SENATE BILL 10/11 - ___: Proposal for a Writing Intensive (WI) requirement

Date: 3 May 2011

From: Writing Intensive (WI) Requirement Task Force:
  Paul Eisenstein (chair), Dean, School of Arts & Sciences
  Maggie Ellison, Business Administration major (2010 graduate)
  Joan Esson, Department of Chemistry
  Regina Kenga, Academic Support Center
  Margaret Koehler, Department of English
  David Levine, Department of Education

Proposal: To formalize a WI requirement for all students at Otterbein

This proposal was presented for the purpose of soliciting feedback to

- the Center for Teaching and Learning on 26 April 2010
- the Academic Support Center on 28 April 2010
- the Department of English on 29 April 2010
- the chairs in the School of Arts & Sciences on 4 May 2010
- the chairs in the School of Professional Studies on 4 May 2010
- faculty and students in the School of Arts & Sciences on 13 October 2010

The proposal below was revised many times in light of the feedback we received.

School of Arts & Sciences discussion and vote on 27 October 2010:

For 38  Against 20  Abstain 4

School of Professional Studies discussion and vote on 14 October 2010:

For 23  Against 3  Abstain 4

University Curriculum Committee discussion and vote on 1 November 2010 and 2 May 2011. Amended proposal adopted on 2 May 2011:

For 14  Against 0  Abstain 0

Impetus and Rationale for proposed addition

The Writing Intensive Requirement Task force was charged by Provost Gökê-Parîolâ on 31 March 2010 to explore and develop the formation of a requirement that would recognize the importance of the foundational writing instruction performed in English department-staffed general education composition courses and the discipline-specific writing instruction performed across the curriculum at Otterbein.

1 An electronic copy of the proposal was sent to chairs on 5 May 2010 for distribution to faculty and/or discussion at departmental meetings.
The existence of WI requirements is an outgrowth of an educational reform that dates back to the early 1980s, when colleges and universities in the U.S. began to develop writing-across-the-curriculum (or WAC) programs. These programs were “aimed at changing practices in the classroom, increasing the amount of and attention to writing in all classes, improving the assignments, and changing the awareness of teachers in all fields to the role of writing in learning” (Bazerman, et. al. 38). Research on the efficacy of these programs has tended to take the shape of ethnographic or case studies that examine the developmental impact of WAC courses on student writing and learning in particular disciplines. Other studies have examined the development of instructors as they have sought to incorporate writing and writing pedagogy in their classes. These studies tend to describe writing and write-to-learn approaches, strategies, and activities in discipline-specific courses, and to distill the lessons learned from their implementation in specific courses. One significant exception to the ethnographic research is the tiered assessment research results of George Mason University, which measures the competence of student writers using holistic assessment of student writing artifacts—both in a general education required course and in the majors. A second exception is the study conducted by Diane Riordan, Michael Riordan, and M. Cathy Sullivan that, using a pre-test and post-test design and control/treatment group comparison, found that a writing across the curriculum project in three junior-level courses in the Accounting major significantly improved student’s writing skills. What many studies show is that the flourishing of writing in the disciplines is linked directly with the provision of resources and with a clear, open and ongoing alignment of course goals, writing assignments, and writing pedagogies with the larger mission of teaching writing in all parts of the university. In short, it is not simply the case that having students write, or write more, in class makes for better writers. As Lia Brillhart and Mary Beth Debs argued in their now almost thirty-year old essay, “Teaching Writing—A Scientist’s Responsibility,” good writing is not the outcome simply of more assignments but rather of instructional methods that place side by side the consideration of important disciplinary concepts and the critical elements of discipline-specific writing. In his High Impact Educational Practices (American Association of Colleges & Universities, 2008), George Kuh names Writing Intensive courses as one of ten practices essential to students’ active and cumulative learning. According to Kuh, the practice of highlighting—and getting students to practice—writing across the curriculum can increase rates of student retention, success, and engagement. Writing Intensive courses appear increasingly to be a “best practice” at institutions of every size and shape (e.g., from the Universities of Wisconsin, Missouri, and Rutgers, to Indiana U of Pennsylvania and Miami U of Ohio, to Carleton, Davidson, and Meredith Colleges). They do not, however, exist at all Schools, let alone all of the schools in our Benchmarking Peer and Aspirant Group. For an overview of some of what we found, see appendix A.

