EXECUTIVE OF COUNCIL

Date: 21 November 2018
To: Executive of Council
From: Glenys Sylvestre, Executive Director (University Governance) and University Secretary
Re: Meeting of 28 November 2018

A meeting of Executive of Council is scheduled for 28 November 2018, 2:30-4:30 p.m. in AH 527. As per Section 4.6.2 of the Council Rules and Regulations, meetings shall be closed except to persons invited to attend and members of Council who choose to attend as guests.

AGENDA

1. **Approval of the Agenda**

2. **Approval of the Minutes of Meeting 31 October 2018** - *circulated with the Agenda*

3. **Business Arising from the Minutes**

4. **Remarks from the Chair**

5. **Report from the University Secretary**

6. **Reports from Committees of Council**
    6.1   Council Committee on Academic Mission, Appendix I, pp. 3-6
    6.2   Council Committee on Budget, Appendix II, p. 7
    6.3   Council Committee on the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, Appendix III, pp. 8-15, Attachment A and B

7. **Graduand Lists**
    7.1   Graduand Lists for Approval – Omnibus Motion – *circulated at the meeting*
        7.1.1   Faculty of Business Administration
        7.1.2   Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
        7.1.3   Centre for Continuing Education

8. **Other Business**
    8.1   Writing Skills Task Force, Attachment C

9. **Reports from Faculties and Other Academic Units**
    9.1   Arts
    9.2   Business Administration
    9.3   Education
    9.4   Engineering and Applied Science
    9.5   Graduate Studies and Research

10.   Adjournment

COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MISSION
REPORT TO EXECUTIVE OF COUNCIL
NOVEMBER 28, 2018

The Council Committee on Academic Mission (CCAM) continues to meet monthly year-round. Membership was refreshed in July as some members stepped off the committee and others came on board. Currently serving on the committee are:

Ex Officio: Thomas Chase; David Malloy
Elected: Marilyn Andrews, Dongyan Blachford, Janine Brown, Jennifer Kramer, Monty Montgomery, Gale Russell and Arzu Sardarli
Students: Patrick Scherr; Raghavi Kemala Rajakumar

There are two subcommittees: the Academic Unit Review Subcommittee and the New Program Subcommittee.

A wide ranging number of topics and concerns have been discussed. The committee has been busy! Highlights include:

1) Academic dishonesty and student preparedness were discussed at considerable length; it was recognized that the two problems are linked. A harm reduction strategy was considered to, potentially, be the best approach to addressing the situation. Possible solutions might include student preparedness assessment technologies (how to measure) and transition technologies (how to improve).

2) Dr. D. deMontigny addressed the committee about academic misconduct on campus, specifically in the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science. The faculty has confronted the problem and has developed a variety of strategies to improve the situation.   One such initiative is to include academic misconduct in student orientation sessions.

3) The Registrar's initiative to videotape students and faculty during the winter semester exam period was discussed extensively. Reasons for launching this initiative were provided. Similarly, it was noted that the University of Regina Faculty Association disapproved of the practice and noted that the U of R was the "first" in Canada to try this approach. A review of the practice was to be undertaken subsequently.

4) Student R. Khanan gave a presentation to the committee on English proficiency and international students.

5) Academic unit reviews at various stages accounted for much of the committee's time. The Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science is currently undergoing an undergraduate accreditation process. It was agreed that it would be redundant to have the faculty prepare separate documentation for the AUR.

It was agreed that the review scheduled for the Department of Politics and International Studies be moved to the 2019-20 year. It had been scheduled for 2020-21.

All of the information pertaining to all of the reviews is available on the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) webpage.

6) The status of enrollment levels at the U of R was discussed. The year 2022, which no longer seems quite so far away, will be the year that when there will be an increase in the number of high school graduates in the normal U of R catchment area. In the meantime, there is still a need to address the intervening period while maintaining a focus on the academic mission aspect.

7) Feedback was received from external reviewers who were surveyed about the way the reviews were conducted. Generally, they were satisfied though they indicated that it would be helpful to provide the review team with more time to come up with a plan before the meetings. As well, they indicated that they would have benefitted from having more time for the meetings during the site visit. This information will be considered for the 2018-19 reviews.

8) CCAM Terms of Reference are being reviewed to reflect changes

9) Updating of the CCAM Terms of Reference is in progress.

10) *OPS-130-005 Academic Unit Review Policy* was updated.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Andrews, Chair CCAM

EXECUTIVE OF COUNCIL
Council Committee on Academic Mission

Item for Decision

Subject: Faculty of Arts – Amalgamation of Departments

MOTION: That the Department of Religious Studies and the Department of Women's and Gender Studies in the Faculty of Arts be combined and renamed the Department of Gender, Religion, and Critical Studies, effective 201920.

The above recommendation was presented to the Council Committee on Academic Mission by the Faculty of Arts on 5 November 2018. At the meeting, CCAM was presented with a letter of support from the Dean, Faculty of Arts and the Acting Department Head, a Memorandum of Agreement between the two departments, and the background and rationale.

Members of the Department of Religious Studies and the Department of Women's and Gender Studies agree that there are efficiencies and complementarities to be achieved through an administrative union of the two units; and, there is a commitment among both parties to preserve *both* the specificity *and* the shared multi-disciplinary nature of both Women's and Gender Studies, and Religious Studies.

Following approval, the two units will unite to form a new unit within the Faculty of Arts to be called the Department of Gender, Religion, and Critical Studies; and, the new unit will operate according to a Memorandum of Agreement.

Rationale:

The Departments of Religious Studies and of Women's and Gender Studies wish to combine themselves into a single department under a new name: the Department of Gender, Religion, and Critical Studies. The units in question currently share administrative resources and have the same head; in addition, two faculty members are appointed jointly to both units, and several courses are cross-listed between the programs. Conceptually, as well, both departments have a more basic affinity: they are area studies rather than disciplines, strictly speaking, and they share a multi-disciplinary approach to their subject-matters, one that emphasizes gap between popular perceptions of these areas (religion, sexuality, gender) and what the evidence can actually support. Formalizing what is already the close cooperation of these units should lead to further collaboration, including enhancing and streamlining course offerings and sharing faculty. What is imagined is at first a merely administrative union, with the extant programs in WGST and RLST kept separate, but with the hopes that the passage of time will lead to increased sharing of resources.

The two departments have both passed motions to this effect. Though the University's policy doesn't require it, the motion was also considered and approved by the Faculty of Arts' Academic Program Development Committee.

Both units are scheduled for unit reviews shortly, WGST in 2019, and RLST in 2020. Since the reviews will be undertaken at a time when the union of the two units is recent and largely formal, it is believed it will be best to conduct the reviews separately, as they are currently scheduled. But it is also the hope that since the reviews will be taking place at a transitional time, they will represent an opportunity for each department to consider and evaluate progress so far, and to plan directions for a future in which the departments' resources are more consolidated.

Date: 14 November 2018
Prepared By: Kristina Untereiner
Submitted by: Marilyn Andrews, Chair (CCAM)

Council Committee on Budget
Report to Council
(November 23, 2018)

At the last Council meeting of April 16, 2018, CCB presented a verbal report of its Winter term activities. Since then CCB held a special brief meeting on May 07, and its regular meetings in May (despite the lack of quorum) and in September 2018. The October meeting was cancelled, due to lack of quorum. As per Rules of Council, CCB quorum is set at 7 out of 13 voting members. The agenda items for discussion will be forwarded in the upcoming meeting of November 26.
Agendas and approved minutes of CCB meetings are available at:
https://www.uregina.ca/president/governance/council/CCB.html

At the time this report was submitted, CCB is pleased to report the following activities.

At the May 07 meeting, the Budget Team advised CCB about the main items of the 2018-19 Budget Letter, before they were announced to the university community. CCB was pleased to learn that most of its recommendations to Budget Team were part of the Budget Letter, with a number of new academic positions allocated in various Faculties.

At the regular May meeting, Lamont Stradeski provided a thorough presentation of the 2018-19 Comprehensive Budget Letter, approved by the University Board of Governors. This presentation gave the CCB members an opportunity to ask detailed questions on various budget items in the Letter. In addition, Dr. Alec Couros gave a presentation of the TLC report, with particular focus on the budgetary implications of its recommendations. In its Nov meeting, CCB will have further discussions on the budgetary implications of recommendations made in the TLC report.

As per annual practice established in 2016, Special Purpose Accounts balances of Fiscal Year 2017-18 were presented to CCB in its September meeting. Members had an opportunity to ask questions and /or make comments. These balances are typically posted as part of September minutes, which are expected to be approved in the upcoming Nov meeting. Previous fiscal years balances of Special Purpose Accounts are publicly available, as part of minutes of Sep 25, 2017 CCB meeting.

Lastly, at the September meeting, Mr. Lamont Stradeski provided a presentation titled Budget 101, which outlined the various components of the University Budget, its processes and the underlying budgetary challenges. The presentation was followed with a Q&A session. A copy of the presentation will also be posted as part of the Sep Minutes, upon their approval.

Should any Council member like to bring an agenda item for CCB consideration, please contact either the CCB Chair at monika.cule@uregina.ca or the CCB admin support Lori.Todd@uregina.ca at least a week prior to the meeting date (scheduled on the last Monday of the month).

Monika Çule,
CCB Chair

Submitted on Nov 13, 2018

**FACULTY OF
GRADUATE STUDIES
& RESEARCH**

REPORT TO EXECUTIVE OF COUNCIL – November 16, 2018

From the November 15, 2018
FGSR Council Committee Meeting

APPROVAL ITEMS FOR EXECUTIVE OF COUNCIL

1. Faculty of Business Administration

MOTION 1:   Program Change
That the Master of Human Resource Management program (course option) be modified to add
GBUS 846AA–ZZ: Selected Topics as an option under "Choose 3 of:" effective 201930.

Master of Human Resource Management

Current MHRM (course option)	Courses	Proposed MHRM (course option)	Courses
Required: (12 credit hours)	GBUS 817 GBUS 838 GBUS 843 GBUS 862	Required: (12 credit hours)	GBUS 817 GBUS 838 GBUS 843 GBUS 862
Choose 3 of: (9 credit hours)	GBUS 844 GBUS 863 GBUS 864 GBUS 868 GBUS 872 GBUS 873 EAHR 811 EAHR 850	Choose 3 of: (9 credit hours)	GBUS 844 **GBUS 846AA–ZZ** GBUS 863 GBUS 864 GBUS 868 GBUS 872 GBUS 873 EAHR 811 EAHR 850
Choose 3 of GBUS 8xx Electives: (9 credit hours) OR 1 GBUS 8xx Elective (3 cr hrs) and GBUS 900*** (6 cr hrs)		Choose 3 of GBUS 8xx Electives: (9 credit hours) OR 1 GBUS 8xx Elective (3 cr hrs) and GBUS 900*** (6 cr hrs)	
Total	**30**	**Total**	**30**

*** The GBUS 900 Project is worth 6 credit hours. Students following the project option must prepare and
present a paper on a suitable topic. The project will be supervised by a committee chaired by a member
of the Faculty of Business Administration. The paper will be presented at a seminar chaired by the Director
of the Kenneth Levene Graduate School of Business. A bound copy of the report will be filed with the
office of the Dean of Business Administration.

Note: Students may request permission to replace one GBUS elective with a relevant graduate course
from another faculty or a relevant senior undergraduate course.

Rationale:
GBUS 846 AA – ZZ was designed to offer special topics specifically in HRM to students taking
this program. These courses are specific to HRM and thus distinct to a MHRM degree.

(end of Motion 1)

FACULTY OF
GRADUATE STUDIES
& RESEARCH

MOTION 2:   Program Change
That the Master of Human Resource Management co-op program be changed to align with the course based program effective 201930.

Master of Human Resource Management

Current MHRM (Co-op option)	Courses	Proposed MHRM (Co-op option)	Courses
Required: (12 credit hours)	GBUS 817 GBUS 838 GBUS 843 GBUS 862	Required: (12 credit hours)	GBUS 817 GBUS 838 GBUS 843 GBUS 862
Choose 3 of: (9 credit hours)	GBUS 844 GBUS 846AA-ZZ GBUS 860 GBUS 861 GBUS 863 GBUS 864 GBUS 868 GBUS 870 GBUS 871 GBUS 872 GBUS 873 EAHR 811 EAHR 850	Choose 3 of: (9 credit hours)	GBUS 844 GBUS 846AA-ZZ ~~GBUS 860~~ ~~GBUS 861~~ GBUS 863 GBUS 864 GBUS 868 ~~GBUS 870~~ ~~GBUS 871~~ GBUS 872 GBUS 873 EAHR 811 EAHR 850
Choose 3 of GBUS 8xx Electives: (9 credit hours) OR 1 GBUS 8xx Elective (3 cr hrs) and GBUS 900* (6 cr hrs)		Choose 3 of GBUS 8xx Electives: (9 credit hours) OR 1 GBUS 8xx Elective (3 cr hrs) and GBUS 900* (6 cr hrs)	
		Co-op Work Term 1 (0 credit hours)	**MBA 801**
		Co-op Work Term 2 (0 credit hours)	**MBA 802**
		Co-op Work Term 3 (0 credit hours)	**MBA 803**
Total	**30**	**Total**	**30**

***The GBUS 900 Project is worth 6 credit hours. Students following the project option must prepare and present a paper on a suitable topic. The project will be supervised by a committee chaired by a member of the Faculty of Business Administration. The paper will be presented at a seminar chaired by the Director of the Kenneth Levene Graduate School of Business. A bound copy of the report will be filed with the office of the Dean of Business Administration.

~~To successfully complete a Co-op work term and receive a grade of "P" (Pass) for each of MBA 801, 802, 803*, students must successfully complete the required work placement, including an evaluation of feedback from the employer, and attain a passing grade on their associated work term report.~~

Although the student's actual schedule may vary, the first Co-op work placement must normally be taken during a Fall semester.

Students will not normally be permitted to register for more than one course during a Co-op work term. A student's program must end on an academic term, not on a Co-op work term.

*Students may complete third optional Co-op work term, MBA 803

Note: Students may request permission to replace one GBUS elective with a relevant graduate course from another faculty or a relevant senior undergraduate course.

Rationale:
When changes were approved to the MHRM program in 2018, the changes were made to the course based program but not to the co-op option. This change is a housekeeping change.

(end of Motion 2)

MOTION 3:   Program Change
That the Master of Administration (course and co-op option) be modified to include GBUS 851AA-ZZ effective 201930.

Master of Administration

Current MAdmin (course option)	Courses	Proposed MAdmin (course option)	Courses
Required: (9 cr. hrs.)	GBUS 817 GBUS 870 GBUS 874	Required: (9 cr. hrs.)	GBUS 817 GBUS 870 GBUS 874
Choose 4 of: (12 cr. hrs.)	GBUS 815 GBUS 860 GBUS 865 GBUS 871 GBUS 873 GBUS 875	Choose 4 of: (12 cr. hrs.)	GBUS 815 **GBUS 851AA–ZZ** GBUS 860 GBUS 865 GBUS 871 GBUS 873 GBUS 875
Choose 3 of GBUS 8xx Electives: (9 cr. hrs) OR 1 GBUS 8xx Elective (3 cr.hrs) AND GBUS 902*** (6 cr.hrs)		Choose 3 of GBUS 8xx Electives: (9 cr. hrs) OR 1 GBUS 8xx Elective (3 cr.hrs) AND GBUS 902*** (6 cr.hrs)	
Total	**30 Cr Hrs**	**Total**	**30 Cr Hrs**

Note: Students may request permission to replace one GBUS elective with a relevant graduate course from another faculty.

*** The GBUS 902 Research Project on Leadership is worth 6 credit hours. Students following the project option must prepare and present a paper on a suitable topic. The project will be supervised by a faculty member of the Faculty of Business Administration. The paper will be publicly presented before a committee of 3 faculty members within the Faculty of Business Administration who are accredited by the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research and appointed by the Graduate Program Committee Chair. A bound copy of the report will be filed with the office of the Dean of Business Administration.

Master of Administration

Current MAdmin (co-op option)	Courses	Proposed MAdmin (co-op option)	Courses
Required: (9 cr. hrs.)	GBUS 801 GBUS 802 GBUS 817 GBUS 870 GBUS 874	Required: (9 cr. hrs.)	GBUS 801 GBUS 802 GBUS 817 GBUS 870 GBUS 874
Choose 4 of: (12 cr. hrs.)	GBUS 815 GBUS 860 GBUS 865 GBUS 871 GBUS 873	Choose 4 of: (12 cr. hrs.)	GBUS 815 **GBUS 851AA–ZZ** GBUS 860 GBUS 865 GBUS 871

	GBUS 875		GBUS 873 GBUS 875
Choose 3 of GBUS 8xx Electives: (9 cr. hrs) OR 1 GBUS 8xx Elective (3 cr.hrs) AND GBUS 902*** (6 cr.hrs)		Choose 3 of GBUS 8xx Electives: (9 cr. hrs) OR 1 GBUS 8xx Elective (3 r.hrs) AND GBUS 902*** (6 cr.hrs)	
		Co-op Work Term 1 (0 credit hours)	**MBA 801**
		Co-op Work Term 2 (0 credit hours)	**MBA 802**
		Co-op Work Term 3 (0 credit hours)	**MBA 803**
Total	**30 Cr Hrs**	**Total**	**30 Cr Hrs**

~~To successfully complete a Co-op work term and receive a grade of "P" (Pass) for each of MBA 801, 802, 803*, students must successfully complete the required work placement, including an evaluation of feedback from the employer, and attain a passing grade on their associated work term report.~~

Although the student's actual schedule may vary, the first Co-op work placement must normally be taken during a Fall semester.

Students will not normally be permitted to register for more than one course during a Co-op work term. A student's program must end on an academic term, not on a Co-op work term.

*Students may complete third optional Co-op work term, MBA 803

Rationale:
GBUS 846AA–ZZ was designed to offer special topics specifically in HRM to students taking the MHRM program. Currently, the GBUS 846 AA–ZZ has been used to create special topics courses in Leadership as well. In order to ensure the distinction between MHRM and MAdmin Leadership programs a special topics course specific to leadership needs to be created. These special topics courses are specific to leadership and relevant to MAdmin Leadership program and thus distinct to a leadership degree.

(end of Motion 3)

MOTION 4:   Program Admissions Suspension
That admissions to the MBA Specialization in International Business be suspended effective 201910.

Rationale:
The enrolments in the MBA specializations in IB have been very low for the past four years **(see Attachment A)**. Given the low enrolments we are unable to ensure consistent offering of the specialization courses without negatively affecting the student learning experience (e.g., low numbers in classes 1 - 3) or expense to the Faculty (e.g., instructor fees; administration time advising students / defusing disappointment). For several years several IB courses have been cancelled due to zero or low enrolments (e.g., International Marketing, International Finance, and International Business) and it negatively affects student experience when courses are listed on the schedule and later removed. The IB specialization courses are offered through the Faculty of Business.

(end of Motion 4)

MOTION 5:   Program Admissions Suspension

That admissions to the MBA Specialization in Engineering Management be suspended effective 201910.

Rationale:

The enrolments in the MBA specializations in ENG have been very low for the past four years **(see Attachment A)**. Given the low enrolments we are unable to ensure consistent offering of the specialization courses without negatively affecting the student learning experience (e.g., low numbers in classes 1 - 3) or expense to the Faculty (e.g., instructor fees; administration time advising students / defusing disappointment). The Eng. Management specialization courses are offered through the Faculty of Engineering.

(end of Motion 5)

MOTION 6:   New Program

That the Masters Certificate in Labour Relations be created effective 201930.

Masters Certificate in Labour Relations

	Courses
Required: (6 cr. hrs.)	GBUS 844 GBUS 873
Choose 1 of the following or any relevant graduate level course***: (3 cr. hrs.)	GBUS 843 GBUS 868 GBUS 870 GBUS 871
Total	**9 Cr Hrs**

*** This elective could include directed readings courses relevant to the Master Certificate in Labour Relations.

Rationale:

Given Regina's status as the headquarters for the (heavily unionized) Public Service Commission, Crown corporations, municipal and provincial levels of government, manufacturers, and agri-businesses, the Master's Certificate has potential to recruit supervisors, managers, and employees from unionized and non-unionized workplaces in the city and from throughout southern Saskatchewan. The Master's Certificate program is in line with the U of R's 2015-2020 Strategic Plan, as well as with the Faculty of Business Administration's (FBA) current strategic plans in that it aligns with respective research clusters ("Social Justice & Community Safety" and "Community and Workplace Wellbeing, Health, and Safety") and Faculty objectives ("Student Enrichment" and "Employment Success", in particular). The courses that constitute the Master's Certificate draw from a range of disciplines, experiential learning components, and research-intensive assignments.

The Certificate consists of three existing courses and thus, will not require additional faculty resources or the development of new courses **(see Attachment B).**

(end of Motion 6)

> **MOTION7:   Admission Requirements**
> That the following admission criteria for the Master of Science in Organization Studies be
> approved effective 201910.

Admission to the Master of Science in Organization Studies
Applicants must meet the entrance requirements of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and
Research and in addition:

1. Applicants are normally required to have completed a four-year undergraduate degree
   with a minimum grade point average equivalent to Canadian 80%.
2. International applicants must submit proof of English proficiency if the language of
   instruction in their undergraduate degree was not English. The minimum required
   TOEFL iBT Test Score is 80. See the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
   website for minimum required scores for subsections of the TOEFL and on other
   language tests.
3. A minimum GMAT score of 600 or a combined verbal and quantitative GRE score of 315
   is normally required.
4. Applicants are normally required to have successfully completed (with a minimum grade
   of 70%) the following undergraduate courses (or their equivalents) within five years of
   applying: BUS 260 (Introduction to Organizational Behavior) or PSYC 220 (Social
   Psychology), STAT 200 or STAT 160 (Introductory Statistics), and an upper year
   advanced statistics and/or research methods course (e.g., PSYC 405, BUS 413, STAT
   354, SOC 404, etc.).
5. Applicants must submit a Letter of Interest where they must specify a member of faculty
   who has agreed to work with them during their program.

Rationale:
This is a housekeeping motion because the admission requirements for the MSc in Organization
Studies were appended to the original motion for the creation of the program and, as such, did
not go through the approval process.

(end of Motion 7)

2. Faculty of Education

> **MOTION 8:   Program Suspension**
> That the School of Librarianship Masters program be suspended until further consultation
> occurs effective 201910.

Rationale:
The courses listed on the School Librarianship Masters template are no longer accurate. The
Faculty will need to complete a wide spread consultation before more forward with more action.

(end of Motion 8)

3. Faculty of Science

MOTION 9:   Reinstate MHIM Program

That the Master of Health Information Management (MHIM) program be re-instated effective 201930.

Rationale:

At the September 7, 2017 meeting of the Council Committee on the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, a motion was passed to suspend the MHIM program. The rationale for that motion was that the funding available to hire a faculty member to support this new program was no longer available. With the most recent University Budget, funding has been allocated to hire a tenure track position within the Department of Computer Science with a focus on Health Information Management.

As a result, we wish to reinstate the MHIM Program, effective Fall 2019. Note that the application deadline for Fall 2019 admissions is March 15, 2019.

This motion does not seek to make any changes to this program, other than making it available for students to pursue. For convenience, the details of the MHIM program (as posted on the FGSR website can be found here: https://www.uregina.ca/gradstudies/future-students/programs/comp-sci.html.

(end of Motion 9)

FACULTY OF
GRADUATE STUDIES
& RESEARCH

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

1. **New Courses**

GBUS 851AA-ZZ – Selected Topics in Leadership (3)
This course addresses selected topics in leadership.

STAT 818 Time Series Analysis (3)
A first graduate course in time series models and analysis. Topics include deterministic and stochastic models, stationary and non-stationary time series models, state space models, spectral analysis, and selected additional topics.

2. **Course Changes**

Current	Proposed
CS 834 Software Security (3) This course surveys emerging research directions in software-based protection mechanisms, with an emphasis on approaches that employ programming language technologies to address security challenges. Topics covered include: Java security, stack inspection, inlined reference monitors, proof-carrying code, certifying compilers, type systems for information flow control, characterization of enforceable policies. Prior to registering in this course, students should have a background in operating systems and either programming languages or introductory compiler design comparable to the senior undergraduate level.	**CS 834 Fundamentals of Computer Systems Security (3)** This course presents the objectives and the fundamentals of computer and network system security: confidentiality, integrity, availability, authentication, and authorization. Common security concepts are detailed, such as cryptography, symmetric/asymmetric encryption, digital signature, certificate authority, hashing, communication protocol security, and audit. Mathematical foundations and applications of these methods will be explained.

3. **Historical Course**

STAT 871 Time Series Analysis (3)
Stationarity, trend and seasonality, autoregressive and moving average processes, nonstationary processes, Box-Jenkins modeling method, spectrum and its estimation.

