**WR303: Writing Process & Pedagogy**

MAJOR ASSIGNMENTS (21-2)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignment** | **Points** | **Date Due** |
| Response Paper Draft | --- | 2 February |
| Examination on the WPWP + English Mechanics | 100 | 8 February |
| Response Paper (≤ 750 words) | 100 | 17 February |
| Disruptive Reflection Essay (≤750 words) | 100 | 3 March |
| Final Scholarly Essay Research Question | --- | 14 April |
| Final Scholarly Essay Draft-in-Progress | --- | 23 April |
| Final Scholarly Essay (~2500 words) | 250 | 11 May |
| Faculty Mentor Assessment | 150 | *11 May\** |
| Client Feedback & Faculty Reports (due by shift-end, evaluated periodically) | 150 | throughout |
| Class Citizenship | 150 | throughout |

\**date of assessment; nothing additional due*

The major assignments of this course—represented below in their entirety—are by and large designed to foster recursive writing, revision, and elaboration. You are generally free to revisit, revise, and adapt ideas and writing from one assignment to the next; in fact, I encourage you to do so. That’s how all scholars build complex, coherent, and impactful academic work.

**MWC-Based Assignment**

**Client Feedback & Faculty Reports**

This semester, every MWC appointment you conduct will entail written feedback to your client (in the form of a headnote and marginal comments) as well as a written report to the client’s instructor. These pedagogical tasks require thoughtfulness, attention to detail, specificity, and rhetorical finesse. Crafting such feedback and reports will help you develop as a professional writer who will often be faced with the task of shaping the performance of others in formative ways, that is, in ways that help others to understand their strengths and weaknesses as well as begin to teach them where—where and how—they might improve. Detailed instructions & expectations for delivering client feedback as well as faculty reports are included in the WFP-MWC Handbook.

**Assessment:**

I will evaluate the quality of your client feedback and faculty reports periodically during the semester. To do so, I will issue a rubric derived from the guidance for such feedback and reports provided in the WFP-MWC Handbook. Grades will be assigned to two groupings of your work: first, all feedback and reports you complete through 26 March; second, all such work completed from 27 March through 7 May (the cessation of CWF shifts in the MWC).

Note: The final grade for your client feedback and faculty reports will not be entered in AMS/CIS until the end of the semester. That grade will be calculated proportionally according to the respective percentages of your sessions conducted in the first and second halves of the semester. For example, if you conduct 5 appointments in the first half of the term (through 26 Mar) and 10 in the second (27 Mar – 7 May), then the letter grades earned for each set of reports would count for 33% and 67%, respectively, for your total grade for this component of the course.

**Response Paper**

**Prompt:**

Your mission in this paper is to craft a cogent, artful response to the text(s) that I assign for any one lesson thus far. Your response must be focused because you are limited to 750 words.

This paper requires that you blend summary and analysis, and that you carefully integrate evidence from sources to support the claims you make as you enter a specific scholarly conversation or debate that you identify and define. This assignment will help you practice concision and precision in your academic writing, and though the paper is brief, you’ll also work on developing a manageable thesis that is meaningfully informed by (and productive of further) scholarly discussion.

Your goals in this Response Paper as as follows:

1. To define a specific scholarly problem or challenge in the field of writing studies;
2. to arrange a scholarly source (or sources) in relation to that specific problem or challenge;
3. to elaborate a selective array of important implications or consequences of a scholarly source’s relationship to that problem or challenge (*not to solve it*);
4. in doing the above, begin to tell me more about your grasp of course material and questions as well as topics of particular interest to you.

**Assessment:**

I will assess this assignment holistically; successful papers will be insightful, well-organized, and analytically-sound. They will be informed by scholarly evidence, accurately characterize ideas from sources, and respond in nuanced, thoughtful ways to the challenges they define. Stylistically, they will be graceful and cohesive.

**Submission:**

Please submit, via email attachment (MS Word), a complete draft of your Response Paper by COB (1700) (1700) on 2 February.

A final draft is due to me via email attachment (MS Word) no later than **COB (1700) on 17 February**. Please submit a cover letter with your final draft (see appendix).

**Some Techniques to Consider in Response Papers**

* Response papers can be, in some occasions, more conversational in tone. This is one of those occasions. Feel free, for example, to write in a voice that makes sense to you. Of course you may also use the first person.
* Although you are certainly not required to do so, you may selectively include explicitly reflective moments to bolster and vivify your argument. (Consider, for instance, how some of the sources we’ve read use reflection in a strategic way.)
* Think big picture *and* details within the big picture. You want to open up questions, and options for exploring them, that may help you to think about topics and sites of evidence for longer essays.
* Look for especially troubling, weird, or intriguing passages in the source(s) on which you focus. Analyzing those, even doing some freewriting on them, may help you write your way to a more specific topic of interest.
* Ensure that you accurately distinguish your views and voice from those of your source.