Mission

---

2 See, for instance, Baehls, Faigley and Hansen, North, Roost, Russek, and Walvoord and McCarthy.
3 At George Mason, individual depts. developed their own discipline-specific rubrics to score writing in the major). For this info, see: [http://wac.gmu.edu/assessing/assessing_the_requirement.php](http://wac.gmu.edu/assessing/assessing_the_requirement.php)
4 For useful overviews of the research devoted to the efficacy of writing across the curriculum efforts, see Bazerman and Russell.
The Writing Intensive (WI) Requirement at Otterbein seeks to build and sharpen the writing abilities of our undergraduate students. We believe that the teaching of writing is inseparable from the cultivation of critical thinking and the development of disciplinary expertise. We affirm that a liberal arts education is the ideal context for fostering students’ appreciation of good writing and for building the skills they need to craft clear and graceful prose for varied purposes. In both Integrative Studies and departmental courses, we believe that students grapple more deeply and more imaginatively with course material when they are engaged in writing. We support the idea that the English department faculty has an integral role to play in the teaching of good writing. We believe, too, that it is the responsibility of every major and program to make writing—and writing instruction—an integral component of undergraduate students’ experience. Good writing takes many forms, and can flourish in many contexts when it is nourished by intensive and carefully planned instruction. At the heart of the Requirement’s design is our commitment to writing and writing pedagogy; to faculty development and mentoring resources for those creating and teaching Writing Intensive courses; and to a strengthened relationship between participating courses and the student writing assistants in the Writing Center.

The Requirement [note: highlighted portion signifies amended portions of the proposal]

1. Beginning with the Autumn 2011 incoming class, all students will complete two writing courses: one foundational writing instruction class and one in their major, that will carry the WI designation:

2. Beginning with the Autumn 2013 incoming class, all students will complete three writing courses: one foundational writing instruction class and two others carrying the WI designation, at least one of which must be in the major:

The requirement— at first two courses and then three— would be met as follows:

- INST 1500: the first-year writing seminar in the Integrative Studies program is a dedicated composition course, which instructs students in foundational writing principles and competencies. All sections of INST 1500 will therefore carry the WI designation. The thread name for this course in the INST Program is Identity Projects (see [www.otterbein.edu/IS/Identity%20Projects/ THREAD.pdf](http://www.otterbein.edu/IS/Identity%20Projects/ THREAD.pdf) for general descriptions and learning outcomes of this thread). As the academic unit charged with staffing this thread, the English department will enumerate specific guidelines and standards for this course (for a draft of these, see appendix B).

- A disciplinary course in a student’s major that carries the WI designation. All major programs will have at least one required course carrying the WI designation.\(^5\) While not a dedicated composition course in the manner of...

---

\(^5\) This course might be the last in a required sequence of courses unified by a common writing assignment and writing pedagogy.
INST 1500, this course shall instruct students in discipline-specific ways of writing.

- To complete the third WI course, students might elect: a second Integrative Studies course that carries the WI designation; a second course in their major that carries the WI designation; a course that carries the WI designation in a second major or a minor field of study; or a WI-designated elective of their choosing.

- So as to give a developmental trajectory to the three course requirement, INST 1500 shall be the co-requisite or prerequisite to other WI courses. Ideally, students would complete the requirement by taking INST 1500 their first year, and then taking a second WI course their sophomore or junior year, and a final WI course their senior year. Departments should be cognizant of this developmental sequencing when developing their WI course(s) and when advising students.

Note: AP Exams and IB diplomas will not earn students INST 1500 credit, but will instead earn them credit in a different, expository writing course in the English department. Since this course is going to be a WI course, we propose that this would count as one of the three required WI courses.