Summary of Registrations in the Levene MBA program

Program	2018			2017			2016		
	Fall	**S/S**	**Winter**	**Fall**	**S/S**	**Winter**	**Fall**	**S/S**	**Winter**
		Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered
MBA - GM	14	19	18	13	16	15	14	5	6
MBA - IB	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	2	3
MBA - ENG	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
MBA - PSM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	**15**	**20**	**20**	**13**	**17**	**19**	**17**	**7**	**9**

Program	2015			2014		
	Fall	S/S	Winter	Fall	S/S	Winter
	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered
MBA - GM	7	3	4	4	2	3
MBA - IB	2	2	2	2	0	0
MBA - ENG	0	0	0	0	0	0
MBA - PSM	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	**9**	**5**	**6**	**6**	**2**	**3**

Program	Active Students: 201820, 201810, 201730	Registered Students for 201820
MBA - GM	27	19
MBA - IB	0	1
MBA - ENG	1	0
MBA - PSM	0	0
TOTAL:	**28**	**20**

Proposal for the Creation of a Master Certificate in Labour Relations

1. **Approval Sheet**

Name of Program: Master Certificate in Labour Relations	
Line Faculty: Faculty of Business Administration	
Faculty of Business Graduate Program Committee Approval	Date: May 17, 2018
Line-Faculty Council Approval	Date: September 14, 2018
Approval at CCFGSR Recommended by CCB Recommended by CCAM	Date: Date: Date:
Approval at Executive of Council	Date:
Approval at Senate	Date:

2. **Executive Summary**

The proposed Master Certificate in Labour Relations aims to provide a curriculum for students that focus on the practices, processes, concepts, and institutional structure of labour and industrial relations. The target audience for the Master Certificate are labour relations practitioners and prospective students who the Faculty might ladder into a degree program. Given Regina's status as the headquarters for the (heavily unionized) Public Service Commission, Crown corporations, municipal and provincial levels of government, manufacturers, and agri-businesses, the Master Certificate has potential to recruit supervisors, managers, and employees from unionized and non-unionized workplaces in the city and from throughout southern Saskatchewan.

The Master Certificate program is in line with the U of R's 2015-2020 Strategic Plan, as well as with the Faculty of Business Administration's (FBA) current strategic plans in that it aligns with respective research clusters ("Social Justice & Community Safety" and "Community and Workplace Wellbeing, Health, and Safety") and Faculty objectives ("Student Enrichment" and "Employment Success", in particular). The courses that constitute the Master Certificate draw from a range of disciplines, experiential learning components, and research-intensive assignments.

The Master Certificate will be administered by the FBA, more specifically by the Kenneth Levene Graduate School of Business, and will be delivered via synchronous methods. The Certificate consists of three existing courses and, thus, will not require additional faculty resources or the development of new courses. Upon completion of this Master Certificate students will be able to pursue a career in the public, private, or non-profit sectors as consultants, labour relations officers, stewards, union representatives, and other fields in both management and labour. The Certificate might also been used to ladder these students into a degree program.

2.1 Overview

In brief, the Certificate is constituted by 2 required courses and one of 4 possible electives. Program graduates will be able to deploy their knowledge in the course of careers in the private, or non-profit sectors as consultants, labour relations officers, stewards, and union representatives. All the courses proposed to be included in this program, as either required or electives, are already offered in the FBA. Therefore the Certificate in Labour Relations program does not require any additional resources. Furthermore, the configuration of courses, as well the focus and purpose of the Certificate fills an existing gap in the FBA. It is sufficiently unique from the Master Certificate in Human Resource Management in that Labour Relations is a standalone field of study and practice beyond the general practice of HRM.

2.2 Program Outcomes

Upon completion of the program students will:
- have developed their written and oral communication skills
- possess a knowledge and skill set related to the processes and institutional foundations of collective bargaining and conflict resolution

3. Detailed Program Description

3.1 Curricular Details

The proposed Master Certificate includes the following courses (all courses existing):

Core Courses (6 credit hours)

GBUS 844 – Labour Relations and Collective Bargaining	3.0 credit hours
GBUS 873 – Negotiations and Conflict Resolution	3.0 credit hours

Electives (3 credit hours – choose one of the following or any relevant graduate level course. Note: This could include directed readings courses relevant to the Master Certificate in Labour Relations.

GBUS 843 – Strategic Human Resource Management	3.0 credit hours
GBUS 868 - Occupational Health and Safety	3.0 credit hours

GBUS 870 - Leadership: Theory & Practice	3.0 credit hours
GBUS 871 - Group Dynamics in Organizations	3.0 credit hours

TOTAL: 9 credit hours

Course Descriptions:

GBUS 844 – Labour Relations and Collective Bargaining

This course examines the history of union development in Canada, and business reaction to this development. Current structures in the labour movement are assessed, as well as the impact of legislation on the nature of collective bargaining. The course focuses on the character and procedures of arbitration, fact-finding, mediation, and conciliation.

GBUS 843 – Strategic Human Resource Management

This course examines human resources functions from a strategic and institutional perspective. The topics include human resource planning, recruitment and selection, performance measurement and assessment.

GBUS 868 - Occupational Health and Safety

This course focuses on the effective management of occupational health and safety (OHS). Beginning with a survey of the history of OHS and the current legal environment, the course turns to contemporary issues in OHS (e.g., psychological harassment in the workplace). Approaches to developing and improving organizational OHS systems which enhance employee safety and well-being are also discussed.

GBUS 870 - Leadership: Theory & Practice

This course covers key leadership/management skills such as clarifying personal vision, coaching, goal setting, conflict management, stress management, emotional intelligence crisis management, process and system design and communication skills. Major competency models of leadership and management are covered to familiarize students with the research and practice of leadership development.

GBUS 871 - Group Dynamics in Organizations

The course will study roles that exist in organizations and the dynamics of the interactions between these roles. In particular, focus will be on the interplay between the leadership role and decision making, creative problem solving and conflict resolution with group members.

GBUS 873 – Negotiation and Conflict Resolution

This course will introduce students to the theory and practice of negotiation and conflict resolution, including alternative dispute resolution.

Proposed Course Schedule

Not applicable

4. Admission

Applicants are admitted through the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research (FGSR) and must meet the following admission standards:

- Four-year undergraduate degree with a minimum grade point average equivalent to Canadian 70%
- Applicants are normally required to have at least two years full-time work experience
  - Experience must be obtained after completion of undergraduate degree
  - Internships, work placements and co-operative education placements are not accepted as work experience
- International applicants must submit proof of English proficiency if their language of instruction in their undergraduate degree was not English. (Score cannot be older than 2 years):

  - Canadian Academic English Language Assessment (CAEL): 70
  - CanTEST: 4.5 with No Band below 4.0
  - IELTS (Academic Version): 6.5 with a minimum of 6.0 in each band
  - MELAB: 85
  - PTE Academic:59
  - TOEFL Paper-based: 580/ Internet-based (DI code: 0830): 80 with a minimum of 20 in each of the four components
  - *Institutional ITP TOEFL is not accepted*

Applicants must have successfully completed all applicable qualifying courses (or their equivalent) with at least 70% in each course.

Qualifying Courses: Any 10 qualifying undergraduate courses

- Accounting or equivalent
- BUS 290 Introduction to Finance or equivalent
- Seven additional qualifying undergraduate courses

Mid-Career option: Management professionals who do not meet the required GPA or those who do not have an undergraduate degree, but who have a minimum of seven years suitable work experience and have completed any 10 undergraduate courses with a grade of no less than 70% in each may qualify for the mid-career option. These candidates *may* be required to take a GMAT exam. For more information, contact levene.advising@uregina.ca.

5. Professional accreditation requirements

Not applicable.

6. Program Rationale

6.1 Contribution to the University's and the Faculty's Strategic Plan

The UofR 2015-2020 Strategic Plan emphasizes three key priorities: student success, research impact, and commitment to our communities. Furthermore, the environmental scan brought up concerns regarding *"the balance between professional and non-professional degrees"*, as well as an *"increasing student demand for career directed and professional education"*. Finally, the UofR Vision Statement points to developing "*career-ready learners*" and "*generating meaningful, high-impact scholarship*", and in the Mission Statement we talk about providing "*meaningful scholarly experiences in pursuit of local and global contributions to knowledge*". The Master Certificate in Labour Relations would contribute to all of the above because it would give graduates an option to ladder into a graduate program in the FBA and, at the same time, it would increase their career-readiness and capacity for advancement.

6.2 Need for the Program

The Certificate in Labour Relations offers a unique configuration of courses and is distinct from its closest comparator, the Certificate in Human Resource Management. Specifically, labour relations is a field of study and practice oriented towards the management and negotiation of employment conditions within unionized industries and workplaces. Considering that Saskatchewan possesses one of the highest union density rates in Canada, and that the University of Regina is conveniently situated in a densely unionized municipality, the Certificate would be a draw for private and public sector employers and employees looking to advance their knowledge of the practice. Anecdotal evidence from students enrolled in GBUS 844 (Labour Relations and Collective Bargaining) suggests that a Certificate in Labour Relations would be highly marketable in Regina and throughout southern Saskatchewan.

6.3 Comparison to Existing Programs

The Edwards School of Business at the University of Saskatchewan currently offers a week long Labour-Management Certificate Program, which functions as a prairie alternative to a comparable world class program at Queen's University. Both the Centre for Industrial Relations and Human Resources at the University of Toronto and the Professional LLM at the Osgood Hall Law School at York University deliver intensive labour relations programs oriented towards professionals at the graduate level. Labour studies, industrial relations, and labour relations degrees, certificates, and other such programs exist at Athabasca University (undergraduate degree and graduate-level certificate), University of Lethbridge (undergraduate degree, management certificate), Capilano University (undergraduate certificate), Simon Fraser University (undergraduate degree), University of Manitoba (undergraduate diploma), Memorial University (undergraduate degree concentration), Brock University (undergraduate), Laurentian University (undergraduate degree, undergraduate certificate), McMaster University (undergraduate degree), University of Saskatchewan (professional program), Queen's University (graduate and professional program) among others in English and French-speaking Canada. Industrial relations remains a staple in business education in Quebec. The proposed Master Certificate in Labour Relations would enable current and prospective FBA students to attain a specialization in this particular sub-field and practices. This could generate interest in the MSc or

other FBA programs, in addition to summoning an interest in the broader field and programs at the aforementioned institutions.

7. Location of the Program and Justification

Not applicable

8. Delivery of Program

The Certificate would be attainable to students who complete the three courses over a three year period.

9. Cost-Benefit Analysis

Given that the courses in the proposed program are existing offerings offered annually (required courses) or bi-annually (some of the electives) the resource impact of implementing this program is minimal. Further, there is already an existing Levene graduate student lounge where students in the proposed Certificate program can occupy a space. No other human or physical resources would be required. Currently, the required and elective courses are being taught on a regular basis by existing faculty. Recruitment efforts and the draw of this particular Certificate could boost enrollments in these respective courses.

10. Timeline

To be determined.

11. Program Administration

As with other Levene Graduate programs the oversight of the implementation, delivery and ongoing quality assurance of the program will rest with the Associate Dean, Research & Graduate Programs with the FBA, staff in the Levene Office (Manager, Program Advisor) and

the FBA Graduate Program Committee. On an annual basis the FBA Graduate Program Committee will review feedback from students and faculty to assess quality assurance.

Advertising and promotion of the program will be bundled with existing Levene Graduate Program efforts primarily led by the Assistant Dean of the Levene Graduate Program. Low cost promotional efforts directed to undergraduate students, graduate students, and professionals will also occur (e.g., posters, faculty members promoting the program to students).

12. Teach-out Provisions

The program may not succeed either because of lack of enrolment or due to sudden faculty departures. In the case of lack of enrolment, Levene Graduate School of Business course offerings will not be affected because these are existing courses which are delivered because of enrolments in existing programs. The delivery of these existing courses is not dependent upon new enrolments in the proposed Certificate program. In case of sudden faculty departures, remaining faculty will assume instruction of required and elective courses.

13. Appendices

Not applicable

University of Regina

Writing Skills Task Force Report

March 2018

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

Writing skills are vitally important for student success at university and in post-graduation pursuits. Literacy is a critical skill for student success in higher-order learning. Furthermore, employers frequently cite strong oral and written communication skills as essential for successful job performance and professional life.

After faculty members expressed concerns about student writing at the University of Regina, President Vianne Timmons appointed the Writing Skills Task Force to consult widely across different University units, and then prepare a report. This report aims to meet the three main directives in the Task Force's terms of reference: to define and analyze significant issues and concerns regarding student writing skills; to identify and examine the variety of courses and writing supports offered by Faculties and other relevant units at the University; and to develop recommendations to improve student competence in writing and close gaps in writing supports. To fulfill its mandate, the Task Force set out to obtain a broad range of perspectives from course instructors, students, and academic staff and administrators about writing skills and the writing support services available at the University of Regina. The Task Force did so through surveys, focus groups, consultative meetings, and email communications. The results of the course instructor survey and student survey were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative methods in order to reveal common themes and connections between the two groups surveyed. The Task Force also sought to identify existing writing-focused courses, seminars, workshops, and tutorial services at the University, and at a number of comparable universities, in order to determine what additional services and supports may benefit students and instructors. Relevant documents and policies were found and analyzed to inform the four groups of recommendations (a summary of which appears on the next page).

Our main finding is that there is a widespread call for better quality and a greater amount of writing support in order to develop writing skills and practices across all Faculties at the University of Regina. Students ask for adequate, timely, and quality feedback from course instructors; clear instructions and expectations for writing assignments; and greater consistency across courses and Faculties. The Task Force's research suggests the need for better coordination between different writing support services at the University of Regina and the federated colleges; more effective promotion and awareness-raising of writing support services among course instructors and students alike; the creation of certificates and incentives to encourage the development of writing across the disciplines; more careful monitoring of students' writing needs and progress throughout their programs; and enhanced online and graduate student writing support. A longer-term recommendation is the hiring of an expert, experienced Writing Coordinator and the establishment of a dedicated Writing Centre. As a crucial part of student success, writing competence should be made an institutional priority at the University of Regina.

Summary of Recommendations

A) University Policies, Procedures, and Services

A1. The University should make writing an institutional priority and create policies and guidelines to uphold that standard.

A2. We recommend bringing the statement in the University of Regina Undergraduate Academic Calendar 2017-2018, Section 5.2.8, to the attention of all course instructors:

- Instructors are expected to conduct their courses in such a way as to obtain evidence of student writing skills, in term papers, essays, reports, or other written work, and to demand competence in writing for a passing grade.

A similar statement should be included in the Graduate Calendar.

A3. The University should create a full-time Writing Coordinator position, initially for a five-year term.

A4. The Task Force recommends that a writing advisory committee be formed.

A5. The University should create a centralized Writing Centre.

A6. The Task Force recommends the immediate implementation of a series of targeted promotional strategies.

A7. Those units providing writing support services should collaborate in order to ensure consistency and quality of these services as well as to prevent duplication of writing support services.

A8. Enhance online writing support services.

A9. Create a more visible online presence for writing support services.

A10. Utilize campus libraries' abilities to serve as facilitators to connect students to writing support services.

B) University Requirements and Supports for Students

We call on students to recognize that university education involves more than learning discipline-based knowledge. Writing is a critical component of university education regardless of disciplinary area of study.

B1. The University should require all incoming students to take a post-admission writing competency test.

B2. We recommend the creation of a Writing-across-Disciplines Designation.

B3. Graduate programs should consider requiring applicants to submit a written sample appropriate for the program or discipline concerned.

B4. It is advisable to review the University's minimum English language proficiency requirements for admission into graduate programs as well as undergraduate programs and consider requiring a minimum score in the writing component of each English language proficiency test.

B5. We suggest that the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research (FGSR) consider successful completion of ESL 050 Advanced Writing as a condition for graduate program applicants studying English as a Second Language (ESL) at the University of Regina.

It may also be necessary to review the English language proficiency tests and subsequently, if needed, to adjust the minimum test scores accepted by FGSR.

B6. FGSR and the Writing Centre (or SSC Writing Services until the creation of the proposed Writing Centre) should cooperate in developing and delivering graduate-student-focused writing support services, including discipline-specific writing supports.

B7. Training (e.g., workshops and seminars) should be provided for supervisors of graduate students on how to better help their students improve their academic writing, specifically their thesis-writing skills.

C) Academic Units

We call upon all academic units to recognize and value writing competency as a fundamental life skill and as a skill essential for career success.

C1. All academic units should review their curricula to ensure that students have ample opportunities for developing broad academic and discipline-specific writing skills.

C2. Academic units should also designate at least one mandatory writing-intensive course as part of their undergraduate programs.

C3. In order to encourage academic units and faculty members to develop and teach writing-intensive courses, we call upon the University administration when making budgetary decisions to recognize the need for low enrolment caps for such courses.

C4. It would be beneficial to review ENGL 100 Critical Reading and Writing in consultation with other Faculties, since this is a mandatory course for most undergraduate degrees across the University. It is also advisable to review KIN 101 Writing and Discourse for Academia since students in KHS have the option of taking either ENGL 100 or KIN 101.

C5. Each academic unit should adopt a set of guidelines for student writing assignments, especially for the courses with multiple sections, in accordance with the learning outcomes of each course and in alignment with the University academic calendars. It is also advisable for each Faculty to develop a consistent set of expectations regarding student writing, writing assignments, and writing outcomes.

D) Support for Course Instructors

D1. We recommend the University provide adequate teaching assistance support and/or other types of relevant support, such as opportunities for training on how to incorporate writing assignments in bigger classes in a time-efficient manner, and investigate possibilities for software programs (such as automated essay-scoring software) to reduce the time needed for marking written assignments and to augment the usefulness of feedback given to students.

D2. Create training opportunities for course instructors regarding how to help students develop their writing skills; how to provide thoughtful, thorough feedback on student written assignments; how to develop and use appropriate grading rubrics and/or guidelines; how to utilize exemplars; and other relevant areas.

- Design and offer an annual or bi-annual intensive summer institute focused on developing writing skills in the classroom.

D3. To encourage course instructors to participate in such training opportunities, a certificate in the teaching of writing could be created.

D4. Create a university writing fund to support course instructors who aim to better develop, assess, and promote student writing skills

E. We recommend that this report be made public and brought to the attention of the University community.

List of Abbreviations

CCE	Centre for Continuing Education
CTL	Centre for Teaching and Learning
EAL	English as an Additional Language
ELNAT	English Literacy Needs Assessment Test
ESL	English as a Second Language program
FGSR	Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
FNUniv	First Nations University of Canada
GLC	Global Learning Centre
JSGS	Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy
KHS	Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies
MAP	Media, Art, and Performance
SSC	Student Success Centre
U of R	University of Regina
URSU	University of Regina Students' Union
WAD	Writing Across the Disciplines, Luther College
WSC	Writing Support Centre

Introduction

5.2.8. Instructors are expected to conduct their courses in such a way as to obtain evidence of student writing skills, in term papers, essays, reports, or other written work, and to demand competence in writing for a passing grade.

-- University of Regina, *Undergraduate Academic Calendar*, 2017-2018

Writing skills are vitally important for students' success both within the university and in their post-graduation careers and other pursuits. Student learning demands a range of skills, including critical and analytical thinking, problem solving, reading, and the ability to process and convey knowledge. Writing is at the core of these higher education skills because writing is active thinking or "thoughts on paper."[1] In fact, as Richard Paul and Linda Elder correctly point out, "writing is so essential to learning that one cannot be educated and unable to communicate one's ideas in writing form."[2]

Understanding the value of writing skills and the expectations of hiring managers is critical for post-graduate success. Employers frequently cite strong written and oral communication skills as a fundamental requirement of a successful professional life.[3] When graduates lack these skills, their chance of finding and keeping employment diminishes. Boyd and Hassett note that many students are graduating without the skills necessary to "clearly communicate their ideas within their discipline."[4] The Task Force found that in much of the recent research, hiring managers and the overall workforce are seeking graduates who possess developed skills in teamwork, decision-making, and written and oral communication. In January 2015, the Association of American Colleges & Universities conducted an online survey to "understand which learning outcomes employers believe are most important to acquire to be able to succeed in today's economy, how prepared they believe recent college graduates are in these areas, and employers' feelings about the importance of applied project-based learning in college." The survey showed that 80 percent of hiring managers would consider hiring a recent

---

[1] The National Commission on Writing notes this often (2003; 2006; 2016).

[2] Paul, R. and Elder, L. (2007) How to write a paragraph: the art of substantive writing. Foundation for Critical Thinking.

[3] https://www.fastcompany.com/3059940/these-are-the-biggest-skills-that-new-graduates-lack

[4] Boyd, G. and Hassett, M. (2000) Developing critical writing skills in engineering and technology studies. *Journal of Engineering Education*.pp. 409-412.

graduate who had completed a variety of courses that focused on significant writing assignments.[5] This finding highlights the employability of students possessing a wide range of writing experience.

Although hiring managers consider written and oral communication skills as critical learning outcomes necessary for success, only 14 percent of those hiring managers who completed the survey think today's students are fully prepared by graduation to have the skills to complete a significant applied learning project.

Another study confirms that many managers believe graduates do not have adequately developed writing skills. As high as 44 percent of hiring managers feel writing skills are lacking with recent graduates.[6] The report's intent was to understand how prepared recent college graduates were when entering into the workforce, and which skills hiring managers expect.

Students can experience significant challenges with respect to their development of crucial writing skills. There are cultural forces, particularly the prominence of social media, which may be contributing to a decline in academic reading and writing skills.[7] Ultimately, the University of Regina will need to address the issue of how best to provide support for the development of students' writing skills.

In March of 2016, the President of the University of Regina, in keeping with the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan's commitment to student success, appointed the Writing Skills Task Force to develop a series of recommendations whose implementation will enhance the writing skills of all students on campus. The President selected the Chair of the Task Force, who issued a campus-wide call for volunteers to serve on the eight-person Task Force. From the resulting list of volunteers, the President and the Chair then selected a representative complement of members whose expertise best lent itself to the Task Force.

---

[5] https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2015employerstudentsurvey.pdf
[6] PayScale's 2016 Workforce-Skills Preparedness Report: https://www.payscale.com/data-packages/job-skills
[7] See Stanford Education History Group's report *Evaluating information: The cornerstone of civic online reasoning* and Mike Caulfield's *Web literacy for student fact checkers* (2017).

Writing Skills Task Force Members

The Task Force was comprised of the following University of Regina members:

- Dr. Nilgün Önder (Chair), Department of Politics and International Studies; Acting Associate Dean of Arts (Research and Graduate)
- Dr. Dongyan Blachford, former Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research (until December 2016); Professor, Department of International Languages
- Dr. Troni Grande, former Head, Department of English; Associate Professor, Department of English
- Dr. Wallace Lockhart, Associate Professor, Faculty of Business Administration (Task Force member until 30 June 2017)
- Mrs. Misty Longman, Manager, Aboriginal Student Centre
- Dr. Barbara McNeil, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education
- Mr. Fadi Tannouri, Instructor, ESL Program and PhD Candidate, Faculty of Education
- Mr. Scott J. Wilson, English Instructor and Writing Across the Disciplines Coordinator, Luther College; former Coordinator of Writing Services, Student Success Centre

The mandate of the Writing Skills Task Force was as follows:

After consulting widely across different units at the University, the Task Force will develop a report to address the following issues:

1) Define and analyze significant issues and concerns regarding student writing skills and competence

2) Identify and examine the variety of courses, seminars, and writing supports offered by Faculties[8] and other relevant units at the University

3) Develop recommendations to improve student competence in writing and close gaps in writing supports

This document presents findings from online resources, survey data, studies, interviews, forums, and consultative meetings. Based on these findings, it makes recommendations in accordance with its mandate.

---

[8] In this report, "Faculty" (capitalized) refers to an academic unit, while "faculty" (not capitalized) refers to an individual course instructor.

Methodology

This inquiry began when University of Regina faculty brought attention to the increasing challenges that students are facing with respect to academic writing as well as the challenges placed on faculty to effectively teach academic writing skills. The President acknowledged the concerns of faculty by establishing the Writing Skills Task Force. While the Task Force's was originally assigned a six-month mandate, the complexity of the issues necessitated a more in-depth investigation, which was in part due to a lack of coordination and communication between the various writing supports available at the University of Regina.

The Task Force set out to obtain a broad range of perspectives from faculty and students about writing skills and the writing support services available at the University of Regina. Based on its mandate, the Task Force also sought to identify existing writing-focused courses, seminars, workshops, and tutorial services at the University and to answer the question of what additional services are needed to benefit students and instructors.

The Task Force's methodology was shaped by the principle that it is important to use a variety of research tools and data to identify the types of challenges U of R students and faculty experience as well as to develop solutions to overcome these challenges. To this end, the Task Force used document analysis, consultative meetings, focus groups, and surveys to collect data and information. The following section summarizes these methods and presents our findings.

Document Review

The Task Force started the process by mapping the landscape of writing-related issues, research studies, institutional practices, and other relevant resources across Canadian higher institutions as well as throughout our own campus. This inquiry involved researching various documents, websites, journal articles, assessment results, surveys conducted at other institutions, and conference presentations. In addition to the research and literature reviews done by Task Force members, in June 2016, the group invited a visiting scholar to present her research on writing centres at Canadian universities. The Task Force reviewed surveys relevant to student writing skills, such as the National

Survey of Student Engagement, as well as some earlier work done at the University of Regina, including the Report of the Dean's Task Force on Reading and Writing, Faculty of Arts, 2004. In addition, we reviewed related articles about writing supports at other post-secondary institutions, including the importance of writing skills when seeking employment after graduation. We also consulted other task force reports to find an effective format for organizing this report.

The Task Force conducted both quantitative and qualitative studies in order to capture a more comprehensive, nuanced picture. This included a primary study conducted through surveys, focus groups, and consultative meetings. The Task Force created many consultative opportunities to ensure broad participation from a variety of experts and stakeholders, including permanent faculty, instructors, sessional instructors, academic support staff, undergraduate and graduate students, and administrators. The Task Force reached out to all Faculties at the University of Regina (from all campuses), including the federated colleges (listed alphabetically: Campion College, First Nations University, and Luther College), and to members at sites off the main campus.

Surveys

The Task Force wanted to collect primary data regarding course instructor and student perceptions and orientations towards writing skills and practices at the University of Regina. To this end, we designed two surveys using Qualtrics: one for students and one for course instructors. The Office of Resource Planning reviewed and approved both surveys. The surveys included closed and open-ended questions. It was important to solicit responses on a given scale as well as free comments. We aimed to get as many open/free comments as possible in order to shed further light on the responses to the fixed questions. To test the clarity and shape the development of the final survey, we conducted a pilot survey for 24 course instructors drawn from all the Faculties of the university.

