Fwd: Disciplinary Communication Grant Application - Sociology

1 message

Academic Senate <senate@ucsc.edu>   Thu, Mar 30, 2017 at 8:27 AM
To: Susanna Wrangell <swrangel@ucsc.edu>, Kim Van Le <kle11@ucsc.edu>

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Hillary Angelo** <hangelo@ucsc.edu>
Date: Thu, Mar 30, 2017 at 8:26 AM
Subject: Disciplinary Communication Grant Application - Sociology
To: Academic Senate <senate@ucsc.edu>
Cc: Tonya Ritola <tritola@ucsc.edu>, Anna Sher <asher@ucsc.edu>

Dear Academic Senate,

I am happy to submit the attached application for a "Modular Writing Curriculum to Support DC Courses in the Sociology Department," which I have prepared with Tonya Ritola (Teaching Professor, Writing Program) and Anna Sher (Assistant Director, Assessment). Attached as one PDF file, please find our grant application, followed by four appendices:

- Appendix A: Criteria-Based Rubric for Sociology 105A
- Appendix B: Assessment Results for 105A Fall 2016
- Appendix C: Letter of Support from Learning Support Services
- Appendix D: Letters of Support from the Chairs of the Writing Program and the Sociology Department, and from the Dean of the Humanities Division and Assistant Dean for the Division of Social Sciences (due to Dean Kamieniecki's upcoming departure)

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you for considering our application.

Best,
Hillary

--
Hillary Angelo
Assistant Professor of Sociology
University of California Santa Cruz

1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
office hours signup

--
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division
125 Kerr Hall
UC Santa Cruz
(831) 459-2086
(831) 459-5469 (FAX)
Website: http://senate.ucsc.edu/

Angelo and Ritola_Sociology DC Grant.pdf
1458K

Sociology Department Disciplinary Communication Grant Application
Hillary Angelo, Assistant Professor, Sociology
Tonya Ritola, Teaching Professor, Writing Program

1. Title of the program

Modular Writing Curriculum to Support DC Courses in the Sociology Department

2. Department/Program

This proposal is a collaboration between the Sociology Department (Division of Social Sciences) the Writing Program (Division of Humanities), and Institutional Research, Assessment and Policy Studies.

3. Amount requested

To launch this program, we request **$29,421-$30,521**. Please see "Detailed Budget" below for specific information about how the funds will be allocated.

4. Number of students affected

In the 2017-2018 AY, the Sociology Department will offer two sections of Sociology 105A and 105B (both required DC courses for the SOCY BA), with approximately 200 students enrolled in each course. Overall, **800 undergraduate students** will be affected.

Additionally, this project will impact **up to 16 TAs** who will serve the DC courses pedagogically by teaching small sections. Both 105A and 105B will utilize four TAs per course. Because some graduate students may serve as TAs for both 105A and 105B, or could serve either course twice, given the new schedule, the total number could be smaller (perhaps 12-14).

5. Overview of the program's DC requirement

The Sociology Department's DC requirement enables students to better understand and evaluate their social world—its character and dynamics, how they have come to live in the ways that they do and with what consequences, and why and how they might act to preserve or change that world. To achieve these ends, students develop their critical thinking and writing proficiencies by creating analytical essays about the interplay between classical and contemporary sociological theories and current sociopolitical contexts.

The Sociology Department has recently revised its DC requirement for the BA. Prior to fall 2016, students satisfied the DC requirement by taking SOCY 103B, The Logic and Methods of Social Inquiry. Now, this course is offered at the lower division and has been renamed SOCY 3A, The Evaluation of Evidence.

As of fall 2016, students meet the DC requirement by successfully completing SOCY 105A, Classical Theory, and SOCY 105B, Contemporary Theory, with a "C" or higher. The courses are designed to be taken in sequence, and beginning in 2017-2018, 105A will be a prerequisite for 105B. The DC requirement in the LALS/SOCY Combined BA is fulfilled by the LALS side of the major.

