
Furman University

Teaching First Year Seminars: A Guide (2013-2014)

<http://www2.furman.edu/academics/fys/Pages/default.aspx>

Contents

Welcome	3
Goals	4-5
Resources	6-7
First Year Seminar Common Experiences	8-10
Seeing First Year Seminars Again for the First Time	11-18
Appendix A: The First Year Seminar Program @ Furman University	19-21
Appendix B: FYW Essay Evaluation Guide	22-23
Endnotes	24

Welcome

Thank you for contributing your teaching and scholarship to Furman University's first year seminar courses. The FYS/W component of the university curriculum provides a *foundational* and *transitional* experience for our students, preparing them to excel in their university experience and beyond.

This guide is a living document designed to provide extensive resources and support for designing, teaching, assessing, and revising FYS/W courses. Thus, any suggestions for revising, updating, and expanding this guide are encouraged.

In 2013-2014, the university will continue to evaluate the FYS/W courses in terms of their effectiveness against the original goals and their contribution to the curriculum and student success.

The following pages are intended as *guiding principles*, but they should also contribute to the wider university conversation about our teaching and student learning, notably as young and emerging scholars. In that context, the goals of the guide include the following:

- Maintaining a clear focus on the original goals of the FYS/W courses and their role in the university curriculum.
- Providing faculty a wealth of resources to achieve those goals.

Please do not hesitate to contact me, Paul Thomas (Education, paul.thomas@furman.edu, 864-294-3386), if you have questions, suggestions, or concerns about your first year seminar.

Paul Thomas
Faculty Director, First Year Seminars

Goals

Rationale for a First Year Seminar Program

In an attempt to create a stimulating intellectual environment, first year seminars will rely on the pedagogical philosophy outlined in the [Seminar Guide](#) to:

- foster a dynamic process between faculty and students in which ideas and knowledge are communicated and discussed in a reflective, critical, and engaging manner;
- enhance the intellectual skills necessary for analyzing and solving complex issues and problems;
- inspire a passion for learning and intellectual pursuits.

Six interrelated learning objectives for the First Year Seminar Program were distilled from the Curriculum Review Committee's report "Invigorating Intellectual Life" and included as part of the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The seminars are intended to show measurable improvement in students':

- dispositions toward the acquisition of knowledge;
- understanding how knowledge is critiqued;
- ability to identify one's underlying assumptions and beliefs;
- understanding and demonstration of scholarly integrity;
- level of information fluency;
- ability to write logically and clearly

Students enter Furman assuming that they will encounter an environment similar to the one they encountered in high school. They view education as a fairly straightforward proposition: instructors will give them information or tell them where to find it; the students will then repeat that information on tests, term papers, and other assignments. In short, students expect to be academically successful at Furman, but not necessarily intellectually stimulated (See "[Seeing First Year Seminars Again for the First Time](#)" below).

These seminars will represent a significant departure from the world of high school, while also providing an experience that differs from most introductory courses. Specifically, the seminars will:

- employ a format that makes students active agents in their own learning;
- require students to reflect upon and critique the ideas and concepts imparted by their instructors and peers;
- spark student interest by providing dozens of seminars encompassing a wide range of topics;
- sharpen students' analytical and communication skills;

- encourage and reinforce intellectual curiosity.

First Year Writing Seminars (FYW)

One of the main goals of writing seminars will be to teach students how to write more effectively. To meet this objective, writing seminar enrollment will be capped at twelve students. General pedagogical guidelines for writing seminars include:

- teaching critical thinking and logical argument through expository writing, working from the premise that writing is a form of thinking, and that ideas are inextricable from their written expression.
- encouraging offerings on any topic by faculty members in any department. In keeping with the emphasis on written expression, students will be required to produce 16-20 pages of finished formal writing, as appropriate to the topic of each seminar.
- incorporating education about plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty in accordance with university-wide policy.
- addressing analytical strategies, organizational methods, and grammatical correctness, although they are not designed primarily to teach the mechanics of writing.
- locating, evaluating, and incorporating information from scholarly sources, as well as giving proper credit to these sources, culminating in a research project.

Instructors will be encouraged to assign a composition handbook as a reference text and to utilize the resources of the [Center for Teaching and Learning \(CTL\)](#) and the StudioLab.

