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Kelly Bradbury, Sue Doe, and Mike Palmquist
Colorado State University

In this chapter, we share the story of Colorado State University's gtPathways Writing Integration Project through a lens of activity theory, highlighting the ways in which each of us, over the course of fifteen years, has met with institutional networks that have and continue to inform, shape, and challenge the goals and the work of the project. Readers can glean from our story insights about the complexities involved in undertaking, developing, and maintaining a socially just writing across the curriculum program amidst an array of changing institutional players and forces. While it is in many ways a story of missed opportunities, it is also a story of localized triumphs, perseverance, and long-term dedication to supporting meaningful work happening from the bottom up.

I think this is a great solution to the problem.
—Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, Late September, 2005

In its current form, unfortunately, it’s likely to fail.
—Mike Palmquist, Early October, 2005

In 2005, facing a mandate from the Colorado legislature that writing instruction be integrated into core courses in the arts, humanities, and social sciences, the vice provost for undergraduate affairs at Colorado State University (CSU) came up with a promising idea. With support from the provost as well as the vice provost for graduate affairs, he secured 75 new graduate teaching assistant lines, all of which would be held by the graduate school and allocated as needed to departments teaching the core courses.\(^1\) Drawing on his experience years earlier

\(^1\) Authorship is alphabetical.
\(^2\) With the exception of Psychology 100, these courses are housed in the College of Liberal Arts. The psychology department is located in the College of Natural Sciences.
as a faculty member at an elite liberal arts college, he envisioned the graduate
students in these new lines working with faculty members to provide meaningful feedback to students on their writing.³

When word of the new initiative filtered down to the writing studies faculty in the English department, through the dean and then through the department chair, in the way this sort of information typically flows, we found ourselves intrigued by the idea, pleased by the commitment of resources (more than a million dollars on an annual basis), and concerned that it had been planned without input from faculty members with expertise in writing instruction. In a meeting to discuss the initiative, Mike was asked to reach out to the vice provost and report back to the group. As one of twelve university distinguished teaching scholars, he had already worked closely with the provost and vice provost and, in addition, was an emerging leader in the WAC community. He had also been involved, at the vice provost’s request, in state-wide discussions of how to implement the legislation that had created the state-wide Guaranteed Transfer Pathways (gtPathways) program.⁴

In his meeting with Mike, the vice provost expressed both great optimism in his vision for integrating writing into gtPathways courses and fond memories of the writing his students had done at his previous institution. His vision was straightforward and elegant: faculty members teaching the core courses would help the GTAs develop the skills they would need to respond to the meaningful and substantial writing assignments the faculty members would design for their courses. When Mike, who since 1991 had been working with his colleagues to redesign a WAC program that took into account the resistance typical of faculty at research-intensive universities (Palmquist, 2000), suggested that more than three decades of WAC research pointed to a dismal outcome for the plan, the vice provost began to pivot, and the conversation turned toward modifications that might lead to greater success.⁵ By the end of the meeting, the vice provost had agreed to support professional development for both GTAs and faculty led by a team of writing studies faculty.

With support from the vice provost in place, the writing studies faculty began exploring options for developing a robust training program that would work in concert with the existing WAC program. Early agreements among the group included the need for program leadership from a senior faculty member, significant release time for the program leader, review of course assignments, and a robust professional development program for the GTAs and faculty members

---

³ CSU was (and remains) the only institution in the state to take this comprehensive (and expensive) approach to addressing the state-mandated writing requirement.

⁴ gtPathways refers to a set of general education courses (totaling roughly 30 credit hours at various institutions) that the Colorado Commission on Higher Education guarantees to transfer across all public colleges and universities in the state.

⁵ To be fair, it would not be inaccurate to report that this pivot was far from instantaneous.
involved with gtPathways courses. A plan was developed, and a meeting was scheduled with the dean.

Unfortunately, convinced that faculty in the college would view the gtPathways writing requirements as not only an infringement of their right to teach their courses in the manner they deemed best but also as an unfunded mandate that would consume time they might prefer to devote to other areas of their academic lives, the dean refused to sign off on the plan. While the dean approved of placing a senior faculty member in charge of what had by then become known as the gtPathways Writing Integration Project (gtPathways Project), the dean opposed any form of faculty professional development, pointing out that it implied a level of control that writing studies faculty should not—and would not—have over the design of assignments in gtPathways courses. The argument that professional development workshops and faculty consultation would be voluntary, compensated, and likely to lead to improved learning outcomes was rejected as overreach.

With these limits in place, the dean asked the department chair and the writing studies faculty to develop a “better” plan and tasked one of the associate deans with managing further discussion of the project. Planning continued throughout the spring and summer of 2006, with an expectation that Mike would lead the project.

That changed in the fall of 2006, when Mike became director of The Institute for Learning and Teaching (TILT), a new unit put in place by the provost to enhance learning and teaching across the university. When no other members of the writing studies faculty were able to take the lead on the gtPathways Project, Mike enlisted the aid of two vice provosts (one who had originated the project and a second to whom he was reporting as director of TILT) in convincing the provost to allocate an additional tenure line to lead the project (additional in the sense that the provost had already given the department a new line to replace Mike as a computers-and-writing specialist). With an agreement for a new tenure line in place, Mike approached the department chair with what he thought was good news.

Surprisingly, the department chair did not welcome the offer of a new tenure line. Faced with anger from what he viewed as the core of the English department—the literature faculty, a group to which he belonged—who had seen their numbers decline over the previous year (complicated largely by the 2003 recession), he initially refused to accept the new line, pointing out that the literature faculty would be angry with him if he did so. After further discussion, which included the observation that refusing the tenure line would result in adding the writing studies faculty to the groups that were upset with him, the chair agreed to accept the new line under the condition that it would not take the place of other (literature) lines he had already requested, and, in consultation with the writing studies faculty, Mike developed a plan to fund the project (see Appendix A). The
dean subsequently agreed to the plan, and Mike drafted a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that defined the duties of the new hire and specified that the new line would not replace any other requested lines (see Appendix B). Sue was subsequently hired into the new tenure line, and she took on leadership of the project.

