**WSAP Instructor Guide**  
**Revised 9/6/2016**

**Table of Contents**

**WELCOME TO THE WSAP**  
page 2

**SECTION 1: TEACHING IN THE WSAP**  
page 3

WSAP Mission Statement
Overview of the Primary Writing Requirement and PWR Courses
Types of PWR Courses
Informed Self-Placement
Diagnostic Essays
WSAP Courses: A Theme-Based Approach to Teaching Writing
Selecting a Course Theme
Writing Course Descriptions
Learning Goals and Outcome Criteria for PWR Courses
Assessment of Teaching
Required Components for PWR Courses

**SECTION 2: WSAP POLICIES & SYLLABUS STATEMENTS**  
page 15

Expectations for Professional Behavior  
Required Syllabus Policies
  Academic Integrity
  Grading and Assessment
  Revision Policies
  Late/Missing Work Policies
  Extension Policy
  Participation Policy (If Graded)
Sensitive Material Statement
Statements about Support Services: CETL
Statements about Support Services: WSC
Addressing Cases of Suspected Academic Dishonesty
Supporting Students of Concern
  CARE Referral
  Submitting a CARE Referral
  Mid-Term Warnings: For Students Earning Below a C
Welcome to the WSAP: Expectations and Ethos of our Community

Welcome to our interdisciplinary community of instructors and tutors! While we have diverse academic interests, we are united by our belief in the importance of communication, both written and spoken, in the academic setting and beyond. In our interactions with students and all program members, we honor the importance of communication by encouraging and listening to the diverse voices and perspectives in our community. As a democratic community, we value the input, ideas, and contributions of all of our members. In fact, over the years, many elements of our program, including the Grad Writing Project and Speaking Fellows, have grown out of the ideas of and feedback from graduate instructors and lecturers.

Our program is designed to be flexible and dynamic, evolving in response to changes in the university setting, student needs, and broader shifts in communication practices. While we are always open to change, it is important that our program, and PWR courses in particular, be grounded in a clear set of learning goals and outcome criteria. The WSAP has created these criteria through a review process led by WSAP instructors, drawing from national standards set by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html) and guided by input and feedback from instructors and the University of Rochester Curriculum Committee.

We value flexibility and individual choice in our program, believing that instructors teach best when they are able to design their own courses and materials, which they are invested in and which play to their strengths as teachers. For this reason, we do not require specific texts or course materials, but provide a framework for WRT courses and allow instructors to develop their courses within this framework.

In order to develop a course that works well within the context of WSAP and college expectations and goals, instructors need a good working knowledge of these contexts. This guide is designed to provide this understanding of WSAP and its role in the college curriculum. In addition, we hope to provide answers to many of the questions past instructors have asked as they developed their courses. This guide begins the conversation about expectations and guidelines for teaching first-year writing courses and helps ensure that students entering courses with different themes are in fact guided by instructors focused on teaching to the same set of learning outcomes.

It is important to us to maintain flexibility and an open, democratic atmosphere, but at the same time we need to act with consistency and fairness when we design PWR courses and interact with and assess students. For these reasons we expect that our instructors will comply with the requirements outlined in this guide, and if you have any questions or concerns about these requirements—or ideas for new ways to do things—speak with a program director so that we can come up with a solution together. We welcome and invite input and feedback about program requirements. Our aim is to maintain open communication and dialogue with all WSAP members, hearing about what is working well, what could be improved, and new ideas to consider in the future.

Thank you for your commitment to the WSAP and to your students. We hope that you enjoy your experience teaching writing and that it contributes something meaningful to your professional identity.

Deborah Rossen-Knill, M.F.A., Ph.D.
WSAP Director, Associate Professor
(585) 273-3584
deb.rossen-knill@rochester.edu

Stefanie Sydelnik
Associate Director, Lecturer
(585) 273-3584
stefanie.sydelnik@rochester.edu
SECTION 1: TEACHING IN THE WSAP

WSAP mission statement
The Writing, Speaking, and Argument Program, in concert with faculty across the college, builds a strong community of undergraduate and graduate writers, speakers, and researchers. Writing, speaking, and argument enable us to discover, develop, test, and communicate our ideas. Effective communication—including critical thinking, problem solving, organization of ideas, and clarity and power of expression—is of enormous importance both in academic and professional settings. Through communication, we see the truth, utility, or beauty of what we know, and make our knowledge have an impact on the world at large.

The Writing, Speaking, and Argument Program leads the effort to familiarize students with key principles and strategies for becoming successful communicators across different modes and contexts. For both undergraduates and graduates, the program fosters a culture of open, honest, and critical communication.

Overview of the Primary Writing Requirement and PWR Courses

The Primary Writing Requirement: The Primary Writing Requirement (PWR) at Rochester is the first step in drawing students into our community of researchers and writers. We aim to help undergraduate students become effective academic writers. All University of Rochester students are expected to satisfy the PWR and are encouraged to do so in their first year of study at Rochester. This prepares students for the upper-level writing requirement that focuses on writing in the majors.

There are three ways for students to fulfill the PWR:

- Take a first-year writing course
- Petition to substitute another UR course
- Petition to substitute a transfer course

Most entering students fulfill the requirement by taking one of the PWR courses offered by the WSAP. The courses that fulfill the PWR are:

- WRT 105
- WRT 105E, a version of 105 for those students who want more support to meet the demands of college-level writing
- WRT 105A (fall) and WRT 105B (spring), which distribute the work of WRT 105 across two semesters (at two credits each), allowing students more time to develop as academic research writers
- WRT 103 and WRT 104, a sequence for students admitted into the English for Academic Purposes Program

In order to fulfill the Primary Writing Requirement in any of these courses, students must earn a grade of “C” or higher.
Types of PWR Courses
To gain a better sense of the distinctions between the various versions of 105, here are the general descriptions of all PWR courses:

**WRT 105: Reasoning and Writing in the College** (4 Credits)
WRT 105 introduces students to disciplinary writing at the college level by offering instruction in small sections that focus on the act of writing. It provides instruction and practice in clear and effective writing and in constructing cogent and compelling arguments, as students draft and revise numerous papers of different forms and lengths. These papers introduce some of the forms of writing students are expected to produce later in their college careers as well as in their public and professional lives after graduation. The subject of the course is writing, but since writing is about something, each section of WRT 105 presents various texts, mostly written, for analysis and discussion in preparation for constructing extended argumentative essays and a final research paper. Students consider the roles of audience and purpose in shaping the organization, style and argumentative strategies of their own papers, and they learn to become critical readers of their writing through peer critiques and revision and editing workshops.
Note: a grade of “C” or higher satisfies the Primary Writing Requirement.

**WRT 105E: Reasoning and Writing in the College** (4 Credits)
WRT 105E is an extended version of Reasoning and Writing in the College. While WRT 105 and WRT 105E have the same expectations for completion, WRT 105E is intended for students who decide that they need a more supported writing experience to meet the demands of college writing. All sections of WRT 105E include an additional class session each week and are taught in computer labs and limited to 10 students. WRT 105E students who have worked diligently but have not attained a B- or better may take an incomplete and sign up for the Extension, a weekly workshop and tutorial that allows students to raise their final grades and satisfy the Primary Writing Requirement.
Note: a grade of “C” or higher satisfies the Primary Writing Requirement.

**WRT 105A: Reasoning and Writing in the College: First Course in WRT 105A-WRT 105B Sequence.** (2 Credits)
WRT 105A (Fall) and WRT 105B (Spring) distribute the work of WRT 105E across two semesters, with WRT 105A covering the first half of WRT 105E. WRT 105A immerses students in the experience of academic writing, with a particular emphasis on analyzing, using, and documenting scholarly and non-scholarly texts. It provides instruction and practice in constructing cogent and compelling arguments, as students draft and revise two short argumentative essays. Students will develop and test their ideas through discussion, informal writing, peer critiques and reflections. All sections of WRT 105A&B revolve around a theme and include a weekly writing group in which students do the work of writing with immediate support from the course instructor. To proceed from WRT 105A to WRT 105B, students must earn a grade of “C” or higher.
Note: A grade of “C” or higher in WRT 105A and in WRT 105B satisfies the Primary Writing Requirement.

**WRT 105B: Reasoning and Writing in the College: Second Part of WRT 105A-WRT 105B Sequence.** (2 Credits)
The second-half of the WRT 105A-WRT 105B sequence, WRT 105B immerses students in the experience of academic writing, with a particular emphasis on analyzing, using, and documenting scholarly and non-scholarly texts. It provides instruction and practice in constructing cogent and compelling arguments, as students draft and revise a proposal and an 8-10 page argumentative research paper. Students will develop and test their ideas through discussion, informal writing, peer critiques and reflections. All sections of WRT 105A&B revolve around a theme and include a weekly writing group in which students do the work of writing with immediate support from the course instructor. To proceed from WRT 105A to WRT 105B, students must earn a grade of “C” or higher.
Note: A grade of “C” or higher in WRT 105A and in WRT 105B satisfies the Primary Writing Requirement.
with immediate support from the course instructor. WRT 105B students who have worked diligently but have not attained a grade of “B-” or higher may take an incomplete and sign up for the Extension, a weekly workshop and tutorial program that allows students to continue working on their writing, raise their final grades, and satisfy the Primary Writing Requirement.

Note: A grade of “C” or higher in WRT 105A and in WRT 105B satisfies the Primary Writing Requirement.