SOCY 105A and 105B teach students how to (1) interpret authors' arguments, the key concepts upon which those arguments are premised, and the implications of authors' arguments for our own time and place; 2) construct their own well-grounded arguments in response; and 3) reference others' ideas through the use of quotation, paraphrasing, and proper citation. In sections taught by TAs, students have the opportunity to present their analyses in a concise and persuasive form.

By completing each course, students satisfy the Committee on Educational Policy's requirement that students write at least 25 pages over the course of the DC curriculum (including essay exams, drafts, and substantial revisions).

6. What is proposed?

Because the DC curriculum for SOCY is a new course sequence that depends upon large lecture courses paired with TA-administered sections, this proposed project is designed to provide pedagogical support for both faculty and TAs to help improve students' proficiencies in writing about classical and contemporary sociological theories.

We propose three initiatives to improve writing instruction in the SOCY DC courses. We will develop:

1. Criteria-based rubrics to assess students' writing;

2. Lecture materials for faculty to supplement teaching of sociological content; and

3. A writing curriculum that TAs can administer in their sections.

Below, we outline the specific components of each initiative.

Initiative 1: For fall 2016, Hillary Angelo, Assistant Professor in Sociology; Anna Sher, Director for Assessment in IRAPS; and Tonya Ritola, Teaching Professor in the Writing Program developed a criteria-based rubric to assess students final projects in SOCY 105A. This rubric defined three domains for student learning (Writing in the Discipline, Foundational Writing Skills, and Information Literacy) and measured four levels of proficiency (exceeds expectations, meets expectations, partially meets expectations, and fails to meet expectations). This rubric was provided to 105A TAs and DC students and served as a revision tool for students as they completed their final projects (See "Appendix A" for the full rubric).

For the 2017-2018 AY, we will modify this rubric for SOCY 105B and provide training for faculty and TAs on how to apply the rubric, including "norming" sessions to ensure inter-rater reliability in the grading process.

Initiative 2: We will develop lecture materials on writing instruction for faculty teaching 105A and 105B. These materials will take the form of lecture notes and PowerPoint presentations keyed to the major writing assignments and TA curricula, to be used in faculty lectures. We plan to create approximately eight presentations for faculty to present in lecture that will guide students' completion of writing assignments in the DC courses.

Initiative 3: We will develop two ten-week curricular sequences for 105A and 105B, respectively, for TAs to implement in their sections, which complements the information presented in lecture. We will develop lessons for 105B building on skill sets students developed in 105A, though each could be taught independently. We will specifically focus on (1) Writing in the Discipline and (2) Foundational Writing Skills (outlined in detail below for question #7.3).

> **Topics May Include**: Reading and annotating theoretical texts, applying theoretical concepts from course texts to contemporary topics, paragraph and idea development, translating theories in their own words, making connections among course theories, developing a thesis, organizing/structuring analytical essays, selecting quotes and explaining another writer's ideas, and revising.

To prepare TAs to use the rubrics and implement the curricula for the 2017-2018 AY, we will offer a four-hour training (with lunch) in the use of the curriculum ahead of fall quarter. TAships for these classes will be competitive, and the Sociology department will offer a certificate to students who complete the training program and TA for the DC courses. Because a number of graduate students have expressed interest in learning how to teach writing and support students of diverse backgrounds and abilities, this training will also meet graduate students' needs.

> **Topics May Include**: Assessing student writing in relation to course outcomes, applying rubrics and giving helpful and efficient written feedback, meeting the needs of diverse learners, and implementing the writing curriculum we will develop.

Timeline

Summer 2017	Develop curricula for TA sections and faculty lectures
September 2017	Organize and offer four-hour TA training
Fall 2017/Winter 2018	Implement 105A and 105B curricula; revise curriculum as necessary after completion of each course
Winter/Spring 2018	Implement second round of curriculum in 105A and 105B
July 2018	Submit final report to Division of Undergraduate Education

7. What problem will this proposal solve?

We are proposing this project for several reasons:

1. The DC requirement is a new development that needs thoughtful pedagogical design for both faculty teaching the courses and TAs administering sections. Additionally, the courses are taught as large lecture courses and consequently, faculty struggle to integrate both disciplinary and writing content seamlessly. While the department is addressing the problem class size by offering 105A and 105B twice in the upcoming academic year and reducing class sizes from 300 to 200 (thereby improving the TA-student ratio), these courses still need a deliberate framework for integrating writing instruction with disciplinary content.