In what follows, we share the story of the evolution of the gtPathways Project in hopes that it can provide writing program administrators insights into the many forces at play in working to establish a writing program and, more specifically, a writing across the curriculum program. We draw on activity theory to help us consider the larger set of networks that have—and continue to—inform, shape, and challenge the gtPathways Project. Activity theory and, in particular, Yrjö Engeström’s (1987, 1990, 2014) elaboration of Lev Vygotsky’s (1978) subject-object-tool model, provides a useful lens through which we can interrogate and draw conclusions about the institutional forces that have shaped the project over the past 15 years, among them the conflicting goals, perceived pressures, and confining systems and networks felt by key players involved with the project. We hope that sharing our story and analyzing it through activity theory will provide insights into practices that can be used to establish complex undertakings in writing studies and, more specifically, writing across the curriculum.

APPROACHING THE PROJECT THROUGH ACTIVITY THEORY

I have found that Engeström’s systems version of activity theory offers insight into the central problematic of my research: how university students learn to write specialized discourse and write to learn specialized knowledge.

— David Russell, 2009, p. 42

In the introduction to their influential edited collection, Writing Selves/Writing Societies: Research from Activity Perspectives, Charles Bazerman and David Russel characterized activity theory as “a set of related approaches that view human phenomena as dynamic, in action” (2003, p. 1). It focuses, they observed, on how “human-produced artifacts” (an umbrella term under which they included activities as wide-ranging as “utterances or text, or shovels or symphonies”) that can be understood best not as distinct “objects in themselves” but rather as objects and, more to the point, activities that achieve meaning within the larger context of the systems in which they are situated (p. 1).

Also referred to as cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT) and sociocultural activity theory, activity theory provides a robust theoretical framework that can help writing program administrators understand the rise, function, operation and, in some cases, the demise of intra-campus initiatives such as the
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gtPathways Project. As an intellectual movement, activity theory emerged from work carried out by Soviet psychologists in the 1920s and 1930s to develop psychological theories that better addressed the work of groups, and in particular theories that could provide alternatives to Western theories that focused on the individual. Key voices in that effort included Alexei Leontiev, Aleksandr Luria, Sergei Rubinstejn, and Lev Vygotsky. Jeanne Pau Yen Ho and her colleagues (2016) characterize activity theory as moving through three phases. The initial phase is characterized by Vygotsky’s three-part model of subject, object, and mediating artifact (see Figure 9.1).

Following the translation of their work, activity theory became a powerful framework for understanding the work of groups. Yrjö Engeström would play a central role in that emergence, drawing on Leontiev’s work to expand Vygotsky’s triadic activity model of subject, object, and mediator into a more complex model that is distinguished by its stronger focus on cultural and historical factors that shape the work of an activity system. His model, and more importantly his extensive efforts to explore the use of activity theory to understand complex, socially mediated actions and decision-making, marked a second phase in the development of activity theory (see Figure 9.2).

The most recent elaboration of activity theory focuses on the ways in which activity systems interact with each other or are embedded in larger systems of activity (see Figure 9.3). In this way, we might explore how the activity systems associated with a college or university might interact with or otherwise influence each other, perhaps through shared membership, shared goals (objects), similar rules (sometimes referred to as norms) or reliance on the same or similar tools. This third-stage approach might also be used to explore how a given university program (or, again, an activity) is embedded within other (and perhaps overlapping) activity systems, such as departments, colleges, schools, and divisions as well as how they are shaped by activity systems such as local communities, professional organizations, and, in the case of public institutions, governmental entities and regulatory agencies.


Some scholars (e.g., Behrend, 2014; Ho et al., 2019) view Leontiev’s elaboration of Vygotsky’s model as a second phase in the development of activity theory. Since Vygotsky and Leontiev were not only contemporaries but collaborators, their work might reasonably be viewed as falling within the first stage.

This description of activity theory is drawn in large part from Mike’s exploration of the origins and operation of the WAC Clearinghouse in a collection, also published by the WAC Clearinghouse, honoring the work of Charles Bazerman (Palmquist, 2023). The re-use of text and figures is intentional and done so with permission.
Figure 9.1. A model of the first phase of activity theory.

Figure 9.2. Engeström’s model of activity theory.

Figure 9.3. Interactions among embedded and overlapping activity systems.
Over the past three decades, activity theory has been used to explore a wide range of complex systems. Scholars have focused on writing studies (Bazerman & Russell, 2003a; Russell, 1995, 2009), instructional technology (Behrend, 2014; Chung, 2019), distributed leadership (Ho et al., 2015; Takoeva, 2017), design thinking (Winstanley, 2019; Zahedi & Tessier, 2018), education (Abdullah, 2014; Al-Huneini et al., 2020; Carvalho, 2015; Pearson, 2009), human computer interaction (Draper, 1993; Kaptelinin & Nardie, 2012; Nardi, 1995), and software development (Dennehy & Conboy, 2017; Hoffmann et al., 2020), to name only a few areas.

In the case of the gtPathways Project, we find activity theory in general, and Engeström’s model in particular, to be a useful framework within which to
understand the influence on the development and operation of the project of activity systems within the larger state and university structures that pursue goals that are often aligned but sometimes in conflict. The primary motivating factor in the origin of the project—an act passed by the Colorado state legislature and its subsequent implementation by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education—was subsequently filtered through the Office of the Provost, the Graduate School, the Colleges of Liberal Arts (CLA) and Natural Sciences (CNS), the English department, and the writing studies faculty. In turn, the eight departments that offered the courses, seven from the CLA, and one from CNS, their faculty groups, and the courses themselves shaped the intra-campus operation of the project. Finally, and not inconsequentially, the entire project was approved at the curricular level (through modification of the grading requirements for individual courses) by the Faculty Council, a key part of the university’s three-part shared governance system. In some ways, the multiple activity systems shaping the creation and operation of the project resemble a set of Russian matryoshka dolls placed inside a basket that is set on a table and available to family and friends who might want to pick it up and play with it. The potential for arranging, rearranging, breaking, and even disposing of it seems quite high. In Figure 9.4, we’ve tried to convey the activity systems (with the exception of professional and local communities) that influence and shape the project as a set of overlapping and embedded spheres.


You only need one advocate.

