logs is seeing the individual logs as sentences. They put the sentences together to make a layer, which is like a paragraph. Each paragraph serves as the next layer of squares to build upon what came before them, and the layers cannot bulge or become too unwieldy; this helps students see the necessity to not write 'mega-paragraphs.' And so you begin with the base of logs, which is the intro, and build upon this foundation the rest of the story."

Sarah made further discoveries into ways to help strengthen students' writing as craft during her second time taking the Fall Faculty Seminar: "I really liked learning about using the four sentence précis during my second time. It solidifies the connectedness of the writing, and helps hone [students'] thinking." Regarding her inspired and resourceful teaching methods, Sarah says that she would like to take students' learning further, in part by beginning to decipher effective means by which to assess student writing: "We don't necessarily find a consistent way to actually assess student writing. That may be my next step."

Open to sharing who stands among her personal favorite writers, Sarah relates, "I have always loved Russian literature, and would probably have to say Leo Tolstoy. I have good memories of lying on the floor and reading *Anna Karenina* as a child. I like his books for the heaviness, but they always have a quest for a happy ending." Sarah adds, "I also like to read British mysteries. Probably because I like puzzles." Sarah undoubtedly stands among those adept at helping others piece it all together.

Accessibility as Professional Responsibility

By Michele Bromley

Accessibility is an issue of paramount importance at Oregon State University. In my work with OSU's Disability Access Services, I was surprised by the lack of awareness among academic faculty of web, document, and built environment accessibility issues on campus. The responsibility of a teacher is to make education accessible to all students—both abled and disabled. Our further responsibility is to pass on that attentiveness to accessibility, equality, and inclusion to students who will be responsible for that same attentiveness to their colleagues, clients, and constituents in the professional world. In the teaching of writing, instructors often emphasize the importance of audience in both the academic and professional realm—it is to this audience that we and our students must be responsible. Is our message clear? Is our message accessible?

Educators are not always aware that accessibility in the academic disciplines is both an ethical responsibility *and* a legal one. Oregon State University's Disability Access Services website's page on Americans with Disabilities Act explains that

"[u]nder Title II of the ADA, public colleges and universities are required to provide auxiliary aids and services to qualified students with disabilities. Providing auxiliary aids and services is not considered special treatment, but rather an equal opportunity to participate in the services, programs, or activities offered by the institution." ("Faculty Information")

Accessibility enables all individuals of varying abilities to achieve on a level playing field. Designated departments like Disability Access Services and the Office of Equity and Inclusion take a leading role in advocating and implementing accessibility practices across OSU's campus. However, it remains every academic professional's responsibility to maintain accessibility awareness and implement practices in his or her own department and classroom.

In a recent presentation to the WIC faculty on Web and Document Accessibility Techniques, Gabriel Merrell, Interim Associate Director for Accessibility for OSU's Office of Equity and Inclusion, shared a quote from Samuel R. Bagenstos's April 22, 2010 testimony before the House Sub-committee:

"As we come to realize anew each day, the pace of technological change is amazing; what appeared impossible just months or years ago is now commonplace. Advancing technology can open doors for people with disabilities and provide the means for them to have full, equal, and integrated access to American life." (qtd. in Merrell)

In this decade there have been a myriad of groundbreaking developments in accessibility technologies that allow even the most technologically disinclined educator to easily produce accessible materials for those individuals who are hearing impaired or suffer from low vision, color blindness, etc.

Oregon State University's Information Technology Accessibility website contains information on web, hardware, software, multimedia, and document accessibility. The Web Accessibility page includes links to information on alternative image text, accessible color choices, descriptive links, navigation, etc. The Document Accessibility page most notably features a link to Gabe Merrell's recent webinar titled Making IT Communications Accessible. The Writing Intensive Curriculum website houses links to accessible guides on: Creating Accessible Microsoft Word Documents, Creating Accessible Microsoft PowerPoint Presentations, Converting Microsoft Word Documents to Accessible PDFs, and Creating Accessible PDFs. Microsoft's Accessibility website features the most current information on Accessibility in Office 2013. These web resources and the further resources to which they lead will help inform teachers committed to providing accessible education to students with varying abilities.

This article cannot fully encapsulate all of the strategies and changes in mentality necessary in order to bring accessibility to the forefront of every open classroom environment. As teachers, we are accountable to our students. We recognize that it is our duty and our responsibility to release students into the world as ethically conscientious and professional adults. My hope is instead that this introductory information and the few resources I have mentioned in this article will act as a catalyst for change—that educators across the disciplines will become committed to equality and inclusion within the context of web, document, and built environment accessibility.