   Having additional writing support is essential to the success of 105A and 105B. Students in the fall 2016 105A course expressed that they would benefit from more direct writing instruction earlier in the quarter; this project seeks to meet this request. Additionally, there is currently only one (and sometimes no) MSI available for the SOCY DC courses with large enrollments, and when tutors are available, they primarily help students understand the course content, rather than improve their writing proficiencies.

2. The Sociology Department has a disproportionate number of high needs students. Within the current senior-level population of students, 66% are first generation, 76% are students of color, 31% are transfer students, 58% are multilingual, and 73% are women. Many of the transfer students take SOCY 105A in their first quarter at UCSC and so have received no writing support in lower-division classes. . This project will help prepare faculty and TAs to better serve incoming transfer students, which we expect will also benefit students even outside of DC courses.

Beyond the DC requirements, many SOCY faculty teaching non-DC courses feel they want to address writing problems in their classes in some way but don't have expertise in teaching writing. The modules will also be available for any faculty to use as "off the shelf" resources to enrich their classes.

3. A recent assessment study, "Sociology Seniors Program Learning Outcomes Assessment 2016-2017: Analytical Writing Skills (PLO 2)" of students' proficiencies in the fall 2016 offering of SOCY 105A suggests that students need additional pedagogical support.

In reference to #3 above, Dr. Anna Sher (Director for Assessment and Survey Research in IRAPS) evaluated a representative sample (*n=89*) of students' writing proficiencies in three areas: (A) Writing in the Discipline, (B) Foundational Writing Skills, and (C) Information Literacy. Overall, 61% of students in the sample were first-generation, 72% were students of color, 53% were multilingual, and 37% were transfer students-- percentages that are reflective of the larger senior Sociology student population. To evaluate students' proficiencies in each area, Dr. Sher disaggregated students' rubric data by criteria and assessed equity in students learning outcomes (See "Appendix A" for the complete rubric).

Overall, we found the following results (See "Appendix B" for a full draft of the report):

A. Writing in the Discipline

- The goal for Sociology is that 75% of its students meet or exceed expectations in this standard, and the department did not meet this goal. For instance, the analysis found that 62% were able to write a clear thesis statement, 67% met expectations in terms of selecting and applying appropriate course concepts, and 68% demonstrated analytical and critical thinking.

- Students of color (Hispanic/Latino and Asian American) demonstrated significantly lower proficiencies for each criterion, compared with their White, non-Hispanic peers (46-63% for students of color "met" or "exceeded" expectations compared to 72-88% of White, non-Hispanic peers).

B. Foundational Writing Skills and C. Information Literacy

- Again, the goal is that 75% meet or exceed expectations for the standard, and in this case the department met its goal.

- Students of color demonstrated significantly lower abilities in structure/ organization of writing than their White, non-Hispanic peers (62-71% compared to 88% "meeting" or "exceeding" expectations).

These findings suggest that students need more support to improve their proficiencies in Area A "Writing in the Discipline" and Area B "Foundational Writing Skills." Further, they confirm faculty anecdotal reports of students struggling with their writing proficiencies at the senior level. As a result, we see this project filling in many gaps for the department.

8. How does the DC fit within your program's learning outcome goals?

The DC requirement is central to meeting the Department's Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). While we recognize that not all our students will become sociologists, developing their "sociological imagination" through written reflection that mobilizes sociological theory to critique and analyze the world around them is the central mission of both the department and major. This is partly why we moved the DC requirement from a methods course to a set of theory courses; as a result, we now need to develop a cohesive writing curriculum for the DC courses. This proposal meets this mission.