‒ Marty Townsend

From the outset, the gtPathways initiative was fraught with difficulty. Some of the challenges came from the departments that were newly required to integrate writing and some came from the CLA dean’s office, which oversaw all but one of the departments involved in the project (Psychology). As might be expected when viewed through the lens of activity theory, the departments and faculty faced with the required and seemingly major curricular changes cried foul, arguing that their academic freedom was being challenged. Many argued that they could not be expected, as disciplinary faculty, to “teach writing” and especially grammar. In response, Sue, who had been hired as the first Director of the gtPathways Project, pointed out that they were being asked to assign writing—and that professionally trained GTAs would assist with assignment design, the development and explanation of writing expectations, and grading. Still, the faculty were not convinced. To their credit, they pointed out that most of the faculty
teaching the affected courses were not in tenure lines and hence could be viewed as an unstable workforce that would offer little continuity and low availability for either professional development of their own or oversight of the GTAs who would be under their watch. Additionally, many senior faculty members in these departments argued that their GTAs would be so overwhelmed with the work of grading student papers that they wouldn’t be able to get their own graduate work done.

The CLA dean and associate dean, which received the majority of this pushback, found themselves on the defensive (as the dean had foreseen). The dean arranged a meeting in which the chairs of departments leveled their anger about the new requirement against Sue and the acting Director of Composition who accompanied Sue to the meeting. Insults were thrown and anger vented, while Sue and her colleague listened carefully and acknowledged that departments were being asked to undertake a major curricular shift. Following the meeting, the dean and associate dean, as a response to pressure, modified the initial requirements for the GTA professional development course. The course was reduced from three credit hours to one credit hour; it would be taught in the first half of the semester; and it would focus strictly on grading and responding. It would be taught by the gtPathways director alone, and the director would be permitted no interaction with faculty members unless they sought it out. In addition, the planned preservice orientation for the GTAs was limited to nine hours the week prior to the start of the fall term.

We realized, of course, that placing restrictions on the director’s interaction with faculty and limiting what could be accomplished in the GTA professional development course runs counter to best practices in WAC and writing program work, including (as Jenna Morton-Aiken argued in this collection) the need for meaningful conversations and active listening between the director and the faculty. Nonetheless, Sue settled into acceptance of the constraints and focused on what she could accomplish, focusing on GTA professional development and adjusting her priority to this new professoriate while directing the rest of her energy toward other parts of her workload distribution, which included 40 percent research and 20 percent service. In the summer before she began directing the gtPathways Project, Sue went to the International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference and the Writing Program Administrator Conference, where she brought her concerns to many fora and gained confidence that she had whole professional associations behind her. One person at the WAC Conference expressed actual envy of Sue’s position, saying “Oh, for an initiative with low expectations!” and WAC pioneer Marty Townsend told Sue that she needed only one advocate. Mike was that advocate, as he was now directing TILT and serving as associate vice provost for learning and teaching.
Prior to the start of the semester, positive news arrived. The CLA dean’s office developed an MOU, with help from Sue, that established expectations for writing assignments in the gtPathways Project (see Appendix C). The MOU established that both low-stakes and high-stakes writing could be assigned throughout the semester and that, at a minimum, one formal high-stakes assignment would be required. While the MOU was intended to reduce anxiety about the amount of writing that would need to be assigned, Sue viewed the MOU as the foundation for discussing writing as not only a form of assessment but more importantly as a tool for enhancing teaching and learning. The pedagogy course for the GTAs could now focus on not only how to grade and respond to final products of writing but also on intervention drafts, on writing-to-learn activities, and on writing-to-engage assignments in gtPathways courses.

In the first year, the pre-service orientation was well attended, but many of the graduate students—some of whom had been in the field doing research—were angry about being asked to come to campus early. Participating departments had been slow to send information to them, and some of the GTAs had picked up on the negative reactions of their faculty mentors. Many arrived at the pedagogy class with skepticism. Sue set her sights on gaining their trust and instilling a belief that they would learn something of value. Sue also pointed out that their appointments were a pretty good deal—a paid position with a full tuition stipend. She also told them, without any initial evidence to support the claim, that their involvement would positively affect their own writing and their career aspirations, particularly if they thought they might want to teach at the college level. As it turns out, those GTAs, many of whom were destined to become part of the new professoriate, emerged as key people to focus on. Many were happy to have graduate support, and most began to see the value of their work with students as a CV builder. Further, because they did not arrive with a set of expectations regarding the courses in which they would serve as assistants, they quickly saw ways in which writing activities and assignments could advance the teaching and learning goals in their courses. Indeed, in time it became clear that they would be the ones to take writing for engaged learning seriously.

Sue initially made grading and responding to writing the focus of the one-credit pedagogy class, surprising the GTAs by showing them a robust literature in these areas and, more generally, conveying that the best practices around writing instruction are not folklore but grounded in theory and research. The GTAs began to show interest in the pedagogical opportunities presented by writing, and some began to imagine action research that they might undertake in their classrooms. One GTA created a bridge between their supervising faculty member and Sue, which led to a research project that became an article through which the disciplinary faculty and Sue gained an important publication.
In the second semester of her first year as director, in an effort to sustain the GTAs’ professional development, Sue encouraged them to think of themselves as writing ambassadors to their departments, drawing on the work of Paula Gillespie at Marquette University. The GTAs began to develop writing workshops for their departments, eventually delivering workshops that, in some cases, were also offered as part of TILT’s Master Teacher Initiative program, which was operating in all of the colleges. With the GTAs developing pedagogical expertise and visibility around writing, Sue and the graduate students began producing a gtPathways newsletter and developed language that they could use for their CVs to explain what they knew about writing assignments, including how to grade and respond effectively, efficiently, and ethically. Eventually, some of the GTAs told Sue that the capacities around writing integration had helped them obtain teaching positions after completing their degrees.

Moreover, many of the GTAs were themselves transformed not only as teachers but as writers, and when their graduate committee members saw this, the faculty began to understand the potential impact of writing integration not only on undergraduates but also on the graduate students who were responding to undergraduate writing. The success with the GTAs was redemptive, and Sue found that she cared less and less about the recalcitrant faculty members and departments within her own college. At the same time, she began to propose WAC research projects which became important to the initiative and to the broader WAC community (Cavdar & Doe, 2012; Doe et al., 2013; Doe et al., 2016; Gingerich et al., 2014).

While Sue became increasingly confident that the intra-campus gtPathways initiative was making a difference, especially given the systematic obstacles that were overcome, she was also increasingly impressed that Mike was able to spearhead a WAC initiative in the first place, especially given the significant pushback of faculty and the low support of leadership. After Sue left the directorship of the gtPathways Project in 2013, it went consecutively to three senior tenured faculty members in the department, each of whom stayed the course, deepening institutional commitments wherever they could as they worked on the project.