Faculty may request a specific Outreach librarian pairing in their course proposal, otherwise they will be paired with one. Faculty members may wish to consult with their [library liaison](#) as they develop their course.

Resources

[First Year Seminars](#) (university link)

[Instructor Guidelines for Funding Requests](#)

[FYS & FYW Instructor Resources \(CTL\)](#)

- [Assignments](#) (Includes Introductory, Process-Oriented, Argumentative, and Research-Based assignments)
- [Syllabi](#) (Includes examples with complete course policies, goals, and schedules for FYS & FYW seminars)
- [Guidelines for Peer Review, Workshops, and Commenting](#) (Includes explanatory handouts & student worksheets)
- [Other Useful Information](#) (Includes documents on commenting, grading, argumentation, and teaching writing, in addition to some links for your students)
- [The First-Year Seminar Reference Series](#) (Includes volumes on designing, teaching, peer review, and assessment in your First-Year seminar)

[Freshman Writing Program](#) (University of New Orleans)

[Knight Institute for Writing](#) (Cornell University)

[Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing](#) (WPA, NCTE, NWP)

[Research and Citation Resources](#) (OWL Purdue University)

[Citation Style Chart](#) (OWL Purdue University)

[Plagiarism Tutorial](#) (Indiana University Bloomington)

[Prompt Analysis for Genre Awareness](#) (A. M. Johns, 2008)

[Writing Center](#) (Temple University)

[The Writing Center](#) (University of North Carolina)

- Writing the Paper
- Citation, Style, and Sentence Level Concerns
- Specific Writing Assignments/Contexts
- Writing for Specific Fields

[ESL Online Tools](#) (UNC)

[Tips on Teaching ESL Students](#) (UNC)

[Tips on Teaching Writing](#) (UNC)

[Why Are There Different Citation Styles?](#) (Yale College)

[Why are there so many Different Citation Styles?](#) (Mercer University)

[Sample FYW Syllabus](#) (Thomas, Adventures in Genre!)

[Sample FYW Schedule](#) (Thomas, Adventures in Genre!)

[Let's End Thesis Tyranny](#), Bruce Ballenger (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*)

Texts: Writing, Grammar, Mechanics

[Style: Lessons in Clarity and Grace, 11th Edition](#), Joseph M. Williams, Joseph Bizup

[Style: Toward Clarity and Grace](#), Joseph Williams

[The Craft of Research, Third Edition](#), Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, Joseph M. Williams

[On Writers and Writing](#), John Gardner

[Writing with Intent](#), Margaret Atwood

[Arts of the Possible](#), Adrienne Rich

[Small Wonder](#), [High Tide in Tucson](#), Barbara Kingsolver

[Vertigo](#), Louise DeSalvo

[Palm Sunday](#), [Wampeters, Foma & Granfalloon](#), Kurt Vonnegut

[The Writer Who Stayed](#); [On Writing Well](#), William Zinsser

[Baldwin: Collected Essays](#), James Baldwin

[The Collected Essays of Ralph Ellison](#), Ralph Ellison

[Teaching Grammar in Context](#), Constance Weaver

First Year Seminar Common Experiences

Many universities have made the transition from freshman composition requirements, embracing first year seminars and writing-intensive requirements. As well, first year seminars often include common experiences and student outcomes, occasionally required of all seminars offered (see [pages 3-4 of Cornell University's requirements](#) for their writing-intensive first year seminars).

This section of the guide offers a consideration of potential common experiences suitable for achieving Furman University's goals for FYS/W courses (see Goals above). Ultimately, faculty members remain responsible for designing assignments, classroom practices, and assessments to achieve those goals.

As foundational courses in the Furman curriculum, the first year seminar (FYS) and first year seminar-writing intensive (FYW) provide essential experiences for students in order to fulfill the goals established for the Furman curriculum. Below are *model common experiences* well supported by research and first year expectations found in universities committed to first year seminars and writing-intensive requirements.

FYW Common Experiences

The FYW, notably, seeks to help students transition to expectations for **autonomous** academic and scholarly writing that differs from the writing they have typically experienced even as elite high school students. For example, students need to gain greater and richer *awareness* of the varied conventions of writing bound to disciplines and beyond academic/scholarly writing.