Specifically, this proposal will allow us to meet and assess the following PLOs:
- **Critical Thinking**: The ability to demonstrate critical thinking through the ability to analyze and evaluate social, political, and/or cultural arguments.
- **Written and Oral Communication**: The ability to formulate effective and convincing written and/or oral arguments.
- **Social Theory**: The ability to demonstrate an understanding of, and the ability to use, several of the major classical and/or contemporary perspectives in social theory.

9. Detailed budget

Teaching Professor Summer Salary	5-unit course equivalency, paid over two months	$9,612-$10,712[1]
Assistant Professor Course Equivalency (fall 2017)	5-unit course equivalency	$17,807
TA Stipends (@ 16)	4-hour training @ 23.47/hr	$1,502[2]
Food for TA Training	Coffee + Lunch	$350
Materials	Guidelines for Writing (Reader)	$150
		Project Total: $29,421-$30,521

---

[1] This range is presented because Professor Ritola recently went under a merit review and will likely receive an increased salary beginning July 1, 2017.

[2] This number is variable depending on how many TAs will teach the courses, as well as their academic standing based on the GSR salary scale. We will have a better prediction of this number in spring quarter.

Professors Angelo and Ritola will use their course equivalencies to complete the following tasks: rubric development for 105B, curriculum development for lecture portion of 105A and 105B (eight total lessons), curriculum development for TA sections of 105A and 105B (10-15 total lessons), TA training for the curricular implementation, assessing the project, and revising curricula based on results.

10. Assessment plan

To assess this project, we will complete the following tasks during summer 2018:

- Evaluate students' abilities to meet the course outcomes by analyzing their performance in each domain and criterion developed in the course rubrics (we will also disaggregate by student demographic characteristics),

- Evaluate students' course evaluation data to learn more about their reported learning and suggestions for course improvement,

- Administer a survey to collect feedback from TAs implementing the new curricula, focusing on the lessons that worked and the lessons that can be improved, and

- Revise the curricula to address student and TA concerns.

11. Sustainability

The modules themselves are sustainable. Once created, they will be available not only to professors teaching 105A and 105B but could be used in sequence for future DC courses (should the requirement move to another course), or piecemeal as desired by faculty teaching any course with writing-based assignments. In addition, these materials could be available for Sociology faculty use as individual units in non-DC courses because they will provide ideas and resources for giving brief writing lessons (and coaching TAs) on helping students develop appropriate essay topics, writing short papers, and completing essay-based exams.

In addition, we envision this as the first phase of a longer process of developing a writing support and tutoring program in Sociology. After we have created the modules in 2017-2018, we will begin working with LSS to expand MSI offerings and/or develop a writing tutoring program in Sociology, likely based on Politics' successful model, beginning in the 2018-2019 academic year. We have enclosed a letter from Charis Herzon, Assistant Director HSI Initiatives/ Retention Services and Interim Director Learning Support Services, expressing her support of this proposal.

Appendix A: Criteria-Based Rubric for Sociology 105A

FALL 2016, Professor Hillary Angelo
(Developed in collaboration with Anna Sher, IRAPS, and Tonya Ritola, Writing Program)

	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Partially meets expectations	Fails to meet expectations	# of points
Thesis (argument) (40pts)	• Paper has a clear analytical thesis that uses the case study to expand on or evaluate two theorists (i.e., By looking at the Dakota Access Pipeline, we find that Marx's explanations are inadequate because X. However, we find that Weber helps X, Y, and Z) **36-40 points**	• Paper has a clear analytical thesis that references two theorists (i.e., Marx and Durkheim help us understand the Dakota Access Pipeline in the following ways: X, Y, Z) **31-35 points**	• Paper has a thesis but does not engage the theories in a critical way (i.e., Marx and Durkheim help us understand the Dakota Access Pipeline) **25-30**	• Paper does not have a thesis that refers to course theories **0-24**	
Selection, explanation, and application of concepts (60pts)	For both theorists, • Selects appropriate concepts and quotations to support a well-developed argument • Offers full explanations of theorists' concepts • Applies concepts correctly to case **56-60**	For both theorists, student • Selects appropriate concepts and quotations to sufficiently support the argument • Offers adequate explanations of theorists' concepts • Mostly applies concepts correctly to case **51-55**	For one or both theorists, student • Selects some appropriate concepts and quotations to support the argument • Offers partial explanations of theorists' concepts • Makes significant errors in application of the concepts or simplistic application **45-50**	For both theorists, student • Does not select appropriate concepts to support argument, OR • Quotes but does not explain theorists' concepts, OR • Applies theorists' concepts incorrectly **0-44**	