**FLASHING FORWARD**

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH ANNOUNCEMENT for gtPATHWAYS WRITING INTEGRATION DIRECTOR: Seeking a non-tenure-track faculty member to assume additional duties with gtPathways writing integration, GTA professional development, and program administration.

- Spring 2020 job posting
With apologies for the long delay, I am writing to see if you remain interested in the gtPathways [director] position. Due to the current COVID-induced budgetary challenges, the position has been changed somewhat.

— Spring 2020 email correspondence

In 2020, Kelly became director of the gtPathways Project. Like Sue before her, Kelly’s directorship centers on training the gtPathways GTAs through the pre-semester orientation and one-credit course. During these trainings, GTAs engage critically with scholarship that examines how writing can foster learning, engagement, and critical thinking. They learn about and work to implement best practices in responding to student writing, designing effective writing assignments, and developing appropriate grading criteria. Kelly and her students discuss strategies for dealing with assessment challenges, such as the writing challenges faced by many non-native English speakers, common difficulties with grammar, and poor uses of sources that can lead to unintentional plagiarism. They also consider inclusive teaching practices through awareness of issues of linguistic supremacy, linguistic justice, and cross-cultural writing differences.

Ideally, Kelly’s job also involves engaging faculty in similar conversations. We say ideally because, through her third year as the director, she has had no faculty members express interest in discussing—or even sharing—the ways in which they integrate writing in their courses. Just as Sue realized during her tenure as director, Kelly quickly learned that her energies are best spent making a difference from the bottom up, so to speak—working to engage and inspire the GTAs who may share their knowledge with faculty members in their home departments and who are working, in some cases, to become future faculty. Centering the GTAs as the foci for the work of the project seems to fall in line with faculty perceptions of the project as well, as the only two faculty members to reach out to Kelly in the past three years have invited her to visit with graduate students in their department about how they as GTAs can integrate writing into their classes and implement best practices in writing assignment design.

As the email correspondence that serves as an epigraph to this section indicates, the position of gtPathways Project director changed substantively in 2020. Those changes included the faculty status of the director. While all previous directors had been tenured or in tenure-track positions, none of the tenure-line faculty were able at the time to serve as director. The selection of Kelly, who was in a non-tenure-line position, marked a significant change in the position. Additionally, the directorship was reduced from a two-semester position to a one-semester (fall) position, with the director returning to a
full teaching load during the spring semester. This change reduced the opportunities Kelly would otherwise have had to reach beyond the primarily GTA-focused professional development work conducted in the first half of the fall semester. In addition, the length of the pre-semester GTA orientation was reduced from nine to six hours, further limiting opportunities to move beyond nuts-and-bolts training during the orientation.  

Noteworthy, as well, was the discovery that through administrative and department leadership turnover, awareness of the responsibilities of the departments, the faculty, and the GTAs funded by the project had been muddied and, in some departments, had disappeared. For example, when Kelly reached out to department chairs to inquire about low (or no) GTA registration for the required course, she learned that the newly appointed graduate advisor in one department was unaware that the GTAs in their department funded through the gtPathways Project were required to register for the course. It follows, then, that the advisor was unaware which and how many GTAs were tasked with helping to integrate and respond to writing in gtPathways courses. When Kelly reached out to upper administration in the CLA to clarify the number of GTAs assigned to the department, she learned that no upper administrator was overseeing the project or holding departments accountable.

When a senior associate dean was assigned to work with the gtPathways Project, Kelly knew she had the support to repair the broken networks between the gtPathways Project and participating departments. With the support of the associate dean, Kelly has been able to raise awareness and re-extend the work of the project. In the fall of her second year as director, department funding was secured to provide Kelly a spring-semester course release so she could work with the WAC program, now housed in the writing center (which Mike directs) on institutional initiatives related to and extending beyond the gtPathways project. And in fall 2022, a revised MOU was developed that spelled out more clearly the responsibilities of the gtPathways Project, the English department, the CLA, and the departments participating in the project (see Appendix D). These shifts in awareness and engagement at the department and college level, provide us with optimism about securing additional support for the project in the future.

FLASHING BACK: EXPLORING A COMPLEX NETWORK OF ACTIVITY SYSTEMS

The University will require departments who receive GTA lines funded through the AUCC/gtPathways Writing Initiative to decide whether they will participate in the professional development program supported by TILT and the University Composition Program or provide their own
training for the GTAs at department expense. Departments can choose to provide their own training only with approval of the College.

– Draft MOU, January 3, 2007

The planning of the gtPathways Project was influenced by the goals (objects, in activity theory terminology) of several groups at and beyond CSU. Its origins in the Provost’s Office reflected mandates issued by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, which in turn was working to implement a law passed by the state legislature and signed into law by the governor. The deans of CLA and CNS, in an effort to ensure that the departments involved in the initiative would be in agreement with its requirements, worked with more than a dozen department chairs, who in turn worked with their faculty to assess and provide feedback on the initiative. Key issues addressed in discussions included the impact on curriculum of the new requirement that 25 percent of the final grade would be based on writing assignments in gtPathways courses, the implications for faculty academic freedom of the new requirement, the labor required to manage the GTAs who would provide feedback to students, the implications of increasing the number of funded graduate students in affected departments, the funding required to implement the project, the responsibilities and authority of the faculty members directing the project, and the role of existing governance structures in overseeing the project.

These issues played out in ways that illustrate the complex manner in which the nested and overlapping systems within higher education operate. In particular, they highlight several key aspects of activity theory, both within a given activity system and across systems. Below, we discuss efforts to understand and address contradictions revealed through the recognition of competing goals and priorities, the rules that influenced how the project was developed and operated, the manner in which labor was carried out, and the outcomes of the project. We hope these aspects can provide insights into how initiatives such as the gtPathways Project are influenced by the systems and networks within which they operate.

**Contradictions, Rules, and Rule Changes**

I could only contact faculty by going through an associate dean who would carefully decide what messages to allow through. As a result, I had to be fairly covert in my efforts to contact faculty. In time, I learned that if the faculty saw how they could benefit from the work (their grad students became better writers as they GTA’d and the faculty themselves got involved in pedagogical research and publication), I could reach them and connections led to conversations about best practices with regard to assignment and rubric design, among other things.