The following are model common experiencesⁱ that are minimal (but not exclusive) expectations for many university FYW seminars:

- Students compose **3-6 multiple-draft original essays** (about 20 *final* pages total), with drafts receiving professor and/or peer feedback throughout the process.
- Student essays are composed from prompts **and chosen** by the students (some combination of prompts and choice determined by the professor); students have substantial experiences choosing topics as well as considering a variety of appropriate genres, modes, and/or media.
- Students compose **at least one extended essay** (which may be the combination of multiple essays throughout the semester) **based on scholarly (and library-based) research**, conducted under the instruction (multiple class sessions) and guidance of the **library faculty member** paired with the course. Such instruction helps students understand the structure of academic literature and the process of **searching for and**

evaluating scholarly sources to inform their stances/claims and support the arguments they make in their writing. Research-based essays conform to a major citation style sheet (MLA, APA, etc.). This **assignment also includes** direct instruction on **plagiarism** and **academic integrity**.

- Students participate in **professor-student conferences** during the drafting of multiple major essays.
- Students participate in **peer conferences** during the drafting of major essays.
- Multiple seminar sessions provide **workshop opportunities** for students to brainstorm, draft, and revise essays **and/or a significant percentage of class sessions are committed to direct writing instruction**.
- Text analysis during the seminar includes **reading like a writer**, in which students examine both what the texts express and *how the writer constructs meaning* (addressing **craft** such as rhetorical strategies, purposeful paragraph and sentence formation, literary techniques, and intentional use of the conventions associated with academic fields and non-academic writing). Texts chosen for the course expose students to a wide variety of genres, modes, and mediums that help student become awareⁱⁱ of a wide variety of writing conventions, notably those conventions found in academic and scholarly writing among the disciplines (see "[Writing for Specific Fields](#)" at UNC).

Writing Outcomes

While students should experience some common experiences with writing—especially regarding the conventions of writing within disciplines—the outcomes of those experiences are more challenging to predict, or even expect. However, both students and teachers in writing intensive courses can increase the potential for those common experiences being effective if many of the elements of writing conventions and expectations are confronted, and even challenged.

The following essays ([accessible here](#)) are important starting points for considering both common experiences and outcomes related to student writing in academic settings:

- The Five-Paragraph Essay and the Deficit Model of Education, Brannon, et al.
- Encouraging Student Voice in Academic Writing, Gemmell
- What Is Happening in the Teaching of Writing?, Applebee and Langer
- Reviewing Student Papers Electronically, Dunford
- The Gray Areas of Grading, VanDeWeghe
- The Tyranny of the Thesis Statement, Duxbury
- Let's End Thesis Tyranny, Ballenger
- Of Flattery and Thievery: Reconsidering Plagiarism in a Time of Virtual Information, Thomas

- Liberating Grades/Liberatory Assessment, Miller

FYS Common Experiences

The FYS focuses on the broader expectations for scholarship students need to acquire to be success in undergraduate courses and beyond. FYS assignments may ask students to produce multiple essays, but assignments other than traditional essays (performances, projects, collaborative products, digital media, etc.) are often included to prepare students for the range of scholarly activities found across disciplines.

The following are model common experiencesⁱⁱⁱ found in many university FYS seminars:

- Students conduct an original research project with a product other than a traditional cited essay, such as digital media (blogging, Twitter, Facebook); this **research-based assignment** is couched in direct instruction on **citation style sheets** (MLA, APA, etc.), **plagiarism** and **academic integrity**.
- Students participate in a **number of various group-based learning opportunities** that require the students to **collaborate** in all phases of the project—brainstorming, drafting, finalizing/formatting, and presenting.
- Students have several opportunities to perform **close reading and analysis** of a **wide range of academic texts** across multiple disciplines in order to increase their awareness^{iv} of academic conventions and ways of knowing.
- Students have **multiple experiences making academic choices**^v throughout the semester—including, for example, choices about topics and format of original assignments as well as self-assessment^{vi} and opportunities to lead classroom discussions and text analyses.

Seeing First Year Seminars Again for the First Time

A central component of revising Furman University's calendar and curriculum included a move to first year seminars—a move away from requiring traditional freshman composition courses taught exclusively in the English Department and toward an interdisciplinary concept of being a student and a scholar in a liberal arts environment. The expectations and concepts driving those seminars have been detailed (see Appendix A below and Goals above), but goals and plans designed before implementation always deserve reconsideration once time has passed and evidence gathered after implementation.