**Disruptive Reflection Essay**

**Prompt**:

Much scholarly writing about teaching and consulting, certainly in the fields of writing studies and writing center studies, makes use of reflection, story, and personal anecdote in strategic ways. That’s not all there is to the scholarship, but it’s often an important component. Just look at many of our course readings—Bartholomae, Baldwin, Young, Brooks, *et. al*.

Accordingly, this task is an opportunity to practice communciating scholarly reflections or stories in a credible and compelling way—and part of doing that is being able to offer reflections in ways that disrupt conventional narratives, expectations, or practices. This disruptive reflection essay, then, is at least implicitly argumentative. **It is an argument in the style of a narrative**, critical reflection on some specific moment of learning about the subject of writing, or the process of teaching writing, that you’ve experienced in the course to date: when were your expectations challenged or your assumptions about this altered? how did you negotiate a particular difficulty? how did that experience change you? The moment of learning you explore might occur in the context of any of our three main components (seminar meetings, faculty mentorship experiences, and peer consulting through the MWC); it could be in relationship to something interpersonal or something you read in a text (and how what you read is complicated by your experience). **Your essay should be no more than 750 words**.

Bottom line: think of this essay as an opportunity to explore a different prose style in service of discovering and beginning to define meaningful topics for further scholarly analysis; just as in more obviously formal academic writing, you’ll want to be on the lookout for ‘interventions’ you can make to challenge conventional wisdom, explore the value of what might appear counterintuitive, or simply improve on accepted ways of doing things.

**Assessment:**

I will assess this essay holistically. Successful essays will construct a detailed, organized, and eloquent exploration of your subject; they should unfold according to a narrative arc and eschew list-like organization. They’ll be written in a style that is clear, plain-spoken, and personal—take risks! Experiment stylistically and frame your reflection so that it resonates with distinctive feeling, makes meaningful claims, and engages the reader in nuanced, gripping ways.

**Submission:**

Please submit your Disruptive Reflection Essay via email attachment (MS Word) no later than **COB (1700) on 3 March.** Include a cover letter with your submission (see Appendix).

**Some Techniques to Consider in Disruptive Reflection Essays**

* What makes your story distinctive and engaging to an outside reader? Think of what you write as not only *expressing* what happened to you, or how you see an issue, but *communicating* why that action ought to a matter to an outside reader.
* Make sure the ‘disruption’ part of this is legible—you may have to briefly characterize (if it’s not obvious) the conventional wisdom or prior attitudes that changed for you in the moment of learning you describe.
* A ‘moment’ of learning doesn’t have to be simply an epiphany, something instantaneous, though it could be. What are the dimensions of a ‘moment,’ after all? Take license, if you need it, in order to make the reflection or tell the story you have to offer.
* While it’s not necessary for you to cite scholarly sources in this essay, you certainly may bring them into the conversation if they help to bolster your argument (or provide more evidence for why it matters).

**Final Scholarly Essay**

**Scaffolded Requirements:**

**1. Provisional Research Question.** Aim for a short paragraph or two that briefly sketches some scholarly background and your experiences in order to specify a specific question or challenge—one that emerges from this background—that you plan to address. Try also to venture a rough, preliminary thesis—a tentative answer to your question—by the end of the message. I strongly encourage you to meet with me, before or shortly after you submit this item, to discuss with me. **Due by COB (1700) on 14 April as an email.**

**2. Draft-in-Progress**. You determine the length but draft, at minimum, (1) a provisional introduction and thesis, (2) a roadmap or outline (in whatever fashion and state of finish that makes sense to you), and (3) some analytical body paragraphs. I strongly encourage you to meet with me, before or shortly after you submit this item, to discuss with me. **Due by COB on 23 April via email attachment (MS Word).**

**3. At least one AI session with me.** You are required to conference with me at least once during this scaffolding process so that I can give you feedback and help you with the way ahead. Of course you may also schedule additional meetings. Finally, keep in mind that the MWC is also a great resource for you too; use each other and Postgraduate Writing Fellows to develop your efforts. **Due between 14 April and 4 May.**

**4. Final Scholarly Essay** (~2500 words). Include a cover letter with your submission (see Appendix). **Due by COB (1700) on 11 May via email attachment (MS Word**).