To capture as many course instructors as possible, we sent the survey invitation to all those who taught at least one course in the last three years, including faculty members, instructors, and sessional lecturers. The survey invitation was sent to 1,426 email accounts, of which 54 emails bounced. We received 226 completed responses to the course instructor survey, which made for a response rate of 16.47% based on the active email accounts and 15.84% based on the total number of emails sent.

For the student survey, Student Affairs sent an invitation to both graduate and undergraduate students. To encourage student participation, we offered an iPad as a draw prize. A total of 471 students took the survey: a response rate of just over 3% of the total student population.

The surveys produced both quantitative and qualitative data. The Task Force used the Qualtrics software to tabulate and cross tabulate the survey responses.[9] We also wanted to find out if there was a correlation between the responses to several survey questions we identified. A graduate student was hired to run the survey data using the statistical software package Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The graduate student coded the qualitative data using NVivo. Coding was done based on a list of recurring themes identified by the Task Force after reviewing the open-ended comments in the surveys.[10]

Focus Groups

To complement and enrich the survey data, we organized four semi-structured focus groups: two for faculty and academic staff[11], and two for students. We scheduled these meetings through a university-wide invitation email. An invitation was emailed to academic staff through the U of R Events email list, and a separate invitation was sent to First Nations University of Canada (FNUniv). To organize the student focus groups, we sent an invitation to the U of R Students' Union (URSU), and all student associations listed on the University's webpage, and asked them to forward the invitation to their student members. We enlisted the help of the Aboriginal Student Centre, the Global Learning Centre, and the Student Success Centre to send the invitation to their student lists.

During the focus groups, the moderator used a set of prepared questions to initiate the discussion. Participants were provided opportunities to raise other relevant issues and questions.

---

[9] The Task Force welcomes queries regarding the survey analysis and would consider requests for accessing the survey data.

[10] A list of NVivo themes and frequency of respondents referring to these themes under each question appears in the appendix.

[11] When we refer to the faculty and academic staff focus group, "faculty" includes all course instructors.

A total of 11 academic staff and 15 students from across the main campus participated in the faculty and academic staff focus groups. To facilitate greater participation from different Faculties and units, we held the focus groups at different main campus locations and in different timeslots. We allocated 90 minutes for each faculty and academic staff focus group session, and 60 minutes for each student focus group session. Food and beverages were provided at all focus group sessions. Furthermore, we invited written submissions from those who were unable to attend in person. We received three written submissions: two from course instructors, and one from a student. For each focus group session, two graduate students were hired to take notes. The graduate students were instructed to write down each comment made by participants, and to email their notes to the Task Force after the focus group meetings. Members of the Task Force who were present at the focus group sessions also took notes. After the focus groups were completed, the Task Force decided to organize an additional focus group with the participation of faculty and academic staff from First Nations University of Canada (FNUniv), because the faculty and academic staff focus groups did not have any participants from FNUniv. An invitation was sent via email to FNUniv faculty and academic staff in June 2017, and a focus group was held on 6 July 2017. One FNUniv member attended the meeting.

After all the focus groups were completed, the Task Force analyzed the notes taken by the two graduate students, along with the notes taken by Task Force members.

Consultative Meetings

In addition to focus groups, the Task Force held consultative meetings with stakeholders, namely the Student Success Centre, the Centre for Teaching and Learning, the English as a Second Language Program of CCE, UR International, librarians, and Associate Deans and designates.

Research Findings and Analysis

Writing Support Services at the University of Regina

In keeping with the mandate of the Task Force, we investigated the variety of courses, seminars, and writing supports offered by Faculties and other units at the University and federated colleges.

Writing Centres

The University of Regina has six writing centres (or similar services) located on the Regina campus:

- Student Success Centre (in-person, and online via email), Riddell Centre 229.
- Department of English Writing Centre, Administration-Humanities 305
- La Cité Tutoring Services (in-person and virtual sessions), Language Institute 220
- Campion College Writing Centre, Campion College 412
- UR International, College West 109
- First Nations University of Canada Writing Centre

Each service is free, and students receive help from senior undergraduate or graduate students. Campion College employs sessional lecturers and instructors in addition to students.

Tutor Registries

In addition to the available free tutoring, students can also find a for-pay tutor on one of two tutor registries:

- Student Success Centre Tutor Registry
- University of Regina Students' Union (URSU) Tutor Registry

In both cases, students can find tutors in a range of subjects, and tutors set their own rate of pay. The SSC registry requires tutors to be recommended by a professor and have at least an 80% average in their tutoring subject area.

Writing Workshops

The University of Regina offers at least 11 free writing workshops at the undergraduate level. Most are available to all U of R students. At the graduate level, public policy students have the choice of at least 17 different writing workshops. However, other graduate students do not have many options tailored to them (though they can attend the SSC workshops listed below). Compared to other universities of comparable enrolment, the U of R has far more workshops.

For undergraduates, Student Success Centre offers five free, forty-five minute academic writing workshops, which cover topics such as style, grammar and punctuation, and research and referencing. In addition, Global Learning Centre offers workshops, including ones on plagiarism, beginner and intermediate grammar, forming an argument, and citation and quotation. Finally, English as a Second Language (ESL) offers Fundamentals for Writing Success, a workshop designed to help students "Improve writing skills through reading and studying academic writing styles and techniques."

For graduate students, FGSR offers Scientific and Technical Writing Skills, which is a half-day workshop that covers structure, grammar, and impact and allows students to "get on-site expert feedback, a chance to work on a current, future, or past piece of writing, and get exposure to many samples of writing, from atrocious to outstanding." However, this workshop is not offered consistently. The Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy (JSGS) has workshops for "students who want to improve their English writing skills and learn how to organize and write the particular documents that are required in the program. The workshops target areas in which students have difficulties, but the School's experience is that every student benefits from a familiarity with these rules and techniques." Topics include, but are not limited to, writing arguments and well-organized paragraphs, writing proposals and literature reviews, wordiness, research, and writing particular types of documents such as briefing notes, logic models, and environmental scans.

In comparison, University of Winnipeg, which has similar total enrollment, roughly 10,000 students, offers two writing-specific workshops for undergraduate students, but has 15 available to all graduate students. The University of Saskatchewan (21,000 students) offers six to ten workshops at the undergraduate level and eight at the

graduate level; Wilfrid Laurier (18,000 students) offers at least five at the undergraduate level and at least ten at the graduate level.[12] In other words, while the University of Regina has many options for undergraduates, it is not offering the same number of these supports for graduate students (unless they are JSGS students), despite the fact that graduate student success requires proficiency in academic writing.

Writing-Focused Courses

The University of Regina offers at least 24 undergraduate classes specifically identified as writing courses. Twelve departments or Faculties offer these courses, including English, Journalism, Women and Gender Studies, Economics, and Kinesiology and Health Sciences. Subjects include critical reading and writing, professional communications and writing, writing and discourse for academia, writing and editing for public relations, and print journalism.

There are at least 10 graduate writing courses, which include: ENGG 789 Technical Writing Laboratory, which is an introduction of technical writing concepts for graduate students with a specific focus on thesis and report writing. The course is intended to help students improve their general writing skills (grammar and organization), while at the same time learning principles and approaches for producing good quality thesis, report, and article manuscripts. Topics covered include thesis and report writing, improving grammar and organization, literature reviews, and referencing and documentation, including plagiarism and how to avoid plagiarizing); EC&I 857 Writing Process and Pedagogy, which focuses on research and theory on literacy development, the writing process and methods of teaching writing. Students use their own writing as a means toward understanding the writing process and the teaching of writing; and JSGS 804 Seminar on Research and Writing, where students learn about research and writing in public policy, including research design, sourcing, evaluation, analysis, and presentation. The course is built on the progressive evolution of a major research paper, and provides critique on both research design and methodology. A number of the courses are offered by the Faculty of Education and are about the theory and pedagogy of writing. While JSGS, Journalism, Engineering and Applied Sciences

---

[12] See Appendix III for more details.

have discipline-specific writing courses, many other academic units do not appear to have such courses.

ESL's Fundamentals for Writing Success is a non-credit course that helps students with writing for real-life situations (such as composing an assertive letter of complaint, or drafting proper emails), and also provides a foundation of English grammar, spelling, sentence structure, vocabulary, etc.

Additional Writing Support Services

Luther College Writing Across the Disciplines Program—The Writing Across the Disciplines (WAD) Coordinator assists instructors of specific Luther College courses in the development and delivery of writing-specific assignments in classes that may not typically include them. The WAD Coordinator also helps students in specific Luther College classes improve their writing skills through in-class workshops, lectures, and one-on-one instruction.

FGSR Graduate Student Writing Room—U of R graduate students meet monthly with experts on writing and research (e.g. library staff, SSC Writing Coordinator) to ask questions in an informal, one-on-one setting. Students are also encouraged to discuss their work and process with other graduate students. This initiative started in Fall 2017.

Lifelong Learning Centre Creative Writing Classes—The Centre for Continuing Education, through the Lifelong Learning Centre, runs creative writing classes and workshops for creative writers of any skill level. One class in particular focuses on writing down family histories and sharing this writing in a supportive setting with facilitators. The participants run some offerings. These classes operate primarily as writing groups without formal instruction or assessment.

Projects in Progress

The English Literacy Needs Assessment Test (ELNAT), which has been administered to well over 1,000 University of Regina students (both Canadian and international), is a learning-assessment tool that aims at supporting students in their literacy skills development throughout their university career. The ELNAT Committee maintains that

this 45-minute reading and writing test has proven to be a very good determinant of students' readiness for the university-level reading and writing tasks in ENGL 100. According to the ELNAT Committee, if given to students early on in their educational programs at the University of Regina, this kind of testing will enhance the University's ability to support students in a well-planned way. Currently, the Faculty of Arts is investigating implementation strategies for the ELNAT as a prerequisite for ENGL 100. Students who fail the ELNAT or receive a marginal pass would be streamed into two existing foundational writing courses: RDWT 120 (Reading and Writing 120)[13] or ACAD 100 (Academic Discourse: Writing, Research, and Learning Strategies).

Surveys

The survey analysis is divided into two sections: course instructors and students. The analysis below considers each survey separately, but whenever relevant the analysis also compares the results of the course instructor and student surveys.[14]

Course Instructor Survey

Of the total 1,426 course instructors who were invited via email, 245 started the survey and 226 completed it, for a completion rate of 84%.[15] For the purpose of the survey, the email addresses of all course instructors who taught at least one course in the past three years were obtained in November 2016. In February 2017, in order to calculate survey participation rates by Faculty-affiliation, a list was created, showing Faculty-affiliation of course instructors who taught a course in the past three years. The list included 286 instructors whose Faculty affiliations were unknown. A search for individual instructors on the U of R website revealed the Faculty affiliations of 220 of these instructors. Based on the revised list of course instructors according to Faculty affiliation, an approximate survey-participation rate for each Faculty was calculated, which appear in Table 1.

---

[13] RDWT 120 is a 3-credit, foundational course in critical reading and writing.

[14] Chi square tests were conducted in the case of student survey analysis because some sample sizes for cross-tabulated scores were too small. We reported the chi-square results in the footnotes. Nevertheless, we must emphasize that all findings should be viewed cautiously.

[15] 54 emails bounced.

Table 1

Survey Participation according to Faculty

Faculty	Number of participants in the survey	Total number of course instructors	Participation rate %
Arts	88	348	25.28
Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy (JSGS)	5	20	25.00
Media, Art, and Performance (MAP)	15	65	23.07
Kinesiology and Health Studies (KHS)	11	65	16.92
Nursing	11	84	13.09
Science	23	177	12.99
Education	30	246	12.19
Social Work	7	66	10.60
Engineering and Applied Science	8	78	10.25
La Cité	2	22	9.09
Business Administration	7	80	8.75
Continuing Education	7	-	-
Other	9	-	-
Missing data	3	-	-
Blank	-	66	-

When evaluating the survey results, it is important to take into account the uneven participation across Faculties. The highest participation was from the Faculty of Arts; 88 course instructors from Arts took the survey. The second highest participation was from the Faculty of Education with 30 respondents. Respondents from the Faculty of Science (a total of 23) constituted the third largest group. Frequencies of participation according to Faculty affiliation should be considered within the context of the total number of course instructors teaching in each Faculty. It is expected that the number of survey

participants from each Faculty would correlate with the total number of course instructors teaching in each Faculty. As seen in Table 1, the Faculty of Arts had 348 course instructors who taught at least one course in the last three years (as of February 2017), which was the greatest number among all Faculties. The Faculty of Education employed the second largest number of course instructors teaching in the last three years, followed by the Faculty of Science with 177 course instructors. However, the differences in the total numbers of course instructors employed by different Faculties cannot entirely account for the significantly varying numbers of survey participants across Faculties.

Another explanatory factor is the divergent survey participation rates. The rate of survey participation was quite uneven across Faculties. The highest participation rate (25.28%) was among Faculty of Arts course instructors; and the participation rate among JSGS course instructors was the second highest (25%). The third highest rate was recorded for the Faculty of MAP: 23.07%. Seven Faculties had participation rates of less than 15%.

Thus, when interpreting the survey results, it is important to consider that some Faculties were self-represented in the survey significantly more than others were. There is no clear or easy answer to the question of what accounts for such significantly differential rates of survey participation among the Faculties. The participation rates do not directly map onto the Faculties according to the amounts and/or types of writing that can be normally expected in different disciplines.

The survey included different categories of course instructors according to employment status. According to the responses to the survey question, "Please check the employment status that applies to you," of 223 total respondents, 110 checked the category of "full-time faculty"; 86 identified themselves as "sessional lecturer," and 15 selected the category of "full-time instructors." Full-time faculty and full-time instructors constituted 56.06% of total respondents; and 38.57% of respondents were sessional lecturers. Thus, different groups of course instructors, full-time and sessional, were well represented in the survey. In addition, the survey elicited broad and balanced representation of all levels of teaching from 100-level courses to graduate-level courses.

The survey also asked respondents to identify the institution that employed them. Table 2 gives the number and percentage of respondents according to the employing institution.

Table 2

U of R	183	81.33%
FNUniv	17	7.56%
Luther	14	6.22 %
Campion	11	4.89%
Total	225	100%

Q2.1 - In your courses, writing assignments (such as essays, reviews, reflections, research papers, etc.) make up _____ of students' final grade. (Choose a percentage from among the options.)

According to the results of course instructor survey, writing assignments are a significant percentage of a students' final grade. As expected, the higher the level of courses taught, the greater the weights of writing assignments are in final grades. Writing assignments make up over 40% of final grades for 50.9% of 100~200-level course instructor respondents; 69.2% of 300~400-level course instructor respondents; and 92.2% of graduate course instructor respondents.

As expected, there are differences across Faculties with respect to the weight of writing assignments in course grades. One needs to be cautious about drawing conclusions, however, because of small samples of respondents in some cases. To ameliorate the small sample problem somewhat, we have combined the responses for all undergraduate courses from 100-level to 400-level according to Faculty affiliation. The results for the Faculties that had the first four highest numbers of survey respondents are as follows. In the case of Faculty of Arts-affiliated course instructors, the frequency of responses selecting the options of 41% and above as the weight of writing assignments in 100 to 400-level courses is 98 out of 140 responses,[16] which is 70%. The corresponding

---

[16] 13 responses selected the option of "not applicable". The n.a. responses were not included in the total number of responses.

frequency for the Faculty of Education is 24 out of 31, which is 77.41%.[17] For the Faculty of Science, the frequency is 4 out of 29, and the relevant percentage is 13.79%.[18] The corresponding frequency and relevant percentage for the Faculty of MAP is 15 out of 23 or 65.21%.[19]

We also cross-tabulated the responses to Question 2.1 with the responses to the question of employment status (Q1.3).[20] 37 of 82 respondents of full-time faculty status (45.12%) selected the options of 41% and above for 100~200-level courses; and 66 out of 90 respondents of full-time faculty status selected the same option for 300~400-level courses (73.33%). 40 of 62 respondents of sessional-lecturer status checked the options of 41% and above for 100~200-level courses (64.51%); and 25 of 38 sessional lecturers chose the same options for 300~400-level courses (65.78%).[21] Thus, according to the survey results, unlike full-time faculty who assign greater weight to writing assignments in 300~400-level courses than in 100~200-level courses, sessional lecturers assign nearly identical percentage weightings for all levels of undergraduate courses.

Q2.2 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=not at all, 5=a lot, NA=Not applicable). In your courses, you use class time on writing skills development.

Not at all ← -- → A lot						N/A
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

187 respondents answered this question with respect to 100~200-level courses. 71 respondents (37.96%) selected the options of mid to a lot (3 to 5) on a scale of 0 to 5. Those who chose the options on the lower end of the scale (0 to 2) outnumbered the respondents who spend medium to a lot of class time on writing skills development in 100~200-level courses. A greater percentage of full-time faculty said they spent none to a

---

[17] 2 "not applicable" responses

[18] 7 "not applicable" responses

[19] 3 "not applicable" responses

[20] The sample sizes for full-time instructors teaching different levels of courses are too small for cross tabulation.

[21] 17 sessional lecturers checked the option of "not applicable" for 300~400–level courses, which was relatively high. However, in view of the University hiring practices, the high number is not surprising because sessional-lecturer positions are more often available for introductory courses than for senior-level courses.

little amount of class time (0-2 on the given scale) compared to sessional lecturers. 53.76% of full-time faculty chose the options of 0-2, and 31.18% selected 3-5 (mid to a lot). The corresponding figures for sessional lecturers are 49.25% and 44.77%. In terms of full-time instructors, 9 of 14 who answered the question about 100~200-level courses said they spent no to a little amount of class time on writing skills development; and 5 said they used medium to a lot of class time.

173 survey respondents answered Q2.2 with regard to 300~400-level courses. The frequency and proportion of respondents who selected the options of 0-2 are far greater than those who selected the options of 3-5. 111 of 173 respondents (i.e., 64.16%) selected 0-2 on the 0 to 5 Likert scale, while 33 (19.07%) answered 3-5. 67 of 98 full-time faculty respondents (72.04%) said they spent no to a small amount of class time on writing skills development compared to 21 respondents (22.58%) who said they used medium to a lot of class time. 31 of 54 sessional lecturers (57.40%) who answered the same question chose the options of 0-2; and 8 sessional lecturers (14.81%) chose 3. It is important to note that a significant number of sessional lecturers who answered this question (15 out of 54) marked the option of not applicable; this outcome is not surprising because sessional lecturers teach 100~200-level courses more frequently than senior-level courses.

A total of 134 survey respondents answered Q2.2 for graduate courses. 45 of them, however, said the question was not applicable to them possibly because they did not teach graduate courses. While taking into account the high frequency of not applicable responses, 61 of 134 respondents (45.52%) said they spent no to a small amount of class time on writing skills development, as compared to 28 respondents who said they used medium to a lot of class time (20.89%). When we exclude the 45 respondents who said "not applicable," the corresponding percentages are 68.53% and 31.46%.

We analyzed the responses to Q2.2 in terms of Faculty affiliation. Since samples from some Faculties are very small, we include the results only for the first four Faculties with the highest number of respondents for undergraduate courses from 100 to 400 levels. In the case of the Faculty of Arts, 76 of 154 respondents answered 0-2 on the seven-item Likert scale, while 64 selected 3-5. The corresponding percentages are 49.35% and

41.55%.[22] 23 of 35 respondents from the Faculty of Education (65.71%) chose 0-2 on the given scale while 10 (28.57%) selected 3-5. 23 of 35 the Faculty of Science-affiliated survey respondents (65.71%) answered 0-2; and 4 (11.42%) said 3-5 on the seven-item scale. In the case of the Faculty of MAP, a total of 26 people answered Q2.2 with regard to 100~200 and 300~400-level courses. 15 of the 26 respondents (57.69%) selected 0-2; and 6 respondents (23.07%) answered 3-5.

Q2.3 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=not at all, 5=a lot, NA=Not applicable). Writing assignments are explained in your course syllabus, on separate assignment sheets, or both.

As in the case of the previous two questions, the survey requested respondents to provide responses for four groups of courses: 100~200-level courses; 300~400-level courses; graduate courses; and non-credit courses. A total of 189 survey takers answered the question for 100~200-level courses. The number of those who selected the highest end of the Likert scale of 0 - 5 far outnumbered those who chose the lower end (0-2). 119 respondents said 5, whereas only 17 answered 0-2. The scores of 4 and 5 were selected by 137 respondents (73.65%) of all those who answered this survey question for 100~200-level courses. The responses for 300~400-level undergraduate courses are very similar. 17 of 175 (9.71%) respondents answered 0-2; 116 or 66.28% selected the scores of 4 or 5.[23] The survey responses are skewed heavily toward the higher end of the scale in the case of graduate courses too. Furthermore, there are no significant differences among Faculties or different categories of employment status (full-time faculty, full-time instructors, and sessional lecturers).

Q2.4 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=not at all, 5=a lot, NA=Not applicable). In your courses, you rely on grading rubrics or guidelines for grading writing assignments.

The number of times the score of 5 was selected is substantially higher than any other scores on the 0-5 Likert scale with respect to all levels of courses. For example, for

---

[22] The percentages do not add up to 100% because of the responses "not applicable."
[23] 21 and 31 people marked the option of not applicable in the case of 100~200-level courses and 300~400-level courses. If we exclude the "not applicable" responses, the relevant percentages will be higher.

100~200-level courses, the frequency of the score 5 is 93 out of 186 total responses. In other words, 93 of 186 respondents said "they rely on grading rubrics or guidelines for grading writing assignments" a lot (score of 5), as compared to a total of 30 respondents who said not at all or rarely (0 to 2 on the scale of 0 to 5). In the case of 300~400-level courses, 73 out of 172 respondents selected the score of 5, as compared to 30 who answered 0-2. When we add up the frequencies of the mid to highest scores (3-5), we get the following results. For 100~200-level courses, 72.58% of respondents selected 3-5; the proportion of those who said 0-2 is 16.12%. For 300~400-level courses, those who answered 3-5 constitute 66.27%, and those who said 0-2 make up 17.44%. We observe a similar result, albeit less skewed toward the higher end, for graduate courses: 19.70% of respondents selected 0-2 scores, while 43.79 said 3-5.[24]

As is the case with Q2.3, the distribution of responses does not differ in any significant way with respect to Faculty affiliation. One noticeable finding, however, is that survey respondents affiliated with the Faculty of Arts are nearly evenly divided with regard to the lower and higher ends of the Likert scale. 15 of 56 Arts-affiliated respondents chose the scores of 0-2; 18 checked 3-5. Thus, Arts course instructors rely on grading rubrics or guidelines for grading writing assignments to a significantly lesser extent in graduate courses than in undergraduate courses.

We also tabulated the responses to Q2.4 with the responses to the question of employment status. The distribution of responses to Q2.4 does not differ significantly with respect to employment status; however, the tabulations also reveal that sessional lecturers rely on grading rubrics more than full-time faculty. For example, in the case of 100~200-level courses, the percentage of full-time faculty who selected the scores of 0-2 on the Likert scale of 0 to 5 is 18.47%; 66.30% checked the scores of 3-5. In comparison, 11.76% of sessional lecturers said 0-2; and 80.88% checked 3-5. For 300~400-level courses, 22.91% of full-time faculty answered 0-2 while 68.75% answered 3-5. The respective percentages for sessional lecturers are 7.4% and 64.8%.

---

[24] The total number of respondents for graduate courses is 137, but 50 of them selected the option of not applicable. If we exclude the not applicable responses, the distribution of responses is as follows: 31.03% for 0-2, and 68.96% for 3-5.

Q2.5 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=not at all, 5=a lot, NA=Not applicable). In your courses, students are provided writing exemplars.

184 survey takers answered the above question for 100~200-level courses. Responses were evenly distributed between the scores of 0-2 and 3-5; 75 (40.76%) and 88 (47.82%) respectively.

An analysis of the responses with regard to status of employment reveals that a much greater proportion of sessional lecturers provide students with writing exemplars. 43 of 67 sessional lecturers (64.17%) selected the scores of 3-5 on the five-point scale; 20 (29.85%) said 0-2. In comparison, 42 (45.65%) of 92 full-time faculty answered 0-2; 35 (38.04%) said 3-5. An important observation is also that the most frequently selected response in the case of sessional lecturers is 5 on the given Likert scale of 0 to 5 (frequency: 21), whereas in the case of full-time faculty, the response 0 = not at all has the highest frequency (24) among all given options. As to full-time instructors, a greater number of full-time instructors chose the lower end of the scale (0-2) than the higher end. Thus, according to the survey, sessional lecturers make more use of writing exemplars as a teaching tool than do full-time faculty and full-time instructors when teaching 100~200-level classes.

171 survey takers answered the above question for 300~400-level courses. The overall result shows that course instructors rely less on writing exemplars as a teaching tool in more senior-level classes. Out of 171 respondents, 85 (49.70%) checked the scores of 0-2, and 56 (31.75%) responded 3-5. This result is not surprising because higher-level courses expect and/or are based on the assumption of a certain level of background knowledge and academic skills on the part of students. It is important to note that while sessional lecturers make a lot of use of writing exemplars in 100~200-level courses, they tend to do less so in 300~400-level courses. The frequency of responses given by sessional instructors to the survey question is even between the lower and higher ends of the scale.

Yet, this decline does not continue in the case of graduate courses. The distribution of responses between the lower and higher ends of the scale is more even. 47 (35.07%) of 134 respondents checked the options of 0-2, and 39 (29.10%) selected 3-5.

This situation can be explained in terms of the fact that graduate studies usually involve different expectations and different types of assignments.

However, there are variations among Faculties when we investigate the survey answers for all levels of undergraduate courses with regard to Faculty affiliation. Faculty of Education-affiliated survey takers' responses are markedly toward the 3-5 end of the scale. In the case of the Faculty of Science, the distribution is greatly skewed toward the "not at all" – "hardly ever" end of the scale. Faculty of Arts-affiliated course instructors' responses are evenly distributed between the lower and higher ends of the scale.