– Sue Doe
When the tenure line into which Sue was hired in spring 2007 was approved, general agreement existed about her role and the shape of the gtPathways Project. A MOU had been circulated among key players in the Provost’s Office, the College of Liberal Arts, the English department, and the writing studies faculty, and it was used to guide the design of the project (see Appendix B). Unfortunately, not long after her hire, Sue found little support from college leadership for her work as project director. In her first semester, she was told by the dean that there was to be no direct communication between the project director and faculty members, chairs, or graduate coordinators in the departments that offered the gtPathways courses. All communication was to be run through the dean’s office. This differed from the approach taken by the College of Natural Sciences, which authorized the project director to work directly with the faculty member who was in charge of the introductory psychology course. Importantly, it seems to reflect a recognition by the CLA dean of the potential conflicts—referred to as contradictions in Engeström’s model of activity systems—across activity systems embedded within the larger college activity system as well as in the activity systems in which the college itself was embedded, conflicts that centered largely on questions of control over curricula. Concerns about who controlled the curriculum were, at that time (though this has diminished over the years), particularly salient, given what were then perceived as demands for oversight of course curricula by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and, on a larger level, by the state legislature. These concerns also reflect a natural and continuing conflict over control of the curriculum among the departments, the colleges, and the Provost’s Office. These conflicts shaped (again, using a term drawn from Engeström’s model of activity systems) the rules that shaped activity within the gtPathways Project activity system.

Significantly, the rule against direct contact distanced the project director from the departments and course instructors, creating a situation that would lead to a lack of understanding of the goals of the project, its benefits to students and faculty members, and the responsibilities of the GTAs funded through the project. The decision—again, a rule that shaped activity within the gtPathways Project—to require that 25 percent of the course grade be based on writing was complicated by the large enrollments in the core courses involved in the project. The allocation of new GTA lines to these courses was based on the recognition that faculty members could not be expected to grade and respond to 100–200 students from any one class. The original ratio had been set at 1:90 (GTA to undergrad), a ratio that was judged to be sufficient to allow GTAs to respond to student writing in no more than 20 hours in any given week. Over time, departments began to recognize that they could ask the GTAs to carry out other duties during weeks in which writing was not assigned, which led to changes in GTA
activity during the semester. Essentially, and largely as members of the writing studies faculty had warned against during the planning phase of the project, mission creep set in. Over time, as noted earlier in this chapter, changes in department leadership and staffing of the gtPathways courses combined with limited interaction between the departments and the gtPathways Project director led to the rationale for the GTA assignments being “lost” (in some departments) or at least becoming less clear than had initially been the case.

Eventually, the rule against direct outreach by the gtPathways Project director revealed a contradiction in the activity system that led to additional changes in how the project operated. After the project was launched and many faculty members expressed uncertainty about how to develop effective and appropriate writing assignments, the CLA dean’s office sought information from the project director that it could share with faculty. Based on information provided by Sue, the CLA dean’s office drafted a MOU between the college and the departments stipulating that faculty members teaching gtPathways courses would meet the objectives of the initiative if both informal and formal writing were assigned (see Appendix C). Departments were informed that they could not ignore or avoid the mandate, and the MOU stipulated that there had to be at least one formal writing assignment in each course. The MOU, as a result, provided the director of the project a basis for talking with faculty members who asked about how they might integrate writing-to-learn and writing-to-communicate assignments as the ends of a spectrum of authorized writing tasks.

An additional change in the rules governing how the gtPathways Project operates would also occur as its first semester of operation approached. What had been proposed as a three-credit full-semester graduate course in pedagogy as the main mechanism for preparing the disciplinary GTAs was recast (and diminished) by the CLA dean’s office into a one-credit, five-week course with a singular focus on grading and responding. This was a departure from its original vision as a course focused on broader issues related to writing integration, such as how to connect assignment design and assessment to project goals. Departments were also given the option to create their own course rather than require their GTAs to take the course created by the writing studies faculty. Two CLA departments took the option of creating their own courses. One used this model for a few years before acknowledging that the labor resources involved in offering the course were too burdensome and redirected GTAs to the gtPathways Project training. The second department maintains their separate course to this day. Interestingly, a third department decided to withdraw its gtPathways course from the university’s core curriculum rather than be forced to adhere to the rules imposed by the CLA dean’s office.

A final initial change in the rules has also had a lasting impact on the operation and sustainability of the gtPathways Project. The director of the University
Composition Program and Sue, as project director at the time, had argued strongly for annual assessments of student writing and GTA response to writing in the gtPathways courses. They explained that starting the project off with a well-designed assessment could provide useful data that could aid departments in course redesign, and, down the road, help justify retention of the newly funded GTA lines. Unfortunately, all suggestions of assessment were rejected. Approximately eight years into the project, when the idea of assessment was brought up again, the idea was again jettisoned. This stood in contrast to a demonstrated need for assessment. Only a few years into the project, when the Great Recession hit campus and budget cuts were implemented, the vice provost who had initiated the project informed Mike that the project (and its more than million-dollar annual cost) were on the chopping block. Working together, Mike and Sue created a memo that argued successfully for continued funding of the project. The basis for that memo was a series of studies by Sue and Karla Gingerich, the faculty member who coordinated the Introduction to Psychology course, which demonstrated improved writing skills among students in the psychology major, improved writing skills among the GTAs assigned to the course, and improved learning outcomes in areas about which students had written in the course. Due to its excellent assessment practices, the only course outside of CLA essentially saved not only the project but the more than 70 GTA lines associated with it.

**Division of Labor**

The gtPathways Writing Integration Project runs in parallel with the university’s traditional writing requirement, which stipulates that undergraduate students meet both an intermediate and an advanced composition course prior to graduation. These core requirements address the written competency of the gtPathways transfer expectations as well, and in 2016 were re-instantiated in revisions to the competency expectations adopted by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. The University Composition Program’s offerings exist alongside other core requirements in the All-University Core Curriculum (AUCC) for foundational math, science and diversity, equity, and inclusion literacies. Importantly, the intermediate and advanced writing courses are taught primarily by a combination of instructors in contingent positions and roughly three dozen English department GTAs. These GTAs receive substantially more professional development than the gtPathways GTAs, yet all GTAs are compensated equally. The faculty members in the departments in which gtPathways GTAs reside typically believe that the time required for responding to student writing is far more substantial than that required in most other GTA assignments at the university. Accordingly, recognizing this disparity, some departments have resisted
efforts to provide additional professional development to gtPathways GTAs. This contradiction between the goals of the departments and the project director has proven intractable. While departments have clearly conveyed that they are not inclined to take advice on how to assign writing, much less how to grade it, they have also expressed skepticism about their own ability to integrate writing into their courses in meaningful ways. When this skepticism has manifested itself as concern about being asked to become grammar experts, the project director has had ready answers and has been able to direct attention toward the use of writing-to-learn and writing-to-engage activities.