This section is intended to reinforce and revitalize the still young but significant First Year Seminars (FYS), including the writing intensive seminars (FYW). Seeing these seminars again for the first time allows professors and their students to confront the seminars as *transitional* and *foundational* courses for the broader curriculum at the university.

Here and briefly, those transitional and foundational elements will be detailed and examined to support professors teaching these seminars and to inform all professors of those key goals of the FYS/W experiences.

The FYS/FYW courses confront professors with some core questions:

- What is the nature of learning? [Notably, moving away from learning as the transmission of content from a professor to a student and toward recognizing the agency of learners in the learning process.]
- What is the role of the professor as teacher?
- What is the role of student, particularly as a transition away from being a student to being a scholar? (See Johns, 2008, re: genre awareness)

Central to the success of the FYS/W program as *transitional* (from high school to college, from adolescence to adulthood) and *foundational* is recognizing who are students are as an identifiable group and as individual, and thus unique, people.

To that end, professors should anticipate what [Adele Schelle has coined “the good student trap”](#):

The odd thing about life is that we've been taught so many life-less lessons. We've all been conditioned to wait for things to happen to us instead of making things happen. If you think you have escaped this conditioning, then think again.

Most of us learned as early as junior high that we would pass, even excel if we did the work assigned to us by our teachers. We learned to ask whether the test covered all of chapter five or only a part of it, whether the assigned paper should be ten pages long or thirty, whether "extra credit" was two book reports on two books by the same author or two books written in the same period. Remember? We were learning the Formula.

- Find out what's expected.
- Do it.
- Wait for a response.

And it worked. We always made the grade. Here's what that process means: You took tests and wrote papers, got passing grades, and then were automatically promoted from one year to the next. That is not only in elementary, junior, and senior high school, but even in undergraduate and graduate school. You never had to compete for promotions, write résumés, or rehearse yourself or even know anyone for this promotion. It happened automatically. And we got used to it.

Furman University attracts and admits a significant proportion of students who are "good students," meaning they are good at being compliant and they have received a tremendous amount of positive reinforcement for that compliance while also having that compliance labeled as "smart" or with an "A."

That compliance, however, may not be the quality central to what is expected, desired, or encouraged in many college classrooms or fields of study—including among the faculty at Furman.

For the FYS/W courses to be effective as *transitional* and *foundational* experiences, then, professors' roles, students' roles, and classroom practices should often be *unlike* what students have experienced before entering college. Both students and professors, however, may find those changes uncomfortable and beyond their shared experiences. (Many if not most professors have been "good students" also, thriving and excelling in traditional content-/ teacher-centered classrooms that honor learning as the transmission of content—direct instruction.)

For both the FYS and FYW seminars, considering the research on best practice for teaching and learning as well as teaching composition (Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde, 2005, 2012) is a valuable starting point for seeing FYS/W courses again for the first time.

To achieve FYS/W's goal of being transitional, classroom practices should be transitional also, including the following (Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde, 2012, pp. 6-7):

LESS	MORE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LESS whole-class, teacher-directed instruction (e.g., lecturing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MORE experiential, hands-on learning • MORE active learning, with all the attendant

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LESS student passivity: sitting, listening, receiving, and absorbing information • LESS solitude and working alone • LESS presentational, one-way transmission of information from teacher to student • LESS rigidity in classroom seating arrangements • LESS prizing of silence in the classroom • LESS classroom time devoted to fill-in-the-blank worksheets, dittos, workbooks, and other “seatwork” • LESS student time spent reading textbooks and basal readers • LESS focus on “covering” large amounts of material in every subject area • LESS rote memorization of facts and details • LESS reliance on shaping behavior through punishments and rewards • LESS tracking or leveling of students into “ability groups” • LESS use of pull-out special programs • LESS emphasis on competition and grades in school • LESS time given to standardized test preparation • LESS use of and reliance on standardized tests 	<p>noise and movement of students doing and talking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MORE student-student interaction • MORE flexible seating and working areas in the classroom • MORE diverse roles for teachers, including coaching, demonstrating, and modeling • MORE emphasis on higher-order thinking, on learning a field’s key concepts and principles • MORE deep study of a smaller number of topics, so that students internalize the field’s way of inquiry • MORE development of students’ curiosity and intrinsic motivation to drive learning • MORE reading of real texts: whole books, primary sources, and nonfiction materials • MORE responsibility transferred to students for their work: goal setting, record keeping, monitoring, sharing, exhibiting, and evaluating • MORE choice for students (e.g., choosing their own books, writing topics, team partners, and research projects) • MORE enacting and modeling of the principles of democracy in school • MORE attention to affective needs and varying cognitive styles of individual students • MORE cooperative, collaborative activity; developing the classroom as an interdependent community • MORE heterogeneous classrooms where individual needs are met through individualized activities, not segregation of bodies • MORE delivery of special help to students in regular classrooms • MORE varied and cooperative roles for teachers, parents, and administrators • MORE use of formative assessments to guide student learning • MORE reliance on descriptive evaluations of student growth, including observational/anecdotal records, conference notes, and performance assessment rubrics
--	---