It is important to note that, according to the student survey, students find writing exemplars helpful, as explained later in this report. Thus, it may be advisable for course instructors to provide students with appropriate writing exemplars in their courses.

Q2.6 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=not at all, 5=a lot, NA=Not applicable). In your courses, students are encouraged to consult with you, a teaching assistant, or a writing support employee about drafts of their writing assignments before submitting the final version.

Like the previous several questions, this question also identifies three levels of credit courses: 100~200; 300~400; and graduate. For all the identified levels of courses, the option of "a lot" or 5 on the seven-item scale was selected many more times than any other option and even more so in the case of 100~200-level courses. For example, for 100~200-level courses, 86 (46.49%) of 185 respondents said "a lot" in response to the question, and 123 (66.48%) respondents answered 3-5. The results for graduate courses are as follows. Out of 134 respondents, 37 (27.61%) said "a lot or 5"; and 61 (45.52%) said 3-5, while 25 (18.65) checked the options of 0-2. Thus, according to the survey, students are encouraged to consult with their course instructor, teaching assistant, or a writing employee before submitting their writing assignments. There are no significant differences with respect to Faculty affiliation and status of employment.

While according to course instructors students are encouraged to consult about their writing assignments, only a small percentage of students seem to utilize consultations, according to the student survey (which appears later).

Q2.7 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=not at all, 5=a lot, NA=Not applicable). In your courses, students submit assignments and receive feedback at different stages of the writing process, so that they build their writing drafts to a final product.

Responses to this question are more or less evenly divided between the lower (0-2) and higher (3-5) ends of the scale for all levels of courses. For 100~200-level courses, 45.16% of respondents chose 0-2; and 44.09% said 3-5. For 300~400-level courses, the corresponding figures are 44.51% and 39.30%. However, in the case of graduate courses, the distribution is reverse: a greater proportion of course instructors said they use staged (scaffolded) writing for student writing assignments. 28.26% selected the scores of 0-2, while 36.96% chose 3-5.

These responses align with students' responses to a similar question in the student survey (see Student Survey Q.2.7 below).

There are some variations among Faculties. The responses of course instructors affiliated with the Faculties of Arts, Science, and MAP are quite evenly divided between the lower (0-2) and higher (3-5) ends of the scale. In the case of the Faculty of Education, the distribution of responses is significantly toward the higher end, whereas in the case of the Faculties of Engineering and Applied Science, Nursing, and Social Work, it is markedly toward the lower end. The Faculty of KHS is also situated more toward the lower end but to a lesser extent. The distribution of responses on the given scale does not differ with respect to the employment status of full-time faculty and sessional lecturers. Responses of both full-time faculty and sessional lecturers are nearly equally divided between the lower and higher ends for all levels of undergraduate courses. In contrast, the responses of full-time instructors are heavily concentrated in the lower end, but the sample is small.

Q2.8 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=not at all, 5=a lot, NA=Not applicable). Your courses include online space (e.g. UR Courses) for sharing, peer reviewing, journal writing and/or discussing student writing assignments.

According to the survey results, using online space for sharing, peer reviewing, or discussing writing assignments is not a common practice among course instructors. In all levels of courses, from 100-level to graduate, the number of course instructors who never

or rarely (0-2) use online space for this purpose is double the number of those who use sometimes or a lot (3-5). The corresponding percentages are as follows: 58.15% and 30.4% for 100~200-level courses; 54.06% and 26.16% for 300~400-level courses; and 41.91% and 20.58% for graduate courses.

There are some noticeable differences across Faculties. With respect to undergraduate courses, the number of those who checked the options of 0-2 is at least twice the number of those who selected the options of 3-5 in the Faculties of Arts, Science, Nursing, Social Work, Kinesiology and Health Studies, and Engineering and Applied Science. For the Faculties of Education and MAP, the numbers are very close. The result is similar for graduate courses; however, the distribution of responses is even more skewed toward the 0-2 end of the scale in the former group of Faculties, while it is even in the case of the latter group. In other words, course instructors in Education and MAP use more online space for student writing.

There are also important differences with respect to employment status. According to the survey results, full-time faculty rely on online space for sharing, peer reviewing, or discussing student writing assignments to a lesser degree than sessional lecturers do. For undergraduate courses, the option of 0-2 was selected 117 times, whereas the option of 3-5 was checked 46 times in the case of full-time faculty. On the other hand, the frequency of the option of 0-2 is only slightly higher than the option of 3-5 in the case of sessional lecturers—56 and 48, respectively.[25] Perhaps this difference between full-time faculty and sessional lecturers is due to online courses, which are likely to be taught more by sessional lecturers; however, we do not have data to confirm this assumption.

Q2.9 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=not at all, 5=a lot, NA=Not applicable). Your courses include online writing resources or tools available from the U of R Student Success Centre, Turnitin, and Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL).

The survey reveals that course instructors make more use of online writing tools in 100~200-level courses than 300~400-level courses as well as graduate courses.

---

[25] When we include graduate courses in the calculations, the proportions do not change much: 163 times for the option of 0-2, versus 68 times for the option of 3-5, in the case of full-time faculty; the corresponding figures for sessional lecturers are 62 and 54.

50.81% of respondents (94 out of 185) selected the scale-points of 3-5; and 37.29% (69/185) chose 0-2. For 300~400-level courses, the frequencies and proportions of responses are evenly divided between the lower and higher ends of the Likert scale. 41.86% (72 out of 172) checked the answers of 0-2, and 38.95% (67 out of 172) said 3-5. In the case of graduate courses, the proportions are 40.74% for the scale points of 0-2, and 22.96% for 3-5; the remaining percentage refers to the responses of "not applicable." Despite the wide availability of online writing resources and tools, many course instructors are not using them much. There may be different reasons for this, including lack of awareness or the fact that available online resources do not meet course instructors' expectations or standards.

Overall, course instructors' response to this survey question mirrors the student response to a similar question in the student survey. Less than 50% of students taking the survey reported using online writing resources (see Student Survey Q2.9 below). This low percentage could be at least partially explained by the fact that many course instructors do not incorporate online writing resources, as revealed by our survey of course instructors.

Course instructors' responses do not vary significantly according to Faculty affiliation. In the case of the Faculties of Arts, Education, KHS, Nursing, and Social Work, the frequency of responses in favour of the higher end of the scale (3-5) is slightly greater than the frequency of responses in favour of the lower end of 0-2 for undergraduate courses. For the Faculties of MAP and Science, the distribution of responses is slightly toward the lower end. The Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science stands out in that 10 of 12 responses are for the lower end of the scale, and the options of 3-5 scored 0 (2 of the 12 responses are "not applicable").

There is slight variation with regard to employment status. For undergraduate courses, the proportion of sessional lecturers who checked the higher end options of 3-5 is greater than the corresponding proportion of full-time faculty. When we include the "not applicable" responses, the proportions are as follows: 45.74% (86 out of 188) of full-time faculty checked the scale points of 0-2; 41.48% (78 / 188) said 3-5. In comparison, 34.42% (42 out of 122) sessional lecturers selected 0-2; 46.72% (57 / 122) answered 3-5. When we exclude the NA responses, the proportions are as follows: 52.43% of full-time

faculty said 0-2; 47.56% answered for 3-5. For sessional lecturers, the corresponding figures are 42.42% and 57.57%. Similar to the results of the previous question, responses to Q2.9 show that sessional lecturers make more use of online writing resources than do full-time faculty; however, this difference is not substantial.

Q2.10 Please comment: What benefits can you see in building more writing assignments into your courses?

The comment sections of the survey were analyzed using the software NVivo.

Total respondents: 175

The most frequent reference (numbering 61) is concerned with the importance of "receiving feedback" and "practicing." The second most frequent mention (27) emphasizes "better communication" or "ability to communicate knowledge." Other frequent references numbering from 13 to 27, in a descending order, emphasize writing as a "transferable skill"; "helping with analysis, synthesis, or critical thinking"; and "deeper engagement with the material."

In response to the same question, many respondents also commented on the demerits of "building more writing assignments into courses." 39 respondents said that their courses already had "sufficient writing components." 16 respondents wrote "no benefits."

Q2.11 Please comment: What drawbacks can you see in building more writing assignments into your courses?

Total respondents: 175

The highest number of references is to "time constraint for course instructors." 83 survey respondents saw time constraint as a main drawback and mentioned more grading, more workload, and not enough time to give adequate feedback. The second most frequently cited drawback is "time constraint for students." 27 respondents commented that a lot of writing assignments mean less time for students to spend on each assignment, and hence the quality of assignments would decline. The close third is the comment that "more writing assignments would take away from time spent on course content"; 25 respondents shared this view. Other frequent mentions are "class size constraints" (18

respondents); "sufficient writing assignments already" (16); and "student resistance" (15). 17 respondents, however, wrote they did not see any drawbacks.

Q2.12 Please comment: What are the challenges of providing more writing instruction or tools in your courses?

Total respondents: 178

"Time constraint for course instructors" is the most frequent comment; 47 respondents mentioned it. 46 respondents commented "it cuts into course content." Other most frequent answers are as follows: "students' lack of interest, motivation, and/or compliance" (35); "varying levels of student skills or competencies" (22); "students ill-prepared for university" (18); "need for individualized writing instruction" (14); and "difficulty of finding good writing tools or samples" (12).

It is important to note that our review of the responses for Q2.12 revealed that some survey respondents misunderstood this question; they interpreted what this question probed as similar to Q2.11.

Q3.1 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=not at all, 5=a lot, NA=Not applicable). Please indicate the extent to which students in your courses need writing support in the following areas (writing support as can be provided by course instructors, teaching assistants, academic units, and writing support centres, such as guidance, guidelines, and advice): 1) applying critical thinking skills; 2) organizing ideas in a coherent manner; 3) writing for a specific audience; 4) preparing to write different kinds of assignments; 5) referencing properly; 6) using syntax correctly; and 7) identifying and editing grammar mistakes

According to the survey, course instructors strongly agree that students need writing support in all the areas listed above. 55.55% to 76.44% of respondents reported 4 or 5 on the seven-item scale (0=lowest; 5=highest). The highest percentage is for the area of "referencing properly" and the lowest is for "preparing to write different kinds of assignments." When we add the mid-point on the scale, which is 3, the percentages range from 79.81 to 90.39. The highest percentage is for the two areas of "applying critical thinking skills" and "organizing ideas in a coherent manner" (90.38% and 90.39%

respectively); the lowest is in the area of "preparing to write different kinds of assignments."

When we look at the proportions of those who checked the mid-to a lot scores (3-5) on the Likert scale (0= lowest; 5= highest) according to Faculty affiliation, there are no significant variations among Faculties. However, the proportions of those who selected the two highest points on the scale (4-5) reveal some divergence according to Faculty affiliation. In the case of the Faculties of Engineering and Applied Science, Science, Social Work, and Business Administration, half or less than half of respondents selected 4-5. In other words, course instructors affiliated with these Faculties do not think students in their courses need writing support a lot but do feel students need support somewhat. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the samples for all of these Faculties except Science are quite small.

The survey results for Q3.1 do not show any significant differences with respect to employment status.

Q3.2 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=Not at All, 5=A lot, NA=Not Applicable) the extent to which you think writing support could help students (writing support as can be provided by course instructors, teaching assistants, academic units, and writing support centres, such as guidance, guidelines, and advice): 1) applying critical thinking skills; 2) organizing ideas in a coherent manner; 3) writing for a specific audience; 4) preparing to write different kinds of assignments; 5) referencing properly; 6) using syntax correctly; and 7) identifying and editing grammar mistakes

Responses to this survey question are in alignment with the responses to the previous question. As course instructors believe that students need writing support in a variety of areas (as listed in the survey), they also think that writing support could help students in all these areas. In fact, those who reported 4-5 on the given scale constitute 69.85% to 84.21% of all respondents according to the areas listed above. The lowest percentage is for the area of "applying critical thinking skills" and the highest percentage is for "referencing properly"; the student survey produced the same result from the perspective of students.

Thus, according to the results of the previous question, course instructors believe that students need writing support the most in the area of referencing properly (4-5 on the scale), and they would benefit from writing support the most in the same area. When we add the mid-point of 3 on the survey scale of 0 to 5, the proportions of course instructors who believe writing support would benefit students range from 86.12% (applying critical skills) to 94.34% (referencing properly). Thus course instructors strongly agree that writing support could benefit students in a variety of ways.

Our analysis of survey responses to the same question with respect to Faculty affiliation do not reveal important variations. Two observations are worth mentioning. First, course instructors from the Faculty of Arts do not believe that writing support could help students in the area of "applying critical skills" as much as it could in the other areas; however, over 70% still reported 4-5 on the 0 to 5 scale with respect to writing support helping students apply critical skills. Second, compared to other Faculties, course instructors from the Faculty of Science are less convinced about the benefits of writing support; nevertheless, half of Science respondents still reported 4-5 on the 0 to 5 Likert scale in all the areas of writing support listed by the survey question.

We also analyzed the results of Q3.2 in terms of employment status. The distribution of responses on the scale of 0 to 5 is quite similar for full-time faculty, full-time instructors, and sessional lecturers. Thus, there is strong agreement among course instructors irrespective of their employment status that writing support provided in a variety of forms can help students to develop their writing skills.

Q3.3 Please comment: If you would like to add comments about Q3.1 or 3.2, please place your comments in the space below.

Total respondents: 80

The most frequent comment is the view that students are lacking in specific skills such as grammar and spelling. 21 respondents expressed this view. The second most frequent comment is about the importance of "consistent support" for students, which 11 respondents shared.

Q3.4 Please comment: In what other ways do you think writing support can benefit students?

Total respondents: 105

Most respondents gave positive comments about the importance of writing skills. They are concerned with "significance of writing skills for careers"; "writing as clear or critical thinking"; "writing as a life skill" and hence the importance of writing support for students.

Q4.1 Please answer on a scale of 0 to 5 (0=not at all, 5=a lot, NA=Not applicable). Please indicate the extent to which:

1) You are aware of the various writing supports that exist on campus.

The majority of survey respondents seem to be well aware of writing support services that are available on campus. 59.93% checked 4-5 on the seven-item scale; 77.77% reported 3-5. The percentage of those who said unaware or hardly aware (0-2) is 20.28% (42 respondents), which is still an important minority. However, some of those course instructors who are unaware of writing supports on campus are distance education instructors, according to the NVivo analysis of the written comments.

As compared to sessional lecturers, full-time faculty and full-time instructors are more aware of writing supports that exist on campus. 61.94% of full-time faculty and full-time instructors reported 4-5; and 82.30% answered 3-5. For sessional lecturers, the corresponding percentages are 54.32% and 70.37%. 27.16% of sessional lecturers responded that they were unaware or hardly aware (0-2), whereas 16.81% of full-time faculty and full-time instructors said that they were unaware or hardly aware. There are important variations across Faculties. The percentages of those who reported 3-5 are as follows for the Faculties with the first four highest numbers of survey respondents: Arts 89.02%; Education 64.00%; Science 55.00%; and MAP 84.61%.

2) You know where the writing support centres are on campus.

Survey respondents reported high awareness of the location of writing support centres. 54.10% checked 4-5 on the Likert scale of 0 to 5, and 66.67% selected 3-5. As expected, these percentages align with the percentages of those who said "they are aware

of writing support services that exist on campus." However, they also show that not all of those who reported awareness of writing support services on campus know where the writing centres are located on campus.

Similar to the results of the previous question, full-time faculty and full-time instructors reported higher awareness of where the writing support centres are on campus, compared to sessional lecturers. 61.94% and 82.30% of the former group reported 4-5 and 3-5 respectively, whereas the corresponding percentages for sessional lecturers are 54.32% and 70.37%. Like the previous question, this survey question reveals important differences between Faculties. The proportions of those who responded 3-5 are as follows for the four Faculties with the highest number of respondents: Arts 85.36%; Education 56%; Science 55%; and MAP 69.22%.

3) You refer your students to a writing support centre on campus.

57.95% of respondents said that they referred their students to a writing support centre a lot (4-5 on the scale), while 26.57% said not at all, hardly, or rarely (0-2). Thus, over half of course instructors referred students to a writing centre a lot. Full-time faculty and sessional instructors differ to some degree with respect to this question. While 64.14% of full-time faculty reported 4-5 on the seven-item scale of 0 to 5 plus not applicable, 51.85% of sessional lecturers said the same. When we include the mid-point on the scale (point 3), we get the following results: 78.28% of full-time faculty and 61.73% of sessional lecturers reported 3-5. As to full-time instructors, 57.14% checked 3-5, but as noted earlier, the sample is small. Thus, since full-time faculty are more aware of the writing support services and of where they are located on campus, they refer their students to them more often. It is worth reporting that among the Faculties with the first four highest numbers of respondents, the Faculties of Arts and Science refer students to writing support centres on campus less frequently, relative to their higher level of self-reported awareness of these services. In other words, in these two Faculties, the proportion of course instructors who said they referred their students to a writing centre on campus sometimes to a lot is noticeably lower than the proportion of those who reported mid-to-high awareness of the writing support centres. 79.26% of Faculty of Arts-affiliated course instructors reported 3-5 in response to the question about referral of

students to a writing support centre; the relevant figure is 35% in the case of the Faculty of Science. On the other hand, the percentages of those who are aware of writing supports on campus and those who refer students to a writing support centre are very close in the Faculties of Education and MAP.

4) **You have had someone from a writing support centre present to your class.**

A great majority of course instructors answered this question negatively. 69.91% reported 0-2, while only 25.25% said 3-5 on the Likert scale of 0-5. A reason for this may be inadequate knowledge of the services provided by the writing support centres. A slightly greater proportion of sessional lecturers made use of this service offered by the writing support centres on campus. 28.39% of sessional lecturers and 21.42% of full-time faculty and full-time instructors said they had someone from a writing support centre present to their class sometimes to a lot.

5) **The writing support centres help to address your students' writing needs.**

Course instructors seem to be divided with respect to their assessments or perceptions of how helpful the writing support centres are in addressing students' needs. 42.65% reported 0-2, while 42.15% said 3-5. The percentage of those who checked 4-5 is only 19.6%. Thus, according to the survey results, course instructors are not satisfied with the writing support centres. We looked at the spread of responses on the survey scale for the four Faculties with the highest number of respondents. The 0-2 end of the scale weighs more heavily than the 3-5 end for all the four Faculties. However, how much it is skewed toward the lower end varies. The lower end weighs much more heavily in the case of the Faculties of Science and MAP than Education and Arts. 50% of respondents affiliated with Science and 58.33% of respondents from MAP selected 0-2; 25% of Science-affiliated respondents and 33.33% of MAP-affiliated respondents said 3-5. 40.24% of Arts-affiliated respondents and 32.00% of Education-affiliated respondents checked the options of 0-2; 51.22% of course instructors from Arts and 48% course instructors from Education reported 3-5.[26]

---

[26] The remaining percentages refer to the responses "not applicable."

Q4.2 Please comment: Have you referred any of your students to a writing support centre on campus in the last five years? Please list which one(s) and comment on the outcome.

Total respondents: 162

95 respondents said "yes"; and 29 said "no." 19 respondents said, "they made general referrals" (e.g. providing class with information about the writing support centres). 32 respondents wrote positive comments on the outcome when they referred students to a writing support centre, while 16 expressed negative views regarding the outcome, such as "not beneficial." 15 respondents did not have knowledge of the outcome. 12 said they referred students but "they do not go."

Q4.3 Please comment: If you have not referred any student to a writing support centre on campus in the last five years, please comment on the reasons for not doing so.

Total respondents: 69

14 respondents said "they don't teach on the U of R campus and don't have access to the writing support centres." Another 5 respondents wrote "they teach online thus don't have access to the writing support centres." 13 respondents said "they are not aware of the writing support centres."

Q5.1 Please answer on a scale of "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" (strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, neither disagree nor agree, somewhat agree, agree, strongly disagree).

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	3	4	5

Responsibility for Developing Students' Writing Skills

In this last section of the survey, which has three components, the first part of the section lists three entities, namely, course instructors, academic units, and student support services, and asks survey participants whether / to what extent they agree or disagree with

the statement that each of these entities is responsible for developing students' writing skills. A majority of respondents somewhat agreed to strongly agreed with the statement for each category. 66.99% of respondents said somewhat agree, agree, or strongly agree with the statement that "all course instructors are responsible for developing students' writing skills." The relevant percentages for the categories of academic units and student support services are 73.26% and 68.82%, respectively. Thus it may be worthwhile to further explore the results for the category of course instructors because survey participants are course instructors.

"All course instructors are responsible for developing students' writing skills."

A significant proportion of course instructors agreed with the above statement. 39.90% said strongly agree or agree. When we add those who reported somewhat agree, the percentage is 66.99%. Thus, a majority of respondents think all course instructors are responsible for developing students' writing skills. However, it is also worth asking whether there are important differences across Faculties this regard. While bearing in mind that the number of respondents from some Faculties is rather small, the spread of responses on the scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree varies considerably across Faculties. When we aggregate the responses of agree and strongly agree according to each Faculty, we arrive at the following results. Faculty of Arts respondents reported the strongest support for the statement "all course instructors are responsible for developing students' writing skills," with 48.15% agreeing or strongly agreeing. Closely following the Faculty of Arts is the Faculty of Science: 45% of Science-affiliated course instructors who took the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The next three highest proportions of agree and strongly agree responses are for the following Faculties: Kinesiology and Health Studies at 36.36%; and the Faculties of Education and MAP at 33.33% each. When we add the somewhat agree responses, the Faculty of Education reported the highest support for the survey statement, with 79.16% of Education-affiliated respondents somewhat agreeing, agreeing, or strongly agreeing. Other Faculties' percentages are as follows: Nursing 72.72%; KHS 72.66%; Science 70%; Arts 69.14%; Business Administration 66.67%; MAP 50.00%; Engineering and Applied Science 28.58%; and Social Work 14.29%. Engineering and Social Work were the only

Faculties where more than half of respondents did not agree that all course instructors are responsible for developing students' writing skills.

It is also important to explore whether the distribution of responses on the given survey scale varies in any significant way with respect to respondents' status of employment at the University. A significantly greater proportion of sessional lecturers supported the statement than did full-time faculty and full-time instructors. 46.25% of sessional lecturers, 36.46% of full-time faculty, and 14.29% of full-time instructors agreed or strongly agreed with the survey statement. When we add those who said they somewhat agreed with the statement, the proportions are as follows: 78.75% of sessional lecturers, 58.34% of full-time faculty, and 50% of full-time instructors somewhat agreed, agreed, or strongly agreed that all course instructors have responsibility with regard to developing students' writing skills.

Fulfilling Responsibilities for Developing Students' Writing Skills

The second section of survey question 5.1 again names several entities including the above, and expects participants to assess to what extent these entities are fulfilling their responsibilities for developing students' writing skills.

"Course instructors are fulfilling their responsibilities for developing students' writing skills."

The spread of responses on the scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree is more or less balanced with the agree side slightly bigger. Those who said agree or strongly agree with the above statement constitute 26.92% of all respondents. When those who somewhat agree are included, the proportion is 37.32%. Those who said strongly disagree to somewhat disagree make up 29.36%. The biggest group of respondents, 33.33%, said neither disagree nor agree. Thus, according to the survey, while more course instructors believe that "course instructors are fulfilling their responsibilities for developing students' writing skills," a significant minority disagrees; and the single largest group is neutral on this question.

"Academic units are fulfilling their responsibilities for developing students' writing skills."

As in the case of the previous question, responses to this one are also quite evenly distributed on the given scale, but in this case, the disagreeing side is slightly bigger than the agreeing side. The former group is 35.5% of all respondents, while the latter constitutes 29.5%. Another 35% said neither agree nor disagree. Thus, the single biggest group of respondents, which is a large minority, is not convinced that academic units are fulfilling their responsibilities with respect to improving students' writing skills. The second biggest group is neutral.

"Student support services are fulfilling their responsibilities for developing students' writing skills."

Student support services received a more positive assessment than did academic units and course instructors. 43.5% of survey respondents reported somewhat agree to strongly agree with the statement that "student support services are fulfilling their responsibilities for developing students' writing skills." 20% strongly disagreed, disagreed, or somewhat disagreed; 36.5% neither agreed nor disagreed.

"The university as a whole is succeeding in developing students' writing skills."

The university as a whole was assessed the least favourably with regard to developing students' writing skills. 31.35% of participants said strongly disagree or disagree with the above statement. Another 20.40% said somewhat disagree. Thus the total proportion of the disagreeing group is 51.75%. Those who reported somewhat agree to strongly agree make up 25.88%; another 22.39% neither agreed nor disagreed.

Ideas for Improving Students' Writing Skills

The last section asks participants whether they disagree or agree with several ideas that may help to develop students' writing skills. The results for each idea are as follows:

"The university should employ a consistent set of core writing skills for introductory courses."

    Agree / strongly agree 53.77%

    Somewhat agree / agree / strongly agree 74.88%

"All undergraduate courses should include teaching and assessment of writing skills."

    Agree / strongly agree 42.29%

    Somewhat agree / agree / strongly agree 68.16%

"The university should assess students' writing skills after admission in order to determine the types of writing support needed."

    Agree / strongly agree 61.20%

    Somewhat agree / agree / strongly agree 82.10%

"Students whose writing skills are weak should be required to participate in supplemental training."

    Agree / strongly agree 70.15%

    Somewhat agree / agree / strongly agree 89.55%

According to these results, more than half of survey respondents (except in one case) agree or strongly agree with the proposed ideas. When we factor in the responses "somewhat agree," the proportions of those agreeing with the proposed ideas reach very high levels. The least support is for the idea that "all undergraduate courses should include teaching and assessment of writing skills." But even in this case, the support rate is 68.16%. Further analysis of responses to this question with respect to Faculty affiliation is warranted. According to the distribution of responses on the given scale, there are some variations among Faculties as expected.