Yet a more fundamental contradiction informs some of the resistance directed toward the project, resulting in clear opposition to any form of professional development, including opportunities to explore best practices in the teaching of writing and the ways in which writing activities and assignments can contribute to department efforts to meet disciplinary and course objectives. This resistance seems to be rooted in the belief that CLA faculty are already outstanding teachers. As such, they are convinced they already possess the knowledge and experience to assign writing successfully and to prepare their GTAs to respond effectively and efficiently to student writing. With this in mind, they have contended that the “excess” funded hours of GTA work can be better directed toward other work, including the GTAs’ own graduate schooling. The result, beyond the initial reduction in the GTA pedagogy course to five weeks and one credit hour, has been a significantly narrower professional development program for gtPathways GTAs.

One additional factor associated with the labor required to teach gtPathways courses is that most instructors in these courses are in contingent positions. The single exception is in the introductory psychology course where the GTAs, all of whom are advanced doctoral students, are instructors-of-record and are led by a course director whose sole job is to make the course and the GTAs successful. The course director has understood from the start of the project that GTAs can benefit as writers themselves from designing, integrating into their courses, and responding to writing assignments. With clear opposition to professional development at the department and college level, it took far longer than expected to build awareness among the faculty members teaching the gtPathways courses of the benefits available to them and their GTAs that could come from working with the project director. But perseverance proved effective and some of the instructors teaching the gtPathways courses have become aware of these benefits and have taken advantage of them. Through a persistent effort to build relationships one by one, the project directors have been able over the past 15 years to convince some instructors of the value of the resources and relationships available through the project. The most effective strategy for building relationships
has been the creation of informal partnerships and networks that tap into the faculty reward system. When faculty in contingent positions saw that their work in writing integration could make their teaching more effective and more satisfying, and when course directors and other tenure-line faculty associated with these courses saw that research and publication opportunities abounded in the realm of writing integration, relationships were strengthened, and opportunities began to expand.

**Competing Goals**

A challenge that evolved over time is the level of commitment to the original mission of the project on the part of the faculty and administration. Fundamentally, and from the start, the departments offering gtpathways courses have pursued goals that are, at least to some extent, at odds with the goals of the gtpathways Project. For example, the economics department is currently assigned 10 GTA lines, but it doesn't require its GTAs to take the gtpathways professional development course. Consequently, GTAs in economics do not receive training in WAC and writing scholarship, and they are likely to receive only minimal training on how to grade the specific assignments their professors assign. From the start of her work as project director, Kelly has found it challenging to connect with administrators and faculty in the department. There does not seem to be a willingness to work with the project director to create, revise, and implement writing assignments.

One of the central problems that comes into clearer focus when viewed through an activity theory lens is the disconnect between the central actors (or community members) in this system. In the project’s current iteration, Kelly trains the GTAs but has had very little communication with the disciplinary faculty mentoring the GTAs. Kelly recalls a few graduate students last year saying that they wish their faculty advisors would read the same writing scholarship they were reading, as they felt they were receiving mixed messages and felt that while they were learning about best practices in designing, integrating, and responding to writing assignments, they were not seeing those best practices enacted—or supported—by their mentors. For example, while GTAs are learning that providing positive feedback is important for writers’ engagement and learning, their faculty mentors may be telling them to just assign a grade or fill out a numerical rubric. Additionally, as GTAs are taught to consider best practices for designing effective writing assignments, they may see the assignments they are assessing as not meeting those criteria.

As Mara Lee Grayson noted in her chapter in this collection, it is important to recognize how the networks at work within our institution—or, as we view
it, the institutional and state activity systems that nest within or overlap each other—can be seen as being in opposition. Over the years, the GTAs in the gt-Pathways Project have almost certainly recognized this, particularly if they have noted differences in the narratives presented by the faculty members they have assisted in the classroom and the narratives shared by Sue, Kelly, and the other project directors.

REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This course’s intensive, five-week exploration through various pedagogies and theories regarding the evaluation of student writing has proven to be an exceptional asset to my role as a GTA and adjunct instructor. Despite my three years of experience as the latter, I discovered after our first gtPathways orientation the extent to which I had been teaching with a deficit of knowledge of research-based best practices. . . . I now feel comfortably equipped with strategies for creating classroom exercises that serve student growth holistically by actively involving students in the process of their own learning.

‒ Department of Journalism and Media Communication GTA

As we look back on the evolution of this initiative from its conception to its current iteration, one conclusion stands out. As the epigraph above shows, our work has helped GTAs gain a deeper understanding of the role writing can play in their teaching and in their own learning. They’ve recognized that even as GTAs tasked (in some cases solely) with responding to undergraduate student writing, they can “teach through their feedback.” They’ve learned that focusing on the content in others’ writing, working to see the strengths in others’ writing, and offering specific praise and critique can foster others’ learning. They’ve considered—and, we think, have continued to contemplate—the roles linguistic justice, linguistic diversity, and cross-cultural writing differences can (and should) play in our teaching of and responding to writing. And they’ve taken this knowledge with them as they have moved forward professionally, in some cases becoming the future professoriate, in other cases becoming non-academic social workers, journalists, political scientists, psychologists, historians, musicians, and philosophers. Thus, despite the challenges we faced, the opportunities that were not embraced, and the conflicting goals, shifts in our division of labor, and contradictions that complicate the story of the gtPathways Writing Integration Project, we remain cognizant of the important work being done with the graduate students. Importantly, we see that work having long-term influence on not only the GTAs but also on those they work with now and in the future.
For rhetoric and composition administrators who have experienced similar competing goals and missed opportunities, we suggest stepping back, taking stock of the situation, and, as appropriate, regrouping your efforts or shifting your focus. We’ve found it useful to use the analytic framework offered by activity theory as we examine the challenges we encounter. The contradictions within a given activity system provide a good starting point for that examination. Asking about their underlying causes can help us determine whether they arise from inadequate or inappropriate tools, from questionable use of those tools, from conflicting rules or norms, from potentially problematic distribution of labor, or from conflicting motivations and goals. Equally important, asking about whether the challenges we face come from conflicting goals and motivations associated with embedded or overlapping activity systems, as we saw in our analysis of the gtPathways Writing Integration Project, can provide insights that can lead to the development of useful strategies for addressing conflicts. We encourage you to work with colleagues and mentors to consider how best to move forward—or to step away (temporarily or permanently). If you have not yet experienced a similar situation, it may be useful to lay a foundation for responding to challenges down the road by developing a support system across campus. If challenges arise in the future, you’ll have a network of colleagues you can work with to find a path forward—perhaps one that involves pivoting to a different initiative or pulling back on your efforts until the time is right to re-engage.

