Using the matrix developed for our program evaluation, program leaders analyzed five groups of data to improve faculty seminars for writing-intensive instruction. In this case program directors used the following data to evaluate seminars: (1) Pre- and Post-Seminar Attitude Survey on Writing Across the Curriculum; (2) solicited and unsolicited faculty evaluations of the seminar; (3) data on faculty participants; (4) writing produced in the seminar by faculty participants; and (5) seminar curriculum. Analysis of the data using the matrix yielded the following patterns of change:

1. The writing-to-learn goal and the collaborative learning-by-doing methodology were readily implemented, in spite of the fact that most participants anticipated a seminar in "what composition specialists know that we should know when we prepare to teach writing-intensive courses."

2. The needs of the discourse communities were more difficult to address because of various situational constraints—namely, the bias, training, and experience of program leaders; expectations and preconceptions of participants; and participants' lack of awareness of unique features of their own discipline's discourse. Early attempts to tap and make explicit the needs and differences of various discourse communities did not fully succeed because seminar leaders did not develop appropriate activities to help participants make explicit how the discourses of their disciplines were alike and different from other discourses.

3. The evaluation matrix helped seminar leaders understand the need to make explicit participants' tacit information about their disciplines and help students understand and master the discourse forms of the various disciplines.

4. New seminar leaders and guest speakers bring with them the biases of their disciplines.

Furthermore, the emphasis of one goal often leads to the sacrifice of another.

As a result of these changes in seminar curricula, seminar leaders are beginning to understand how preconceptions about what various disciplines do influence what writing programs are able to accomplish. As a result of the seminars, faculty participants are able to reconceptualize the courses they teach to accommodate the broader focus of collaboratively-based learning by writing.

AN INTERACTIVE MATRIX FOR EVALUATING PROGRAM PROCEDURES

Thomas L. Hiiger, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Program evaluation has changed. Where early efforts looked for inputs which influenced outcomes, recent models give equal or greater emphasis to processes and contexts. Thus, an important goal of program evaluation is describing and, over time, redefining goals of program evaluation.

The teaching of writing too has changed; we now emphasize written language that is specific to a community of users, and language learning that occurs within contexts of specific communities of users, with masters teaching apprentices. In at least some universities, the teaching of writing has moved from English Departments into the many departments whose members constitute different language-using communities. The newly ordained writing instructor is the master physicist, historian, or engineer. Changes in university writing programs require new approaches to program evaluation. To describe the processes and contexts of a program which involves writing instruction in many disciplines, today's evaluator must study the processes and contexts of each discipline.

Experience with the University of Hawaii at Manoa's Writing Program suggests that diffuse evaluation can be aided by an interactive matrix. The matrix involves three program processes: collecting, analyzing, and disseminating. It also involves three program components: ideology, goals, and personnel. Most importantly, it
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Using the matrix developed for our program evaluation, program leaders analyzed five groups of data to improve faculty seminars for writing-intensive instruction. In this case program directors used the following data to evaluate seminars: (1) Pre- and Post-Seminar Attitude Survey on Writing Across the Curriculum; (2) solicited and unsolicited faculty evaluations of the seminar; (3) data on faculty participants; (4) writing produced in the seminar by faculty participants; and (5) seminar curriculum. Analysis of the data using the matrix yielded the following patterns of change:

1. The writing-to-learn goal and the collaborative learning-by-doing methodology were readily implemented, in spite of the fact that most participants anticipated a seminar in "what composition specialists know that we should know when we prepare to teach writing-intensive courses."

2. The needs of the discourse communities were more difficult to address because of various situational constraints—namely, the bias, training, and experience of program leaders; expectations and preconceptions of participants; and participants' lack of awareness of unique features of their own discipline's discourse. Early attempts to tap and make explicit the needs and differences of various discourse communities did not fully succeed because seminar leaders did not develop appropriate activities to help participants make explicit how the discourses of their disciplines were alike and different from other discourses.

3. The evaluation matrix helped seminar leaders understand the need to make explicit participants' tacit information about their disciplines and help students understand and master the discourse forms of the various disciplines.

4. New seminar leaders and guest speakers bring with them the biases of their disciplines.

Furthermore, the emphasis of one goal often leads to the sacrifice of another.

As a result of these changes in seminar curricula, seminar leaders are beginning to understand how preconceptions about what various disciplines do influence what writing programs are able to accomplish. As a result of the seminars, faculty participants are able to reconceptualize the courses they teach to accommodate the broader focus of collaboratively-based learning by writing.
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Program evaluation has changed. Where early efforts looked for inputs which influenced outcomes, recent models give equal or greater emphasis to processes and contexts. Thus, an important goal of program evaluation is describing and, over time, redefining goals of program evaluation.

The teaching of writing too has changed; we now emphasize written language that is specific to a community of users, and language learning that occurs within contexts of specific communities of users, with masters teaching apprentices. In at least some universities, the teaching of writing has moved from English Departments into the many departments whose members constitute different language-using communities. The newly ordained writing instructor is the master physicist, historian, or engineer. Changes in university writing programs require new approaches to program evaluation. To describe the processes and contexts of a program which involves writing instruction in many disciplines, today's evaluator must study the processes and contexts of each discipline.

Experience with the University of Hawaii at Manoa's Writing Program suggests that diffuse evaluation can be aided by an interactive matrix. The matrix involves three program processes: collecting, analyzing, and disseminating. It also involves three program components: ideology, goals, and personnel. Most importantly, it