"All undergraduate courses should include teaching and assessment of writing skills."

    Somewhat agree / agree / strongly agree

Faculty of Arts 67.91%

Business Administration 66.67%

Education 79.17%

Engineering and Applied Science 71.43%

Kinesiology and Health Studies 63.63%

Media, Art, and Performance 41.67%

Nursing 72.72%

Science 52.64%

Social Work 100%

The data reveal that the lowest support for the idea is from the Faculty of MAP, while the Faculty of Social Work reported the highest support (100%). In this latter case, the sample is quite small, however. The second lowest support is from the Faculty of Science with an agreement rate of 52.64%.

Q5.2 Please comment: What can the University do to develop students' writing skills?

Total respondents: 128

Survey respondents made a wide variety of suggestions in response to the above question. The most frequent suggestion is "mandatory writing courses or workshops." 19 respondents made this suggestion. It is followed by the recommendation of "streaming students via a writing assessment test after admission" (12 respondents). Those who recommended streaming students also often mentioned streaming students with low writing assessment scores into basic mandatory writing courses or workshops. 10 respondents proposed assessing students' writing skills before admission. Other most frequently proposed solutions are "better promotion of writing support services" (12); and "provision of more resources for the SSC" (11).

Q5.3 Please comment: What additional comments or suggestions do you have to improve students' writing abilities?

Total respondents: 97

Survey takers made a wide variety of suggestions or comments. The most frequent ones are, in descending order, "mandatory foundational / basic writing course" (11 respondents); "higher university entrance requirements" (10); and the "importance of writing for all disciplines" (10).

Course Instructor Survey Summary

1) The representation of Faculties in the survey is uneven. The number of respondents is quite small for some Faculties relative to the total number of course instructors in them. This situation is an important limitation of the survey.

2) Writing assignments constitute a significant percentage of course assignments. As expected, the higher the level of courses taught, the greater the weights of writing assignments in final grades. There are differences across Faculties with respect to the weight of writing assignments in final course grades.

The survey has revealed a notable difference between full-time faculty and sessional lecturers with respect to the percentage weights of writing assignments in final course grades. Full-time faculty assign a weight of 41% or over to writing assignments more frequently in 300~400-level courses than in 100~200-level courses, whereas sessional lecturers' responses are nearly identical for both levels of undergraduate courses.

Many survey respondents see various benefits in building more writing assignments into courses, but they also point out that time constraint is a major barrier to doing so.

3) Significantly more than half of course instructors taking the survey spend none to a little amount of class time on students' writing skills development. There are some variations among Faculties in this regard. When compared to full-time faculty, a greater proportion of sessional lecturers spend medium to a lot of class time on writing skills development in 100-200-level courses. A significant number of survey takers mentioned

time constraint as an important reason for not including more writing instruction or tools in their courses; and many commented that time spent on writing instruction cuts into course content time.

4) Substantially more than half of course instructors explain writing assignments a lot in course syllabi and/or separate assignment sheets in all levels of undergraduate and graduate courses. There are no significant differences among Faculties or different categories of employment status (full-time faculty, full-time instructors, and sessional lecturers).

5) A great majority of course instructors rely on grading rubrics or guidelines for grading writing assignments. There are no significant differences among Faculties in this respect. Sessional lecturers appear to rely on grading rubrics or guidelines more than do full-time faculty.

6) Course instructors seem to be evenly divided with respect to the use of writing exemplars as a teaching tool in 100~200-level courses and in the case of graduate courses. In 100~200-level courses, about half of survey respondents provide students with writing exemplars while the other half do not. However, sessional lecturers make more use of writing exemplars as a teaching tool than do full-time faculty and full-time instructors when teaching 100~200-level classes. In senior-level undergraduate classes, course instructors rely on writing exemplars even less. However, there are noticeable variations among Faculties with respect to the degree to which course instructors provide students with writing exemplars as a teaching tool.

7) According to the survey, students are encouraged to a significant extent to consult with their course instructor, teaching assistant, or a writing employee before submitting their writing assignments. There are no significant differences with respect to Faculty affiliation and status of employment.

8) Fewer than half of course instructors use the tool of staged writing for student writing assignments; the proportion is slightly higher for 100~200-level courses. However, staged (scaffolded) writing is used to a greater degree in some Faculties than others. Full-time faculty and sessional lecturers do not demonstrate differences with regard to the use of staged-writing as a teaching and grading tool.

9) The use of online space for sharing, peer reviewing, or discussing student writing assignments is not a common practice among course instructors. However, there are some noticeable differences across Faculties as well as with regard to the employment status of course instructors. Full-time faculty rely on online space for sharing, peer reviewing, or discussing student writing assignments to a lesser extent than do sessional lecturers.

10) Many course instructors are not using online writing resources or tools much, despite the wide availability of such online resources. The survey responses on this issue do not vary significantly according to Faculty affiliation. However, there is a small variation according to employment status. Sessional lecturers are making somewhat more use of online writing resources as compared to full-time faculty, but the difference is not substantial.

11) Course instructors, both full-time and sessional across Faculties, strongly agree that students need writing support in all the areas of writing competencies listed in the survey (applying critical thinking skills; organizing ideas in a coherent manner; writing for a specific audience; preparing to write different kinds of assignments; referencing properly; using syntax correctly; and identifying and editing grammar mistakes). 90% of respondents agree that students need writing support (some to a lot) in "applying critical thinking skills" and "organizing ideas in a coherent manner". In this context, many survey respondents commented on the importance of student writing skills for clear communication, critical and analytical thinking, and employment and careers; they also described writing as a life skill.

12) As course instructors believe that students need writing support in a variety of areas relevant to writing competencies, they also strongly agree that writing support could help students to develop their writing skills in these areas.

13) 78% of course instructors are somewhat or well aware of the writing support services that are available on campus. However, an important minority are unaware or hardly aware of the available writing supports. Some of those instructors teach off campus. A higher percentage of sessional lecturers, 27%, are unaware or hardly aware of the writing support services, as compared to the proportion of 17% in the case of full-time faculty and instructors. According to the survey, course instructors from some Faculties are more

aware of the writing supports available on campus than are course instructors affiliated with other Faculties.

A significant majority of course instructors (67% who selected somewhat or a lot) know where the writing support centres are on campus, while a substantial minority does not know or hardly know the location of the writing support centres.

In alignment with the findings above, 78% of full-time faculty and 62% of sessional lecturers refer students to a writing support centre sometimes or a lot. However, only a small proportion of course instructors, 25%, have had someone from a writing support centre present to their class.

14) Many course instructors are not satisfied with the writing support centres with regard to meeting their students' writing needs. The percentage of course instructors who believe the writing support centres help to address their students' writing needs a lot is only 20%. The course instructors least satisfied with writing support services are from the Faculties of Science and MAP.

15) A significant majority of course instructors (67%) somewhat to strongly agree with the statement that "All course instructors are responsible for developing students' writing skills." In all Faculties except Engineering and Applied Science and Social Work, at least half (but mostly more than half) of course instructors taking the survey somewhat to strongly agree with the statement. It is important to note that a significantly greater proportion of sessional lecturers somewhat to strongly agree that all course instructors have responsibility for developing students' writing skills, as compared to full-time faculty and full-time instructors.

However, those who believe that course instructors are meeting their responsibilities regarding student writing skills are in the minority. Those who are convinced that academic units are fulfilling their responsibilities with respect to improving students' writing skills also constitute a minority of the survey takers.

Survey respondents assess the university as a whole the least favourably with regard to developing students' writing skills. Only 26% of course instructors somewhat to strongly agree that the University is succeeding in developing students' writing skills.

16) Great majorities of course instructors somewhat agree to strongly agree with the following ideas aimed at developing students' writing skills:

"The university should employ a consistent set of core writing skills for introductory courses."
Agree / strongly agree 53.77%
Somewhat agree / agree / strongly agree 74.88%

"All undergraduate courses should include teaching and assessment of writing skills."
Agree / strongly agree 42.29%
Somewhat agree / agree / strongly agree 68.16%

"The university should assess students' writing skills after admission in order to determine the types of writing support needed."
Agree / strongly agree 61.20%
Somewhat agree / agree / strongly agree 82.10%

"Students whose writing skills are weak should be required to participate in supplemental training."
Agree / strongly agree 70.15%
Somewhat agree / agree / strongly agree 89.55%

The comments written by survey respondents also indicate that there is substantial support among course instructors for a writing competency assessment test post admission as well mandatory foundational writing courses or seminars for students whose academic writing skills are not strong enough.

Student Survey

471 students responded to the student survey, for a response rate of 3.14%. Of the 471 students who started the survey, 431 completed it, for a completion rate of 92%.

Student Participants' Demographic Information

Section 1 of the survey focused on student demographics. Among the participating students, 406 were from the University of Regina, 27 were from Campion College, 22 were from Luther College, and 15 were from First Nations University. By Faculty, student participation was greatest in the Faculty of Arts (107 students), followed by Education (73 students), Science (64 students), Business Administration (48 students), and Engineering and Applied Science (37 students). By status, student participation included 389 Canadian citizens, 81 Canadian permanent residents, 51 international students, and 31 Aboriginal students. (This adds up to 552 student participants, which is higher than the 471 survey responses, as some students may have checked more than one category in this survey item.) By degree, student participation was greatest among those pursuing a bachelor's degree (367 students) and master's degree (92 students). (Some students checked more than one category in this survey item, so Qualtrics indicates 546 responses to this survey item, even though there were only 471 student participants.)

Before reporting the results, we should note that the above information and the following data may skew the picture of writing supports and writing support needs due to the relatively low response rate, the relatively low representation of certain groups (e.g., international students), and the disproportionately high percentage of Arts students who responded to the survey. In particular, the relatively low response rate created challenges to reaching generalizable conclusions because, once we made efforts to explore demographics in detail (e.g., first-year students as compared to fourth-year students; Arts students as compared to Science students), the sample sizes became too small in many instances.

Student Participants' Writing Experiences

Section 2 of the survey focused on students' writing experiences. In this section, questions 1 to 9 used a 7-point Likert scale to elicit responses on students' perceptions of

various aspects of writing within their academic program. It was helpful to sort students' responses into broad categories, as indicated here:

Not at all ← --- → A lot						N/A
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

The data are reported below.

Q2.1: Please indicate the extent to which you find writing assignments, such as essays, reviews, and research papers, a valuable component in your academic program.

For this survey item, 442 students responded. Among the responding students, the majority were from Arts (104 students), Education (70 students), Science (61 students), and Business (44 students). Overall, 72%[27] of responding students reported finding writing assignments a valuable component in their academic program. Across Faculties, however, there was variation. For instance, 81% of Arts students and 76% of Education students reported finding writing assignments a valuable component of their academic program, as compared to 64% of Science students, and 66% of Business students.[28] Across academic degrees, there was variation as well. While only 69% of undergraduate degree students felt that writing assignments were a valuable component in their academic program, 93% of master's degree students, and 85% of doctoral degree students found writing assignments valuable. This difference was statistically significant.[29]

In support of the closed-ended Qualtrics data, analysis of the open-ended responses in NVivo show a considerable proportion of students stating that writing within their undergraduate program has helped them to develop their writing skills. Though in some instances students cannot pinpoint exactly what has been helpful or how it has been so, many students comment on the value of practice within their discipline. Through writing in their programs, students report developing confidence in researching, citing other works, writing more "professionally" or "academically," and writing with stronger argumentation and concision. Many students also comment on the benefit of ENGL 100

---

[27] In these data, all percentages correspond to assigned scores of 4 or 5 on a 7-point Likert scale.
[28] The difference between Arts students and Business and Science students was statistically significant at the p=0.05
[29] p=0.05

and ENGL 110 in helping them to learn how to express an opinion and write persuasively. (However, some students express concern that the course focus is far removed from their major and that the course demands are above a 100-level course.)

Q2.2: Please indicate the extent to which you are aware of the writing assignments in your courses.

For this survey item, 440 students responded. The majority of respondents were from Arts (103 students), Education (69 students), Science (61 students), and Business (44 students). Overall, 82% of responding students reported being aware of the writing assignments in their courses. Across Faculties, however, there was variation. 89% of Arts students and 84% of Education students reported awareness of writing assignments, as compared to 69% of Science students and 77% of Business students.[30] This difference may be that Arts students have relatively higher familiarity with the genres within their discipline than do Science students with the genres within their discipline.

Q2.3: Please indicate the extent to which you find writing assessment guidelines helpful.

442 students responded to this survey item. Overall, 76% reported finding writing guidelines helpful. As with the previous two questions, there was some variation based on academic unit. 80% of Arts students and 80% of Education students reported finding writing guidelines helpful, as compared to 72% of Science students and 64% of Business students.[31] This survey item also appeared to show variation based on students' status, though the difference was not statistically significant. 78% of Canadian citizens, compared to 67% of international students, reported finding writing guidelines helpful. As for degree (i.e. undergraduate as compared to graduate), 77% of undergraduate students and 80% of master's students reported finding writing guidelines helpful, as compared to only 65% of doctoral students.[32]

---

[30] The difference between Arts students and Science students is statistically significant at the p=0.05 level.
[31] The difference between Arts/Education students and Business students is significant, but at the p=0.1 level, not at the p=0.05 level.
[32] The sample size with doctoral students was not large enough to conduct a chi-squared test.

Q2.4: Please indicate the extent to which you find writing instruction valuable when assignments are specific to your major or academic program.

442 students responded to this survey item. Overall, 77% of students reported finding writing instruction valuable when assignments are specific to their discipline. Student perceptions were much more similar in this question as compared to previous questions, but the data did indicate a significant difference[33] between Arts students, 86% of whom responded positively; and Science students, 70% of whom responded positively.

Many students express a desire for more explicit writing instruction within their courses. Students note the distinction between receiving writing *practice* (Q2.1) and receiving writing *instruction* and express concern that, without writing instruction, their writing practice is not leading to writing improvement. In some instances where students do receive writing instruction, they feel that it mostly just repeats what they learned in high school. Many students would like more explicit writing instruction that aligns more closely with the writing demands of their academic programs.

Q2.5: Please indicate the extent to which you find writing exemplars, such as helpful examples or samples, valuable.

A total of 440 students responded to this survey item. 74% of students reported finding writing exemplars helpful. Students' responses were similar across all Faculties.

It is important to note that, for some of these questions (e.g. Q2.4 and Q2.5), students' responses do not necessarily have a one-to-one relationship with actual writing practices in students' academic programs. For instance, although students report finding writing exemplars helpful (Q2.5), their responses to the survey item do not necessarily mean that the students feel that they receive *sufficient* writing exemplars in their courses.[34] In fact, in the open-ended responses in the survey, many students indicated that they would like more explicit discipline-specific writing instruction and writing exemplars.

Many students expressed concern that they are expected to enter their program of study with the necessary writing skills already developed; they said that their courses lack

---

[33] p=0.05

[34] Eliciting a response on this latter issue, such as "You are provided sufficient writing exemplars," was avoided to reduce the leading nature behind some questions.

sufficient explication of writing expectations or appropriate modeling (i.e., exemplars) of writing standards.

Students expressed concern that they do not receive helpful feedback or constructive criticism to guide them to make improvements on their writing. They commented that they had to guess what is expected of them with respect to writing requirements in a particular course. Additionally, students note that the experience varies between instructors and across courses, which often leads to confusion about what constitutes good writing.

Q2.6: Please indicate the extent to which you consult with your instructor, a teaching assistant, or a writing support employee about drafts of your writing assignments before submitting the final version.

For this survey item, 442 students responded. 24% of responding students reported consulting with someone before submitting the final version of their writing assignment. Among the responding students, the majority were from Arts (104 students), Education (70 students), Science (61 students), and Business (44 students). Although there was variation with respect to how much students utilized consultations across Faculties (28% of Arts students; 23% of Education students; 34% of Science students; 16% of Business students), the differences were not statistically significant.[35] The same is true of differences based on degree (23% of Undergraduate students, versus 30% of master's students) and status (31% of international students; 23% of Canadian students; 33% of Aboriginal students).

Consulting with an instructor appears to be preferred over getting help from a writing support employee. Students feel that discipline-specific assistance from their course instructor is more helpful/valuable in meeting their needs, as they are not sure whether a writing support employee would have sufficient subject-area knowledge to assist appropriately. Similarly, students feel that getting feedback/assistance from their instructor is more appropriate because their instructor ultimately grades their paper. (There seems to be a preference to cut out the middle person, and this seems to be

---

[35] p=0.05

particularly true in the case of graduate-level or technical writing issues, when students feel that a writing support employee may not have the background knowledge to assist.)

Q2.7: Please indicate the extent to which you work on your writing assignments in stages.

For this survey item, 439 students responded, and overall, 50% reported working on writing assignments in stages. Students' responses were similar across academic units. However, students' responses were significantly different[36] based on level of study. Specifically, whereas 65% of master's students reported working on assignments in stages, 47% of undergraduate students reported doing so.

In comparison to previous questions (Q2.1-Q2.5), Question 2.7 (much like Q2.6) revealed a relatively lower favourable response rate among students. In the open-ended responses, students reported that the greatest obstacle to writing in stages was lack of time, particularly when a full course load is considered. Based on their existing workloads, students expressed concern that they do not have sufficient time to complete assignments in stages.

Q2.8: Please indicate the extent to which you find it helpful to peer review, and/or discuss your writing assignments with others.

For this survey item, 440 students responded, and overall, 50% reported finding it helpful to peer review or discuss assignments with others. However, there was significant difference[37] between academic units. 39% of Arts students reported finding peer review helpful, as compared to 63% of Science students.

For this question, there may be a difference in the use of peer review based on the nature of writing assignments within a particular course or program. In some cases, students reported using peer review because their courses involved group papers. In those cases, group members acted as multiple editors. In other cases, students reported using peer editors because peers were familiar with the topic and knew the expectations of the assignments.

---

[36] $p=0.05$
[37] $p=0.05$

Q2.9: Please indicate the extent to which you use online writing resources or tools available from the University of Regina Student Success Centre, Turnitin, and Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL).

For this survey item, 440 students responded. Overall, 44% of students reported using online writing resources. Students' responses were similar (and relatively unfavourable) across all academic units, with the exception of Nursing. For instance, whereas 37% of Education students reported using online resources, 71% of Nursing students did. This difference is statistically significant. Based on students' status, there was statistically significant difference as well.[38] Whereas 47% of Canadian citizen students and 57% of Aboriginal students reported using online writing resources, only 24% of international students did.

Students expressed a tendency to use online resources (such as Grammarly and Turnitin) mainly for proofreading and editing issues. Many students also expressed a preference to rely on a trusted peer for such needs.

Q2.10: Please select the best answer for your situation. Your writing assignments make up typically ___% of your course assessments.

Before reporting the results to this question, we should note that getting to the heart of this issue is a challenge as students' writing demands may vary greatly across courses and across Faculties. Nevertheless, we were interested in exploring how much writing students actually do in their courses *on the whole*, and the data do provide a general picture of students' writing demands.

As expected, students' responses show that writing demands become generally more significant as students progress through their studies over academic years.

In 100-level undergraduate courses:
- 35% report that writing constitutes more than 60% of their course assessments
  - 63% report that writing constitutes more than 40% of their course assessments

In 200-level undergraduate courses
- 33% report that writing constitutes more than 60% of their course assessments

---

[38] $p=0.05$

- o 67% report that writing constitutes more than 40% of their course assessments

In 300-level undergraduate courses

- 43% report that writing constitutes more than 60% of their course assessments
  - o 70% report that writing constitutes more than 40% of their course assessments

In 400-level undergraduate courses

- 50% report that writing constitutes more than 60% of their course assessments
  - o 69% report that writing constitutes more than 40% of their course assessments

In graduate-level courses

- 76% report that writing constitutes more than 60% of their course assessments
  - o 90% report that writing constitutes more than 40% of their course assessments

At the same time, it is important to note variability across Faculties. Students in some Faculties (Engineering and Applied Science, Nursing, and Science) report having comparatively fewer writing demands in their introductory years than students in other Faculties (Education, Social Work). Students in some programs or majors (Computer Science, Education, Engineering, MAP, Math) indicate that their program or major does not place much emphasis on writing and that it has not helped very much with writing skills development. For instance, Math students comment that their writing is limited to proofs, while Computer Science and MAP students comment that some of their courses have no writing demands.

Student Participants' Self-Perceptions and Self-Evaluations on Writing

Section 3 of the survey *focused more closely on students' self-reflections and self-perceptions.* In this section, the closed-ended questions used a 5-point Agree/Disagree scale to elicit responses. Students' responses were sorted into two general categories reflecting "agreement" (i.e. "somewhat agree" or "strongly agree") and "disagreement" (i.e. "somewhat disagree" or "strongly disagree").

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	3	4	5

The findings for Section 3 are reported below.

Statement: I am an experienced writer.

- 72%[39] of all responding students report that they are experienced writers

For this survey item, students' responses showed a significant difference[40] based on status. While 75% of Canadian students (368) responded that they are experienced writers, only 55% of international students (44) did. Across academic units, there was variation as well. For instance, 77% of Arts students (103), 77% of Social Work students (31), 77% of Engineering students (34), and 74% of Education students (70) reported being experienced as writers, as compared to only 57% of Science students (61). This is a statistically significant difference.[41]

Statement: I am a skilled writer.

- 70% of all responding students report that they are skilled writers

As with the previous question, students' responses differed greatly based on status. 73% of Canadian students (367) reported being skilled writers while only 49% of international students (43) reported being so. This was a statistically significant difference.[42] Students' responses also varied based on academic unit. Whereas 78% of Arts students (103) reported being skilled writers, only 56% of Science students (61) did. This was a statistically significant difference.[43]

It is important to point out that, according to our analysis of the student and course instructor surveys, there is a significant discrepancy between what course instructors think about a student's writing and how students perceive their own writing. 80-90% of course instructors agree that students need at least some writing support in many different areas of academic writing (see Faculty Survey Q3.2 above). The view that

---

[39] In these data, all percentages correspond to the percentage of students who responded either "Somewhat Agree" or "Strongly Agree."
[40] $p = 0.05$ level
[41] $p = 0.05$ level
[42] $p = 0.05$ level
[43] $p = 0.05$ level

students often struggle with academic writing was frequently expressed in the faculty and academic staff focus groups as well as in the survey comments written by course instructors. In contrast, approximately 70% of students believe that they are experienced or skilled writers. Thus, students' self-perception could be an important factor preventing them from consulting with their professors, teaching assistants, or writing support staff about their writing assignments and seeking support.

Statement: I get enough feedback on my writing assignments from my course instructor or teaching assistant.

- 61% of all responding students report that they get enough feedback on their writing assignments

Students' responses to this survey item were relatively low compared to responses to other survey items. At 68% and 77%, respectively, Arts students (103) and Social Work students (31) reported more satisfaction with the amount of feedback that they receive than students in other academic units did. 55% of Business students (44), 54% of Science students (56), and 47% of Engineering students (34) reported getting enough feedback. The difference between Arts students and Engineering students is statistically significant.[44]

Statement: I find the feedback on my writing assignments from my course instructor or teaching assistant helpful.

- 77% of all responding students report that they find feedback on their writing assignments helpful

82% of Arts students (102) and 94% of Social Work students (31) reported that feedback was helpful, in comparison to 65% of Business students (43) and 65% of Engineering students (34). This difference is statistically significant.[45]

Statement: Getting feedback on my draft paper from a writing support employee is helpful.

---

[44] p=0.05 level
[45] p=0.05 level

- 75% of all responding students report that getting feedback from a writing support employee is helpful

Though there were minor differences between groups based on academic unit and status, the differences were not statistically significant.[46]

Statement: Getting feedback on my draft paper from a fellow student is helpful.

- 65% of all responding students report that getting feedback from a peer is helpful

Students' appreciation of peer feedback was relatively low. By status, 73% of international students, 65% of Canadian students, and 55% of Aboriginal students reported valuing peer feedback, though the differences between these groups was not statistically significant.[47]

By academic unit, there was statistically significant difference as well. While 71% of Education students (63), 71% of Science students (55), 73% of Engineering students (33), and 77% of Social Work students (30) reported valuing peer feedback, only 55% of Arts students (89) did. (59% of Business students (39) reported valuing peer feedback, but this value was not statistically significant from the other groups.)

By degree, 65% of bachelor's students (314) and 80% of master's students (74) reported valuing peer feedback. This difference is statistically significant.[48]

Statement: I use the feedback on my writing assignments to improve my writing.

- 85% of all responding students report that they use feedback on their writing to improve their writing

Perhaps not surprisingly, most students reported efforts to use feedback to improve their writing. While all groups reported efforts to use feedback, the 74% of Business students (43) who did was statistically different[49] from the 97% of Social Work students (31) who did.

---

[46] $p=0.05$ level
[47] $p=0.05$ level
[48] $p=0.05$ level
[49] $p=0.05$ level

Statement: I feel confident about making suggestions on a fellow student's writing.

- 71% of all responding students report that they feel confident about making suggestions to a peer on his/her writing

For this question, 60% of Aboriginal students (30), 61% of international students (41), and 73% of Canadian students (363) reported feeling confident about giving peer feedback, though the differences between these groups are not statistically significant.

There was no difference between students based on academic unit or based on degree (undergraduate vs. graduate).

Statement: I understand what makes a successful academic paper.

- 81% of all responding students report that they understand what makes a successful academic paper

By status, whereas 83% of Canadian students (367) reported understanding what makes a successful paper, only 68% of international students did.[50] (83% of Aboriginal students (29) also reported understanding what makes a successful academic paper, but due to the sample size, this value was not statistically different from the value seen with international students.)