Looking back, we see what happened with the gtPathways Writing Integration Project as a reflection of Miller’s (1993) textual carnivals and, in particular, local manifestations of disciplinary politics that led to missed opportunities that continue to plague the project. The meaningfulness of these missed opportunities is only now beginning to be realized as we see English departments, specifically, and the liberal arts, more generally, struggling to identify themselves as relevant to students and to higher education as a whole, particularly in institutions that are grappling with mid-pandemic strategic planning. This moment may present opportunities for writing program and WAC administrators, but much hinges on how the initiative is engaged in coming years. Today, the university is in a different moment institutionally than it was in 2005, when we had not yet experienced the Great Recession, much less the COVID-19 pandemic. Certainly, opportunities remain, and new opportunities continue to present themselves. For our institution, it lies in department, college, and university leadership that has recognized the role of disciplinary writing activities and assignments as a high impact practice. Nevertheless, the saga of missed opportunity was there from the start of this WAC initiative and continues today with new variations. We press on to make this right.
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APPENDIX A: PLAN PRESENTED TO THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

November 27, 2006
To: English Executive Committee
From: Mike Palmquist
Re: Supporting gtPathways GTA Professional Development and WAC

For more than a year, the rhetoric and composition faculty in English have worked to develop a plan to support the use of writing in gtPathways courses at the University. Our plans were developed to support President Penley’s decision to require that all gtPathways courses in the social sciences (many with enrollments of over 200 students per section) would base at least 25 percent of the course grade on written work. The new AUCC core now codifies this requirement for the social science courses in the core. To support this initiative, the President provided funding for 74 new GTA lines in the social sciences in CLA and psychology in CNS.

This summer, the Provost’s office approved the rhetoric and composition faculty’s plan to support the professional development of GTAs involved in the gtPathways writing initiative. That plan involved providing me with release time and staff support to work with social science faculty and GTAs. My appointment as TILT director resulted in the development of a new plan, in which I proposed to provide this support through per-section hiring of instructors who had previously served as composition lecturers. For a variety of reasons, this plan was rejected by the rhetoric and composition faculty. A new plan, outlined below, reflects discussions with the rhetoric and composition faculty, [Vice Provost] Tom Gorell, and [Vice Provost] Alan Lamborn.

This plan will provide gtPathways GTAs with an intensive semester of professional development designed to enhance their ability to respond fairly and effectively to student writing. The key elements of the plan involve:

- Notifying GTAs of the conditions of their employment as gtPathways GTAs in their appointment letters and contracts.
- Assigning GTAs to a class for 15 hours per week in the first semester of their GTA assignment and for 20 hours per week thereafter.
- Requiring GTAs to sign up for E607 Teaching Writing in the first semester of their GTA assignment.
- Requiring GTAs to participate in workshops throughout their assignment.
- Providing opportunities for one-on-one consultation and grading review conferences to GTAs.

To support this plan, I propose reconfiguring base funding for the gtPathways writing initiative to support the hire of a new assistant professor of rhetoric and composition. If approved, I would also offer funding from TILT to help bridge the cost of this position over the next two years. In the third year, funding
would be provided through the funds assigned to the Provost’s office to expand the tenure-track faculty at CSU.

The department is currently conducting a search for an assistant professor in rhetoric and composition. I propose hiring a second assistant professor from this pool. This hire would teach a normal load and undertake the full range of scholarly activity typical for a new assistant professor. It is possible that this person would also serve as the director of writing across the curriculum.

This plan provides an effective means of continuing our efforts to support writing-across-the-curriculum. Through agreements with the Dean and Provost, it should also provide a means of expanding our tenure-track faculty without reducing replacement or new hires in coming years.

APPENDIX B: DRAFT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE AUCC/GTPATHWAYS WRITING INITIATIVE

January 3, 2007

Parties:
Provost’s Office
College of Liberal Arts
Department of English
Institute for Learning and Teaching
Graduate School

1. A new tenure line will be created to support the AUCC/gtPathways Writing Initiative.
2. Bridge funding for the line will be provided in FY 08 from . . .
3. The creation of this line will not take the place of lines that would otherwise have been allocated to the College of Liberal Arts or the Department of English.
4. The faculty member in this line will:
   • serve as AUCC/gtPathways Writing Initiative coordinator
   • teach at least two and as many as three sections of E607 Teaching Writing during each academic year
   • supervise the adjunct faculty who will teach other sections of E607
   • develop workshops for and consult with GTAs
   • support faculty teaching AUCC/gtPathways courses in their efforts to incorporate writing into their courses

---

9 The course referred to in this MOU as E607 Teaching Writing became the 1-credit, 5-week course we refer to in our discussion and is now titled E608: Integrating Writing in the Academic Core.
• serve as director of the University’s Writing-Across-the-Curriculum program

5. Over time, these responsibilities are likely to be shifted to other faculty members of the composition and rhetoric faculty, as part of their regular rotation of administrative responsibilities.

6. The Institute for Learning and Teaching will provide support for the AUCC/gtPathways Writing Initiative through funding for up to two sections of E607 Teaching Writing taught by experienced lecturers and supervised by the AUCC/gtPathways Writing Initiative coordinator.

7. The University will require departments who receive GTA lines funded through the AUCC/gtPathways Writing Initiative to decide whether they will participate in the professional development program supported by TILT and the University Composition Program or provide their own training for the GTAs at department expense. Departments can choose to provide their own training only with approval of the College.

8. Departments who choose to participate in the TILT/Composition Program professional development program will assign GTAs to 15 hours of classroom support and 5 hours of professional development in their first semester as a GTA and 20 hours of classroom support in subsequent semesters. Departments will also require GTAs to:

• enroll in E607 Teaching Writing in the first semester of their GTA assignment
• participate in writing workshops and other professional development opportunities throughout their assignment

9. This agreement is subject to revision by agreement of all parties. The English Department can withdraw from the agreement only by relinquishing the tenure line, or through mutual agreement of the other parties.