**WRT 103: EAPP Critical Reading, Reasoning, and Writing (6 credits)**
WRT 103 is an introduction to critical reading and writing skills. Lessons will center on the analysis of varied readings and on using writing as a tool for critical thinking and reflection. Students will be introduced to concepts of rhetorical analysis and the use of logic, as well as considering the roles of the audience and the purpose in shaping the organization, style and argumentative strategies of their papers. In addition, students will build writing fluency and self-expression through free writing and in-class writing. Collaboration is an important part of learning; therefore, students will work together as they learn to critique their work and the work of their peers. Attention will be given to writing beyond the classroom, such as communicating with faculty and other campus programs and departments.

Note: A grade of “C” or higher in WRT 103 and in WRT 104 satisfies the Primary Writing Requirement.

**WRT 104: EAPP Research, Reading, and Writing (6 credits)**
WRT 104 extends the critical reading and writing skills learned in WRT 103: Critical Reading, Reasoning, and Writing to the act of research. Research may include traditional library sources and academic journals, but it may also include primary research, such as fieldwork, surveys, and interviews. A variety of texts will be analyzed and discussed in preparation for constructing extended argumentative essays and a final research paper. Reading and responding critically to texts will be practiced. Students will learn to incorporate source material into research writing and to integrate one's ideas with those from other texts. Collaboration is an important part of learning; therefore, students will work together to learn to critique their work and the work of peers. Attention will be given to writing beyond the classroom, such as communicating with faculty and other campus programs and departments.

Note: A grade of “C” or higher in WRT 103 and in WRT 104 satisfies the Primary Writing Requirement.

**WRT Extension:**
The WRT Extension is a weekly workshop and tutorial offered through the Writing Center for all WRT 104, WRT 105E, and WRT 105B students who have worked diligently but have received a grade of C+ or lower. These students can take an incomplete in WRT 104, WRT 105E, or WRT 105B and sign up (by speaking to their instructors) to participate in a weekly workshop/tutorial that offers intensive work on writing in small group and individual settings. In weekly Extension sessions, students continue to revise writing from their WRT courses. Students may also choose to work on forms of academic writing relevant to their spring coursework – forms which may include summary, critical response, the argumentative essay, the lab report, and others. Guided by their instructor and by Writing Center consultants, students plan, draft and revise their writing, critique each other's work, assess their own writing, and participate in small group sessions on writing issues that the group faces. The semester's work will culminate in a final portfolio that features polished essays and an overall self-reflection.

The Extension is designed for WRT 104, WRT 105E, and WRT 105B students but, if space is available, may be made available to WRT 105 students who have worked diligently but have received a grade of C- or lower.
Informed Self-Placement

In order to determine which PWR course is the best choice for their needs, entering students are asked to complete a placement survey. This survey asks students to reflect on their experience and comfort-level with academic writing. Students also have the opportunity to engage with a sample reading selection and accompanying prompt that approximates the kinds of readings and assignments that they would encounter in a 105 class. Based on this survey, students are guided toward the version of the PWR course that may be the best fit. Students who desire more guidance can speak with placement advisors. The guiding principle of informed self-principle, however, is that the final decision about which course to take rests with the student. Our aim is to provide students with the information and guidance they need to make a well-informed and thoughtful decision. For students who find that the type of course they selected is not working for them, we offer the diagnostic process and a two-week drop/add period to allow them to shift into a more or less supported version of WRT 105 as needed.

Diagnostic Essays

At the start of each semester, students in all sections of WRT 105/E/AB complete an in-class diagnostic essay during one of the first two class sessions of the semester. After reviewing this writing sample, instructors who have concerns about the placement of any of their students should consult with the Director, Associate Director, or Writing Placement Coordinator.

Instructors should plan 35 minutes of in-class diagnostic writing during one of the first two class sessions. If you have students add the course after the diagnostic essay, please still ask them to complete the essay, ideally in your office or in a quiet place near your office.

Please read diagnostic essays as quickly as possible, as the purpose is to identify students who may have difficulty learning in your course—either because the work is too hard or too easy.

As soon as possible, before approaching the student, let the Director, Associate Director, or Writing Placement Coordinator know about any outliers—essays that suggest students may not thrive in your course. We’ll work with you to decide how to create the best learning situation for your student.

Diagnostic Essay Prompts: For their diagnostic essay, students should present an argument or position supported by evidence. It’s important to explain the purpose of this writing, but instructors don’t always call it a “diagnostic essay” with their students; alternatives might be in-class writing, warm-up writing, etc.

Diagnostic essay prompts are typically open-ended questions that students can answer without having to do substantial preparation or reading. A typical strategy is to present something students can discuss together as a group (such as a provocative question or idea, short video, quotation, poem, excerpt, etc.) and then have students present an argument or position in writing. Along similar lines, the class might brainstorm ideas, arguments, or positions as a group, and then write their diagnostic essays individually.

In addition to helping instructors determine that the course is a good fit for each student, diagnostic essays are also a good way for instructors to get a sense of each student’s writerly voice from the get-go.
WSAP Courses: A Theme-Based Approach to Teaching Writing

The theme-based curriculum of WSAP courses rests upon the notion that writing does not exist in a vacuum; your course themes provide ideas, concepts, and arguments for students to engage with, ideally sparking their interest and intellectual curiosity. As your course descriptions demonstrate, one of the key functions of the theme in WRT 105 is to generate authentic questions for students to think, read, and write about; engaging with these questions will allow your students to develop their own arguments and contributions to scholarly conversations. Thus, in a theme based writing course, your content and writing instruction should come together, enabling students to explore and think deeply about the course theme as they engage in the practices and processes that are central to academic discourse.

The course theme allows you and your students to explore a new or longstanding interests, but the primary function of PWR courses is to enable students to learn principles, skills, and strategies for effective academic communication. To this end, instructors should aim to integrate theme-based aspects of the curriculum with workshops, assignments, and lessons that support students’ growth as writers. To achieve this goal, we encourage all WSAP instructors to:

- See students as flexible, self-aware writers making choices based on the rhetorical situation (which includes audience, purpose, genre, and mode)
- Understand the importance of process
- Help students transfer writing principles and skills to different disciplines/discourse communities and writing contexts
- Use writing to explore and express ideas
- Teach invention, revision, and editing
- Teach argument as a means to develop, formulate, and analyze ideas
- Teach students principles of academic writing and how to make choices as an academic writer
- Use an approach that allows students to fully investigate their own ideas
- Communicate a love of language, writing, and teaching writing
- Create a positive learning environment for students
- Offer a course that many undergraduates would find interesting

Selecting a Course Theme

One of the strengths of the WSAP is the diversity of interests and disciplines represented by our instructors. Some instructors select themes close to their academic or professional interests, while others choose themes in order to learn more about them (alongside their students). As a result, our course offerings represent a rich array of topics, questions, texts, and approaches. WRT 105 students often choose sections based on their interest in the topic or the relevance to their major, while others take the opportunity to pursue topics outside their course of study.

To help “test” your theme as an appropriate and accessible choice for the WSAP and future students, consider the following questions:

- Is the theme interesting to you (the instructor) and likely to be interesting to students?
- Does the theme truly support open inquiry?
  - Do theme-related readings inspire questions that have more than one reasonable answer?
  - Is theme accessible (no need for special expertise, appropriate for freshman level)?
- Does the instructor’s relationship to the topic make students’ open inquiry possible?
  - Is the theme free of a hidden or explicit agenda?
○ Do students feel able to discover meanings and argue for conclusions that differ from the
instructor's?
● Does the theme promote *sustained* interest and engagement across the semester?
  ○ Does the theme allow variation in problems or questions?
  ○ Is theme open to students from different disciplinary, gender, race, religion, cultural,
educational, and language backgrounds?
  ○ Does the theme allow for different kinds of texts? (think genre and multi-modal)
  ○ Does theme lend itself to separating the course experience into a series of related
sub-themes?

*Potential problems:*
  ● *Excessively disturbing content makes thinking and writing emotionally difficult.*
  ● *Instructor knows topic too well; content—not writing and inquiry--drives course.*
  ● *Single, limited focus or single line of inquiry closes off possibilities for inquiry or feels too
repetitive.*
  ● *Theme has short-term interest, but little potential for deep engagement through analysis or
argument.*

**Writing Course Descriptions**

What to know before you begin conceptualizing your course description:
  ● The greatest challenge of teaching WRT 105 lies in integrating the course theme and writing content
and communicating that writing is not only the primary focus, but also an exciting intellectual area.
The description is your first conversation with your students about how course theme and writing
work together.
  ● Your unique course description instantiates the general WRT 105 description developed by an
interdisciplinary group of faculty.
  ● Undergraduates constitute your primary audience; their parents, college faculty, and administrators
are your secondary audiences.

Before writing your own description, familiarize yourself with the general description of WRT 105 at
[writing.rochester.edu/courses/WRT105.html](http://writing.rochester.edu/courses/WRT105.html), as well as the individual section descriptions on the WSA
Program site ([writing.rochester.edu/courses/current_courses.php](http://writing.rochester.edu/courses/current_courses.php)) and the Registrar’s site
([cdcs.ur.rochester.edu](http://cdcs.ur.rochester.edu)).

**How to Begin:** One way to approach the course description, and your course in general, is to brainstorm a
few related questions or problems that might outline the broad focus of your class.

Before you begin writing the description, take a look at a variety of current [course descriptions](http://writing.rochester.edu/courses/current_courses.php). Take note of
what is similar across disciplines, find one that you like, and decide what it is you like about it.