By academic unit, 84% of Arts students (102), 89% of Education students (70), and 88% of Engineering students (34) reported understanding what makes a successful academic paper, while only 68% of Business students (44) and 67% of Science students (61) did. These differences are statistically significant.[51] (The findings in this question relate back to the findings in Question 2.2.)

There was no difference between students based on degree.

Statement: I know how to write a successful academic paper.

- 77% of all responding students report that they know how to write a successful academic paper

---

[50] This difference is statistically significant at the $p=0.05$ level.
[51] $p=0.05$

For this question, 79% of Canadian students (367) and 61% of international students (44) reported knowing how to write a successful academic paper. This difference was statistically significant.[52]

By academic unit, 83% of Arts students (102), 80% of Education students (70), and 85% of Engineering students (34) reported knowing how to write a successful paper, as compared to only 62% of Science students (61). These differences are statistically significant.[53] (The findings in this question relate back to the findings in Question 2.2.)

There was no difference based on degree.

Statement: My English language skills have had a significant positive impact on my grades.

- 84% report that their English language skills have had a significant positive impact on their grades

For this survey item, students' responses showed difference based on their status. 87% of Canadian students (351) said that their English language skills had a significant positive impact on their grades, whereas only 70% of international students (43) did. This was a statistically significant difference.[54]

Statement: My English language skills have had a significant negative impact on my grades.

- 14% report that their English language skills have had a significant negative impact on their grades

As one would expect, the responses to this survey item showed the opposite trend of the previous survey item. Only 12% of Canadian students (336) felt that their English language skills had a significant negative impact on their grades, as compared to 33% of international students (2). This difference was statistically significant.[55]

Statement: My papers are marked fairly, without bias based on my language skills.

---

[52] p=0.05
[53] p=0.05
[54] p=0.05
[55] p=0.05

- 67% report that their papers are marked fairly, without bias against language skills

This question did not reveal any statistically significant differences between sub-groups in the survey.

Students' Writing Support Needs

Section 4 of the survey focused on students' perceived value in receiving writing supports. In this section, a 7-point Likert scale (0=Not at all $\leftrightarrow$ 5=A lot; 6=Not applicable) was used to elicit responses on students' perceptions of various aspects of writing support needs. It was helpful to sort students' responses into broad categories, as indicated here:

Not at all $\leftarrow$ -- $\rightarrow$ A lot						N/A
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

The findings for Section 4 are reported here:
- Approximately 76% believe that writing support could help with proper referencing (e.g., APA, MLA)
- Approximately 68% believe that writing support could help with organizing ideas coherently
- Approximately 66% believe that writing support could help with writing for specific audiences
- Approximately 66% believe that writing support could help with writing different kinds of assignments
- Approximately 66% believe that writing support could help with identifying and editing grammar mistakes
- Approximately 60% believe that writing support could help with using syntax correctly
- Approximately 58% believe that writing support could help with applying critical thinking skills

Although approximately 70% of students think of themselves as experienced or skilled writers, varying majorities of students, ranging from 58% to 76%, also see value in

receiving supports across a range of writing skill areas. Of the 471 students who took the survey, a clear majority express desire for assistance with applying critical thinking skills, organizing ideas, writing for a specific audience, preparing to write different kinds of assignments, referencing properly, using syntax correctly, and identifying and editing grammar. Among those skill areas, referencing properly and organizing ideas received the highest ratings, while applying critical thinking skills and using syntax correctly received slightly lower ratings. As indicated previously, many students said that they are getting practice with these issues within their discipline but that they would like instruction that is more explicit.

Students' Awareness of Writing Supports

Section 5 of the survey focused on students' awareness of existing writing support centres (WSCs) on campus. In this section, the questions used a 7-point Likert scale to elicit responses. It was helpful to sort students' responses into broad categories, as indicated here:

Not at all ← -- → A lot						N/A
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

The findings for Section 5 are reported below.

Q5.1a: Please indicate the extent to which you are aware of the various writing supports available on campus.

- Approximately 49%[56] are aware of existing WSCs

Q5.1b: Please indicate the extent to which you know where the writing support centres are on campus.

- Approximately 46% know where WSCs are

Q5.1c: Please indicate the extent to which you use a writing support centre on campus.

- Approximately 15% use WSCs

Q5.1d: Please indicate the extent to which you have had someone from a writing support centre present to you in your class.

---

[56] In these data, all percentages correspond to assigned scores of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale.

- Approximately 24% reported having had someone from a WSC visit their class

Q5.1e: Please indicate the extent to which the writing support centres help to address your writing support needs.

- Approximately 21% said that the writing support centres address their needs

Thus, according to the survey results, both students and course instructors are mostly dissatisfied with the WSCs' services in addressing students' writing support needs. It is important to note that this dissatisfaction is not necessarily based on students' and course instructors' actual experiences with the WSCs but their perceptions of what the WSCs do. Nevertheless, this finding should be taken seriously when reviewing the WSCs' writing support activities.

For most survey items in this section, Aboriginal students appeared to have slightly higher totals than other status groups, but those totals were not statistically significant.[57]

In the open-ended survey responses in NVivo, the *most recurring theme is that of not needing the current forms of writing supports on campus*. While acknowledging that their writing could improve, students express that they are generally satisfied with their academic results and confident about their writing skills. (This corresponds to some of students' responses in Section 3 of the survey.) Students also state that their writing demands are not necessarily pressing enough for them to require further assistance beyond what they have readily available (e.g., family members, friends). Considering their situation in balance, they believe that they are meeting their writing needs on their own and achieving their academic goals without further writing support. (As shown in Q2.10, students in some academic units report having relatively light writing requirements in their courses and in the majors.)

At the same time, however, students *may have a misconception of what writing support means* and of *what the writing support centres do*. For instance, in Question 3.1[58] on the student survey, 313 students report that they are experienced writers and 304 report that they are skilled writers, indicating a certain degree of confidence in their

---

[57] p=0.05

[58] Q3.1 is a Likert item that asks students to reply on a range from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree to the statement, "I am an experienced writer" and "I am a skilled writer."

writing ability. However, in Q 2.5[59], 325 students also respond that they find writing exemplars helpful or very helpful, and 202 students report that they *do* consult with an instructor, teaching assistant, or writing support employee about drafts of their writing assignments. In other words, students may want and seek out writing support (e.g. exemplars/models, consultations), but they may not necessarily consider the assistance that they seek and get as writing support *per se*.

The second most recurring theme is that students are unaware of writing supports on campus. Students' lack of awareness includes the seemingly interrelated issues of *where the writing support centres are* and *what the writing support centres do*.

Other common themes that appear in the open-ended survey responses in NVivo include:

- Students express concern that writing support centres on campus may not meet their particular needs (e.g., discipline-specific writing support needs, graduate-level writing support needs that are too specific for generic feedback from unskilled/unknowledgeable tutors). Because students hold this view, they do not make an effort to locate the WSCs.

- A few students have the belief that the types of writing support that they need would involve costs. They would like specific assistance with revision and editing that they believe the WSCs at the University of Regina will not provide.

- Some students also express discomfort and embarrassment with approaching unknown people at the WSCs. Students feel self-conscious and worry about having an unknown person as their audience and source of feedback. These students prefer one-on-one sessions with their instructor or with a peer.

- Students rely on more familiar and readily available resources (e.g., family, friends). In some cases, students are advised against using WSCs (as a way to promote independence, to avoid getting "the wrong advice").

- Students who study remotely state that they do not have access to WSCs where they are located and are unaware of online writing supports for distance education students.

---

[59] Q2.5 is a Likert item that asks students to reply on a range from 'A Lot' to 'Not at All' to the statement, "I find writing exemplars (helpful examples or samples) valuable."

- Students express concern that they do not have enough time to get writing support.
- Students have many assignments and by the time they get to approaching/completing assignments, there is not enough time to get assistance.
- Students feel that booking an appointment at a WSC difficult and that it is just easier for them to handle their writing support needs through other means (such as working things out independently rather than waiting for an open time).
- Students express concern about possibly losing or wasting time by going to a WSC because they may get only generic help.
- Students are curious about whether WSCs can help to revise and edit their work (or whether such assistance is beyond the scope of WSCs).
- Students express concern that they are expected to enter a course with the required set of writing skills; they do not necessarily feel that they are getting enough support within a course. Their concerns include unclear expectations from instructors, even after requesting information, and lack of consistency across instructors/courses.

Focus Groups

At the faculty and academic staff focus group meeting, librarians expressed strong interest in the topic of writing support for students. Students come to campus libraries looking for help with their writing assignments, perhaps because they view libraries as "neutral ground." Students seem more hesitant to go to course instructors or to writing support centres because of the perceived stigma around requiring help.

Students may not know whether there are relevant supports available, or where the support centres are located. The librarians suggested that there is a need to make it clearer where students can go for assistance. Libraries act as "signposts" that direct students to where they can get help (e.g., the Student Success Centre and other writing support centres on campus).

In the experience of the librarians, many graduate students seek help with respect to their research questions. Most undergraduate students go there to get help with finding relevant research materials, and proceeding through the stages of research. They also ask about proper citation methods. Librarians were concerned that when students come to the

library, it is not a day in advance, but in a rush just before their assignment is due. International students seek help with drafting and thinking through their papers, especially with respect to ensuring "proper English."

Libraries provide a variety of resources for students and course instructors: workshops for plagiarism, research, digital and information literacy, as well as online resources, such as citation manuals and research guides.

While libraries cannot currently help with proofreading, they are exploring the possibility of "pop-up writing tutors in the Archer Library." They envision even more collaboration with Faculties in order to support students with regard to plagiarism, information literacy (e.g., information literacy and developing research questions), and in the area of composition. They would like Faculties to collaborate more closely with campus libraries in organizing workshops and seminars for students in the areas of information and digital literacy. They particularly emphasize that they would like such workshops to be incorporated into introductory courses to promote information literacy. The librarians also recommended the creation of a single online site for writing resources.

The participant at the focus group meeting with FNUniv faculty explained that the writing support centre of FNUniv was moved to their library to better serve students because the centre lacked resources for self-sufficiency while the library had more resources relevant to writing support and could remain open longer hours. The fact that student demand for writing support was minimal in the first half of a semester was another important reason for moving the writing support. Thus, this new arrangement was expected to improve efficiency of limited resources.

Participants at all of the focus group meetings agreed that writing skills are "vitally important" and "crucial" for academic success and for post-graduation professional success. Despite how crucial writing is at university, several students commented on the challenges of transitioning from high-school writing expectations to university-level academic writing. At the faculty and academic staff focus groups, many participants suggested that students often arrive at university unprepared for the university curriculum.

Faculty identified time as a major obstacle to providing adequate writing-specific instruction to students. It is difficult to teach and learn to teach writing. So is learning to

write. The notes from both focus groups tell us that there is a recognition of the diversity of the student body and therefore the diversity of students' needs with respect to writing. A number of students made statements that suggest they need personalized writing guidance throughout the writing process (not simply corrections on their assignments) from experienced writing support staff. At one of the student focus groups, students suggested that they want to learn how to get better at writing, and how to understand the process of writing, rather than simply relying on tutorial corrections. On the other hand, at the other student focus group, some students were discouraged by their writing support centre experience because tutors were not able to provide the proofreading or copyediting they thought such services ought to provide.

Tutoring services on campus are offered both as walk-in and booked appointments. The benefits of both were acknowledged. Students commented on the varying quality of writing support services and tutors across the different on-campus writing centres. Some students expressed a preference for walk-in services instead of pre-booked appointments, but they were not able to book appointments because the writing centre schedule was full. Others liked being able to book a time in advance. They conceded that they often go last minute and then cannot get appointments.

Focus group meetings with students also revealed that teaching and learning writing are viewed primarily as the task of courses offered by the English Department. Although it was not a dominant theme at the faculty and academic staff focus group meetings, a participant who is well versed in teaching and researching about reading and writing commented that it is a "fallacy" that English Departments are primarily responsible for teaching writing. The same participant challenged the common perception that English professors can (or should) teach everyone to write appropriately for their discipline. The participant noted that there are some examples of ENGL 100/110 courses that are more discipline-specific and/or include content aimed at a particular body of students (e.g., Social Work majors and Nursing majors). This participant, however, also emphasized that teaching and learning writing are not and should not be limited to particular areas of study or particular courses.

For instance, students pointed out that there is some urgency to support writing development among students in Engineering; Business; Graduate Studies; ESL,

especially essay-writing classes; Physics (e.g., writing lab reports etc.); and in the English Department itself. Those students present at the forum called for guided assistance—they need more mentors and fewer critics because of a presumption that students are admitted with a certain level of writing skill. And, as some focus-group participants explained, students should be given assistance from the first year and as soon as their English mark falls below a certain threshold. Some student contributors stated that admission requirements should have a writing component for all Faculties. Graduate participants highlighted the lack of writing support services for graduate students, and called for enhanced support. The needs of international students for writing and language support were also emphasized.

Thus there is a widespread call for better quality and a greater amount of writing support for further development of writing skills and practices across all Faculties in the University. Students ask for adequate, timely, and quality feedback from course instructors, as well as clear instructions and expectations. They also ask for writing exemplars and greater consistency across courses and across Faculties. A participant at the faculty and academic staff focus group recommended thorough feedback, but also feedback that was more of a dialogue with students, including asking the student questions and using humour instead of mostly focusing on errors. The participant uses such feedback as encouragement for students to revise based on those interactions.

At the faculty and academic staff focus group meeting at FNUniv, the following comments were made regarding the demographics and needs of students attending FNUniv. Over 70% of FNUniv students are mature students; over 75% are women; and most have children and are single working parents. These students thus require an appropriate support system. FNUniv students also come from different geographical communities such as on-reserve and urban centres. Students from such different communities have different starting conditions and thus come to university with distinct academic needs similar to other student populations on campus. It was also pointed out that English is an additional language for some Indigenous students. Some Indigenous students are used to thinking and writing in a language with a structure that is different from English.

At the faculty and academic staff meetings, there was broad agreement about what good writing entails—clear arguments and critical thinking, well-organized essays, awareness of purpose and audience. There was also agreement that teaching and learning writing skills are everyone's responsibility. They commented that students lack the basics of writing (structuring essays; how to provide evidence; good research, etc.). Participants expressed concern that students do not know how to use online resources when writing essays, how to research the online resources, or how to get relevant information and data and synthesize them (students sometimes seem to equate Google searches with scholarly research).

Staged (scaffolded) assignments improve the quality of writing, but time constraints limit instructors' ability to use scaffolding. Some faculty members commented that it would help to have University-wide guidelines on writing (but not rubrics, given the diversity of fields of study). Participants also pointed out that different Faculties prefer some genres of writing assignments and that it is important to explain to students what a particular genre of writing requires.

At both the faculty and academic staff and student focus groups, concerns about plagiarism and proper citations were mentioned. Not knowing the conventions of academic writing may lead to plagiarism, but not having adequate reading and writing skills may also result in academic misconduct. One faculty participant said that students should better use online tools such as Turnitin to better understand how to properly cite sources and integrate the ideas of other scholars.

Course instructors seemed to recommend peer evaluation. However, students do not think that peer review is effective. While it was not a prominent theme at the faculty and academic staff focus groups, some participants recommended peer review as a form of writing support. Participating students expressed doubts about the benefits of peer review while some acknowledged that there might be some benefits depending on the competency and skill levels of peer reviewers. They also expressed negative opinions regarding students grading other students' assignments. Students were especially critical of team or group writing projects, stating that they often led to poor writing, despite the original intent of such assignments: to prepare students for the workforce. Some students, particularly from Business and Engineering, called for more support with group writing

projects. Moreover, the relationship of language skills to writing skills was a recurrent theme in the student focus groups, along with the need for greater support for developing language skills for those students whose primary language is not English.

Participants at the faculty and academic staff meetings made a number of suggestions:

- The University should guarantee that students graduate with good writing skills.
- The University should adopt and show the principle that writing is relevant and important for post-graduation and the student's entire life
- The University should provide more support for faculty in teaching
- Course instructors should refer students to writing support centres as early as possible
- The University should increase awareness of writing supports
- Course instructors should provide in-class reading and writing workshops for students
- Students should receive supplemental instruction as opposed to a "repair-shop" approach
- Writing should be embedded in all courses
- More writing support should be provided in French-based programs

Consultative Meetings

The following analyzes the discussions that took place at our consultative meetings. The format of these meetings was open-ended discussions focusing on the units' activities and responsibilities in the area of student writing skills and/or writing support services.

Student Success Centre

At a meeting in May 2017 with the Task Force (including Scott J. Wilson, at that time the Student Success Centre Writing Services Coordinator), Associate Director of Student Success, Naomi Deren, shared the 2014-2015 Tutoring Services Report and the Student Success Centre (SSC) operational statistics for Writing Services in fall and winter semesters from 2012-16 (see attached). In November 2017, the Task Force requested the

latest Tutoring Services Report from the SSC. The SSC Director Kevin Bolen kindly provided the 2015-16 report.

The SSC keeps useful data and tracks student appointments. The mission of the SSC is to work closely with all Faculties in an effort to tailor their services to Faculties' particular needs. The SSC gets referrals from course instructors, organizes workshops, and works closely with the Global Learning Centre. There is an overlap between tutors who are hired at the SSC and the Global Learning Centre. A significant number of students utilizing SSC services are international students. The SSC aims to serve all students who walk through their doors, both undergraduate and graduate students, although their mandate is primarily to serve undergraduate students. At the meeting, the SSC representatives said the SSC Writing Services did not have adequate permanent staff to better train tutors and expand services to support ESL students. The SSC had been allotted a 0.25 appointment for their Writing Coordinator. By the time the SSC produced its report, the SSC had created a full-time writing coordinator position in Fall 2017.

The SSC Writing Coordinator makes classroom presentations upon request, providing discipline-specific writing support. The most frequent request from course instructors for these class presentations is based on a concern with proper referencing. The SSC offers a variety of academic skills workshops, on site or in-class. One-third of offered workshops pertain writing skills. Some Faculties and departments have incorporated in-class writing workshops offered by Student Success into their classes (Business, Kinesiology and Health Studies, Indigenous Health Studies, Psychology), but the SSC has not received many requests from other Faculties such as Engineering and Applied Science, or Science. The SSC representatives mentioned that they try to tailor these workshops to specific classes. They have started to prepare material and train tutors for different disciplines such as Public Policy and Business. They are willing to make an effort to accommodate their workshops to the needs of students and course instructors in different areas and with different types of writing assignments.

The SSC offers online writing advice on their website through the Online Writing Laboratory (OWL). Topics include writing basics, business writing, affective grammar, referencing, etc. Students can also email their writing assignments to a writing tutor and receive electronic feedback within 72 hours. Furthermore, online instructors can include

writing support tools in UR Courses, such as workshop videos (also available on YouTube).

The SSC does not offer copyediting of upper-year assignments or graduate theses, but they do tutor graduate students (when possible). However, undergraduate students are their focus, since they operate as a division of Student Affairs.

In response to a question from the Task Force whether better coordination among the different writing support centres is needed, the Associate Director said there is a need for better quality control across all writing support centres. For example, there appears to be a need for consistency in tutor training, methodology, and approaches to writing support across the writing support centres.

The SSC offers a variety of writing-related services for students. These services include individual writing appointments; learning lounge writing workshops;[60] in-class writing workshops; and drop-in writing services. The SSC's statistics of writing services in the fall and winter semesters of the academic years 2012-13 to 2016-17 reveal the following trends.[61] First, the total number of available writing appointments tended to decline from 2012-13 to 2016-17. Whereas there were 2,627 available writing appointments in the fall and winter semesters of 2012-13, the number dropped to 1,378 in the fall and winter semesters of 2016-17. This represents a drop of 1,249 appointments, which amounts to 47.5%. Second, a parallel development was a declining number of writing appointments booked by students during the same period. Students booked 2,149 writing appointments during the fall and winter semesters of 2012-13, and 1,008 writing appointments during the same semesters of 2016-17. Thus, there was a 53.1% drop in students' bookings of writing appointments. Third, there was a significant gap between the number of writing appointments attended by students on the one hand, and the total number of available writing appointments during the same academic years. The capacity significantly exceeded actual utilization each semester and academic year covered by the

---

[60] These writing workshops include the four-part series of academic writing workshops: Pre-Writing, Writing & Revising, Research and Referencing, and Style. Videos of the series are also available on YouTube. At the time of writing (26 December 2017, 7:40 pm), the four parts of the series have a total of 2,532; 582; 529; and 321 views, respectively. Another writing-related workshop offered by the SSC is on grammar and punctuation.

[61] The statistics do not include the spring/summer semesters. However, according to the SSC's 2014-15 and 2015-16 Tutoring Services Reports, both available appointments and appointments attended in the spring/ summer terms were quite small.

data. The gap was 826 spots in 2012-13; 525 in 2013-14; 785 in 2014-15; and 695 in 2015-16.[62] This meant that the SSC Writing Services' capacity utilization ranged from 73% (highest, 2013-14) to 64% (lowest, 2015-16) during the same period. It is important to note that some of this unused capacity is a result of students booking appointments and then not keeping those appointments. The difference between appointments booked and appointments attended was as high as 348 appointments in fall and winter 2012-13; the difference tended to decline in subsequent years, dropping to 162 in the fall and winter semesters of 2015-16. The SSC's data also indicate a positive correlation between the number of writing appointments offered by SSC and the number of appointments booked and attended by students. This situation may be explained in terms of the availability to students of a greater variety of time options when SSC provides a greater number of appointments.

According to the SSC Tutoring Services Report 2015-16 Report, SSC aimed to achieve 80% capacity utilization by means of a reduction in the total number of available appointments and further promotion of the services provided. To provide better flexibility for students, in 2016-17 they introduced drop-in writing services.

According to both the 2014-15 and 2015-16 SSC Tutoring Services Reports, the majority of student appointments are booked by first-year and second-year students (not so much by senior and graduate students). The 2014-15 Report suggests that because more advanced students "tend to work more independently," this explains why "the number of third year to graduate studies students who use Writing Services is decreased" (p. 7).[63] The reports give statistics regarding student usage of writing services by Faculty affiliation. The Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies are the biggest users in terms of appointments attended by students.

The Writing Services Month-to-Month Usage Overview for 2014-2015 and 2015-16 reveals that student appointments are more frequent in the middle of the fall and winter semesters (October, November, and March being months of peak activity). The

---

[62] The available 2016-17 statistics for writing appointments attended by students are not comparable to the earlier years because the 2016-17 statistics include drop-in students. The total number of utilized appointments and drop-ins was 1,200, still lower than total utilized appointments the previous academic years.
[63] At the meeting, we received the 2014-2015 report. A more recent report was requested and received, to facilitate the Task Force's subsequent analysis.

2014-15 report indicates that another means of increasing student usage would be to hire tutors with disciplinary "experience with the subject matter especially with high attendance courses and Faculties" (p. 13). Having tutors with expertise in the specific disciplinary areas of the students requiring writing support could be a highly effective strategy, in keeping with students' own needs as self-reported in the student survey.

While the SSC has recently scaled back individual writing appointments, it has started to offer a greater number of in-class writing workshops.[64] The recent increases in requests for in-class writing workshops can be partly explained in terms of course instructors becoming more aware of this service and a greater number of course instructors wanting to use the service. However, at the same time that SSC and course instructors have recently tended to make a greater use of in-class writing workshops, the number of writing workshops offered in the Riddell Centre Learning Lounge by the SSC and the number of students attending these workshops have shown a declining trend. It is important to note that, according to the available data, the Learning Lounge writing workshops are not consistently well attended. Attendance on average per workshop ranged from 1.47 students to 9.72 students in the academic years from 2013-2017.[65] The average number of attendance per workshop was consistently higher in the fall semesters than in the winter semesters; yet the highest average attendance in a fall semester was no more than 9.72 students during the period.[66]

The four-part series of academic writing workshops (Pre-Writing, Writing & Revising, Research and Referencing, and Style) are also available on YouTube, which have attracted a moderate number of viewers thus far (see footnote 58). As the SSC looks for ways of improving students' utilization of its writing support services, in addition to more effective promotion of these services among students and course instructors, the Task Force proposes that the SSC should develop different mechanisms of collaboration with course instructors to integrate writing workshops and/or tutoring into course syllabi, especially for 100- and 200-level courses.

---

[64] The number of in-class writing workshops was 6, for a total of 284 students in fall 2015; and 21, for a total of 900 students in fall 2016, according to the available SSC statistics.

[65] It is also worth noting that there is a maximum of 15 spots available for those workshops.

[66] The SSC did not offer writing workshops in the spring and summer semesters of the mentioned academic years.

The recent declines in the number of writing appointments booked by students, as well as in the level of attendance in the Learning Lounge writing workshops, cannot be explained only in terms of the greater use of in-class writing workshops or availability of the videos of the four-part series of academic writing workshops on YouTube. Another possible reason, as noted earlier, is the SSC's cuts in available writing appointments as part of its efforts to improve efficiency; the cuts meant a lesser variety of time slots available to students. However, there is also a third plausible explanation—the availability of other options to students. As will be explained later in the Task Force's report, UR International now offers a variety of writing-related workshops in addition to English language coaching sessions. These workshops are open to any students attending the U of R or federated colleges.

The SSC does well to submit annual reports and highlight their data findings—to gather their own data and interpret it themselves. The students' assessments of the services provided by the SSC do not appear in the annual reports. There are some attempts to solicit student feedback: via electronic surveys sent out twice a semester, and via paper surveys given to students at their appointments. However, as reported at a later meeting by the former Writing Services Coordinator to the Task Force, the return rate of student evaluations of the SSC writing services is low.

In various focus groups and consultative meetings held by the Task Force, it was mentioned that students are sometimes reluctant to go to the SSC or to Writing Services, because of the stigma associated with getting help and because of the perception that the Student Success Centre and Writing Services are (despite the Centre's name) only for students who are *not* succeeding. In order to better support students in their writing skills development, it is thus important to address this stigma and develop strategies to overcome this misperception.