APPENDIX C: MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
– COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

WRITING IN AUCC COURSES IN LIBERAL ARTS
Effective Fall 2007

All AUCC courses in Categories 3B, C, D and E of the core must satisfy the following requirements regarding writing. These must be clearly stated on the syllabus for the course.

Goals for writing in AUCC courses:
There are two goals for writing assignments in AUCC courses:¹
(1) to improve students’ comprehension of course content and,
(2) to improve students’ proficiency in writing.

*Note 1: Both of these goals are best achieved when students receive feedback on their writing assignments and have an opportunity to make use of that feedback.*

1. **Writing requirements:**

   (1) At least 25 percent of the course grade must be based on written work that satisfies the following:
   
   a. At least one writing assignment must be an out-of-class piece of written work.
   
   b. In-class written work, such as on exams, must be in the form of essays.

   *Note 2: While this represents a minimum standard, to maximize the benefits to students of more writing multiple opportunities to write and respond to feedback are recommended, such as:
   
   1. Several out-of-class writing assignments.

   OR

   2. One or more rewrites of an out-of-class writing assignment.

   (2) Expectations of written work must be clearly stated on the syllabus. Among other things the instructor considers appropriate, those expectations should include students demonstrating:
   
   1. The ability to convey a theme or argument clearly and coherently.
   2. The ability to analyze critically and to synthesize the work of others.
   3. The ability to acquire and apply information from appropriate sources, and reference sources appropriately.

   *Note 3: Instructors should use their own discretion in communicating to students the relative importance of the various expectations in their own writing assignments in terms of how they will be graded.*

2. **Plagiarism Statement:**

   More writing in AUCC courses also brings the risk of increased incidents of plagiarism. It is strongly recommended that instructors have a statement in their syllabus that clearly states that plagiarism is not acceptable and is a form of academic dishonesty. An example is:

   Plagiarism is a form of academic dishonesty. As per university policy “Any student found responsible for having engaged in academic dishonesty will be subject to an academic penalty and/or University disciplinary action.”

   On page 38 of the *2006 – 2007 General Catalog*, plagiarism is defined:
“Plagiarism includes the copying of language, structure, ideas, or thoughts of another, and representing them as one’s own without proper acknowledgement. Examples include a submission of purchased research papers as one’s own work; paraphrasing and/or quoting material without properly documenting the source.”

APPENDIX D: 2022 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING – COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

GUARANTEED TRANSFER PATHWAYS WRITING INTEGRATION PROJECT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Effective Fall 2022

The purpose of this MOU is to lay out the responsibilities of the English Department and the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) in their shared commitment to ensuring the effectiveness and longevity of the Guaranteed Transfer (gt) Pathways Writing Integration Project. Implemented in Fall 2007, the gtPathways Writing Integration Project supports the meaningful integration of writing into the majority of CLA’s All University College Curriculum (AUCC) courses with the goals of improving undergraduate writing proficiency and enhancing comprehension of course content. As the 2007 MOU between the Provost’s Office and the College of Liberal Arts (titled “Writing In AUCC Courses In Liberal Arts”) notes, with this initiative, the College of Liberal Arts is committed to supporting the Faculty Council approved minimum of 25% of the final course grade in designated AUCC courses for writing assignments, designed to foster students’ learning and communication skills. To meet these goals, faculty teaching many of these courses are assigned GTAs funded by the graduate school whose job it is to assist faculty in commenting on, responding to, and grading undergraduate student writing and who receive professional development training to do this work effectively.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT AND THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

The English Department will:

• Provide a pre-semester general orientation for GTAs in August.
• Offer 3 sections of E608: Integrating Writing in the Academic Core (1 credit) each fall.
• Determine and hire the instructor of record for E608 and the pre-semester orientation. This person shall carry the title of Director of the gtPathways Writing Integration Project. The appointment of the
director shall be approved by the Rhetoric and Composition Faculty Committee.

- Maintain the gtPathways Writing Integration Project website.
- When compensation is possible, support the Director in conducting annual or biennial assessments of student writing performance and learning fostered by the work of the gtPathways Writing Integration Project.

The College of Liberal Arts will:

- Ensure that departments understand and implement practices consistent with the gtPathways Writing Integration Project expectations laid out below.
- Designate the CLA Associate Dean for Academic Programs as the point of contact in the Dean’s Office for the gtPathways Writing Integration Project.
- Distribute to faculty teaching gtPathways courses the 2007 MOU titled “Writing In AUCC Courses in Liberal Arts,” which lays out the goals and requirements for writing integration in gtPathways courses. (See below.)
- Distribute to departments communications from the Director of the gtPathways Writing Integration Project such as an annual report or newsletter.
- By June 1 each year, secure from departments the names of faculty and courses that will have gtPathways GTAs. Knowing this information makes connections with faculty and associated GTAs more feasible.
- Secure from each department one syllabus, a few sample writing assignments, grading criteria, and papers to aid the Director of the gtPathways Writing Integration Project in ensuring the GTA training reflects current practices across departments. Samples should be updated every two years.
- Facilitate communication between the Director and participating faculty to aid the Director in formally assessing student writing performance and learning, consistent with Higher Learning Commission accreditation requirements and University expectations.

EXPECTEDATIONS OF DEPARTMENTS WHO RECEIVE FUNDED GTA POSITIONS TO SUPPORT THE GTPATHWAYS WRITING INTEGRATION PROJECT

Participating departments should:

- Select graduate students to serve as GTAs for faculty teaching designated gtPathways courses with the writing requirement. These GTAs
must support faculty in commenting on, responding to, and grading undergraduate student writing.

• Ensure that gtPathways GTAs attend the pre-semester orientation and complete E608 so they have the training they need to effectively comment on, respond to, and grade undergraduate students’ writing.
  ◦ If participating departments choose not to have their gtPathways GTAs attend the pre-semester orientation and complete E608, they must provide their own GTA training specific to ensuring GTAs can meaningfully comment on, respond to, and grade undergraduate writing in designated gtPathways courses.
  ◦ If departments choose to provide their own professional development training for GTAs, they must submit their detailed training plan to the CLA Associate Dean for Academic Programs.