**Purpose**

Key questions your description should answer for your audience:
  ● How do writing, reading, and argument help students develop and explore interesting questions?
  ● How will your course theme engage students from different disciplines and allow exploration from
different disciplinary perspectives?
  ● Does your course theme engage students from different disciplinary, gender, race, religion, cultural,
educational, and language backgrounds?

- How will the course encourage students to make connections across course readings and think deeply?
- How does the course theme help students develop as academic writers?
- How does your particular description enact the goals established in the general WRT 105 (or 105E or 105A&B) course description (writing.rochester.edu/courses/WRT105.html) and related learning objectives (writing.rochester.edu/courses/alternativecriteria.html)?
- Does your description model the kind of writing you would like to receive from your students?

Common Problems

- Limiting your theme to your own research interests: this can make it very hard to create space for authentic student inquiry, to select appropriate readings, and, more generally, to avoid developing a content course with writing—as opposed to a theme-based writing course.
- Using highly technical or abstract language that is not well suited to your audience.
- Suggesting that your course has two separate and unrelated topics, writing and your theme.

For consistency, all descriptions should:

- Include a statement about peer feedback, reflection, revision, and the required 8-10 page argumentative research paper.
- Identify text genres (e.g., scholarly articles, films, fiction, philosophical tracts) and at least one or two representative texts so that students can learn a bit about course content.
- Be no more than 1,024 characters, including spaces.
- If a significant portion of your course (about 25% or one unit) addresses issues of race and diversity, please let the WSAP know this when you submit your course description and we will make this evident through the registrar’s CDCS page.
- If your course includes unusually violent, sexually explicit, or otherwise potentially disturbing materials, please add a short warning to your course description and syllabus. This need not be much, perhaps something as simple as:

  Please be aware that this course has violent or highly graphic sexual content [whichever pertains] that some may find upsetting. Please feel free to contact the instructor for more information.

Learning Goals and Outcome Criteria for PWR Courses

All PWR courses should address the WSAP Learning Goals and Outcome Criteria, which you can find here: http://writing.rochester.edu/courses/alternativecriteria.html.

Across all academic communities writing, speaking, and argument enable us to discover, develop, test, and communicate our ideas. The Primary Writing Requirement courses familiarize students with key principles and strategies for developing as successful communicators across different modes and academic contexts.

The outcome criteria hold up the foundational knowledge and processes that support ongoing growth as academic communicators. They articulate key aspects of composing processes and of academic compositions. This is because process is part of product. At the same time, in many contexts, our product alone represents not only our message, but also us. To distinguish process-oriented objectives from product-oriented criteria, the sub-heading "the composition" separates out assessment criteria for the
argumentative research paper. All other learning objectives correspond to the student’s awareness of composition knowledge and composing processes.

Assessment of Teaching
Just as we provide extensive feedback to our students to help them develop as writers, feedback on our teaching is an integral part of our growth as instructors. In the WSAP, this feedback comes through two key forms: class observations and course evaluations. Additionally, all instructors in the Writing Program participate in a training program and can seek optional mentoring and assessment in subsequent years.

Class Observations
An important part of assessing effective teaching is through course observations. During the first year of teaching, instructors are observed informally (by program mentors) and formally (by practicum leaders). These observations are an opportunity to reflect on what went well during a class session and to gain the perspective of an outside observer. For each class visit, the instructor composes a self-reflection while the observer composes an assessment of the class; they then meet to discuss the assessments in a private conference. The observer writes an evaluation of the instructor; the instructor decides whether or not to file this evaluation in his/her dossier after the first observation (fall semester); after the second observation (spring semester), a written evaluation must be filed in the instructor’s teaching dossier in the WSAP. The observer uses the WSAP observation form to evaluate and share feedback with the course instructor (available on our website under instructor resources: http://writing.rochester.edu/services/faculty/index.html).

Class observations, evaluations, and other forms of mentoring are available to instructors beyond the first year of teaching. We strongly encourage instructors to continue working with the Director, Associate Director and practicum leaders through class visits, private conferences, and workshops. This allows advanced instructors to maintain close communication, share knowledge and information, and collaborate on program policies and concerns with the program staff. It also provides the Director and Associate Director with current information on advanced instructors’ teaching and the opportunity to write up-to-date letters of reference for future job searches.

Course Evaluations
As with all University of Rochester courses, all WSAP courses are evaluated by students. Course evaluations provide important information about what is working well in our courses and what we can improve. In addition to the online evaluations administered by the University, the WSAP has created an evaluation specifically for WSAP courses. The WSAP evaluation, created by instructors with feedback from program administrators, allows us to receive specific feedback about how effectively our courses are teaching to the outcome criteria.

We would like to provide some perspective on how evaluations in general are treated by the WSAP. They are intended partly to provide the program with data about trends across the board (for example, that students in many 105 sections are expressing a desire for more instructional time on writing for different audiences). Evaluations also make up one component of decisions around competitive positions (e.g., Doust, Post-doc, Lecturer).

We do realize that you may feel pressure around evaluations and that this pressure could lead you to inadvertently encourage your students to offer primarily positive feedback. We hope the information and ideas below will reduce this anxiety and help you feel comfortable asking your students for honest, balanced feedback.
1. When we make fellowship or other “hiring” decisions, we do not look only at numerical scores. In fact, we rely heavily on qualitative feedback to understand how students are experiencing their writing instruction. A 3-level rating with substantial comments indicating the acquisition of writing knowledge can lead to a stronger Doust application, for example, than a higher number that isn’t supported by students being able to explain what they have gained as writers.

2. If students feel that they cannot share what’s not working, you will have lost the opportunity to accurately assess your work in the classroom and identify areas for improvement. In the long run, being able to articulate your growth as an instructor may well serve you better on the job market.

3. When instructors have received significantly low-scoring feedback (2 standard deviations below the mean), we aim to work closely with each instructor to help them be more successful in the classroom. Low-scoring evaluations will provide an opportunity for us to consult with you about resources and strategies to help you to teach more effectively. In our experience, this process has led instructors to grow and become stronger candidates for competitive WSAP positions.

With these ideas in mind, we encourage you to ask your students to respond honestly and thoughtfully to the evaluation forms. It may help you to frame the process as something akin to peer response.

**Mid-semester Evaluations**

Mid-semester course evaluations allow instructors to gauge how well their courses are working for students while there is still time to address this feedback with that group of learners. **These evaluations are required for all first-year instructors and encouraged for returning instructors.** Students should respond anonymously and without your being present (you may want to leave the room and have a student put all responses in an envelope for you), but unlike with end-of-semester evaluations, you do collect and keep their responses. No one other than you will see these evaluations unless you choose to share them. Please know that practicum leaders, mentors, and program administrators are happy to discuss the feedback you receive on these evaluations with you and to help you implement changes to address trends.

**Required Components for PWR Courses**

Some of the best features about PWR courses are the rich diversity of topics and the variety of disciplines that are represented by our instructors. However, there are some components required for all PWR courses to ensure consistency in the student experience. These components uphold the PWR course **Learning Goals and Outcome Criteria**, which articulate the knowledge needed for successful academic communication across the college.

Guided by the outcome criteria and required components for PWR courses, we expect—and hope!—that instructors will make their courses their own. For example, while peer response is expected for each formal assignment, each instructor selects, adapts, or designs their own peer response model. Likewise, while all students should complete a few shorter formal assignments (3-5pp) across the semester, these assignments range in structure, content, and mode, including texts such as blog posts, video essays, op-eds, and literature reviews.

What follows is a list of all components required for PWR courses. These components are detailed in other sections of this guide.

**Formal Assignments**
• **Four formal assignments.** All PWR courses should include four formal assignments or the equivalent (see common models), and one of these assignments must be the 8-10 page argumentative research paper.

• **Early assignments that build toward the research paper.** There are a multitude of possible formal assignment types and sequences that would meet WSAP expectations. The sequence and nature of these assignments is up to each instructor. One principle to keep in mind is that the course should include early formal and informal assignments that scaffold and build towards the 8-10 page argumentative research paper.

• **A multimodal assignment.** Working in multiple modes (e.g., linguistic, visual, aural, gestural, and spatial) prepares students for the increasingly multimodal global communication context and helps them see how composition choices vary with purpose, mode, and audience. Any of the short formal papers or informal assignments in a PWR course could be multimodal; common formats include concept maps, blog posts, video essay, presentations, etc.

• **A revision process that includes peer response, self-reflection, and instructor feedback.** To help students develop as thinking, flexible writers, we believe that formal assignments should provide an opportunity for writers to engage in writing processes, reflect on what practices and strategies are most effective for them, and develop their compositions in response to feedback from readers (peer and instructor). For this reason, each formal assignment should include a process of drafting and revision that includes peer response, self-reflection, and instructor feedback (but the sequence, type, and models for such feedback is up to each instructor). The first draft that you receive from the student should be considered the first/rough draft and not graded as the final paper until the writer has had a chance to revise in response to feedback. If he/she has missed the opportunity to receive peer and/or instructor feedback, tutors at the Writing and Speaking Center can provide a reader’s response and feedback.

• **Student reflection.** Every draft (including final) of a formal assignment submitted to an instructor should be accompanied by some form of reflection that gives students a voice in the feedback cycle.