Critical thinking and analysis (50pts)	• Discusses, in detail, implications of the case for understanding the theories or vice versa • Provides original interpretations of readings or quotes, clearly moving beyond points made in the lecture **46-50**	• Discusses some implications of the case for understanding the theories or vice versa • Provides some original interpretations of readings or quotes, in addition to points made in the lecture **41-45**	• Mentions but doesn't explain the implications of their analysis, OR • Mostly repeats ideas presented in course lecture **35-40**	• Does not discuss implications of their analysis **0-34**	
Structure (organization) (50 pts)	• Structure logically advances thesis, and successfully develops a cohesive argument (e.g., compare and contrast two theorists) **46-50**	• Structure logically advances thesis, and clearly shows an attempt to develop a cohesive argument (e.g., compare and contrast two theorists) **41-45**	• Structure does not logically advance thesis; argument is hard to follow **35-40**	• Structure has no apparent logic, OR • Advances no main argument, OR • Misses sections of the paper **0-40**	•
Style and clarity (30 pts)	• Writing is clear, strong, easy to read, and virtually free of grammar and punctuation errors **26-30**	• Most of the writing is clear, and the writer's minor errors do not distract from the ideas **21-25**	• Writing includes unclear language, typos, and/or errors that make parts of the paper difficult to follow **15-20**	• Writing contains many sentence-level errors (i.e., grammar, punctuation, and spelling) that make it difficult to read **1-15**	•
Citations (20 pts)	• In-text citations and bibliography are cited appropriately in ASA format **16-20**	• Most in-text citations and bibliographic entries are cited appropriately in ASA format, with a few inconsistencies **11-15**	• Some in-text citations and bibliographic entries are cited appropriately in ASA format **6-10**	• Sources are not cited, OR • Writer does not include a bibliography **0-5**	•

Appendix B: Assessment Results for 105A Fall 2016

Sociology Seniors Program Learning Outcome Assessment 2016-17:
Analytical Writing Skills (PLO 2)

--Anna Sher, Director of Assessment and Survey Research, IRAPS

_____

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sociology senior students' analytical writing skills were evaluated using a rubric (direct evidence). A representative sample of senior student papers (*n* = 89) was collected in the 105A (Classical Social Theory) during fall 2016.

The rubric included six skills in three areas:

> A. Writing in the discipline,
> B. Foundational writing skills, and
> C. Information literacy.

For each skill, we articulated and measured four levels of proficiencies ranging from not meeting expectations to exceeding expectations.

Our research goal was to identify areas where our students need improvement. In our analysis of the results, we grouped the top two levels and used a standard of 75% of students meeting or exceeding expectations to identify areas needing improvement. We also examined equity in learning outcomes using Chi-square analysis to compare subpopulations.

Our key findings were as follows:

- In the area "Writing in the discipline of sociology," students as a group were below the expected standard of 75% of students meeting or exceeding expectations. This area included the following skills: writing a clear thesis, selecting and applying appropriate concepts, and demonstrating analytical and critical thinking. Further analysis showed that students of color, Hispanic/Latino and Asian American students, demonstrated significantly lower proficiencies in each of these three skills compared to their White, non-Hispanic peers (46-63% of students of color vs. 72-88% of White, non-Hispanic peers met or exceeded expectations depending on the skill).

- In areas B and C, senior students as a group were above the expected standard of 75%. However, Asian American and Hispanic/Latino students demonstrated significantly lower proficiencies in structure (organization) of writing compared to their White, non-Hispanic peers (62-71% vs. 88% met or exceeded expectations).