What is best practice? Zemelman, Daniels, and Hyde (2012, pp. 8-18) identify 14 principles grouped in 3 clusters, as follows:

STUDENT-CENTERED

The best starting point for schooling is young people’s questions and interests; all across the curriculum, beginning with students’ own questions should take precedence over the recounting of arbitrarily and distantly selected information. For almost any chunk of required subject matter, we can find “a way in”—a

subtopic, a puzzle, an angle, an implication—that can activate kids' intrinsic motivation.

Authentic: Real, rich, complex ideas and materials are at the heart of the curriculum. Lessons or textbooks that water down, control, or oversimplify content ultimately disempower students.

Holistic: Young people learn best when they encounter whole ideas, events, and materials in purposeful contexts, not by studying subparts isolated from actual use.

Experiential: Active, hands-on, concrete experience is the most powerful and natural form of learning. Students should be immersed in the most direct experience possible for the content of every subject.

Challenging: Students learn best when faced with genuine challenges, choices, and responsibility in their own learning. We need to provide “content ladders” that move kids steadily upward in complexity and challenge, as school years and school careers proceed toward college and career readiness.

COGNITIVE

The most powerful learning comes when children develop true understanding of concepts through higher-order thinking associated with various fields of inquiry and through self-monitoring of their thinking. This means teachers must explicitly model the characteristic thinking processes and strategies of each subject area, apprenticing their students to the field's ways of knowing.

Developmental: Children grow through a series of definable but not rigid stages, and schooling should fit its activities to the developmental level of students.

Constructivist: Children do not just receive content; in a very real sense, they re-create and reinvent every cognitive system they encounter, including language, literacy, and mathematics. Students' work in school should be building knowledge through inquiry, not simply listening to someone else mention information.

Expressive: To fully engage with ideas, construct meaning, and remember information, students must regularly employ the whole range of communicative media—speech, writing, drawing, poetry, dance, drama, music, movement, and visual arts.

Reflective: Balancing the immersion in experience must be opportunities for learners to reflect, debrief, and abstract from their experiences what they have thought and learned. Putting that reflection to work, students set goals for themselves, monitor their progress, and take responsibility for their own growth.

INTERACTIVE

Powerful learning happens in classrooms where there is lively conversation, discussion, and debate. Teachers tap the power of young peoples' social energy to advance their thinking.

Sociable: Learning happens most efficiently in an atmosphere of friendliness and mutual support, and teachers take steps to create safe, comfortable, and energizing classroom communities.

Collaborative: Small-group learning activities draw upon the social power of learning better than individualistic, competitive approaches. In school, as in life, people must learn to work effectively in small groups—with partners, teams, and longer-term inquiry groups of all types.

Democratic: The classroom is a model community; students learn what they live as members of that community. In school, we are not just training “consumers”; we are nurturing citizens—our future neighbors, coworkers, and fellow voters. (pp. 8-9)

These principles and the preceding suggestions of “less” and “more” are valuable ways to re-imagine FYS/W courses compared to how traditional K-12 classes and college classes create and reinforce the “good student trap.”