Criteria for participating classes

The criteria we set forth below are intended to be generative rather than prescriptive. We understand that the English department has developed a clear set of expectations and standards for writing instruction in INST 1500 courses (see, again, Appendix B). We also believe that faculty who want to propose and develop a WI version of courses within the thread INST courses will find the criteria below to complement their other learning goals. There is the possibility, too, of dyad or SYE courses earning the WI designation. Moreover, the criteria articulated below are intentionally flexible to accommodate the writing conventions and formats unique to individual disciplines. We believe departments and disciplines should ask and answer for themselves the question: “What kind of writing do our graduates need to be able to do?”

Keeping in mind the diversity of disciplines across the University, we have elected not to set quantitative expectations. The kinds of writing assigned in a Studio Art course, a Nursing course, a course in Computer programming, or a course in American History are likely to vary widely. We do expect, however, that the Advisory Committee overseeing the requirement will consider questions of quantity in the context of the norms and skill sets appropriate to specific disciplines. Some disciplines, for instance, may emphasize instruction

---

6 We have heard from at least one department that wishes to offer two WI major courses—one of which would be in the first year. In such a department, the first WI course would have INST 1500 as a co-requisite. We do not believe students should take a disciplinary WI course before taking INST 1500. Moreover, we believe it should not be possible for students to complete the requirement in their first year.
in—and the practice and production of—shorter, real-time writing artifacts. Others may stress longer papers or reports that are planned, drafted, and revised.

Courses participating in the requirement will

- Devote ongoing and deliberate attention to the value and characteristics of good writing
- Define writing goals that are explicitly linked to the course's learning outcomes
- Guide students to understand writing as a process shaped and informed by instruction—with stages that include thinking, planning, drafting, peer and/ or teacher feedback, revision, editing and proofreading
- Provide students with multiple forms of feedback on their writing. These forms can include peer review, individual conferences, small group workshops, written comments, and consultation with Writing Center writing assistants
- Contain three or more writing assignments, at least one of which includes feedback, revision, and/or the opportunity to use or apply feedback to a subsequent writing opportunity. These assignments may be components of one significant assignment, multiple shorter assignments, or some combination of the two. Assignments can include papers, posters, literature reviews, lab reports, artists' statements, technical manuals or directions, interoffice memos, web pages, learning logs, and other forms and types of writing appropriate to the discipline
- Employ informal, ungraded writing assignments
- Teach students how to assess, credit, and cite source texts
- Be limited in enrollment, where possible, to 20-24 students. Courses in excess of this cap may have a graduate or undergraduate writing assistant(s) assigned to them who will play an active role in providing feedback on writing

Learning Outcomes

After completing the WI requirement at Otterbein, students will be able to

- Describe the processes that undergird their own writing and the way these processes developed over time
- Demonstrate command of foundational writing principles and competencies as well as the principles and competencies unique to their discipline. These principles and competencies include: identifying and defining a thesis or central claim; articulating a credible and logical argument; presenting evidence, analysis, or reflective commentary with clarity and organization; seeking, receiving and using feedback for revision; and attending to lower-order concerns such as style, mechanics, and grammar
- Effectively seek and use feedback for revision
Write an essay that advances a central claim and supports it with evidence and analysis.

Describe and demonstrate the norms, conventions and rhetorical moves characteristic of their discipline and produce at least one example of a discipline-specific writing artifact.

Transition and Implementation

Because the launch of the WI requirement coincides with semester transition and curricular transformation at Otterbein, we recognize that some departments may initially feel concerned about adequate time to designate, create, and/or equip oneself to teach a WI course in the major, or about space for another requirement in an already tight set of requirements for graduation. The amendment introduced at the Curriculum Committee was in large part motivated by a desire to address these concerns. The following observations are also worth mentioning:

- From our conversations with colleagues across the university, we know that almost every single department is already doing writing instruction and will thus be identifying—rather than creating—the department’s WI course.

- WI courses in the major would not need to be identified until sometime next year, since incoming first-year students in Autumn 2011 will be taking INST 1500—the first of the two-course requirement.