- This evidence indicates that students need more support to improve their proficiencies in Area A "Writing in the Discipline" and in Area B "Foundational writing skills".

- We found no significant differences in student proficiencies related to gender, first generation, first language, and transfer status.

Methodology (Direct Evidence)

We evaluated final papers in the 105A Classical Social Theory. This course examines different aspects of the sociological traditions in Western civilizations. This course also serves to satisfy DC requirement starting in fall 2016.

This course enrolls juniors and senior students. For the assessment study, we analyzed only papers written by seniors (n=89); this sample of students was representative of the senior Sociology student population.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Direct Evidence

We evaluated five aspects (skills) of analytical writing in three areas:

> A.Writing in the discipline,
> B. Foundational writing skills, and
> C. Information literacy.

Area A. Writing in the discipline (three skills): The following percentage of students met or exceeded expectations in each skill: 68% -- in critical thinking and analysis, 67%-- in selecting, explaining, and applying concepts, and 62%-- presenting a clear thesis and argument (see Table 1 on next page).

The results show that from a quarter to a third of students struggle with each of these aspects: presenting a clear thesis and argument (35% partially met expectations), selecting, explaining, and applying concepts (32% partially met expectations), and critical thinking and analysis (25% partially met expectations).

Area B. Foundational writing skills (two skills): 89% met or exceeded expectations in writing style and clarity and 77% -- in structure and organization.

The results show that in this area, about a quarter of students struggled with one skill in particular: structure and organization (25% partially met expectations).

Area C. Information literacy (1 skill): 90% met or exceeded expectations in citing using ASA style.

Table 1. Assessment of Sociology seniors' analytical writing skills

	Did not meet expectations	Partially met expectations	Met expectations	Exceeded expectations	**Met or exceeded expectations**
A. Writing in the discipline					
Thesis (argument)	3%	**35%**	32%	30%	**62%**
Selection, explanation, and application of concepts	2%	**32%**	42%	25%	**67%**
Critical thinking and analysis	8%	**25%**	43%	25%	**68%**
B. Foundational Writing Skills					
Structure (organization)	0%	24%	45%	32%	77%
Style and clarity	0%	11%	51%	38%	89%
C. Information Literacy					
Citations	2%	8%	38%	52%	90%

ANALYSIS OF EQUITY IN STUDENT OUTCOMES

Below we examine equity in student levels of proficiency in each of the six skills based on gender, race/ethnicity, language group, first generation status, and transfer status by conducting Chi-square analysis.[1] We compared three race/ethnicity groups with sufficiently large number of students: Asian-American, White, Non-Hispanic, and Hispanic/Latino students. We also examined proficiencies across three language groups, Monolingual, Early Bilingual, and Late Bilingual.[2] (See Table 2 on next page).

We found no significant differences in student proficiencies related to gender, first generation, first language, and transfer status.

We found significant differences in proficiencies of students of color and White, non-Hispanic students in area A "Writing in the discipline" (significant at $p<.05$ or $p<.01$). Specifically, Hispanic/Latino and Asian American students demonstrated significantly lower proficiencies in each of three skills compared to their White, non-Hispanic peers (46-63% of students of color vs. 72-88% of White, non-Hispanic peers met or exceeded expectations depending on the skill). In area B "Foundational writing skills," Asian American and Hispanic/Latino students demonstrated significantly lower proficiencies in structure (organization) of writing compared to

---

[1] We used chi-square analyses with Fisher's exact tests comparing two categories (those who met/exceeded expectations vs. those who partially met/did not meet expectations).

[2] Students reported on their UC application what language(s) they spoke at the age of 5. Early Bilingual includes students who checked English and other language (s). Late Bilinguals includes students checked language other than English.

their White, non-Hispanic peers (62-71% vs. 88% met or exceeded expectations). There were no differences in style and clarity or use of citations.