For many professors, then, classroom practices directly impact if and how the seminars address the transitional and foundational goals of FYS/W. Zemelman, Daniels, and Hyde (2012, pp. 28-87) recommend seven structures:

1. Gradual Release of Responsibility
2. Classroom Workshop
3. Strategic Thinking
4. Collaborative Activities
5. Integrative Units
6. Representing to Learn
7. Formative-Reflective Assessment

Further, the FYW requires unique concerns related to writing instruction; consider the following suggestions regarding creating effective composition courses and building a classroom environment to support students as *purposeful* and *intentional* writers and scholars (Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde, 2012, p. 155):

INCREASE	DECREASE
Student ownership and responsibility by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • helping students learn to choose their own topics and goals for improvement • holding brief teacher-student conferences • teaching students to reflect on their own progress 	Teacher control of decision making by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deciding all writing topics • suggesting improvements without student problem-solving effort first • setting learning objectives without student input • providing instruction only through whole-class activity
Class time on writing whole, original pieces through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • real purposes and audiences for writing • instruction and support for all stages of writing • prewriting, drafting, revising, editing 	Time spent on isolated drills on “subskills” of grammar, vocabulary, spelling, etc. Writing assignments given briefly, with no context or purpose, completed in one step

Writing for real audiences, publishing for the class and wider communities	Finished pieces read only by the teacher
Teacher modeling of writing—"writing aloud" as a fellow author to demonstrate • drafting, revising, sharing • writing skills and processes	Teacher talks about writing but never writes or shares own work
Learning grammar and mechanics in context, at the editing stage, and as items are needed	Isolated grammar lessons, given in order determined by the textbook, before writing is begun
Making the classroom a supportive setting, using: • active exchange and valuing of students' ideas • collaborative small-group work • conferences and peer critiquing that give responsibility to authors	Devaluation of students' ideas: • students viewed as lacking knowledge and language abilities • sense of class as competing individuals • cooperation among students viewed as cheating, disruptive
Writing across the curriculum as a tool for learning	Writing taught only during "language arts" period
Constructive and efficient evaluation that involves: • brief informal oral responses as students work • focus on a few errors at a time • thorough grading of just a few of student-selected, polished pieces • cumulative view of growth and self-evaluation • encouragement of risk taking and honest expression	Evaluation as a negative burden for teacher and student by: • marking all papers heavily for all errors, making teacher a bottleneck • editing by teacher, and only after a paper is completed, rather than having the student make improvements • grading punitively, focused on errors, not growth

Finally, the FYS/W seminars constitute an important foundational purpose regarding scholarship—citation (being aware of academic integrity and the parameters of plagiarism). Both the FYS and FYW should play a key role in introducing students to conventional selection, use, and citation of references and support material for their original work. This should include helping students recognize that *different fields of study implement different citation guidelines and conventions of best practice in citing works*. Both the FYS and FYW course should introduce, reinforce, and help students incorporate the following expectations for documented student products:

- Introducing student to and holding students accountable for the [university academic integrity pledge](#):

It is the desire of Furman University to unite its members in a collective commitment to integrity. In so doing, Furman University strives to teach its members to live lives of humility, respect, and responsibility. Therefore, it is the expectation that all members of the Furman University community will conduct themselves with integrity in all endeavors. In honoring these values and ideals as Furman University's foundation, it is with utmost faithfulness and dignity that I will subscribe to them.

- Introducing student to and holding students accountable for the [university's definition of plagiarism](#):

PLAGIARISM

- Representing someone else's ideas, words, expressions, statements, pictures, graphs, organizational structure, etc., as your own without proper acknowledgment or citation. Please note that this applies to material drawn from any source, including the Internet. You should consult with your instructor about the proper citation format for Internet sources.
 - Copying word for word from another source without proper attribution.
 - Paraphrasing another's written ideas and presenting them as one's own.
- Exploring the nuances between citation and formatting as that pertains to shifting definitions of plagiarism. See the conditions noted as follows:

FROM DOCUMENTATION ERROR TO PLAGIARISM

- Student includes quote marks and appropriate page number but switches source author names.
 - Student includes quote marks and appropriate source author but cites inaccurate page number.
 - Student includes appropriate source author and page number but jumbles paraphrasing and quoting by misuse of quote marks.
 - All references in the text of the essay are appropriate, but they do not correspond with the bibliography in the works cited/[references] list.
 - Student documents accurately in the text of the essay but fails to include the source in the works cited list.
 - Student includes all appropriate documentation and cites the source properly in the works cited list but includes quoted material without including quote marks.
 - Student paraphrases or quotes from a source included in the works cited list but fails to acknowledge that source in the text of the essay (omitting source author names and page numbers).
 - Student paraphrases or quotes from a source but fails to cite that source in the text of the essay or the works cited list. (Thomas, 2007, p. 84)
- Requiring students to produce *cited original work* and holding students accountable for implementing and learning basic expectations of citations as well as having multiple experiences with a variety of citation style requirements relevant to a variety of disciplines: Humanities/ MLA, social sciences/APA, etc.