- Since the 3-course WI requirement will not take effect until autumn 2013, it would not likely be until the 2014-15 school year that various “third options” be in place. In response to concerns about where students would take their third WI course, we point out that 26% of current students carry either a second major or a minor and would likely meet their third WI course requirement in the second major or the minor. We also know of a few majors that already will have more than one course in the major flagged as WI, and with the extra time built into the proposal, additional departments might identify second WI courses in their curricula. Finally, though we cannot identify specific courses (since there will not be incentive to create them until Otterbein adopts a Writing Intensive requirement), we imagine that some students will meet that third WI requirement in an Integrative Studies thread course designated as WI, or in INST-approved substitutes. Appendix C is a rough estimate of the number of students (from our present vantage point) who might need an INST course to meet the three course WI requirement.

- Finally, there will be prerequisite-less WI courses at the 2000 level in some departments (e.g., English, History & Political Science) that students can take as electives to fulfill the requirement.

---

7 In Autumn 2010, 694 out of 2657 (or 26.1%) of registered undergraduates were registered as carrying more than just a single major—i.e., either a second major or one (or more) minor(s). This number might go down given the small uptick in the size of majors on semesters.
In short, the phased-in approach of the requirement strikes a balance between doing nothing to signal the University’s commitment to the teaching of writing and moving with a speed that compromises the quality of the instruction we are able to deliver.

**Oversight of the Requirement**

For the WI requirement to fulfill its mission, an advisory committee shall need to be convened to oversee it. We recommend that the Provost appoint a Chair for this committee. Membership should be made up of rotating faculty members drawn from a variety of disciplines—two representatives from the School of Professional Studies and two from the School of Arts & Sciences. In addition to these rotating members, the Committee should include one standing representative from the Academic Support Center, the English department, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Integrative Studies Program. One student from each School should also be appointed to the Committee. Ideally, one of these students should be a writing assistant from the Writing Center. The advisory committee shall approve new participating courses and monitor existing ones; plan and implement an assessment mechanism (this might include a future connection with e-portfolios or other programmatic and/or departmental assessment mechanisms); and collaborate with the Center for Teaching and Learning on the provision of faculty development opportunities for those who want to develop and enrich their own writing pedagogies. We propose that the Advisory Committee report its membership and its information about approved courses to the University Curriculum Committee (and thus to the Senate), so that the entire University is able to see who is overseeing the requirement and so the whole university can see each year what the existing WI courses are and what the new WI courses are. Finally, we propose that the Advisory Committee chair report to the Provost and Deans in the course of the requirement’s implementation for the purpose of assisting or working with departments who might be struggling to develop courses to fulfill the requirement.

**Effect of Addition on Staffing**

We believe that appropriate faculty expertise to deliver the requirement is already present or can be gained by present faculty. Present personnel and expertise in the department of English is already such that the role of INST 1500 in this requirement requires no additional staffing. We believe, too, that many departments are already offering courses that carry out discipline-specific writing instruction. The degree to which the writing pedagogies in these courses needs to be sharpened no doubt varies. As should be clear from what appears above, the goal of the requirement is to make more visible the intentional, discipline-specific writing instruction that exists in departments. The staffing impact we see centers largely on the INST courses that apply to stand as WI courses, though there are likely to be departments that are increasing by one the number of credits of a particular course so as to attend to discipline-specific writing (which would require overload compensation). The proposal asks that WI courses be capped where possible at between twenty and twenty-four students, or that courses in excess of this number have a writing assistant assigned to them.

---

8 One department we heard from has indicated, for instance, that a one-credit hour course in their new curriculum might jump to two credits as it incorporates instruction in writing specific to the disciplines it houses.
If a series of them are capped at this number, this might necessitate the creation of an additional section of a particular INST thread course. See Appendix C for our best approach of this issue.