Table 2. Percent of seniors who met or exceeded expectations (combined) by ethnic group

	Asian American	Hispanic/Latino	White, non-Hispanic
Thesis (argument)	**46%**	**54%**	80%
Selection, explanation, and application of concepts	**62%**	**63%**	72%
Critical thinking and analysis	**54%**	**56%**	88%
Structure (organization)	**62%**	**71%**	88%
Style and clarity	92%	78%	100%
Citations	92%	85%	92%
N of students	13	41	25

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Learning Support Services   **1156 High Street**
                                                                                    SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95064

March 28th, 2017

Letter of Support Sociology Disciplinary Communication Grant

It is with great pleasure that I write to confirm that Learning Support Services (LSS) looks forward to providing LSS Programs for the redesigned DC Sociology courses 105A and 105B. LSS has traditionally supported these courses with Modified Supplement Instruction and plans to continue with the intent of working closely with the department and faculty to also redesign the LSS support to better meet the needs of the students and intended learning outcomes of the courses.

LSS and Departments offer areas of expertise that we can leverage to design learning environments that are diverse and intentional. We are most effective when we collaborate with the teaching team comprised of the Faculty, TAs, and LSS tutors/MSI leaders. Examples of previous collaborations include LSS support of Math 2 and Math 3, Biol 20A, and a large-scale program in Politics aimed to support students in their development of disciplinary writing skills. In these collaborative models, LSS works closely with the faculty and department to hire and train upper level undergraduates who offer a near-peer component to the learning environment.

Please feel free to contact me with questions.

Sincerely,

Charis Herzon

Learning Support Services Interim Director

Hispanic Serving Institution Initiatives Assistant Director

charish@ucsc.edu

(831) 459-3460

CC:

Hillary Angelo, Assistant Professor, Sociology
Tonya Ritola, Teaching Professor, Writing Program
Herman Gray, Professor and Department Chair, Sociology
Pablo Reguerin, Assistant Vice-Provost Student Success
Sharon Castro, Lead MSI/Tutor Coordinator

Google @ UCSC

Jessica Lawrence <jlawren2@ucsc.edu>

Re: from Herman: Sociology Department DC Grant Proposal

1 message

Kyle Eischen <keischen@ucsc.edu>   Wed, Mar 29, 2017 at 12:43 PM
To: Herman Gray <herman@ucsc.edu>
Cc: Jessica Lawrence <Jlawren2@ucsc.edu>, Sheldon Kamieniecki <sk1@ucsc.edu>, Jill Esterás <jesteras@ucsc.edu>

Dear Herman,

This is a terrific proposal, and has the Division's full support. For so little money we will be able to improve the writing of numerous students and provide expert guidance moving ahead (a wonderful combination). We strongly endorse the department's Senate Disciplinary Communication grant proposal.

Sincerely,

Kyle Eischen,

Assistant Dean

On Mar 23, 2017, at 12:16 PM, Jessica Lawrence <Jlawren2@ucsc.edu> wrote:

Dear Sheldon,

I write to express my enthusiastic support for the Writing Curriculum to Support DC Courses in the Sociology Department put forward by Hillary Angelo and her colleague, Dr. Tonya Ritola teaching Professor in the Writing Program. The proposal (attached below), in the amount of $29-31K, is a collaboration between the Sociology Department (Division of Social Sciences) the Writing Program (Division of Humanities), and Institutional Research, Assessment and Policy Studies. Overall, 800 undergraduate students will be affected. Additionally, this project will impact up to 16 TAs who will serve the DC courses pedagogically by teaching small sections.

As you will recall the Sociology Department has revised the undergraduate curriculum to better able us to serve our majors and to deliver our curriculum more efficiently given our current FTE. As you are of course well aware, the department is also bracing for an expected increase in demand for sociology courses that will place an additional burden on our already impacted major.

The DC funding proposal put forth by Hillary will go a long way to help insure that we are able to deliver our two upper division core theory courses and DC requirement efficiently and with the quality of content and course support that is a key component and necessary to insure its success.

I support the proposal and hope that you will lend your support to the proposal as well.