Ultimately, the writing experiences of students in FYW seminars should provide students multiple experiences with drafting original essays so that those students learn and understand the conventions of academic and scholarly writing, including the opportunity to revise attempts at proper citations.

References

Johns, A. M. (2008). [Genre awareness for the novice academic student: An on-going quest](#). *Language Teaching*, 41(2), 237-252.

Thomas, P. L. (2007, May). Of flattery and thievery: Reconsidering plagiarism in a time of virtual information. *English Journal*, 96(5), 81-84.

Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (2005). *Best practice: Today's standards for teaching and learning in America's schools* (3rd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (2012). *Best practice: Bringing standards to life in America's classrooms* (4th ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Appendix A

The First Year Seminar Program @ Furman University

Liberal learning demands critical engagement with ideas. In the First Year Seminar program students have the opportunity to begin their academic careers at Furman in small cohorts, where seminar-style discussion and faculty interaction help students adjust to the intellectual and academic rigor of a distinctive liberal arts college. In these interdisciplinary courses students learn to think and write critically, evaluate sources, develop intellectual curiosity, and approach learning as a valuable, ethical pursuit. Rather than passively absorb lectures, students will actively shape and direct their learning in animated discussion, dynamic learning activities, and challenging culminating projects.

Much of the following information has been obtained from the [“2011-2012 First Year Seminar Guide.”](#)

Rationale for a First Year Seminar Program

In an attempt to create a stimulating intellectual environment, first year seminars will rely on the pedagogical philosophy outlined in the Seminar Guide to:

- foster a dynamic process between faculty and students in which ideas and knowledge are communicated and discussed in a reflective, critical, and engaging manner;
- enhance the intellectual skills necessary for analyzing and solving complex issues and problems;
- inspire a passion for learning and intellectual pursuits.

Six interrelated learning objectives for the First Year Seminar Program were distilled from the Curriculum Review Committee's report “Invigorating Intellectual Life” and included as part of the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The seminars are intended to show measurable improvement in students’:

- dispositions toward the acquisition of knowledge;
- understanding how knowledge is critiqued;
- ability to identify one's underlying assumptions and beliefs;
- understanding and demonstration of scholarly integrity;
- level of information fluency;
- ability to write logically and clearly

For Faculty

Students enter Furman assuming that they will encounter an environment similar to the one they encountered in high school. They view education as a fairly straightforward proposition: instructors will give them information or tell them where to find it; the students will then repeat that information on tests, term papers, and other assignments. In short, students expect to be academically successful at Furman, but not necessarily intellectually stimulated.

These seminars will represent a significant departure from the world of high school, while also providing an experience that differs from most introductory courses. Specifically, the seminars will:

- employ a format that makes students active agents in their own learning;
- require students to reflect upon and critique the ideas and concepts imparted by their instructors and peers;
- spark student interest by providing dozens of seminars encompassing a wide range of topics;
- sharpen students' analytical and communication skills;
- encourage and reinforce intellectual curiosity.

First Year Writing Seminars (FYW)

One of the main goals of writing seminars will be to teach students how to write more effectively. To meet this objective, writing seminar enrollment will be capped at twelve students. General pedagogical guidelines for writing seminars include:

- teaching critical thinking and logical argument through expository writing, working from the premise that writing is a form of thinking, and that ideas are inextricable from their written expression.
- encouraging offerings on any topic by faculty members in any department. In keeping with the emphasis on written expression, students will be required to produce 16-20 pages of finished formal writing, as appropriate to the topic of each seminar.
- incorporating education about plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty in accordance with university-wide policy.
- addressing analytical strategies, organizational methods, and grammatical correctness, although they are not designed primarily to teach the mechanics of writing.
- locating, evaluating, and incorporating information from scholarly sources, as well as giving proper credit to these sources, culminating in a research project.

Instructors will be encouraged to assign a composition handbook as a reference text and to utilize the resources of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and the StudioLab.

To support the information fluency component, a librarian will be paired with each writing seminar. Faculty may select an appropriate reference librarian or request a

librarian pairing by emailing the reference coordinator, currently Mary Fairbairn. The seminar librarian will serve as a resource for students throughout the semester, and—in collaboration with his or her colleagues—will conduct information fluency sessions during class time for students.