Body

Works Cited

"Faculty Information on the Americans with Disabilities Act." *Disability Access Services*.   Oregon State University, n.d. Web. 31 May 2013.

Merrell, Gabriel. " Web and Document Accessibility Techniques." *Eating-to-Learn Seminar*   *WIC Spring 2013 Lunch Series*. Oregon State University, Corvallis. 12 April 2013. Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation.

A Book Review:

Teaching and Learning Creatively: Inspirations and Reflections. Edited by Patricia A. Connor-Greene, Catherine Mobley, Catharine E. Paul, Jerry A. Waldvogel, and Art Young. West Lafayette: Parlor Press, 2006: xi + 131 pp. $16.00, paper.

By Phillip Brown

     Teaching and Learning Creatively is a unique book in the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) field. It functions like a portfolio, showcasing student work side-by-side with reflections from the teachers who gave the assignments. Each piece illustrates a variety of ways to introduce creativity into the curriculum across the disciplines. This movement is the brain-child of Art Young, professor emeritus at Clemson University in South Carolina. Originally begun as a Poetry Across the Curriculum (PAC) program, it has since expanded to include other creative assignments such as websites, flowcharts, and technical drawings. However, the bulk of student work in this book stems from assignments to write poetry in a variety of courses, from abnormal psychology to technical writing, from chemistry to landscape architecture design. I believe it is that broad scope which makes this book a pleasure to read as well as a convincing piece of evidence in support of creative teaching and learning. Now, the teachers themselves would acknowledge that not every student takes the poetry assignments seriously or responds insightfully to the prompts. However, examples featured in the book highlight the most successful outcomes, and the results are an exciting indication of possibilities for learning in new ways across the curriculum.

        The introductory essay, "The Challenge of Teaching Creatively," describes the dissatisfaction with student engagement that many teachers experience, including the authors themselves. In their own classes, they observed that many curricular assignments did not encourage students to express the kind of focus and passion demonstrated in more creative or individual pursuits outside the classroom. After some brainstorming, the teachers decided to ask their students to write poetry, despite personal reservations about not being poetry instructors. Results, however, were encouraging; they saw students engage with course material in fresh and exciting ways.

        The essay goes on to address the methodology and pedagogy behind the assignments, beginning with a brief history of the creative teaching and learning movement at Clemson University. Begun in 2000, the PAC program sparked the creation of another project called Creative Response to Learning (CRL) in 2004. In 2005, the PAC and CRL projects combined to create the Teaching and Learning Creatively (TLC) project. Although these programs have made great strides at Clemson, the authors are quick to point out that many instructors have reservations about implementing poetry in their classrooms. Through small workshops, Young and his colleagues help coach the instructors through the methodology (i.e., making creative assignments low stakes, sharing them with the class to foster a sense of community, even holding a competition to encourage stronger effort). Veterans of the program share success stories as well. As an instructor, I appreciated these tips and suggestions and felt encouraged to try introducing poetry into my own curriculum.

        The rest of the book is dedicated to delightful examples of student work. The accompanying reflections from their instructors provide context for the assignments and insight into the process. Many instructors seem particularly touched by students' poems and graphics, mentioning how the assignments can create a reverse relationship where the teacher learns from the student. I could certainly relate. I was particularly affected by the poems from the psychology, sociology, and nursing courses, in which students conveyed an empathic understanding of the individuals helped by those programs. Other poems were humorous, like one from an art history student that imagines Marcel Duchamp's painting, *Nude Descending a Staircase*, as a depiction of a harried debutante who arrives naked to her ball. Another, from a course in Women's Studies, captures the darker side of today's highly sexualized culture, describing some young women at a downtown bar whose efforts to dress attractively draw the attention of some ill-meaning men. Interestingly, the poem is written from the perspective of the women, employing a "we" pronoun, which shows the student's effort to relate more personally with her subject matter through this creative assignment. These are only a few examples of the many instances of insight and engagement in this book.

        Overall, *Teaching and Learning Creatively* is an intriguing, playful look at the potential power of implementing creative assignments across a wide spectrum of disciplines. Like an exhibition catalog handed out at galleries and museums, this book is a curated collection of the best pieces. It serves as a visual reminder of the work being done by instructors and leaders in WAC programs—not only at Clemson University, but across the country. As creatively assembled as the pedagogy it preaches, this book is a valuable resource for anyone interested in Writing Across the Curriculum—particularly if that interest is combined with a creative spirit and a willingness to risk writing poetry.