Best,

Herman

Google @ UCSC

Tonya Ritola <tritola@ucsc.edu>

DC Grant for Working with Sociology: Chair Support

Heather Shearer <hshearer@ucsc.edu>　　　　　　　　　　　　　Wed, Mar 15, 2017 at 11:28 AM
To: Tonya Ritola <tritola@ucsc.edu>
Cc: Hillary Angelo <hangelo@ucsc.edu>

Dear Tonya,

I support this grant. The project outlined in the grant usefully complements other WP initiatives relating to assessment, curriculum design, and TA training (i.e., WRIT 202). The three-pronged approach you have outlined promises to improve learning conditions for students--and appears to be sustainable approach (which is key to its success).

Sincerely,
Heather

On Mon, Mar 13, 2017 at 9:47 AM, Tonya Ritola <tritola@ucsc.edu> wrote:
Hi Heather,

I am attaching a DC Grant Application, "Writing Curriculum to Support DC Courses in the Sociology Department," for the 2017-2018 AY. This proposal is a collaboration between the Writing Program, the Sociology Department, and IRAPS and is meant to improve students' writing proficiencies in the Sociology DC courses.

To submit this application, I need to provide both chair and decanal support. Could you please review the application and let me know if you support it? An email confirmation should be sufficient.

If you approve it, should I send it to Tyler directly, or should it come from you?

Please let me know if you have any questions. I will be sending an additional grant application for Writing 2 on Wednesday.

Sincerely,
Tonya

--
****
Tonya Ritola, PhD, she/her
Teaching Professor, Writing Program
University of California Santa Cruz
1156 High St.
Santa Cruz 95064
Phone: 831-459-2216
Mailstop: Humanities Academic Services
****

--
Heather Shearer, PhD
Teaching Professor and Writing Program Chair
University of California at Santa Cruz
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064

Crown 126

Tonya Ritola <tritola@ucsc.edu>

Approval Needed (March 30th): Internal DC Grant for Undergraduate Education

Tyler Stovall <humdean@ucsc.edu>   Fri, Mar 17, 2017 at 12:43 PM
To: Tonya Ritola <tritola@ucsc.edu>
Cc: Heather Shearer <hshearer@ucsc.edu>, Hillary Angelo <hangelo@ucsc.edu>, Judy Plummer <jplummer@ucsc.edu>

Dear Tonya,

I happy to support your application for this grant. It looks like an important and well-conceptualized project.

Best of luck,

Tyler

On 3/16/17 10:24 PM, Tonya Ritola wrote:

> Dear Tyler,
>
> I recently sent you an email (included below) requesting your approval for an internal grant through the
> Division of Undergraduate Education. I have spoken with Amber Burke and Katie Novak about the proposal,
> and they advised me that it does not need to go through the Office of Sponsored Programs because it is an
> internal, UCSC-specific grant.
>
> Katie asked that I re-send you my email, including the attachments. I am providing that for you here.
>
> You need only send me email confirmation of your support for this grant, should you choose to support it. I
> will include your correspondence with my application packet, along with Chair Shearer's support email.
>
> I appreciate your patience as we've negotiated this process and look forward to hearing from you. I will also
> be sending another proposal soon.
>
> Sincerely,
> Tonya
>
> --
> Dear Tyler,
>
> I hope you are well.
>
> I am applying for a Disciplinary Communication Grant to develop a cohesive writing curriculum to support
> Sociology faculty and graduate students teaching the DC courses. To submit this grant, I need both chair and
> decanal approval. If possible, could you please review my application and let me know if you approve it by
> March 30th?
>
> I am attaching two documents to this email: the grant application itself and Heather's support of the grant.
>
> Please know that I am submitting another grant focusing on the WP specifically, and I should have that to you
> very soon.
>
> I am happy to answer any questions you have. Thank you for your consideration.
>
> Sincerely,
> --
> ***
> Tonya Ritola, PhD, she/her
> Teaching Professor, Writing Program
> University of California Santa Cruz
> 1156 High St.