Appendix B

FYW Essay Evaluation Guide

	Unacceptable	Beginning	Competent	Exemplary
Establishing a Focus (Articulating a locus of inquiry, a research question, an issue, or a statement that students pursue in the writing.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No background or context on how question or thesis arose. Boundaries of what is known and unknown about the question / thesis not included or poorly defined. Question or thesis poorly defined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete background or context on how question or thesis arose. Boundaries of what is known and unknown about the question / thesis mentioned but no details. Question or thesis apparent but unfocused. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear explanation of background or context on how question or thesis arose. Boundaries of what is known and unknown about the question / thesis developed. Question or thesis clearly defined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well articulated explanation of background or context on how question or thesis arose. Boundaries of what is known and unknown about the question / thesis elegantly articulated. Question or thesis clearly defined.
Taking a Stand (Making a claim, making an argument.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear position taken or claim made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Position or claim is not clearly stated or is underdeveloped. Details are unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear position taken or claim made. Details of claim present. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Takes a strong, well-defined and articulated position. Fully-developed details of the claim presented.
Carrying the argument through (Coherence, unity, thesis doesn't get lost in the body and then re-surface at the end)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear introduction or main topic. The paragraphs in the body fail to develop a main idea. There is no conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction states the main topic. The paragraphs in the body lack supporting detailed sentences. The conclusion does not adequately reflect the thesis, does not provoke thought or explore implications and ramifications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction presents the main topic effectively. Each body paragraph has sufficient supporting detail sentences that develop the main idea. The conclusion is the logical "next and final step" of the argument and provokes thought or explores implications and ramifications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction presents the main topic effectively and provocatively. Each body paragraph has thoughtful supporting detail sentences that develop the main idea. The conclusion is engaging, is the logical "next and final step" of the argument and explores implications and ramifications.
Evidence and Documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims are not supported. The paper does not follow scholarly conventions for proper documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some claims are supported by valid, reliable evidence, but support is inconsistent, OR claims are supported, but the evidence is of questionable credibility. The paper has errors in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims are usually supported by valid, reliable evidence from credible sources, and the student makes a reasonable attempt at synthesizing the evidence with her or his own ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims are supported by reliable, valid evidence from credible sources and effectively synthesized. The paper cites sources correctly. The paper is highly

		documentation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper is less than convincing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper cites sources correctly. • The paper is, for the most part, convincing. 	convincing.
Language / audience	The paper does not use appropriate language for its audience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are many grammatical errors • The word choice and tone are not appropriate for the assignment • It has not been proofread for typographical or spelling errors. 	The paper is inconsistent in its use of appropriate language for its audience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are one or two major grammatical errors • The word choice and tone are not inconsistently appropriate. 	The paper uses appropriate language for its audience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no major grammatical errors • The word choice and tone are acceptable, though the writing may be occasionally vague or imprecise. 	The paper uses language deftly, with awareness of its audience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no grammatical errors • The word choice and tone are precise, cogent, and appealing.
Structure (Student uses structure as an organizing tool; component parts work in concert; conclusions are effective.)	No structure is apparent or the structure of the essay is an accident: while there are paragraphs, they are not thoughtfully connected and don't build to a logical conclusion or set of conclusions.	Some consideration of structure is evident. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete paragraph organization • Missing or ineffective transitions. 	Structure is clear. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language is used to orient the reader. • Paragraphs deliberately connect to one another through consistently meaningful transitions. 	The structure of the essay supports its form in artful and insightful ways. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraphs are carefully and clearly integrated. • Transitions guide the reader skillfully.

ⁱ See pp. 3-5 of Cornell University's common expectations: http://www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute/forms/IR%202013-14-Final.pdf

ⁱⁱ See Johns (2008): <http://www.usfc.sdsu.edu/~annjohns/Docs/Porte.publishedversion.%202008.pdf>

ⁱⁱⁱ See Habits of Mind discussions here (http://www.uno.edu/fwp/habits_of_mind.aspx) and here (pp. 4-5, <http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf>)

^{iv} Again, see Johns (2008) above.

^v See The Good Student Trap, Adele Schelle: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A50758-2003May13.html>

^{vi} See Miller (2008), Liberating grades/liberatory assessment: <http://www.freireproject.org/ojs/index.php/home/article/view/295/148>