Need of Curricular Addition for Academic Support

For the requirement to flourish, resources will need to be made available to faculty in both Schools. These resources can take several forms. These include

- Money for faculty attendance at conferences and workshops devoted to writing and writing pedagogy (e.g., Bard Institute for Thinking and Writing, The Center for Writing Excellence at Miami University of Ohio, Cornell Consortium for Writing in the Disciplines, etc.).
- Faculty development workshops convened on our own campus that feature outside experts, faculty members from the English department (or, depending on focus, from other departments) and that are devoted to elements of writing and writing pedagogy. Resources should be devoted to workshops with both broad and discipline-specific appeal. Broad-appeal topics might include: using peer review in the classroom; teaching the longer paper; commenting on student writing; responding to drafts; teaching writing with technology, etc. We acknowledge that, especially at the outset of this requirement, disciplines might need resources aimed at the integration of writing instruction into disciplinary courses.
- Expansion of Writing Center to train and house more writing assistants.
- Development of Supplemental Instruction model, with a Writing Center assistant attached, assigned, or otherwise incorporated into Writing Intensive courses.
- Professional Learning Community devoted to writing, writing pedagogy, and Writing Across the Curriculum.
- Availability of resource texts (e.g., Writing-Based Teaching: Essential Practices and Enduring Questions).
- Promotion and development of on-line journals or writing contests that would feature exemplary writing across the curriculum.
- Devotion of a Fall Faculty Conference to the teaching of writing.
- Membership in Consortia, Email Discussion Groups, or other groups devoted to the teaching of writing across the curriculum.

We expect the provision of resources to commence on the heels of the requirement’s adoption, the formation of the Advisory Committee, and the identification of its chair. We know that a small number of departments might be planning a 1000-level WI course in their major, but the majority is likely to explore a 2000 or 3000-level course as their WI course(s). While this means that the majority of departments have a year or more to develop their WI courses, we believe that there is no reason to delay in the provision of resources to departments with faculty members who want to explore making their courses into WI ones. Leslie Ortquist-Ahrens, director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, has expressed a willingness on the part of the CTL potentially to dedicate some of the CTL’s Professional
Development Activities next year—e.g., learning communities, reading groups, symposia, webinars, faculty workshops—to the theme of Writing

**Myths and Facts about Writing Intensive Courses**

**Myth:** I assign a couple of lab reports or a fifteen-twenty page paper in my course, so my courses are already writing intensive.

**Myth:** In a writing intensive course, teachers read, comment on, and grade an unlimited number of drafts of a single paper . . . until a student's work warrants an A.

**Myth:** The teaching of writing is the responsibility of the secondary schools from which our students arrive and of the English department, whose teachers are trained to correct the errors that appear in student writing.

**Myth:** Teaching writing takes too much time, interfering with key course learning goals.

**Myth:** Teaching writing means marking up a student's paper so that he or she is made aware of every single stylistic or mechanical error.

**Facts:** Foundational writing instruction courses and writing intensive courses are not simply measured by the amount of finished pages a student produces in one, or simply by the fact that the course grade is determined in part by a writing assignment(s). Instead, foundational writing instruction and writing intensive courses attend to writing as a process, building in opportunities for feedback and revision. These opportunities for feedback and revision are designed to lead students to see writing as a process, as a skill one improves over time, and are not unlimited. This feedback goes well beyond the correction of editing and proofreading errors, and it can and should involve more than just the teacher, making use, for instance, of peer review or the Writing Center. The teaching of good writing—especially in the disciplines—requires the commitment of everyone. In writing intensive courses, students do not simply learn to write but write to learn. The writing in such courses is thus inseparable from their learning goals.