Centre for Teaching and Learning

The Task Force met with the Faculty Associate for the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), Dr. Stephen Cheng, in June 2016. We discussed the activities of the CTL and asked whether CTL offered any writing-related skills workshops or seminars. Dr. Cheng explained that writing had not been an important part of the CTL's mandate and

activities. We also asked whether course instructors requested support regarding teaching related to writing skills, and Dr. Cheng responded that, to his knowledge, the CTL had not received such requests. In subsequent conversation with the Task Force, SSC's former Writing Services Coordinator, Scott J. Wilson, reported that he gave four teaching workshops at the CTL for course instructors: two on improving students' critical reading skills, and two on improving students' critical writing skills. As of May 2017, the CTL has been placed on hiatus, pending a review and revisioning process led by a faculty member in the Faculty of Education.

English as a Second Language

We met with the Academic Coordinator of the English as a Second Language Program (ESL), Jacqueline Spalding, in July 2016 and again in December 2017.[67] ESL operates under the umbrella of the Centre for Continuing Education, a cost-recovery unit. During these meetings, the Academic Coordinator informed us of writing courses that are offered through ESL and answered questions from the Task Force. One non-credit course is Fundamentals for Writing Success. This course is a 5-week 20-hour course that focuses on foundational writing skills, including sentence structure, paragraph structure, and essential grammar. The main target group of this course is English as an additional language (EAL) students with intermediate English language skill, but it is open to anyone who would like to improve their writing skills. The other two courses are part of the EAL academic program. They are Literature and Writing Skills; and Advanced Writing. The former is a foundational academic writing and literature class designed for EAL students who plan to pursue academic studies at the University. It also aims to prepare these EAL students for ENGL 100. Advanced Writing is geared toward students who plan to pursue academic studies at the University, and it is strongly recommended for prospective graduate students. It includes modules on research methodologies and citation styles. The course is now available in two formats: its traditional classroom format, and a new integrated online (70%) and face-to-face (30%) format.

---

[67] Between the two meetings, there was a change in the position. We thus met with two persons at different times.

To conclude, the ESL program offers several writing-skills focused courses that aim to develop EAL students' writing competencies in English. While recognizing that the ESL Program and UR International have different mandates, the two institutions stand to benefit from each other's expertise and experiences in supporting and teaching international and EAL students. One way in which ESL and UR International have already cooperated together is in their collaboration with the English Department and the Faculty of Arts, in the development of the above-mentioned writing placement test that could be administered to all incoming students at the University of Regina after admission, once they arrive on campus (ELNAT).

UR International

The Task Force met with Associate Vice-President (International), and Chief International Officer (UR ILO) Livia Castellanos, along with staff members of UR International on 6 July 2017 to consult regarding the kinds of communication and writing-intensive programs and services provided by the Global Learning Centre to support international students on campus. The support services fall into three categories: English language coaching; conversation skill development; and additional supports through study assistance, peer advising, and academic skills courses or workshops, including writing-related workshops.

In the Global Learning Centre, several English language coaches are available throughout the fall and winter semesters, for a total of 63 hours each week devoted to English coaching. The English coaches are current upper-level University of Regina students (often from English and Education) with strong writing skills and some teaching experience. They receive training at the beginning of each semester, facilitated by the SSC and the Teaching and Learning Centre. Students have a number of options available for tutorial help: individual appointments booked in advance with a tutor; walk-in appointments (8-10 walk-in hours available each week); or workshops on academic or writing skills (which resemble some of the SSC workshops). However, the rationale for this duplication is that international students often feel more comfortable attending workshops specifically for EAL learners. UR International has recently made efforts to

advertise their services beyond their mandate of only serving international students, so these services are available to all U of R students.

In November 2017, to have a better understanding of the writing-related student services provided by UR International, the Task Force requested from UR International data on writing-related workshops, attendance in these workshops, appointments and walk-in appointments by students seeking writing supports. According to the information provided by UR International, the Global Learning Centre offered the following writing-related workshops in winter 2017: Avoiding Plagiarism, Academic Dishonesty and Misconduct; Paraphrasing; Critical Reading, Thinking, and Writing; and Strengthening Your Grammar Skills. Approximately 30-35 students attended each workshop in January and early February; attendance in each workshop was around 20-25 students in mid-February; and 10 students in late March and April. The Global Learning Centre delivered similar workshops in fall 2017. In addition to the workshops listed earlier, other writing-related workshops offered by the Centre in fall 2017 included Enhancing Note-Taking Skills; Enhancing Critical Reading and Writing Skills; Library and Research Skill Development; Enhancing Presentation Skills; and Polishing Your Academic Writing and Understanding Feedback. Student attendance in these workshops in the fall semester shows a pattern and level identical to the winter workshops; that is, attendance was the highest in the early weeks of the semester (30-35 students each workshop); somewhat lower in the mid-semester (20-25 students); and the lowest toward the end of the semester (approximately 10 students). In addition, approximately 950-1,000 students took advantage of English coaching through booked appointments or walk-in hour sessions during each of the fall and winter semesters of 2017. While we do not have data concerning what proportions of students attending these workshops are international, the Task Force recognizes that UR International offers exemplary support to students by providing a place that fosters a strong sense of belonging and attachment to the University of Regina.

UR International strongly supports the mandatory use of the ELNAT (English Literacy Needs Assessment Test) for all students after admission. Recognizing that communication is a crucial academic skill, UR International wants to work with learners to develop their oral and written communication skills. It is crucial that student needs are

assessed soon after the student arrives at the University of Regina. Once the student's skill level is known, the necessary interventions can be provided, and ideally students can be followed throughout their university careers.

As noted earlier, there is some duplication of writing support services offered by the SSC and UR International. The Task Force suggests that it is important to address this issue with respect to more efficient and effective utilization of the University's resources, as well as consistency in writing supports provided by different units.

However, the Task Force recognizes UR International's earnest efforts to support international students holistically, in terms of academic skills, life skills, and adaptation to the Canadian cultural environment. The Task Force affirms that UR International can continue to play an important role in developing EAL and international students' oral language and communication skills in terms of everyday and academic language and vocabulary. Oral language is a foundational skill required for literacy development, and the focus on conversation is vital to writing as it is necessary to have abundant practice in converting speech into written language as part of a social practice. Therefore, the GLC should continue to provide student support services in the area of conversation coaching and peer support, particularly for international students. In fact, these supports could be expanded to offer more discipline-specific mentorship. The English coaches are students often drawn from the Department of English or Faculty of Education. The Task Force suggests it would be beneficial for students if coaches and mentors could be drawn from their own disciplines and preferably have EAL teaching experience/expertise.

These GLC oral language coaching/mentorship services would complement the proposed Writing Centre's writing-focused services. UR International should collaborate with the proposed Writing Centre to help international students connect with the Writing Centre as a means of further developing their academic writing skills.

Archer Library

Each Faculty across the University is assigned a liaison librarian who is highly motivated to provide in–house support to students and course instructors. Several of these librarians, whose schedules permitted, attended the consultative meeting. The librarians showed a strong willingness to enhance student experience in the areas of their mandate here at the University of Regina. They reported that students perceive Archer Library as a "signpost"

that can help locate resources. Students who do not complete their writing assignments in advance often cannot get support at writing centres and go to the library instead. However, there are limits to how much writing instruction Archer Library can provide, and some frustration is produced by the fact that students are looking to them for support with their writing assignments.

Librarians do have an important role to play in directing students to appropriate resources. They can build awareness about plagiarism and about information literacy. They can help students develop research questions through the "reference interview," as well as find sources. Nevertheless, they cannot mentor students with their writing assignments. The librarians find a need for greater one-on-one support. They also cited the need for more equitable writing supports for distance students. Along those lines, a liaison travels to the Saskatoon campus for information sessions. Archer Library is eager to serve in a greater facilitative role to connect students to available writing supports. They would like to cooperate with department heads and/or associate deans to organize information literacy sessions for each area instead of more general ad hoc sessions. Furthermore, they suggested more information literacy support and more assignments that could be included in courses. Archer Library is working with some Faculties to integrate information literacy into introductory-level courses and to develop new not-for-credit courses. These Faculties include Nursing, Business, and MAP.

Associate Deans

After the Task Force completed its consultative meetings with various units and centres with the mandate of serving the academic needs of students and/or course instructors, we invited the associate deans or equivalents of all Faculties, federated colleges, and First Nations University of Canada. In May 2017, a meeting was held, which associate deans, equivalents, or designated representatives of the Faculties of KHS, Education, MAP, Arts, Business Administration, JSGS, and Luther College attended. The Chair of the Task Force asked the associate deans to comment upon the importance of writing skills to their Faculty unit. There was overall agreement that writing is very important for all areas. Some also emphasized the connection between reading and writing. Several associate deans further elaborated on the ways in which writing is important to their students. For

example, KHS offers 100- and 200-level writing-intensive courses and the instructor closely works with SSC Writing Services to provide writing support to students.

The representative from the Faculty of Arts highlighted the Faculty's offerings of tutorials and courses in basic reading, writing, and academic integrity in addition to many course offerings with writing-intensive contents. The Associate Dean of Business Administration pointed out that writing is important to Business Administration students because they are expected to write case analyses, case reports, and research assignments. The Assistant Dean of Luther College noted that writing is "central to the mission of Luther College and that writing is important in science, arts, and fine arts. As part of this mission, Luther has a Writing Across the Disciplines Coordinator who works with faculty members and students." The Luther Assistant Dean also emphasized that not only do students need writing skills to communicate well in university but that writing skills are also important in the workplace. While agreeing that writing is important, the Associate Dean of MAP commented on particular challenges regarding integrating writing into undergraduate studio courses. The importance of writing skills at the graduate level for MAP students was highlighted as well. The Associate Dean of Education stressed the complexity of the reading and writing process, as well as the need to build on the skills students bring to learning.

The Chair of the Task Force invited the associate deans and designates to share their thoughts on the question of a post-admission writing skills assessment test. Most agreed that it was a good idea, while some associate deans raised some concerns and asked further questions. One concern was that such a test might discourage prospective students from enrolling in the University of Regina, which led to the question of whether other universities implement such tests. One of the associate deans suggested that a certain minimum high school graduating grade point average, such as 80%, could be used as an indicator for determining whether incoming students need to take the assessment test. Another question focused on what courses of action the University needs to take based on the results of the assessment test; in other words, what would be the interventions. A participant mentioned that students could benefit from basic reading and writing courses such as RDWT 120, ARTS 010, and ACAD 100.

In terms of respondents' thoughts on using class time for writing instructions, some associate deans conceded that more writing instruction would take time away from teaching course content. However, some also suggested that writing is a process requiring practice. Some participants also mentioned that there is resistance from both students and course instructors because more writing assignments add to the workload of both students and instructors.

At the meeting, the participants were also asked to discuss whether their Faculty units need more discipline and/or genre-specific writing support. The Associate Dean of MAP noted that the Faculty of MAP would benefit from University support for grant writing, while the Faculty also provides some support. The representative from the JSGS pointed out that the JSGS offers workshops and seminars on the genres that are relevant to the area of public policy studies such as briefings, logic models, and environmental scans. In an email sent to the Task Force, the Associate Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science, who could not attend the meeting, emphasized that Engineering and Science students would significantly benefit from a technical writing course. He also pointed out that writing is challenging for graduate students as well. At the associate deans' meeting, several participants highlighted the importance of making explicit genre-specific expectations.

In conclusion, the participants all agreed that writing is an important skill for students across disciplines and that the University needs to build on existing writing supports and enhance students' experiences. They also called for more opportunities for dialogue on writing.

Recommendations

The Task Force's mandate included the development of recommendations to improve students' writing competence and close gaps in writing support. Surveys, focus groups, consultative meetings, analysis of relevant documents and policies, our collective discussions, and assessments at frequent meetings over the past two years have informed the following recommendations. The recommendations are organized into four categories: university policies, procedures, and services; university requirements and supports for students; academic units; and support for course instructors. This organization is based on two principles: which group would most benefit from the recommendation, and which group would have more responsibility for carrying out the recommendation. However, it is important to keep in mind that these categories are not mutually exclusive; most of these recommendations are inter-related, and implementation of recommendations in one category will likely have broader impact.

A) University Policies, Procedures, and Services

A1. **The University should make writing an institutional priority and create policies and guidelines to uphold that standard;** this could be done by a mission statement on the value of student writing skills and students', course instructors' and the University's responsibilities for teaching and learning academic writing. The next University Strategic Plan should adopt student writing as a priority and include a plan for developing student writing skills.

A2. **We recommend bringing the statement in the Undergraduate Academic Calendar Section 5.2.8 to the attention of all course instructors:**

> Instructors are expected to conduct their courses in such a way as to obtain evidence of student writing skills, in term papers, essays, reports, or other written work, and to demand competence in writing for a passing grade.
> --*University of Regina Undergraduate Academic Calendar*, 2017-2018

We suggest that deans, associate deans, department heads, and program coordinators could take responsibility for disseminating this statement.

A similar statement should be included in the Graduate Calendar. The only section relevant to writing requirement in the Graduate Calendar is the following statement in the Calendar's grading system section, which indicates what constitutes a failing grade:

> unsatisfactory ability to solve moderately difficult problems related to the subject material and/or to examine the material in a critical and analytical manner (sic) the work contains many errors in grammar, spelling, format, citation style, or referencing and/or there are substantial difficulties in effective communication, coherence, or clarity.

A3. **The University should create a full-time Writing Coordinator position, initially for a five-year term.** The Coordinator must have proven expertise in the area of academic writing as well as administrative experience. The person will provide visionary leadership toward the goal of making writing an essential part of the curriculum and academic culture at the University of Regina. The Coordinator will take responsibility for developing a strategy for the re-visioning and restructuring of writing support services at the University. This strategy will include the objective of minimizing duplication of services and improving efficiency. To this end, the Coordinator shall work with the SSC, UR International, ESL, Archer Library, and the federated colleges to make the writing support services more complementary. The person will also oversee training of writing support staff and tutors as well as provide and coordinate support to course instructors.

A4. **The Task Force recommends that a writing advisory committee should be formed;** and it should be composed of representatives from each Faculty. The Committee will advise and work with the Writing Coordinator to develop the above-mentioned strategy and address Faculty-specific needs.

A5. **The University should create a centralized Writing Centre** where all writing support services come together. It is important to locate the Centre in a prominent place

on campus in order to increase accessibility and visibility of writing support services for students and course instructors.

A6. **The Task Force recommends the immediate implementation of the following promotional strategies:**

- To increase student and faculty awareness of writing support services, these services should be promoted and publicized at different levels of the University organization. The promotional strategy should:
    - Target various groups, e.g., undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, instructors, and sessional lecturers (teaching on and off campus), administration, advisors, and student groups.
    - Make a variety of information more widely available through various mechanisms: types of supports offered; how students can access these services; the fact that there is no additional cost for students to utilize these services; that these services are an active learning experience and not a copyediting service.
    - Publicize tutoring success stories/award winners (e.g. the SSC Cross-Disciplinary Writing Award) and create new awards of this kind.

A7. Pending the creation of a centralized Writing Centre, **those units providing writing support services should collaborate in order to ensure consistency and quality of these services as well as to prevent duplication of writing services.** These units include the SSC, English Department Writing Centre, UR International's Global Learning Centre, Archer Library, and federated college libraries and writing supports.

A8. **Enhance online writing support services:** both live stream and interactive (e.g., via Zoom, Skype, and WhatsApp); develop a multimedia interactive site that offers not only schedules, appointment requests, PDF documents, but also video tutorials. This is especially important for courses being taught off the main campus as well as for online or blended courses.

A9. **Create a more visible online presence for writing support services** on the University of Regina home page, each Faculty's main page, Archer Library's website, and student support services websites.

A10. **Utilize campus libraries' abilities to serve as facilitators to connect students to writing support services.**

B) University Requirements and Supports for Students

The recommendations in this section focus on the University's expectations of students and student responsibilities. **We call on students to recognize that university education involves more than learning discipline-based knowledge. Writing is a critical component of university education regardless of disciplinary area of study.** University education should develop students as scholars, thinkers, writers, analysts, and problem-solvers. These are critical qualities and life skills that students take with them after graduation and utilize throughout their lives. By the time students graduate, they should have developed academic writing proficiency. More and more higher education institutions are adopting learning-outcomes exit tests to assess students' competency in a variety of areas, including the above-mentioned skills, prior to graduation.

Undergraduate Students

B1. To help and support incoming students in developing their writing skills, **the University should require all incoming students to take a post-admission writing competency test;**[68] students scoring lower than a certain minimum should be streamed into a mandatory foundational writing skills course, which will carry at least three credit hours. This mandatory course could be a new course to be developed by a consortium of representatives from each Faculty. Alternatively, ACAD 100 Academic Discourse: Writing, Research, and Learning Strategies; or RDWT 120 Reading and Writing could serve this purpose after they are reviewed and revised (if necessary) based on the recommendations of a consortium of representatives from each Faculty.

---

[68] The English Literacy Needs Assessment Test (ELNAT) is one such assessment tool that can be considered.

B2. We recommend the creation of a Writing-across-Disciplines Designation.

It is important that the University (a) demonstrate that writing skills are valued; and (b) provide incentives for students to develop their writing skills. A Writing-across-Disciplines Designation for undergraduate students would help accomplish these goals. This designation should be noted in students' parchments and transcripts. The Writing-across-Disciplines Designation would be granted upon meeting the following conditions:

Designation Requirements[69]
- Completion of 5 courses from the list of writing-focused or writing-intensive courses 200 – 400 level courses
- A minimum 70% in each of the five courses
- At least 3 must be from outside the student's major and minor
- No three courses can be from the same academic discipline
- At least 2 courses must be at the 300 or 400 level
- A university-wide list of writing-intensive or writing-focused courses will be prepared based on the lists of such courses to be created by each Faculty.

A writing-intensive course is a topic course that puts the emphasis on writing assignments (such as research papers, written reports, policy briefs and the like) as the main component of course requirements and evaluation. To qualify as a writing-intensive course for the purpose of the Writing-across-Disciplines Designation, a writing-intensive course must meet the following criteria:

1. Written assignments make up at least 50% of the final grade in the course.

2. The course provides explicit instructions on writing and uses clear criteria for evaluating written assignments.

3. The course provides writing tools or resources appropriate for the discipline or genre.

4. Students receive feedback on their written assignments that is aimed at improving their writing.

---

[69] The inspiration for this proposal came from Simon Fraser University's Writing, Quantitative, Breadth Requirements. https://www.sfu.ca/ugcr/for_students/wqb_requirements.html

On the other hand, **a writing-focused course** is a course specifically designed for developing students' writing skills broadly or in a particular area of study or profession.

Graduate Students

Academic writing competency is essential to successful completion of graduate programs across disciplines. Despite the importance of higher-level academic writing required in graduate programs, our investigation has revealed that graduate students at the University of Regina are not provided with adequate or consistent writing support services. To support and improve academic writing competency of graduate students, the Task Force makes the following admission and post-admission recommendations.

Admission Requirements

B3. Some graduate programs require a written sample of academic work as part of graduate program application. We recommend that all graduate programs should **consider requiring graduate program applicants to submit a written sample appropriate for the program or discipline concerned**. We are also mindful of some potential problems associated with this requirement (for example, plagiarism).

B4. Language proficiency is an indispensable component of writing competency. It is advisable to **review the University's minimum English language proficiency requirements for admission into graduate programs as well as undergraduate programs and consider requiring a minimum score in the writing component of each English language proficiency test.** A significant number of faculty members who took the Task Force's survey commented that international students need to be better prepared in the area of English language proficiency and writing prior to admission. It is important to point out that our comparison of the minimum required scores on English language proficiency tests accepted by the U of R and U of S for graduate program admissions has revealed that the U of S requires higher scores on some tests than the U of R does.

B5. **We also suggest that FGSR consider successful completion of ESL 050 Advanced Writing as a condition for graduate program applicants studying ESL** at the University to be considered for full admission into a graduate program at the U of R. Currently, this course is recommended by the ESL Program to EAL students planning to enroll in a graduate program. At the time of writing, the course is under consideration by FGSR as an admission requirement for EAL students studying ESL at the U of R who seek admission into the graduate programs in English (Faculty of Arts) and Media Studies and Media Production (Faculty of MAP). We suggest that other graduate programs should also consider adopting this requirement. In conjunction with the adoption of ESL 050 Academic Writing as a graduate admission requirement for ESL students completing the U of R's Advanced English for Academic Purposes program, completion of an equivalent course should be required for those graduate program applicants who use completion of an academic ESL program offered at another higher education institution in Canada as a proof of English language proficiency in their application to a U of R graduate program.

The implementation of this recommendation may necessitate **a review of the English language proficiency tests and subsequently, if needed, an adjustment of the minimum test scores accepted by FGSR**, specifically with respect to academic writing competency. The Task Force recognizes that this requirement may discourage some international/EAL prospective graduate students from applying to a graduate program at the University of Regina. However, by adopting good standards for writing competency, the University could set an example for other Canadian universities.

Post-Admission

After arriving at the University, graduate students should be provided with adequate supports geared to their particular needs as graduate students. The University, FGSR, and individual graduate programs should aim to provide graduate students with a variety of opportunities and supports geared toward their development not only in the areas of research, scholarship, or creative activities but also in the areas of writing and communication skills.

B6. Graduate students have specific writing needs, especially in the area of thesis writing. Currently, the University does not offer consistent writing support services tailored to the writing needs of graduate students. We suggest that **FGSR and the Writing Centre (or SSC Writing Services until the creation of the proposed Writing Centre) should cooperate in developing and delivering graduate-student-focused writing support services, including discipline-specific writing supports.**

B7. We also highlight the need to **provide training (e.g., workshops and seminars) for supervisors of graduate students on how to better help their students improve their academic writing, specifically their thesis-writing skills.**

C) Academic Units
We call upon all academic units to recognize and value writing competency as a fundamental life skill and as a skill essential for career success.

C1. The Task Force acknowledges that no single writing course is adequate to develop student writing skills. Writing competency requires consistent practice and hence the necessity for building writing into all levels of university courses, from introductory to graduate levels, across disciplines and Faculties. It is imperative to start building students' academic writing skills in introductory-level courses and develop them through all the stages of a student's program. To this end, we recommend: **All academic units should review their curricula to ensure that students have ample opportunities for developing broad academic and discipline-specific writing skills.**

C2. While providing students with such opportunities from the time of students' entrance to the university until their graduation, **academic units should also designate at least one mandatory writing-intensive course (as defined earlier) as part of their undergraduate programs.** In such courses, while students will learn the course content through writing-intensive assignments, writing assignments will help students to improve

their overall writing skills as well as their abilities to write in the genres of their disciplines.

C3. Writing-intensive courses involve more time spent on assessing written assignments and providing feedback on these assignments. Thus, **in order to encourage academic units and faculty members to develop and teach writing-intensive courses, we call upon the University administration when making budgetary decisions to recognize the need for low enrolment caps for such courses.**

C4. In conjunction with the implementation of Recommendation B1, **it would be beneficial to review ENGL 100 Critical Reading and Writing in consultation with other Faculties, since this is a mandatory course for most undergraduate degrees across the University. It is also advisable to review KIN 101 Writing and Discourse for Academia since students in KHS have the option of taking either ENGL 100 or KIN 101.**

C5. A major concern often raised by students in the Task Force's survey and focus groups is the inconsistency in course instructors' expectations and evaluations of student writing in different sections of the same course and across disciplines and Faculties. To address this concern, we recommend that **each academic unit should adopt a set of guidelines for student writing assignments, especially for the courses with multiple sections, in accordance with the learning outcomes of each course and in alignment with the University academic calendars. It is also advisable for each Faculty to develop a consistent set of expectations regarding student writing, writing assignments, and writing outcomes** in accordance with the University policy as described in the Undergraduate Academic Calendar Section 5.2.8 and Section 5.10 Grading System and Descriptions.

D) Support for Course Instructors

D1. According to the Task Force's survey of course instructors and faculty and academic staff focus group discussions, an important barrier to incorporating more writing

assignments in courses and providing thorough feedback on written assignments is the time constraint. To help and support course instructors who include or would like to include more writing assignments in higher-enrollment courses, we recommend the University **provide adequate teaching assistance support and/or other types of relevant support such as opportunities for training on how to incorporate writing assignments in bigger classes in a time-efficient manner and investigate possibilities for software programs (such as automated essay-scoring software)[70] to reduce the time needed for marking written assignments and to augment the usefulness of feedback given to students.**

D2. According to our research results, course instructors often need training on how to help students improve their writing skills. To this end, we propose the following: **Create training opportunities for course instructors regarding how to help students develop their writing skills; how to provide thoughtful, thorough feedback on student written assignments; how to develop and use appropriate grading rubrics and/or guidelines; how to utilize exemplars; and other relevant areas.**

- Such training opportunities can be provided in the form of workshops and seminars throughout the year. The proposed Writing Centre and the Centre for Teaching and Learning together could be the main units for delivering these workshops and seminars.
- We also recommend the creation of **an annual or bi-annual intensive summer institute focused on developing writing skills in the classroom.** The summer institute should be open to graduate students as well as course instructors.

D3. To encourage course instructors to participate in such training opportunities, a certificate in the teaching of writing could be created; this certificate would be earned by completing a series of designated workshops and seminars. Course instructors could include these certificates in their performance review forms.

---

[70] For example, see Improving the writing skills of college students by Ronald T. Kellogg and Bascom A. Raulerson, *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review 14 (2)* 2007, pp. 237-242.

D4. It is advisable to **create a university writing fund** to support these initiatives and provide financial support for course instructors who wish to attend workshops, seminars, institutes, or conferences which are focused on developing, assessing, and promoting student writing skills. The University should seek out external donors and institutions to replenish the proposed University Writing Fund.