• **For each formal assignment, at least one workshop on using, integrating, and citing sources (including multimodal assignments).** Citing and integrating sources is often more complicated than we think, such that student writers need repeated practice to make informed choices when using sources. PWR courses may be students’ only direct instruction in this area. For these reasons, all courses should include workshops that allow writers to understand and practice how to use and represent sources honestly and meaningfully given the writer’s purpose, the audience, and the genre/mode. These workshops, which do not need to take an entire class period, may occur at any stage of the writing process and should provide students with an opportunity to apply the skills, concepts, and strategies to their formal assignments.
  
  ○ Some possible workshop topics: processes and tools for tracking notes and sources, effective summary, appropriate paraphrase, integrating quotations, selecting among different ways to represent source material, balancing the writer’s ideas and source’s ideas, ways to signal source material, establishing writer’s stance toward source material, practice categorizing and citing the range of sources they encounter, and exploring the function of source material (Bizup’s BEAM approach).
Regardless of the topic, workshops should give students the opportunity to understand when to cite, as well as resources for how to cite the variety of sources they encounter.

Other Assignments

- **Diagnostic writing.** All PWR students must complete a 35-minute in-class diagnostic essay within the first 2 class sessions; instructors should read these essays right away.

- **WSAP handout on academic integrity around writing:** “Academic Integrity: Understanding How to Give and Receive Help when Writing Papers”. Early in the semester, instructors should assign, discuss in class, and give students the opportunity to engage with the principles and scenarios presented in the WSAP handout.

- **Low-stakes ungraded writing to think.** To support the use of writing as a tool for thinking, all PWR courses should provide students with opportunities to work through ideas informally.

- **Readings about writing.** Texts about writing allow students to see writing studies as a discipline and to expose them to various ideas about and approaches to writing. Depending on your course’s theme and writing story, readings about writing might be integrated into PWR courses in a variety of ways, including writing textbooks, scholarly articles, popular articles, and handouts based on books/articles.

- **Library collaboration.** In collaboration with your course librarian, one library session should be scheduled and planned in advance (two sessions are recommended).

Assignment Deadlines

- **Due dates.** Course schedules should include all assignment deadlines, including those for course readings/viewings, informal writing, rough drafts, peer response, reflection, and final drafts. This allows students to have a clear sense of their work load across the semester and to plan accordingly. Similarly, to help students manage their schedule, we recommend that assignment deadlines be on the day of class meetings.

- **Support breaks and balanced living.** Avoid having assignments due during or immediately following a break.

Timelines for Returning Student Work

- **Timely feedback.** Feedback must be returned within one week of receiving drafts; students then need at least one week to revise after receiving your feedback.

- **Timely grading.** To allow students to learn from and build on formal assignments, final, graded papers should be returned within one week of submission, and at least several days prior to the deadline for the rough draft of the next formal assignment.

WSAP Policies on Grading and Assessment

- **Grading criteria** must appear on all formal assignment prompts in order for students to see how their writing will be assessed and evaluated. We encourage instructors to draw on the WSAP Learning Objectives and Grading Criteria, specifically those under “the composition,” when creating grading criteria for formal assignments. For the argumentative research paper, we recommend, at
the very least, that grading criteria reflect the expectations in the “Engaging Sources” and “Strength of Argument” sections of the Learning Objectives, as well as clarity of prose (e.g., structure and language use).

- **Embrace the messy exploration that is drafting.** With the goal of helping students develop their writing processes and allowing them to use writing to discover and develop their ideas, instructors should encourage students to embrace the messy exploration of early drafts. *Rough drafts should not be graded*; as this would suggest that drafts are polished, final products.

- **Holistic grading.** Because the WSAP believes that compositions function as a whole, with all parts working together to communicate a message to an audience, we ask that instructors use letter grades to assess formal assignments holistically (i.e., do not assign point values to various parts of the essay based on a rubric). To enable the process of calculating final grades, the WSAP has assigned a numerical value to each letter grade (see “Grading Policies” section).

- **Grades are final.** To ensure equity across course sections, once a final draft of a formal paper has been graded, it cannot be revised and resubmitted for a higher grade. If you would like to build opportunities for more revision into your course, we recommend considering the portfolio grading model.

**Communicating WSAP and College Policies**

- **Accommodations:** Any time instructors receive a letter from CETL indicating that a student requires accommodations, the instructor should initiate communication with the student to learn about their needs and how to meet them.

- **WSAP and College Policy Statements** must be presented to students in writing at the start of the course. (See Section 2 below for standard WSAP policies to include on your syllabus.):

  **Basic Information about the Course**
  - Instructor contact information
  - Office hours
  - Course description
  - Required texts/e-reserves

  **Required Policies**
  - Academic Honesty Policy
  - Grading Policies
  - Revision Policies
  - Late/missing Work
  - Extensions
  - Participation (if graded, a policy must be included)
  - Sensitive Material (required only if relevant)
  - Statements about Support Services (CETL & WSC)

**SECTION 2: WSAP POLICIES & SYLLABUS STATEMENTS**

**Expectations for Professional Behavior**

**Timely and Respectful Communication**

As members of the WSAP, we aim to maintain and model clear, open, and respectful communication with
one another and with our students.

**Communicating with the WSA Program**

Communicating effectively within WSAP affects our ability to maintain a positive working environment. For this reason, we expect that WSAP members, instructors included, to use their UR email account (or have messages forwarded to an account they use regularly), and to respond in a timely manner to WSAP members and students. It is important that instructors read and respond to messages from WSAP staff, colleagues, and directors. Timely communication—one of the professional responsibilities of our instructors—allows the program to run smoothly. Conversely, when instructors do not respond to emails, office staff must spend extra time tracking down individuals. Please avoid this issue.

Note: Because we consider responsible communication to be a critical part of the instructor’s professional responsibilities, we consider timely and respectful communication with WSAP staff when making hiring decisions for competitive teaching positions (Doust Fellowships, Postdoctoral Fellowships, Lecturer Positions).

**Communicating with Students**

One of the responsibilities faculty have to their students is clear communication. With this in mind, we ask that all WSAP instructors:

- Hold at least two office hours per week and be available by appointment (see more details below)
- Respond to student emails in a timely manner (within 24 hours during weekdays) and let students know when they can and cannot expect to hear from you (e.g., evenings, weekends, holidays, etc.)
- Return drafts with feedback and/or grades in a timely manner (within 1 week)
- Include clear, transparent, and precise course policies. What you say should be what you mean: avoid including inaccurate information (e.g., particularly harsh policies) to lead students to behave in a certain way; if you include a policy, plan to follow it.
- Record, in writing, any special arrangements that are made with a student (extensions of deadline, etc.) and share the summary with your student. If possible, construct the summary together to be sure that you and the student understand the arrangement in the same way.
- Encourage questions in multiple ways, through multiple modes. Questioning is critical to successful communication, but the Instructor-student power differential may make it difficult for students to ask for clarification or further explanation. By offering a variety of opportunities to ask questions and by modeling questions students might have, you create a comfortable environment for students to voice their misunderstandings, confusions, and the questions that grow out of these.

**Office Hours**

When scheduling your office hours, please keep in mind the following guidelines:

- List days, times, and locations of your regular office hours on your course syllabus, and note that you are also available by appointment.
- Schedule your office hours for maximum accessibility: for example, avoid scheduling your hours at the same time on Monday/Wednesday or Tuesday/Thursday because this might create difficulties for students taking classes at that time.
- Be in your office during your office hours. This allows not only your current students, but also past and possible future students, as well as program staff, to find you should they have questions.
- If, due to an unusual circumstance, you need to change your scheduled office hours, please be sure to communicate this to students in a timely manner.

**Maintaining Professional Boundaries**
The WSAP expects that instructors will maintain professional boundaries in the instructor-student relationship. While each individual will have his/her own teaching persona, ranging from more casual to more formal, we do expect all instructors to be appropriate in their interactions with students. With this in mind, we recommend that you carefully consider where and when you meet with your students for individual conferences. Meeting in informal places creates different dynamics; think carefully about the tone and atmosphere that you want to set for the meetings and how comfortable you and your students will be with the setting. For simplicity, and to maintain professionalism, we encourage you to meet with students in your office and WSAP spaces.

**Student Privacy**

*Meetings with Students*

It is important that we respect students’ privacy when discussing grades, progress, concerns, and any other aspect of students’ work and performance in our courses. Protecting the privacy of students’ grades and academic records is not only mandated by the Family Educational Rights & Privacy Act (FERPA), but also enables us to foster comfortable and safe learning environments for all students. Whenever you discuss students’ grades, their progress, and any other confidential issues that have to do with evaluation of their work or performance in your course, we ask that you be mindful of the setting of the discussion. Out of respect for the student’s privacy, these issues should not be discussed in public spaces. Moreover, if you have an open or shared office, you should always ask if the student is comfortable discussing the matter in that environment. For particularly sensitive issues, those of you with shared or open offices may want to offer to meet in a confidential space if that would make you and/or the student more comfortable; a confidential space is required for discussions of academic honesty cases. Instructors can contact WSAP secretaries for help finding a confidential space.

*Returning Papers and Portfolios*

Students’ work should not be left for them in any public area, as this violates their right to have information about their academic performance kept confidential. If you plan to return work after classes end, please use one or more of the following methods:

- Graded papers may be returned to students through Blackboard, as long as students do not have access to other students' work.
- Arrange times when the student can come to your office to pick up their work. These times might include next semester's office hours for students who plan to leave shortly after classes end.
- Mail work to the student's CPU box. It's easiest if students choosing this option write their CPU box number at the top of their work.
- Mail work to the student's off-campus address. In this case, you might ask the student to attach a self-addressed stamped envelope to the final paper or portfolio.