Writing and Research Assistance for International Students

By Laurie Bridges, Assistant Professor, Instruction and Emerging Technologies Librarian

As anyone working in higher education knows, international student numbers are booming. In the Oregon University System the international student population grew 45% between 2008 and 2011, as compared to a 20% growth for overall enrollment (Graves, 2011). At Oregon State University the total number of international students was 2,362 in the fall of 2012, an increase of 27.5% over the previous year. This increase in international student numbers benefits the campus and domestic students by globalizing the student body. However, it has also left many instructors unaware of the many resources and services on campus available to support international students in the writing and research process. Let's review some of the campus resources for getting international students the support they need.

1. **Determine if the international student is enrolled in INTO OSU.** Check the student's status on your Detail Class List in Online Services. The Detail Class List identifies Pathway students by Level: INTO OSU GE/AE/Pathways, and by Admit Type: INTO OSU JV students. Then contact the undergraduate pathways programs coordinator, Susan Beddes, Susan.Beddes@oregonstate.edu

Body

or the graduate pathways program coordinator, Erich White, Erich.White@oregonstate.edu. Susan and Erich can work with you in helping INTO OSU students or answer any questions you have about the INTO OSU program.

2. **Encourage students to set up a research appointment with a librarian.** If the student is enrolled in INTO OSU, encourage him or her to contact one of the two librarians who liaise with INTO students: Laurie Bridges Laurie.Bridges@oregonstate.edu or Uta Hussong-Christian Uta.Hussong-Christian@oregonstate.edu. If the student is not enrolled in INTO OSU, encourage him or her to contact the appropriate library subject specialist directly. Librarians routinely meet with students one-on-one to assist in their research needs, including identifying keywords and conducting a literature review.

3. **Review Expectations about Academic Integrity.** Although the motivations may differ, both domestic and international students may be guilty of plagiarism. In your syllabus, provide a brief explanation of your expectations along with some useful resources. Many students have questions about academic integrity and plagiarism. In coordination with the offices of Student Conduct and Community Standards (SCCS) and Technology Across the Curriculum (TAC) the library has developed an online guide, Academic Integrity for Students, designed to help students more fully understand academic integrity, plagiarism, and SafeAssign. In addition, there is an online guide for instructors that includes resources to help teach students about plagiarism and academic integrity, Academic Integrity for Instructors.

4. **Encourage students to set-up an appointment at the Writing Center.** Writing Center assistants are trained to work with international students at any stage of the writing process. Students should call 541-737-5640 to set-up an appointment or submit their writing to the Online Writing Lab.

Graves, B. (2011, September 26). Oregon universities open today with record international student enrollment. *The Oregonian.* Retrieved from: www.oregonlive.com/education/index.ssf/2011/09/oregon_universities_open_...

Culture of Writing Award Winners

By Zach Pajak

Through the annual Culture of Writing Awards, WIC and participating departments and schools foster a commitment to excellence in undergraduate student writing and recognize the value of writing across the disciplines. Participation in the Culture of Writing Awards has thrived since 2006 as students earn recognition and cash awards through either individual or team writing projects. This year, participation continues to be strong with early results showing 30 awardees. WIC would like to thank all participating departments for their continued desire to recognize and reward outstanding student writing. Congratulations to this year's award winners!

	Student Name /Graduating Date	**Title of Winning Paper**	**Department**	**Nominating Professor**
1	Madeline Benoit	*A comparison of penetrating captive bolt and halal slaughter at point of slaughter in cattle – is slaughter by captive bolt more humane than halal style slaughter?*	Animal & Rangeland Sciences	Claudia Ingham
2	Irene P. Cooper	*The Life of the Company: Chekhov's Borkin as Deconstructed Fool*	OSU Cascades/English	Ellen Santasiero
3	Amy Harris	*It's A Man's World*	OSU Cascades/Political Science	James C. Foster
4	Amber Fulkerson	*Mt. St. Helens Sediment Management System*	Civil and Construction Engineering	Franklin E. Sherkow
5	Megan Hamblen			
6	Holden Rennaker			
7	Brett Voyles			
8	Samuel Son Yoo			
9	Jordan Massie	*The salmon adipose fin: new evidence of a neural network implies functionality*	Department of Fisheries and Wildlife	Brian Sidlauskas
10	Anthony C. Amsberry	*Ion Exchange Project*	School of Chemical, Biological, and Environmental Engineering	Philip Harding
11	Garrett D. Cogburn			