**Appendix A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creighton</td>
<td>four approved WI courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>one Writing Efficiency course in core curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>one Writing Workshop course in core curriculum; one WI in major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamline</td>
<td>one WI per year; one must be in the major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon</td>
<td>Foundational writing course, WAC program but not clear if WI courses are required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fairfield. WI in honors program
Drake WI in FYS, writing intensive honors program
Butler one WI junior or senior-level course within the major
John Carroll one English composition course, and one WI course in major
Ithaca College 100-level writing course, nothing else I could find
George Mason at least one WI in the major at 300 level or above
Belmont two required core composition courses
Hampton two required courses in written communication
Pacific Lutheran two required WI courses; Inquiry Seminar (taken first or second year, fulfills one.)
Susquehanna one Writing and Thinking in core plus two WI
U of Redlands two WI: one in core in first year, one in major
Wagner two WI: one in first-year reflective tutorial and on ein Literature (WI lit. courses designated with a “W”)
Westminster (PA) one composition course for all entering students, plus two WI courses, the first to be taken by end of sophomore year
Mount Union three WI in three different disciplines (“Disciplines can be housed in the same department”)
Oberlin “certification of proficiency in writing from two different Oberlin College instructors who have taught the student in specially designed ‘writing intensive’ or ‘writing certification’ courses in two different departments or programs
Wright State six WI courses—four in general education and two in the major field of study
Villanova four WI and four WE (writing enriched)
Kent State one WI in the major

9 Website description contains the following proviso: “In rare instances, a student may use a writing-intensive course from another discipline if approved by the student's major department or school.” We include this here as a signal that a department might choose a course from a different department to serve as its disciplinary WI course.
Duquense: four WI beyond the two course core writing sequence; at least two in the major

Sewanee: two WI—one core writing and one in major

U of Tampa: three WI beyond two course core writing sequence

Ohio Wesleyan: freshman writing plus three WI courses

Baldwin Wallace: two-semester (one year) writing course

Wittenberg: English 101 for everyone plus seven WI courses, including two in the major

College of Wooster: one composition course plus 1 WI course

Ohio State: three-course sequence (110, 367, and one writing course in the major)

University of Pittsburgh: introductory composition plus 2 WI courses

Carleton College: three Writing-Rich courses

Swarthmore College: three WI courses

Cornell University: first year writing seminar, expository writing course, and a writing in the majors course

Appendix B

Draft of Additional Disciplinary Learning Outcomes for INST 1500

1. To read and think closely, creatively, analytically, and innovatively.

2. To articulate a clear, critical thesis in an introduction.

3. To support a thesis with relevant and varied forms of evidence and sustained critical analysis.

4. To substantially revise one's own writing using instructor comments and peer reviews.

5. To craft sentences and paragraphs which demonstrate correct and effective mechanics, grammar, usage, and style.

6. To begin to develop creative and novel ways of framing an argument; and to engage multiple points of view, distinct audiences, and interdisciplinary perspectives.
Works Cited


Appendix C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Needed WI sections outside major (max)</th>
<th>Number of current majors (from Autumn 2010 Census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Acct and Econ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem (and Biochem)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equine Science</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Sports Science</td>
<td>1-2 (depends on major; calculated at half)</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Political Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology and Earth Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Sciences(^\text{10})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Philosophy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre and Dance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students without a 2(^\text{nd}) major or minor (^\text{11})</td>
<td>1738 X 0.74</td>
<td>1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total per class (Total/4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total WI sections needed (322/ 20\(^\text{12}\)) (MAX) = 16.1
Number of INST thread sections needed to cover same number (322 / 35) = 9.2
Number of additional sections needed = 6.9

Number of additional sections needed in majors to support WI (as reported by departments):
- Communication: 2 sections
- Biology and Earth Science: 1 section @ 2-3 hours

NOTE: Above estimates accounts neither for those who will earn a WI for AP or IB credit, nor for majors who have a second, non-required WI course in their curriculum (e.g., Psychology), nor for those taking an INST sub carrying a WI designation.

\(^{10}\) At last report, the Math and Computer Science majors were likely to have one WI course but Actuarial Science might not.

\(^{11}\) At the Autumn 2010 census, 26% of students had declared a second major or minor.

\(^{12}\) The proposal states that enrollment in a WI course would be capped “where possible” to 20. INST 270 & INST 300—the second and third composition and literature courses in the previous INST curriculum—were capped at 24. If the cap were 24, that would change the total WI sections needed from 16.1 to 13.4.