If you have other plans for returning work after the semester ends, please be sure that your actions do not violate students’ privacy rights. If in doubt, please check with the WSAP.

**Cancelling Classes**

It is common that instructors cancel class meetings to allow time to hold individual conferences with students; the WSAP allows, and even recommends, that instructors do this twice a semester. Aside from these canceled sessions that are replaced by one-to-one work with student writers, the WSAP would like you to consider the following guidelines around canceling class sessions for other reasons.

Because college courses (unlike high school courses) have so little contact time with students, please minimize cancellations. For example, if you know that you will need to miss a class for a non-emergency situation (such as a professional conference or special family event), we ask that you account for this in your
course schedule. You can do this either by replacing the missed session with individual or group conferences after you return, creating a well-structured peer response activity for students to complete while you are away, or by finding a colleague who can step in as a substitute instructor for the session.

There may be times, however, when you will need to cancel a class for other unexpected reasons, such as an emergency or inclement weather. In the case of inclement weather the University of Rochester and WSAP will communicate with instructors about any University-wide recommendations or cancellations. If the University is open and you have to miss a class due to an unexpected and/or emergent circumstances, please let the WSAP know about your absence as soon as possible so that we can have appropriate information for your students. If possible, please also announce the cancellation to your students directly. In cases when it is possible (such as not being able to make it to campus due to weather), we ask that you find a way to “make-up” the canceled session. This can be done through creating an online, virtual discussion and activity for students to complete or, if you have a later session cancelled and replaced with individual conferences, reconvening that session to account for the unexpected cancellation (while still holding the individual conferences as planned).

With respect to cancelling classes and hiring substitutes, WSAP can only bring in and compensate substitute teachers in the case of an emergency that goes beyond missing one class, such as surgery, serious illness, or death of a family member.

**Submitting Final Course Grades**
At the end of each semester, the WSAP will distribute an email containing important information and program deadlines for submitting final grades. The WSAP requests grades to be submitted in advance of the College deadline to enable us to address difficult grading situations prior to the Registrar’s final deadline. If you have any difficult grading situations, questions, or concerns please contact a WSAP director as far in advance as possible.

**Required Syllabus Policies**
The course syllabus begins an important conversation between you and your students: it introduces you as an instructor and communicates your course goals and activities. Ultimately, it functions as a contract between you and your students about what to expect from the course. As such, the syllabus should be as clear as possible about course policies and schedule. Of course, be fair in following and enforcing your course policies; but at the same time, be open to students, listening to their situations when problems arise and making exceptions when extenuating circumstances warrant those exceptions (these situations are typically handled in collaboration with a WSAP director, the CARE system, and/or other offices on campus).

When designing the course policies portion of your syllabus, it is important to understand that there are some statements and policies you must have, and others you may choose to have. Mandatory statements and policies support the educational goals and standards set by the College and WSAP and ensure consistency across all sections of PWR courses. This section identifies standard statements and WSAP policies, but your syllabus would, of course, include other elements, such as a course description, a list of required texts, etc. As you develop your syllabus, feel free to adopt any of the language in this document.

To ensure consistency across all sections of courses that meet the PWR, the WSAP has developed standard policies that govern key areas such as grading, revision, and the criteria that students must meet to
satisfy the Primary Writing Requirement. Some of these standard policies must be clearly stated in the course syllabus for students, while others might help you develop course objectives and grading criteria.

**Academic Integrity**
Academic integrity is essential to the University community and an extremely important component of research-based writing. PWR courses address academic integrity through course policies, in-class discussion and practice, and standard program procedures (should a situation with academic dishonesty arise).

As described in the WSAP learning objectives, our key goal is for students to understand the principles around citation and to get lots of practice working with sources—including practice locating and evaluating sources; representing sources through summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation; documenting sources accurately through attributions and in-text citations; and authentically engaging with a range of sources—including scholarly, peer-reviewed texts—in order to test and support arguments.

This section deals with how academic integrity should be represented via the course syllabus, including standard program policies around violations; for more about how to handle suspected cases of academic dishonesty in your class, please see the sub-section below (“Addressing Cases of Suspected Academic Dishonesty”) as well as the WSAP’s “Guidelines for Dealing with Suspected Cases of Academic Dishonesty”.

**WSAP Handout on Academic Integrity**
To help students understand academic integrity when asking for help and feedback on their writing, we ask that all WRT instructors review and discuss the WSAP handout on academic integrity: “Academic Integrity: Understanding How to Give and Receive Help When Writing Papers”. This handout addresses key principles to help student-writers maintain ownership over their text, describes the roles of writers and readers in the process of sharing feedback, and includes some challenging scenarios to discuss with your students.

**Syllabus Statement: Academic Honesty Policy**
Please explain why honesty is important in our academic research community so that the students see honesty as something more than just another rule. You can do this by framing the standard College honesty policy with your own text about the larger purpose and importance of the policy to the community. You may also want to explain that part of the purpose of PWR courses is to help students understand documentation conventions in academic discourse and the fact that conventions vary across disciplines.

Please be sure that policies around academic honesty are transparent and explained in your syllabus. Your academic honesty policy should communicate the following information to students:

- Communicate the value of honesty
- Define plagiarism (use standard definition below)
- Identify the consequences of academic dishonesty in your course (use WSAP-defined penalties below)

**Communicate the Value of Honesty**

Here is some language describing why we, as members of the WSAP and College, feel that honesty matters. Feel free to use this text, build on it, or create your own.
It is through our own honesty and our trust in others’ honesty that we can learn from each other and work together to create new knowledge. For this reason, when dishonesty enters our community, we put in question all of the work we do and undermine our ability to bring new knowledge and good to the world.

Define Plagiarism
For consistency across sections, please include in your syllabus the following statement from the College’s Academic Honesty Policy.

[Plagiarism is] the representation of another person’s work as one’s own, or the attempt “to blur the line between one’s own ideas or words and those borrowed from another source.” (Council of Writing Program Administrators, January 2003, http://wpacouncil.org/node/9). More specifically, [it is] the use of an idea, phrase, or other material from a written or spoken source without signaling the source at the place of use in a work for which the student claims authorship.

Examples include: the misrepresentation of sources used in a work for which the student claims authorship; the improper use of course materials in a work for which the student claims authorship; the use of papers that are purchased and turned in as one’s own work; submission of written work such as laboratory reports, computer programs, or papers, which have been copied from the work of other students, with or without their knowledge and consent.

Students can avoid the risk of plagiarism in written work or oral presentations by clearly indicating the source of any idea or wording that they did not produce, either in footnotes or in the paper or presentation itself, and in a list of references (e.g., bibliography or works cited page). Sources must be given regardless of whether the idea, phrase or other material is quoted directly, paraphrased or summarized in the student writer’s own words. Direct quotes must always be placed in quotation marks in addition to the other citation information that is required.

In addition to the College’s definition above, please also help students understand the kinds of sources that should be cited and acknowledged, particularly those that might be confusing for students, such as Wikipedia, informal conversations, discussion or notes from a class presentation.

Consequences of Academic Dishonesty
All WRT syllabi should state:

In all cases of suspected plagiarism or other forms of academic dishonesty, the College’s procedures and policies governing academic honesty will be followed. This pertains to all work in writing courses, including (but not limited to) rough drafts, final drafts, presentations, multimodal projects, and informal writing assignments. As required by College policy, all instances of academic dishonesty are reported to the College Board of Academic Honesty. For the complete College honesty policy, see http://www.rochester.edu/college/honesty/index

In cases where academic dishonesty has been established, the typical penalties for a first event in a WSAP course are as follows. In cases of particularly egregious dishonest behavior, the penalty may be more severe.
WSAP Penalties for Academic Dishonesty in PWR Courses (WRT 103, WRT 104, WRT 105, WRT 105E, WRT 105 A&B)
Depending on the grading schema in your course, please use the language below for penalties for academic dishonesty.

For incidents of dishonesty in PWR courses that use contract-portfolio grading
- Any incident of dishonesty in informal assignments or rough drafts results in a 1/3-letter grade reduction in the final course grade.
For final portfolio: the work fails to meet assignment criteria and should be graded with this in mind and in accordance with the syllabus policies, and the course grade may not be higher than C-.

For incidents of dishonesty in PWR courses that use standard grading procedures (i.e., assigning individual grades to formal work)
- For informal assignments: the work fails to meet assignment criteria and earns no credit (which, according to the syllabus, may or may not affect course grade); the penalty is a 1/3-letter-grade reduction in the final course grade.
- For rough drafts of formal papers: the student may write a new draft for a final paper grade; the penalty is a 1/3-letter-grade reduction in the final course grade.
- For a final draft of a formal paper, presentation, or multimodal project other than the 8-10-page argumentative research paper: the work fails to meet assignment criteria and earns a 0. For the 8-10-page argumentative research paper: The paper earns a 0, and the course grade may not be higher than C-.

**Special Note to PWR instructors regarding formal papers and presentations:** A 0 for a formal composition will likely leave a student near or below a course grade of C; those below a C will need to retake the first-year writing course to fulfill the primary writing requirement. This is particularly true when the research paper is involved. In other courses, in addition to earning a 0 for the work, a student would be given a penalty, typically a full-grade reduction in final course grade. In these cases, the student might earn, for example, a C, end up with a D because of the grade reduction associated with the penalty, but not have to retake the course. Because C is a critical threshold for first-year writing, adding an additional penalty would have a disproportionate impact on the first-year writing student. For this reason, with approval from the Chair of the Board on Academic Honesty, when formal work is involved we assign a 0 for the work, but do not reduce the final course grade.