Body

	Student Name /Graduating Date	Title of Winning Paper	Department	Nominating Professor
12	Emily C. Flock			
13	Victoria Price	*Looking at Commoditization of Legal Services since the 1980s through U.S.–Japanese Agreements: The Position, Regulation, and Possible Effects of U.S. and Japanese Lawyers Abroad*	Department of History, Honors College	Christopher McKnight Nichols
14	Julie Van Blokland	*Methods 1: Research Design*	Sociology Department	Mark Edwards
15	Allison Mermelstein	*Emblems of Paternity: Symbolic Objects in* Star Wars *and* Sir Degare	School of Writing, Literature, and Film	Tara Williams
16	Amy R. Schermerhorn	Pseudomonas *species isolated from unpasteurized goat milk identified by polymerase chain reaction and DNA sequence analysis of bacterial ribosomal RNA genes*	Microbiology Department	Walt Ream
17	Thomas A. Pitts	*Euclidean Tessellations and Regular Polygons in the Taxicab Plane*	Department of Mathematics	Tevian Dray
18	Alejandra Marquez Loza	*Influences of an Anti–inflammatory Drug, Ibuprofen, on Spatial Memory and NMDA Receptor Subunit Expression During Aging*	BioResource Research	Katharine G. Field
19	Jordan Gerding	*Process Improvement Study for Brick–Laying*	Construction Engineering	David Rogge
20	Tanida Chongvilaiwan	*Oregon Freeze Dry Value Stream Mapping and Product Costing (project sponsored by Oregon Freeze Dray)*	Industrial Engineering	Javier Calvo, John Parmigiani, & Tracy Ann Robinson
21	Megan K. King			
22	Alexandria Lee Moseley			
23	Benedikt Bochtler	*Sand Mold Clamping: Final Report (project sponsored by ESCO Corporation)*	Mechanical Engineering	Javier Calvo, John Parmigiani, & Tracy Ann Robinson
24	John Teeter			
25	Robert Lee Helmer Thompson			
26	Bryan Robert Cooper	*Casting Filter Testing Apparatus: Final Report (project sponsored by PCC Structurals)*	Mechanical Engineering	Javier Calvo, John Parmigiani, & Tracy Ann Robinson
27	Lucas Murphy Teeter			
28	Bettina Ruth Zimmer			
29	Emily Cade	*Intake of grape–derived polyphenols reduces C26 tumor growth by inhibiting angiogenesis and inducing apoptosis – an analysis*	Biochemistry and Biophysics	Indira Rajagopal

Body

	Student Name /Graduating Date	Title of Winning Paper	Department	Nominating Professor
30	Courtney L. Darr	*Investigating the Relationship between Affectionate Communication, Positive Emotions, and Prosocial Behavior*	School of Psychological Science	Sarina Saturn

Wisdom from Award Winners

"Minimize your ink-to-information ratio. Simply say what needs to be said." **—Anthony Amsberry, Bioengineering**

"The key to quality composition starts with choosing a topic that genuinely interests you. It will stimulate thoughtful writing and result in a more coherent finished product. I suggest beginning with a solid outline based on thorough research of the primary literature relative to your field and using it as a foundation for draft construction. Starting well in advance of your deadline will leave time for multiple draft revisions, and using peer-review to gain feedback can be very helpful. By setting goals, and sticking to them, the writing process can be less painful and far more fulfilling." **—Jordan Massie, Fisheries & Wildlife**

"Nothing will come of a paper you are not passionate about. You will not research as efficiently nor write as effectively. People can read your excitement and enthusiasm--it reaches a deeper emotional level. If you don't find something to love in your paper, it might be good—well written and accurate—but it will never be as fully engaging and it will never be great." **—Allison Mermelstein, School of Writing, Literature, & Film**

"Exploring contentious issues is often the best fodder for writing a research paper. Be prepared to delve deep into the research to give yourself a comprehensive and complete picture of the topic before reaching any conclusions."**—Madeline Benoit, Animal & Rangeland Sciences**

Fall 2013 WIC Faculty Seminar Call for Participants

The Fall 2013 WIC Faculty Seminar is just around the corner. Faculty interested in participating should ask their department heads to email a nomination to WIC director Vicki Tolar Burton at Vicki.tolarburton@oregonstate.edu.

The seminar, for both faculty teaching WIC courses and faculty using writing in non-WIC courses, focuses on teaching of writing best practices across the disciplines. Upon completing the five-session seminar, participating faculty receive a modest honorarium. Held on five consecutive Tuesdays, here are the dates for seminar sessions:

*All seminars are conducted 3-5pm, Milam 215.

Register as soon as possible—seminar spots are filling up quickly!

CONTACT INFO

Copyright © 2013 Oregon State University
Disclaimer