E. We recommend that **this report be made public and brought to the attention of the University community.**

Appendices

Appendix I: Writing-Focused Supports and Courses at the University of Regina

Writing Centres

- Student Success Centre (in-person, and online via email), Riddell Centre 229.
- Department of English Writing Centre, Administration-Humanities 305
- La Cité Tutoring Services (in-person and virtual sessions), Language Institute 220
- Campion College Writing Centre, Campion College 412
- UR International, College West 109
- First Nations University of Canada Writing Centre

Other Supports

Luther College Writing Across the Disciplines Program

FGSR Graduate Student Writing Room

Undergraduate Writing Courses

ACAD 100 – Academic Discourse: Writing, Research and Learning Strategies—This course provides first-year students with tools for successful communication across the disciplines by emphasizing elements of effective writing and academic research. Topics include rhetorical considerations for effective writing, process-oriented writing and revision, critical reading skills, approaches to group collaboration, research tools, bibliographies, academic integrity, and citation methods.

ECON 280 – Writing for Economists—Students will work, individually and collaboratively, in classroom and library, on a range of writing assignments built around current economic policy issues. The goal is to help students improve their research and writing skills.

ELNG 325 – The Teaching of Writing—Classroom applications of recent theory, research, and practice in the teaching of writing for elementary pre-service teachers. Study of writers' processes and strategies through participation in a writing workshop.

ENGL 100 – Critical Reading and Writing I—This course develops students' proficiency in critical reading and writing through the study of a wide range of non-literary and literary texts, and the study of composition, with emphasis on connections between modes of reading and writing.

ENGL 110 – Critical Reading and Writing II—A study of a special topic in literature, which may include non-literary texts, in conjunction with a continuation of the writing program begun in ENGL 100.

ENGL 251 – Expository and Persuasive Writing—The theory and practice of expository and persuasive writing. Each student will be expected to write several papers in a variety of modes of writing.

ENGL 252 – Creative Writing I—An introduction to the craft of creative writing, with work in poetry, drama, and prose fiction.

ENGL 351 – Advanced Writing—An advanced course in the theory and practice of writing. Each student will be required to write several papers.

ENGL 352 – Creative Writing II—An advanced course in the craft of creative writing. The course will specialize in one genre of writing each semester.

ENGL 368 – Special Studies in Language and Writing—Studies of specific issues in language and/or writing. The particular focus of the course will be chosen and announced each semester.

FILM 310 – Screenwriting—Introducing the fundamentals of writing for the screen.

JRN 300 – Introduction to Print Journalism—Study and practice of newsgathering fundamentals and principles in reporting for newspapers and their websites. A focus on information gathering, clear, complete, accurate and fair story writing to deadlines, the essentials of headline writing, page layout and editing according to Canadian Press style guidelines followed in newspapers across the country.

JRN 305 – Intermediate Print Journalism—Continuing study and practice of newsgathering and writing for daily news, with in-depth reporting on current issues. A focus on beat coverage, editing and production, feature preparation, backgrounders, analysis pieces, and style guidelines. A critical study of Canadian newspapers through analysis, examination and debate of examples of excellent journalism.

JRN 401 – Advanced Print Journalism—This fourth-semester course focuses on specialized reporting of news and current affairs, and writing of opinion pieces and editorials. Students are expected to bring an analytical approach to the course following the internship experience, monitor major print media coverage of particular issues, and research and investigate publishable stories independently.

JRN 413 – Magazine Writing and Literary Journalism—An intensive writing seminar/workshop with a focus on developing the creative voice and how to apply literary conventions to journalistic writing. A detailed examination of the roots of New Journalism, creative non-fiction, literary journalism, self-directed journalism and the freelance environment.

JRN 414 – Directed Investigative Reporting Project—Original, in-depth research into matters of major public interest and importance, organizing the material, writing and editing the script with a view toward publication and/or broadcast. The student will work directly with a faculty supervisor.

JS 291 – Professional Communications and Writing—An introduction to the integration of theory and practice in justice issues.

KIN 101 – Writing and Discourse for Academia—The course introduces students to the University of Regina and Faculty of KHS community, culture, services, and opportunities. The course focuses on a variety of approaches to reading, writing and researching with the intent to develop the student's overall communication skills. Emphasis is placed on critical thought and effectively communicating well-developed ideas when writing research papers, and how to formulate, organize, and present meaningful academic arguments.

PR 101 – Writing and Editing for Public Relations—This course will introduce students to the conventions and formats of writing for public relations, as distinguished from other forms of business writing. Students will develop an awareness of audience, objectives and key messages when planning their writing before moving on to practice with several common public relations formats.

RDWT 120 – Reading and Writing I—Practice in fundamentals of critical reading and writing skills. This course prepares students to take ENGL 100.

THST 411 – Writing One-Act Plays—Composition of original one-act scripts with detailed discussion of dramaturgical problems having to do with such matters as style, structure, and characterization.

THST 412 – Writing Full-Length Plays—Composition of original full-length scripts with detailed discussion of dramaturgical problems having to do with such matters as style, structure, and characterization.

WGST 205 – Women's Autobiography, Life Writing and Empowerment—A feminist exploration of women's autobiographical expressions including: memoirs, journals, personal essays, autoethnography, scripts, and film. Autobiography gives voice to the way social constructions of gender, race, class, age, ability and sexuality regulate and influence women's lived experiences. Methods of resistance and empowerment embedded in autobiography are examined as well.

Graduate Writing Courses

ENGG 789 Technical Writing Laboratory (1)—Introduction of technical writing concepts for graduate students with a specific focus on thesis and report writing. The course is intended to help students improve their general writing skills (grammar and organization), while at the same time learning principles and approaches for producing

good quality thesis, report and article manuscripts. Specific topics to be covered include thesis and report writing, improving grammar and organization, literature reviews, and referencing and documentation, including plagiarism and how to avoid plagiarizing.

EC&I 846 Current Research in Reading Theory and Pedagogy—Study of theories and aspects of reading processes and general principles of literacy learning. A review of research regarding materials and practices in reading instruction will be presented.

EC&I 847 Techniques and Theories of Observation and Assessment in Reading and Writing—Techniques and theories of observation, testing, analysis, and assessment will be studied in order to gain an understanding of developmental literacy problems and their underlying factors through appropriate research methods.

EC&I 857 Writing Process and Pedagogy: The Saskatchewan Writing Project—This course focuses on research and theory on literacy development, the writing process and methods of teaching writing. Students use their own writing as a means toward understanding the writing process and the teaching of writing.

EC&I 859 Current Research in Second Language Reading and Writing Acquisition—An examination of current theory and research in reading and writing acquisition which informs curricula and pedagogy. Research methodology used to study reading and writing acquisition will also be examined.

EC&I 860 Current Research in Writing Acquisition and Pedagogy—An examination of current research and theory that inform curricula and pedagogy. The course will concentrate on emergent writing, pre-teen and adolescent writing, and writing pedagogy/evaluation. Three research perspectives will also be studied: quantitative, qualitative and linguistic.

JSGS 804 Seminar on Research and Writing—Introduction to research and writing in public policy including research design, sourcing, evaluation, analysis and presentation. The course is built on the progressive evolution of a major research paper, and will provide critique on both research design and methodology.

JRN 801 (401) Advanced Print—Focuses on specialized reporting of news and current affairs, writing of opinion pieces and editorials. Students are expected to bring an analytical approach to the course following the internship experience, monitor major print media coverage of particular issues, and research and investigate stories independently.

JRN 813 (413) Magazine and Literary Journalism—An intensive writing seminar/workshop with focus on developing the creative voice and how to apply literary conventions to journalistic writing. A detailed examination of the roots of New Journalism, creative non-fiction, literary journalism, self-directed journalism and freelance environment.

FRN 861AA-ZZ Études spécialisées en théorie littéraire—Étude de théories pouvant porter sur l'écriture, la création, la communication, la lecture, la réception et/ou les

communautés littéraires.// Study of theories related to literary writing, creation, communication, reading, reception, and/or literary communities.

Undergraduate Writing Workshops

English as a Second Language (ESL)

Fundamentals for Writing Success—Improve your writing skills through reading and studying academic writing styles and techniques.

Student Success Centre

Academic Writing: Grammar and Punctuation—Students will learn how to identify and fix common writing errors such as subject-verb agreement, comma splices, sentence fragments, and run-on sentences. This workshop will also include lessons on proper possession, dangling modifiers, and all the basic details on how to use a comma, semi-colon, and other tricky pieces of punctuation.

Academic Writing: Research & Referencing—will leave students better able to navigate the labyrinth that is university-level research. This workshop covers keys to proper research, types of research, as well as research objectives and designs. We will then discuss sources (types, as well as quality), referencing (citations and citation styles), plagiarism, proper paraphrasing and summarizing, as well as research tips.

Academic Writing: Pre-Writing—covers the preparation tools necessary for essay writing. Students often underestimate the amount of work that goes into proper brainstorming, outlining, developing a proper subject and then figuring out their argument and why it matters. In this workshop, students will learn about writing with purpose and conviction, about the conventions of university-level writing, and about how the expectations differ from their high school experience. Moreover, we will discuss forming and sustaining a proper argument and will cover thesis statements before doing an outline development workshop. Once you have your subject, your argument, and a roadmap for how to get there, it is time to write.

Academic Writing: Style—students will learn how to avoid the seven Deadly Style Sins of Academic Writing (not a comprehensive list). The workshop covers avoiding first-person narration, rephrasing rhetorical questions, defining or removing jargon, slang and clichés, eliminating wordiness as well as identifying passive voice and making it active.

Academic Writing: Writing and Revising—we will discuss essay structure, proper introductions, the necessary steps to perfect paragraphs, and some strategies for writing conclusions that show your reader that your argument and your paper was worth the trip. This workshop will break academic writing into component parts to show that writing does not come from some mysterious place. There is method to academic writing madness.

Global Learning Centre

What is Plagiarism and How to Avoid It—Come find out more information regarding this form of academic misconduct, how it can affect your academic standing, and how to avoid it!

Grammar 1 (Beginner/Intermediate)—Learn proper English grammar rules and tips on how to avoid making writing mistakes.

Grammar 2 (Intermediate/Advanced)—This is a follow-up workshop for Grammar 1. Learn and practice specific common grammar fundamentals and how to fulfill the requirements of university writing requirements.

Forming an Argument—Gain a clear understanding of an argument in academic essays, and how to ensure your essay persuades your reader.

Citation and Quotation—Learn how to properly cite sources and quotes in your essays!

Graduate Student Writing Workshops

Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy

Academic Integrity: Strategies for Avoiding Plagiarism—You will learn exactly what JSGS considers to be plagiarism and strategies for avoiding it.

Writing a Well-Argued Paper—Argumentation is key to all academic and professional writing. You will learn how to make a convincing argument. This workshop is designed to help you with all your assignments at JSGS.

Writing Well-Organized Paragraphs—Well-organized and persuasive papers begin with coherent paragraphs. In this workshop, we will focus on writing introductory, body and concluding paragraphs.

Writing a Literature Review—Knowing how to integrate the ideas and research results of others into your own argument is key to successful academic and professional writing. This workshop introduces you to the literature review.

Writing a Proposal—You will learn JSGS's expectations for a strong proposal. We will explore these expectations with activities that focus on the abstract, introduction, literature review and methods section of a proposal.

Weaving Ideas Together: Flow and Coherence in Writing—You will learn how to improve flow and coherence in your writing by using a technique used by professional writers: the old-new information pattern.

Plain Language: Ridding your Writing of Wordiness—Government documents are often marred by weak verbs and long dull sentences. You will learn how to make your writing engaging and readable.

Doing Effective Research—Research tools and search engines will be presented.

Writing a Briefing Note—Succinct briefing notes are critical government documents. Through models of strong and weak briefing notes, you will learn what makes a good briefing note.

Writing Book and Article Critiques—Learning how to evaluate scholarly work is essential for a graduate student. You will learn how to write critical book and article reviews.

Mastering the English Sentence—We will review sentence structure and common student errors such as: Fragments and comma splice.

Mastering English Verb Tenses in Academic and Professional Writing—We will review English verb tenses and learn how and where to use them in documents, essays and proposals.

Expressing Caution—Both academic and professional writers know how to adjust the strength of their conjecture often using modal verbs to do so (would, could, can, may, etc.). Learn how to use other verbs to hedge and to qualify.

Using English Articles—International students often have difficulty with articles. Review the rules for articles and you will practice using them in your writing.

Writing a Logic Model and Environmental Scan—You will learn how to write these key documents.

Overcoming Punctuation Problems—Being able to write error-free prose is essential for public servants. You will learn to recognize the errors that you tend to make and practice improving punctuation in sentences.

Writing about Data: Similarity, Difference, Comparison and Contrast—Comparing data points and sets is a key part of academic writing, and a task that students need practice with.

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

Scientific and Technical Writing Skills—Make an impact with your scientific and technical writing skills! This two day, hands-on workshop is aimed at those with scientific and technical backgrounds. From structure and grammar to impact – get on-site expert feedback, a chance to work on a current, future, or past piece of your writing, and exposure to many samples of writing, from atrocious to outstanding.

Appendix II: Focus Group Questions: Course Instructors and Students

Course Instructor Questions

1) How important are students' writing skills in your academic program?

2) Based on your observations and experiences as an academic, please tell us about the major challenges that students experience in the process of writing academic assignments?

3) Whose responsibility is it to help students to develop their writing skills?

4) What do/can you do as a course instructor to develop and encourage students' writing?

5) Have you ever sought support for teaching students how to be effective writers (i.e., support from a writing centre, tutor, or other resources)? If so, how successful was this support? (If not, why not?)

6) What else can /should faculty do to develop students' writing skills? And what are the main obstacles in this regard?

7) What could on-campus writing centre administrators do to increase use of the service (in terms of faculty/instructors setting up in-class workshops, or setting up specific tutoring times for their students, or in making writing centres more appealing for students)?

8) What can/should the University as an institution do?

The following three themes quite often came up in the comment sections in the faculty survey:

9) More writing instruction / assignments take time (or focus) away from course content.

10) Course instructors themselves need support / guidance to better able to help students to develop their writing skills.

11) Basic / foundational writing vs. discipline-specific writing (or technical writing): What can the University and Faculties do to address both aspects of writing?

More detailed questions

1) Could you elaborate on the feedback that you provide on students' writing? (What do you focus the feedback on, e.g. depth of ideas, structure of assignment, accuracy of language, mechanics? How deep is your feedback, e.g. highlighting/circling areas of concern, writing a few words in the margins, writing a paragraph or more at the end of an assignment? How long does it take to provide feedback to one student on a writing assignment?)

2) Do you think scaffolded assignments (when students submit assignments and receive feedback at different stages of the writing process, so that they build their writing drafts to a final product) are helpful for developing writing? If yes and you do not currently assign scaffolded assignments, what are the main obstacles to doing so? If yes and you currently use scaffolded assignments, what are the benefits to doing so? If no, say why not.

Student Questions (A)

1) In your opinion, how valuable/important are writing skills in your academic program?

2) How important do you think writing skills are in the employment industry you are pursuing?

3) In your opinion, how clear were writing assignment expectations made to students in the courses you took? Do your instructors/ professors provide scaffolding / staged assignments and/or writing rubrics for your assignments?

4) Looking at your current writing skills, do you have a specific area in which you struggle? Critical thinking, grammar, communication of thought, etc. What kind of support do you need to overcome this challenge?

5) When looking at your writing assignments, are your average marks consistent? Or do you notice that your writing assignment marks vary – both high marks and low marks regularly? Do they vary by discipline (which faculty or department the assignment is in).

6) Are you provided writing feedback on your assignments? If so, do you take the feedback given to you to strengthen your writing skills?

7) In your opinion, how can instructors/ professors help students to develop their writing skills further?

8) How can your faculty or department assist you in developing your writing skills further?

9) How can the university help students develop their writing skills further?

On-campus Writing Supports

1) Do you think you need support to become a better writer?

2) Which on-campus writing supports are you aware of? Which one do you use?

3) How often do you use these writing supports?

4) Why do you use the writing supports on campus?

5) Can you provide any specific examples of your experiences with on-campus writing supports?

6) If you don't use the writing supports provided on campus, what are the main reasons for not doing so?

7) Do your instructors/professors recommend you use on-campus writing supports? Do they recommend and/or provide external writing supports or examples to assist you?

8) Do you have any suggestions that would help you and others to become better writers?

9) Do you know anyone who is a "good" writer? If so, what do you think helped him/her to become that way?

Student Questions (B)[71]

1. In your program of study, can you let us know the following—on average:

   a) How many writing assignments you have per semester

   b) Average length of writing assignments (word count/paragraphs)

   c) Time you take to complete assignments (hours)

   d) How many drafts you do before submitting

2. In your opinion, how valuable/important are writing skills in your academic program? How important do you think writing skills are in the employment industry you are pursuing?

3. In your opinion, how clear are writing assignment expectations? Do your instructors/ professors provide scaffolded / staged assignments and/or writing rubrics for your assignments?

4. Looking at your current writing skills, do you have a specific area in which you struggle? Critical thinking, grammar, communication of thought, etc.

---

[71] After the first focus group, we condensed the questions and asked for more specific information in terms of writing skills workload.

5. When looking at your writing assignments, are your average marks consistent? Or do you notice that your writing assignment marks vary – both high marks and low marks regularly? Do they vary by discipline (which faculty or department the assignment is in)?

6. If you don't use the writing supports provided on campus, what are the main reasons for not doing so?

7. Do your instructors/professors recommend you use on-campus writing supports? Do they recommend and/or provide external writing supports or examples to assist you?

8. Do you have any suggestions that would help you and others to become better writers?

9. Do you know anyone who is a "good" writer? If so, what do you think helped him/her to become that way?

Appendix III: Writing Support Services at Selected Universities

The Task Force researched what writing workshops and writing supports are available for students at other Canadian universities. The following writing services for both undergraduate and graduate students are offered at those institutions:

Dalhousie University

19,831 Students (2014)

Writing Supports

Writing Centre (https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/writing-and-study-skills.html)

Online Writing Centre resource guide (http://dal.ca.libguides.com/writingcentre)

Writing Workshops (https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/writing-and-study-skills/events.html)

- Academic Integrity Principles
- Using Cited Material
- Academic Integrity Module: Follow-up Sessions
- Write In

Graduate Workshops/ Supports

Writing Week for Grad students

Memorial University

18,413 Students (2015)

Writing Supports

Writing Centre (https://www.mun.ca/writingcentre/)

Peer Tutoring

Online services for distance students

Online Resource Guide (https://www.mun.ca/writingcentre/resources/)

Graduate Workshops/ Support

Thesis-writing Retreat

University of New Brunswick

11,000 Students (2014)

Writing Supports

Writing Centre (http://www.unb.ca/fredericton/studentservices/academics/writing-centre/)

Online workshop slides

Writing Workshops (http://www.unb.ca/fredericton/studentservices/academics/writing-centre/wss-workshops.html**)**

- Citing, Quoting, & Plagiarism
- Ethical Editing
- I Wish I'd Said That
- Writing an Argumentative Paper
- Improving Reading Speed and Recall
- Six Steps to Better Writing
- Writing Better and Faster

University of Saskatchewan

20,957 students

Writing Supports

Writing Centre

Distance Education Writing Centre
(http://ccde.usask.ca/distanceeducation/ccdewritingcentre)

Writing Workshops (https://library.usask.ca/studentlearning/workshops/writing-workshops.php)

- Writing Clearly and Concisely
- Managing the Essay-Writing Process Using the Online Paper Planning Tool
- Managing the Essay-Writing Process Using the Online Paper Planning Tool
- An Introduction to Chicago Style Citing, Footnoting, and Formatting (Undergrad Students)
- An Introduction to APA Style: Integrating Quotations, Citing Sources, and Creating a References List
- Combat Procrastination at Research and Write Night

Graduate Workshops/Supports (https://distanceeducation.usask.ca/support/writing-centre.php)

- Strategies for Avoiding Plagiarism video tutorials
- Writing a Well Argued Paper video tutorials
- Writing Well Organized Paragraphs video tutorials
- Integrating Evidence video tutorials
- Writing a Literature Review video tutorials
- Writing a Thesis Proposal video tutorials
- Flow and Coherence video tutorials
- Perfect Punctuation video tutorials

University of Victoria

21,593 Students (2015)

Writing Supports

Writing Centre (https://www.uvic.ca/learningandteaching/home/home/centre/)

Online and distance tutoring

Academic communication learning plan development

Writing tips & Guides

Research, planning, writing, and citation self-help videos

Writing Workshops
(https://www.uvic.ca/learningandteaching/cac/assets/docs/Spring%202018%20Program%20Calendar%203%20pg.pdf)

- Pronunciation Clinic
- Reading Strategies
- Vocabulary Building Strategies
- Academic Language and Tone
- Scientific Writing
- Critical Thinking
- Effective Presentations: Strategies for preparation and delivery
- Walk the Walk and Talk the Talk: Confident Communication with the CAC
- INDIVIDUAL "LEARN ABOUT…" workshops for you, by appointment

Graduate Workshops/ Support

- Grad Writing Room
- Academic Writing for Graduate Students: A Six-Session Series

University of Windsor

15,587 Students (2016)

Writing Supports

Writing Support Desk (http://www.uwindsor.ca/success/338/about-writing-support-desk)

Writing Workshops (provided through student intranet site)

Graduate Workshops/ Support

Write Now! At Leddy Library: Grad Writing Sessions

University of Winnipeg

9,449 students

Writing Supports

Writing Centre (https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/writing-centre/)

Certificate in Writing (https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/rhetoric/programs/certificate-in-writing.html)

Writing Workshops (https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/academic-advising/study-skills-workshops.html)

- Academic Writing
- Reading Strategies

Graduate Workshops/ Supports (https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/writing-centre/docs/Graduate%20Student%20Writing%20Workshops%20Fall-Winter%202017-18.pdf)

- Citation Practices
- Literature Reviews and Synthesis Writing
- Starting the Research Process
- Writing Abstracts
- Writing Introductions
- Preparing for your Defense
- Writing PhD Statements of Purpose
- Writing Conclusions
- Citation Management
- Proposal Writing
- Navigating Scholarly Publishing
- Reading Strategies
- Adapting your Writing for Presentation/3MT
- Managing Writing Projects
- Thesis Writing Retreat

Wilfrid Laurier University

17, 594 Students (2016)

Writing Supports

Writing Centre (https://students.wlu.ca/academics/support-and-advising/writing-support/index.html)

Undergraduate Workshops

- Grammar
- Core elements of academic writing
- Writing for English-language learners

Writing Resources and guides

Online Writing Workshops (provided through student intranet access)

Writing Circle: Make Progress with Your Writing Assignments

Scholarship Proposal Writing Workshop

Graduate Workshops/ Support (https://students.wlu.ca/academics/support-and-advising/writing-support/graduate-students.html**)**

- Graduate Writing Consultants/Tutors
- Scholarship/funding proposals.
- Thesis proposals
- Course assignments
- Major research papers
- Theses
- Journal articles
- Conference proposals and papers
- Applications for graduate school
- General advice about writing: text organization, effective sentence structure, and grammar

Appendix IV: Selected Sources on the Teaching of Writing

Anderson, C. (2000). *How's it going? A practical guide to conferring with student writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Carroll, L.A. (2002). *Rehearsing new roles: How college students develop as writers.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.

Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing without teachers* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (2000). *Everyone can write: Essays toward a hopeful theory of writing and teaching writing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (2012). *Vernacular eloquence: What speech can bring to writing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gallagher, K. (2011). *Write like this: Teaching real-world writing through modeling & mentor texts*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Gibbons, P. (2009). *English learners, academic literacy, and thinking: Learning in the challenge zone*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Giltrow, J., Gooding, R., Sawatsky, M., & Burgoyne, D. (2014). *Academic writing: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Peterborough, ON: Broadview.

Gottschalk, K. & Knight, J.S. (2003). *The elements of teaching writing: A resource for instructors in all disciplines*. Boston: Bedford-St. Martin's.

Graves, D. H., & Kittle, P. (2005). *Inside writing: How to teach the details of craft*. Newmarket, ON: Pearson Education Canada.

Kirby, D. L., & Crovitz, D. (2012). *Inside out: Strategies for teaching writing* (4th ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Lindemann, E., & Anderson, D. (2001). *A rhetoric for writing teachers*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

McComiskey, B. (2000). *Teaching composition as a social process*. Logan: Utah State UP.

Muñoz Page, M. E. (2010). *ESL writing: Intermediate and advanced*. Piscawaty, NJ: Research & Education Association.

Murray, D. M. (2003). *A writer teaches writing*: *A practical method of teaching composition* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Newton, J.M. et al. (2018). *Teaching English to second language learners in academic contexts: reading, writing, listening, and speaking.* London: Routledge.

Pennington, M. C., & Burton, P. (2011). *The college writing toolkit: Tried and tested ideas for teaching college writing*. Sheffield, UK: Equinox.

Romano, T. (1995). *Writing with passion: Life stories, multiple genres.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Selber, S.A. (2004). *Multiliteracies for a digital age.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Selfe, C.L., (2007). *Resources in technical communication: outcomes and approaches.* Amityville: Baywood.

Spandel, V. (2012). *Creating writers: 6 traits, process, workshop, and literature* (6th ed). Pearson Higher Ed USA.

Sword, Helen. (2012). *Stylish Academic Writing*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Tate, G., Rupiper, A., & Schick, K. (2001). *A guide to composition pedagogies*. New
York: Oxford UP, 2001.

Thaiss, C., & Zawacki, T.M. (2006). *Engaged writers, dynamic disciplines: Research on
the academic writing life.* Portsmouth: Heinemann-Boynton/Cook.

White, E.M., & Wright, C.A. (2015) *Assigning, responding, evaluating: A writing
teacher's guide* (5th ed.). Boston: Bedford-St. Martin's.