WSAP Penalties for for all other courses (non-PWR courses: 108, Extension, 245, 27X, etc.)

Please understand that any incident of academic dishonesty in this course will be reported to the Board on Academic Honesty and be subject to the academic honesty policy’s sanctioning guidelines.

If you want to add something about severity, you could consider adding the following:
Policy violations can affect not just your grade, but also your future applications for leadership positions and graduate schools, as well as your visa status in the case of suspension or expulsion.

Honor Pledge (Recommended, not required)
According to the College’s Academic Honesty Policy, all students are required to sign honor pledge on their examinations: “I affirm that I will not give or receive any unauthorized help on this exam, and that all work will be my own.”

It is recommended that instructors also require the following wording as a pledge on other graded assignments. (On work other than examinations, such as papers, students need only to include the pledge; they do not need to sign it.)

“I affirm that I have not given or received any unauthorized help on this assignment, and that this work is my own.”

If you ask students to include this pledge when submitting work, please communicate this expectation as part of your syllabus policies on academic honesty.

Please note that students are still responsible for upholding the Academic Honesty Policy, whether or not they are instructed to include an honor pledge.

Grading and Assessment

Syllabus Statement: Grading Policy
Your syllabus should briefly explain how each category of assignment will be graded. It is useful to provide information about each major type of graded assignment, its purpose within your course, and how it will be evaluated (homework assignments, formal papers, participation, etc.). Please grade formal papers using letters, as numbers suggest a degree of objectivity that is generally not reliable. It is also useful to be clear about your obligations to the students. Plan to return formal papers within one week of receiving them or before students have to turn in another draft, whichever comes first.

Please be sure that your grading procedures are transparent and explained in your syllabus. Your grading policy should communicate the following information to students:

- The major assignments and/or categories of assignments to be graded
- How each type of assignment will be graded (e.g., A – E; check minus, check, check plus; ungraded, etc.)
- How the overall course grade will be calculated (including grading percentages and grading scales)
- That students need at least a grade of C in WRT 105/E/A&B to satisfy the Primary Writing Requirement.

There are several grading models that support the goals of the WSAP including portfolio grading, contract grading, and traditional grading. Here is how a traditional model, frequently used in WRT courses, might be represented on a syllabus:

You must earn at least a grade of C in this course to satisfy the Primary Writing Requirement.
When breaking down the course grade into percentages for assignments (e.g., research paper) or a group of assignments (e.g., informal writing), consider how well the percentages reflect the relative importance of the assignment given the overall goals of the writing course. The research paper, for example, is the most important assignment of WRT 105/E and should therefore carry the most weight.

**Integrate Ungraded Informal Writing**

Remember to integrate *ungraded* informal writing so that students can use writing to discover and develop ideas without fear of “getting it wrong.” If you are assigning informal writing specifically for skill building—as opposed to exploration, discover, experimentation, you may (or may not) decide to grade it in a way that communicates degree of success to the student. In this case, consider a check/check minus or three-point scale approach, perhaps with the opportunity to redo the work until the skill has been mastered.

**Grading Formal Papers (Based on Criteria)**

Formal papers should be graded with letter grades. Numbers suggest a degree of precision that conflicts with our understanding of writing as a complex rhetorical act, and which also conflicts with our approach of grading formal papers holistically. In order to calculate course grades accurately, do not assign grade ranges to formal papers (e.g., B-/C+).

Assess formal assignments based on the learning objectives/grading criteria you have listed on the assignment prompt. Do not grade papers based on the degree of difference across drafts or the student’s “effort.” In short, “effort” is impossible to assess, as students’ writing processes are not visible to you and some students will try extremely hard, but still may produce writing below competence.

Here are some guidelines for assessing final versions of formal papers based on criteria:

- In general, an A-range paper may need a tweak here or there, but generally accomplishes all the expectations well.
- A B-range paper may need tweaking in many ways, or it might be quite effective in some ways but not others.
- A C-range paper carries out each expectation, but in a way that consistently requires some revision (as opposed to editing).
- A grade below a C fails to carry out several expectations in a competent way, or completely fails to address a key expectation.

**Grading Criteria versus Grading Rubrics**
Both instructors and students benefit from grading criteria that clearly establish the rhetorical context and expectations for an assignment. However, when these expectations are represented in a grading rubric, the paper is reduced to a large number of parts that are assessed in isolation. As a result, we all lose sight of the essay as a whole, which undermines our ability to teach writing as a complex rhetorical act. For this reason, we encourage you to develop grading criteria, but ask that you not use grading rubrics. Rather, PWR papers should be graded holistically; they should be evaluated as a whole, rather than a series of parts with particular point values.

**Calculating Course Grades**
For the sake of consistency across sections and to help instructors develop grading scales, the WSAP has developed a 100-point scale for calculating grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95 - 100</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 94</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 - 89</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 - 86</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 82</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 - 79</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 - 76</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 72</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 - 69</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 - 66</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 62</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 60</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When using grading scales to calculate final grades, you will need to “translate” letter grades for formal papers into numbers. Given our goal of equity for students, we ask that all instructors use the midpoint of the scale when converting letter grades to numerical scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Numerical Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No paper submitted</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Course Grades Below a “C” and the Extension Option**
It is our responsibility as WSAP instructors to honestly assess our students work and performance in the class based on course outcome criteria and grading policies. Students who earn a grade of C- or lower do not fulfill the Primary Writing Requirement. This often means that the student will need to retake a PWR course. In some cases, if the student has turned in all assignments and worked responsibly across the semester, he/she may be eligible to participate in the WRT Extension, a small workshop that enables students to continue working on and revising their writing for an additional semester. If you have a student who is not fulfilling the PWR, please speak with a WSAP director about the situation if you think he/she may be a candidate for the Extension, or, if you think that the student has faced circumstances over the semester that warrant the consideration of other possible options. Please also feel free to connect any student who is not fulfilling the PWR with WSAP director, as we can help the student identify the obstacles to success and create a plan for moving forward, perhaps in a more supported version of WRT (105E or 105AB).

**Final Course Grades of “E”, “N”, and “I”**

At the end of each semester, the WSAP holds a final grading meeting to address any questions about difficult grading situations and the Deans’ Office sends out a grading memo to all UR instructors. We also want to offer some extra guidance through brief descriptions of each grade as a supplement to the definitions you receive from the Deans’ Office.

For more information about University grading policies, see the Registrar’s webpage on grading: [https://www.rochester.edu/registrar/grading/](https://www.rochester.edu/registrar/grading/). The Registrar’s site includes an FAQ as well as information about submitting grades through Blackboard’s Instructor Access.

**E** (*a failing grade*) *is an assessment of a student's academic performance in your course.* If you assign an E, you are saying that the student has been present (though perhaps in a spotty way) throughout the semester, has completed the majority of the work, and has completed the final assignment.

**N** *means that you are not able to assess the student’s performance.* It should be given in the following situations:

- When a student had not attended,
- When--regardless of the reason--a student has not submitted the final assignment,
- When there is a pending plagiarism case in your course,
- When you have submitted an Instructor Warning Letter or Instructor Resolution Letter but have not received confirmation from the Board on Academic Honesty that is has been approved and that the student has completed the required follow-up tutorial. Note: this process should involve consulting with a WSAP director about the potential academic honesty case before you meet with the student.

**I** (*Incomplete*) *should be used when you and a student have agreed that an extenuating circumstance (e.g., a medical or personal emergency) warrants giving the student extra time to complete course work.* I is most appropriate when a student has missed one unit of the course; it can cause difficulty for you and the student if much of the course must be completed. In general, even in the case of medical or personal emergency, an I should not be used if it results in your re-teaching much of WRT 105 through an independent study.

If you have a compelling reason to award an I, please speak to Program Directors before discussing this option with the student. Finally, the grade of I must be accompanied by an Incomplete Contract form (signed by instructor and student), which is available in the Writing, Speaking, and Argument Program Office and in the College Center for Advising Services (312 Lattimore). Please give copies of Incomplete Contracts to the WSAP office and keep a copy for yourself. In addition, ask the student to keep the “student copy” and to
bring the “College Center for Advising Services” copy to CCAS (312 Lattimore).

**Extra Credit**
Most WSAP instructors do not include extra credit as part of their courses. If you do feel strongly about offering your students opportunities for extra credit, be sure to state this in your syllabus, and be sure that your policies around extra credit are clear, fair, equitable, and available to all students in your course. Extra credit may not be used to increase the grades of formal writing assignments.

**Quizzes, Exams, Tests**
PWR courses stress the use of writing to aid critical reading, problem definition, and discovery. We want students to understand the principles of academic writing that work across different disciplines and develop the ability to choose strategies that put these principles into practice. Quizzes help little or not at all in meeting these objectives. In fact, they might reinforce the view of writing that students often carry from high school: that writing is a prescribed set of steps, rules, and static strategies that can be mastered through memorization. In addition, quizzes and tests too closely resemble high school activities—a standard complaint that students have about WRT 105—and are often perceived as busy work. But more importantly, since this is a writing course that aims to teach students to write and research in the way more advanced students and faculty do, then we should as much as possible try to introduce them to the integrated reading/writing/research process that faculty engage in as they do their work.

