

Writing Across the Curriculum
EPR Workshop, 8 August 2006
By Jeanne Hahn

The responses were generally in the form of a list; virtually all were descriptive.

The most common form of writing, across all planning units, was the weekly seminar response paper; the second most common form was synthesis or integrative essays; the third was the research paper (although there was enormous variation in length, supervision, drafts, etc., sometimes making it difficult to determine what constituted a “research” paper). These seem to constitute the “norm,” and many programs used them in combination. Very seldom (but there were a few) was there a combination of creative writing (fiction, scripts, etc), synthesis essays, and research papers. As most responses were descriptive, few stated the explicit purpose of the writing—e.g. to express quantitative work in written form, to relate theory to practice—although many provided generalized purposes such as clearer thinking, deeper understanding of the texts, etc.

The writing itself covered many styles:

- Synthesis/integrative papers
- Seminar response papers (most common)
- Research papers, both solo and collaborative
- Seminar journals, field journals
- Autobiography
- Creative writing, poetry

Writing specific to disciplines, especially for SI and ES:

- Natural history journals
- Field journals
- Lab notebooks, lab journals
- Abstracts, scientific notation

A large number of other styles were less often mentioned:

- Grant writing
- Position papers
- Web-X writings, blogs
- Writing from oral history interviews
- Legal writing
- Popular/journalistic writing, Zines
- Business memos
- Translation/transcription
- Critical review essays

There were also a number of techniques mentioned:

- Revisions/drafts (often revisions were mentioned, drafts much less frequently)
- Writing workshops (most often in Core and done by the Writing Center)
- Peer review
- Use of tutors

Writing for publication
Writing for specific audiences
In-class writing
Use of the Sinclair/Levensky model

Thirty-six core programs reported. Of the thirty-six, thirty-one reported that writing was a major emphasis of the program, five that it was a minor emphasis. Only twelve Core programs reported using workshops.

Across the planning units the least amount of reported writing seems to have been in the Expressive Arts, although in several cases substantial writing was done.