Instead of scheduling quizzes that test students’ knowledge of readings, create exercises, in-class activities, or discussions that encourage students to use their knowledge actively—activities that students cannot complete without having done the reading.

**Handling Appeals for a Higher Grade from the Student**
**Program Policy.** If the student wants to revise the paper for a higher grade, explain that the WSAP policy is that no final drafts can be revised for a higher grade. However, through conversation with the student and/or seeking second readers, you might have reason to adjust the student’s paper grade.

If the student is contesting a grade, because they feel the grade they earned is unfair, in the spirit of open communication, listen well and remain open to a dialogue with the student. Remember Elbow and Belanoff's paradox, “the reader is always right; yet the writer is always right” (Peter Elbow and Pat Belanoff, *Sharing and Responding*, p. 4)

During this conversation, you and the student can discuss the paper. Listen to the writer’s concerns, and ask them to explain, with reference to the prompt and paper, where they see the piece achieving key outcomes of the assignment. This conversation may lead to a resolution. However, if you reach an impasse, or if the situation is particularly difficult (parents are involved, emotions involved), please consult with a WSAP director.

**Revision Policies**

**Syllabus Statement: Revision Policy**
Please explain clearly in your syllabus that students will be given an opportunity to develop and revise their work. To reflect our teaching philosophy, link the rationale for revisions to the principle of communication: to fully understand the meaning they’ve created in a text, writers need to review/reflect on their work and experience how it is interpreted by readers.
In all courses (without exception), once you assign a final grade to an essay or turn in a final course grade, a student may not revise for a higher grade.

Creating Space for Revision
Because feedback and revision are central to effective writing, all PWR courses must include at least one cycle of feedback and revision for each formal paper. The first draft that you receive from the student should be considered the first/rough draft and not graded as the final paper until the writer has had a chance to revise in response to feedback. If he/she has missed the opportunity to receive peer and/or instructor feedback, tutors at the Writing and Speaking Center can provide a reader’s response and feedback.

However you approach revision in your course, the process must be grounded in two principles: 1) students may revise as much as they would like before the paper is submitted for a grade; 2) once the paper has been graded, students may not revise the paper for a higher grade.

In your course calendar, clearly identify dates for the various stages that lead to revisions: first drafts, peer responses, personal conferences, second drafts, etc. Please allow enough time in the course calendar for you to return drafts to students (within a week) AND enough time for students to revise (at least a week).

Instructors currently use a number of acceptable models for sequencing feedback and revision that meet these requirements. For example, instructors choose different end points for the revision process, with some instructors asking for a final draft at the end of a unit (traditional model) and others asking for them at the end of a course (portfolio model). All these approaches are consistent with the program's philosophy, provided that your syllabus and assignments articulate your revision requirements and options.

Instructor Feedback
When commenting on a draft, don’t evaluate it as a final paper, but instead view the draft as an important step in the process of discovering and developing ideas through writing.

Here are some principles to keep in mind when commenting:

- Instructor comments should encourage students to think for themselves about difficulties with and ways to improve the essay.
- Instructor should encourage students to own their writing. (Consider: to what extent does the instructor present him/herself as one of a number of critical readers of the text? As expert?)
- Peer responses, reflections, and instructor’s comments should function together as a critical dialogue that guides the intelligent writer and supports the writer's control over the text.
- Instructor feedback should reflect a teacher functioning as a reader, teacher, coach—not editor. Feedback should support classroom instruction by focusing on the particular writing and thinking skills emphasized in class, readings, and pre-writings.
- Instructor feedback should enable the student to understand and build on the effective movements in his or her essay, as well as identify, explain, and point to strategies for solving problems.

In keeping with the principle of equity, WRT instructors are expected to share feedback with student-writers at least once per paper. However, for courses in which the argumentative research paper is the third formal assignment, instructor feedback on the fourth formal assignment may be optional. Some instructors consider their feedback on shorter or more creative final papers/projects as an optional complement to the feedback from peer response and self reflection—a perspective which is based on the belief that students' final
experiences in PWR courses should reflect expectations in upper-level writing courses, where students take greater responsibility for completing revisions and seeking out instructor feedback. If you hold the latter view and choose to make your input optional for one short formal assignment late in the semester (not including the argumentative research paper), then please articulate your approach and its purpose on your syllabus. Please also be very clear that any student still has the option to come to you for your input during this short final paper.

**Late/Missing Work Policies**

As with all course policies, policies surrounding late and missing course work should be clear and transparent to students. When designing these policies, keep your educational goals and teaching principles in mind. While it is important for students to maintain responsibility over their work and overall performance in the class, we also don’t want to create situations where students simply cannot catch up. This is particularly true for penalties around late first drafts—please think carefully about possible unintended consequences of these late penalties, which, if too steep, may prevent a student from writing a paper once he/she has fallen behind. (If a student is missing a substantial number of assignments and/or unexpectedly disappears from class, please follow up with a Program Director about how to address the situation.)

**Syllabus Statement: Late/Missing Work Policies**

Policies for late or missing work should be clearly stated in the syllabus. It can be helpful to frame these policies not as strictly punitive, but rather as tied to the larger goals of the course. In short, when students are missing work, they are also likely missing out on practicing important concepts and skills, engaging deeply with course texts, or participating meaningfully in class.

**Sample Policy: Informal Assignments/Homework**

Here is how the policy might sound for late informal assignments:

> Because informal homework assignments are designed as the basis for class discussion and as preparation for formal assignments, it is imperative that you complete them and turn them in on time. Therefore, I will not accept any informal assignments after the class period in which they are due. If you know that you are going to be absent, make arrangements to turn in your homework on time: you can submit the assignment on Blackboard, send me the assignment as an email attachment, or place a hard copy in my mailbox in the Writing, Speaking, and Argument Program Office (RR G-121). In the case of an emergency circumstance that has prevented you from being able to turn your work in on time, please contact me to discuss how you can complete the work.

This policy might be different in the case of illness or emergency. Ideally, the learning value is not completely lost if done after-the-fact.

**Sample Policy: Formal Assignments**

Instructors handle late first drafts in different ways; some include late first drafts in the late policy and others do not. Your late policy should be clear about whether it applies to all scheduled drafts of a paper, or just the final draft.

> This course moves at a rigorous pace and it will be difficult to catch up if you fall behind. If you are struggling with a paper, please contact me before the paper is due and I will be glad to help you utilize resources and support to enable you to submit your paper in a timely manner. If you do
not have a completed draft for the peer review workshop, your grade on the final draft of the paper will be reduced by 1/3 of a letter grade and you will be responsible for completing a peer review outside of class (with a classmate or a writing tutor). I may not be able to provide comprehensive comments and feedback on drafts that are turned in late. Although I will accept late final drafts, you will be penalized for turning in the paper late. Your grade will be lowered by 1/3 of a grade for each day that the final draft is late (including weekends and holidays). For example, if you turn in an A- paper one day late, the paper will receive a B+, two days late a B, etc. This penalty will freeze when you have reached a full two letter grade drop (this means, for example, that a B paper that is six or more days late can earn no higher than a D). In the case of an unusual or emergency circumstance that has prevented you from being able to turn your work in on time, please contact me to discuss how you can complete the work; in the cases of such circumstances the late penalties may be modified or waived completely.

For some instructors, papers are considered late if they are incomplete; that is, if they do not include particular elements (such as peer-reviewed drafts and self-reflections). In this case, you should specify what students should turn in with final drafts (e.g., all preliminary drafts, peer response, reflection). Here is an example of how this policy might be worded:

Please Note: If a paper is turned in without peer feedback and a reflection, it will be considered incomplete and will be subject to the late paper policy, outlined above, until all requirements are met.

It helps to restate this policy on each formal assignment prompt.

Extension Policy

Syllabus Statement: Extensions
Every WRT syllabus should include clear policies around late and missing work. Additionally, it is helpful to supplement late policies with an invitation to students to come and talk to you if and when they need an extension. As with all course policies, be sure any policies around extensions are fair and equitable for each student in your course. If you grant an extension to one or a few students for a test or sporting event, offer extensions to the entire class. The exception would be an extension for a student who has had extenuating health or personal circumstances which have prevented him/her from working on and completing the paper on time; in this case the extension provides the student an equitable amount of time to complete the work.

When granting extensions for class assignments, it is helpful to put this in writing so that both you and your student have a clear understanding of the terms of the extension.

Accommodations
Occasionally, you may have a student with a documented disability whose accommodations include extensions. In these cases, instructors would be notified by CETL (Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning) and often work with CETL to develop a plan which is reasonable for both student and instructor.
Participation Policy (If Graded)
A syllabus statement is required if participation is graded; if not graded, a statement about active/meaningful participation is still recommended.

This statement should describe the basic expectations for student involvement in the class. You do not have to grade participation, but it still might be a good idea to describe your expectations for student engagement and class atmosphere. If you do grade attendance/participation, your policy should not be used in a way that undermines learning and teaching objectives. For example, assigning a 0 for attendance/participation for X number of missed classes might result in the student’s withdrawing from participating in classes he/she attends after such penalties are enforced. Instead of stressing how participation/attendance points can be lost, stress how they can be gained. Consider positive incentives in place of negative incentives. For example, tie attendance to meaningful participation (peer response, writing portions of an essay in class, informal writing, presenting questions on reading, getting feedback on ideas, etc.). These are all ways that students can have a meaningful role in the course and help shape and own their learning. If all these things are happening, then a penalty for lack of attendance is no longer necessary.

If you are doing a lot of teaching and modeling in class, students who miss these activities will not be able to demonstrate proficiency in the skills those activities model. Thus, missed classes will be reflected in the grade the student receives for individual assignments and for the course in general.

Policies that replace solving an attendance problem with negative consequences ultimately undermine teaching and learning. When students start missing class, it might be a moment for the instructor to ask why this is happening. (Does the class respond to this student’s needs? Is there something going on in the student’s life that prevents him/her from coming to class?)

Finally, policies that fail students because they have missed too many classes can come in direct conflict with the College grading policies and cannot be included on syllabi.

Please remember that participation should be defined in a way that goes beyond the idea that participating means talking a lot. Participation and engagement can happen in a variety of ways (active listening, asking questions, reading aloud, online posts, in-class writing, etc.) and these ways should be described for students.

Sensitive Material Statement
If your course includes unusually violent, sexually explicit, or otherwise potentially disturbing materials, please add a short warning to your course description and syllabus. This need not be much, perhaps something as simple as:

Please be aware that this course has violent or highly graphic sexual content [whichever pertains] that some may find upsetting. Please feel free to contact the instructor for more information.

Statements about Support Services: CETL
We have worked with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) to develop a program statement for WRT syllabi that would invite (but not require) students with special needs to speak with instructors about their learning needs. Please use this statement for your syllabus:

Please know that this classroom respects and welcomes students of all backgrounds and
abilities, and that I invite you to talk with me about any concern or situation that affects your ability to complete your academic work successfully.

If you wish, you might also mention the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) as a resource for all students. CETL “supports undergraduate students in the College with services that promote academic success, including course-specific collaborative study groups, study skills counseling, a study skills course, and disability support.” (CETL provides support for graduate students as well: they support graduate-student work as classroom TAs, laboratory TAs, and instructors. Graduate students are also welcome to make use of services that support their own learning.)

The following statement comes from the CETL website:

CETL is a resource available to all students in the College. All kinds of students with all kinds of GPAs and academic records make use of our programs. We work with strong students who wish to become even better, as well as with students who have not yet tapped into the strategies needed to succeed in college, and everyone in between. We offer an extensive study group and Workshop program, individual study skills counseling, study skills workshops and a study skills course, and disability support. We are located in 1-154 Dewey Hall on the River Campus. To make an appointment or to learn more, stop by our offices, call us at (585) 275-9049, or send an email: cetl@rochester.edu.

**Statements about Support Services: The Writing and Speaking Center**

It is important to emphasize that the Writing and Speaking Center is not just for struggling writers. Instead, introduce the Writing and Speaking Center services by stressing the idea that the Writing and Speaking Center is a place where students can get critical feedback:

At the University of Rochester, we all communicate as writers and speakers, and every writer and speaker needs an audience. The Writing and Speaking Center is a free resource available to all members of the University—undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty. The Writing and Speaking Center welcomes visitors who are at any stage of the writing process, from brainstorming ideas to polishing a final draft. Similarly, students can visit a Speaking Fellow at any point as they are developing or practicing a presentation. To learn more about the Writing and Speaking Center's services and/or to find a tutor, please visit [http://writing.rochester.edu](http://writing.rochester.edu).

At the beginning of each semester, the Writing and Speaking Center Coordinator invites all writing instructors to schedule class visits from experienced Consultants who can introduce their services to WRT students.

**Addressing Cases of Suspected Academic Dishonesty**

If you suspect plagiarism or some other form of academic dishonesty, speak with a Program Director before addressing the issue with your student. Regardless of where the plagiarism occurs (informal or formal writing; first, second, or final draft), it should be addressed and considered seriously. For more information about handling cases of suspected plagiarism (including how to determine if it is an instance of patch writing or an educational issue), please see the WSAP’s “Guidelines for Dealing with Suspected Cases of Academic Dishonesty”.
In undergraduate courses in which dishonesty results from inexperience, a Warning Letter may be issued in lieu of a penalty. Please consult with a director and refer to the College’s Academic Honesty site for information and instructions: https://www.rochester.edu/college/honesty/instructors.html#warning.

Supporting Students of Concern
Due to small WRT class sizes, instructors often get to know their students very well. This has many benefits including that you will be able to offer individualized feedback to your students and get to know them as writers. It also means that you may be one of the first people on campus to notice when a student is struggling. Part of our role as instructors, particularly instructors of first-year students, is that we identify and support students in need. Typically, instructors become concerned when a student has significant difficulty with the work of the course, has a pattern of missing class or assignments, becomes unresponsive to email, shares information about struggles related to academic or personal life, or exhibits concerning behaviors or changes in behavior.

WSAP and the College have many resources to help students, and the earlier we connect students to resources, the better their chances of succeeding in your course and other courses. We ask that you work with Program Directors and campus resources to connect students with the help they need.

For students having significant difficulties with your class, please resist the urge to draw conclusions about why they are not performing to your expectations. As we all know, life can be very difficult and complicated, and no matter how well we know our students, our experience with them is only one part of their lives. Outside of class, a remarkably varied and unimaginable set of circumstances may be interfering with a student's ability to participate in and complete assignments for your course. While the student is ultimately responsible for their work, we aim to be sure that we provide students with opportunities to get the support they need to work through their difficulties. This often begins with an instructor meeting with the student to learn about what is making it difficult for the student to succeed and ideally leads to a plan for moving forward. When the student is having significant difficulty or has unexpectedly disappeared from class, instructors should consult with a Program Director, who will help determine if a CARE referral and/or midterm warning is appropriate.

Please also know that it is never too early to consult with Program Directors about a situation. The earlier we know about a possible problem, the better able we are to help the student and the instructor have a positive semester. Often these situations are quite complex, and Program Directors can access additional information about the student’s history. While they cannot share this information with you (because of student confidentiality), they can advise you about the next steps based on the specific circumstances of the student. Consulting with Program Directors can also provide a helpful outside perspective and can help ensure that instructors are dealing with the situation fairly (including helping instructors not become too emotionally invested). Moreover, there are sometimes additional options for completing the PWR that might be a good option for the student (again, depending on the specific situation). Above all, our goal is to avoid end-of-the-semester crises, while supporting both you and your students.

CARE Referrals
When you are concerned about a student in your course, because of either behavior or academic performance, your first step should be to contact a Program Director. Depending on the situation, they may advise that you submit a CARE referral.
The CARE network enables members of the University community to express their concern about a person, incident, or issue by submitting one of the following reports online:

- **CARE referral** (if you have a concern about an individual student or yourself)
- **Bias-related concern** (if you know of an incident motivated by age, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, national origin, race, religion, or sexual orientation)
- **Community concern** (if you have a concern that impacts the UR community, such as a humanitarian concern or natural disaster)

Submitting a referral initiates a review process and/or coordinated response involving the appropriate individuals, staff, and offices. Currently, the CARE team comprises a representative from Residential Life, UR Public Safety, UCC, graduate relations, the College Center for Academic Support, and the Office of the Dean of Students.

Once a student had been identified as needing support, the CARE team can best respond with an inclusive, suitable response often engaging the individual(s) most closely connected with the student in need. Connecting with students in distress can take on many forms (emails, phone calls, check-ins from a resident assistant, communication with instructors, etc.). The appropriateness of each contact method is addressed by the CARE team and is determined on a case-by-case basis.

For more information about the CARE network, visit the FAQ: [https://www.rochester.edu/CARE/faq.html](https://www.rochester.edu/CARE/faq.html)

**CARE-WSAP Reporting Processes**

**WSAP Process for Emergency Situations**: In an emergency situation (e.g., student might harm themselves or others), please contact Public Safety (275-3333) and/or the UCC emergency line (275-3113).

**WSAP Process for Non-Emergency Situations**: If you believe a situation might warrant a CARE referral, and if you believe that the situation is not so serious that it cannot wait 24 hours, begin by contacting Program Directors about the situation. Based on your account and our information about the student, we will recommend the next action, which will likely be some combination of reaching out to the student, submitting a mid-term warning, and/or submitting a CARE referral. This system will help the CARE team know that WSAP program directors are assessing the situation from an academic perspective, assure them that certain steps have already been taken, and help all of us stay equally well informed about students of concern.

After you have submitted a CARE referral, please let WSAP Program Directors and the CARE system know about any changes in the situation with the student (e.g., student is now doing well), and always feel free to ask to discuss a situation.

**Submitting a CARE Referral**

You can submit a referral online: [http://www.rochester.edu/care/reports.html](http://www.rochester.edu/care/reports.html)

Here’s more information about what happens after referrals are submitted.

**Mid-Term Warnings: For Students Earning Below a C**

When you are concerned about a student in your course, because of either behavior or academic performance, your first step should be to contact a Program Director. Depending on the situation, they may advise that you submit a mid-term warning.
Each semester, the University Registrar sends an email regarding mid-term grade reporting. This message indicates a time frame during which instructors are able to submit mid-term grade reports via Instructor Access for any students who are not performing satisfactorily in the course. While the University asks for reports on any students whose work is below a C-, the WSAP asks that instructors teaching PWR courses submit mid-term warnings for any student whose current grade in the course is below a C; this is because we want to flag all students who are at risk of failing to earn the C necessary to fulfill the PWR.

When a midterm warning is submitted, a warning letter about the student’s unsatisfactory progress is sent to both the student and their adviser. This process is designed to encourage early notification to students who may be experiencing academic difficulties in courses and to initiate discussions about their options and potential supports for their work in the class.