**The Prompt:**

In this culminating assignment, you’ll construct a focused, researched, innovative argument that addresses some key aspect of collegiate writing and peer writing consultation. The precise topic within those fields is up to you, but you’ll have plenty of support from me and from classmates in developing your ideas. To get started, consider reviewing the scholarship that most interested you over the course of the semester. This is an opportunity for you to clarify and pursue your own interests and, where possible, to build on (to revisit, revise, or adapt) other writing and thinking you’ve done for the course in the context of a major project.

Accordingly, the argument you develop should be conversant with scholarly work in the field, and it should endeavor to make a serious intervention in that work. Your final essay should be polished and developed in the style of a formal academic argument. (Though that style needn’t rule out some reflective components—just take a look at the range of scholarly readings we do over the whole semester to get a sense of the stylistic variety available to you.) Imagine the essay’s ideal audience as a group of fellow scholar-practitioners: this should be advanced first draft of a paper you might eventually present at an academic conference or publish in a peer-reviewed journal, such as [*WLN*](https://wlnjournal.org), [*Praxis*](http://www.praxisuwc.com/), [WCJ](http://www.writingcenterjournal.org), or other leading publications in the field.

Your essay will need to be thoroughly researched: it should cite **at least six scholarly sources** (at least three drawn from assigned scholarly readings for WR303 and at least three that you have located on your own), in addition to whatever primary evidence you might enlist, such as sample student writing, interviews, or records from WC Online. In your search, I encourage you to engage the following resources:

* [**https://wlnjournal.org/**](https://wlnjournal.org/)**.** The *Writing Lab Newsletter* is a long-running journal in the field. You may recall it as the original publisher of pieces we read by Andrea Lunsford, Jeff Brooks, and others. Its vast archive is searchable. If you choose to include a source from *WLN*, it should be a lead article (at least five pages in length).
* [**http://www.praxisuwc.com**](http://www.praxisuwc.com)**.** *Praxis* is a more recently-established journal, with slightly deeper, more involved pieces than WLN. (“The Idea of a Multiliteracy Center” was published there.) All articles are available online.
* [**http://www.writingcenterjournal.org/**](http://www.writingcenterjournal.org/)**.** The Writing Center Journal is another long-running journal in the field. Its archive is vast, and should be easily accessible via JSTOR.
* [**http://usmalibrary.usma.edu/**](http://usmalibrary.usma.edu/). The library also has quite a few relevant books (in hard copy and e-formats) that you can find easily through sensible keyword, title, and author searches. Still other materials can be accessed through EBSCO and JSTOR (e.g. the [Writing Center Journal](http://www.writingcenterjournal.org/find/) and many other leading peer-reviewed journals in education, pedagogy, and related fields).

**Some Techniques to Consider in Your Final Researched Essays**

* As you move through your project, especially near the beginning stages, focus on narrowing your topic: you cannot focus on all of college writing, nor all college writers. Are you especially interested, say, in the difficulties that students experience in general composition courses? courses in certain disciplines, or in their majors? Are you interested in writers at particular stages of the process, e.g. beginning or experienced college writers, or writers with particular strengths or weaknesses? Similarly, what aspect of Writing Centers interests you? Any one of the components of one-on-one sessions might be of particular interest to you—or maybe you’re interested in particular debates around methods or identities, or even certain topics? Where Writing Centers fit in universities, or how they square with other writing passions and obligations students have? It will be essential to develop a manageable topic.
* As you draft and eventually move toward your final product, avoid conducting an AAR, show-and-tell, or PR campaign. This is serioius scholarly essay targeted to other scholar-practitioners in the field. That’s your audience. You want to make what you have to say relevant to people outside of West Point.

**Other Assignments**

**Faculty Mentor Assessment.** See the guidelines on “Faculty Mentorship” at the very end of this packet. This guidance explains your responsibilities for this component of WR303 and will guide your Faculty Mentor’s assessment of your performance, which will be delivered after the end of classes. That said, you and your Faculty Mentor are empowered to negotiate your own path toward fulfilling the objectives articulated there. (Contact me with any questions or concerns along the way.)

**Written Progress Review (WPR).** You will have twenty-five minutes to complete this brief examination. The purpose of the WPR is to ensure you have accurate and adequate working knowledge of 1) the West Point Writing Program and Mounger Writing Center as represented throughout our website and in relevant sections of our *Handbook* and 2) a useful grasp of how to approach challenges—on the page and off—in the MWC. **In class on 8 February.**

**Class Citizenship:** This is a seminar-style college course for exceptionally thoughtful, driven cadets. Our purpose as an intellectual community is to engage with the state of writing studies and writing center pedagogy as it exists, but also to pose cogent challenges to its assumptions and practice in the hopes of improving them. To do so we will each draw on our own varied experiences and study of writing, of life, and of USMA. We will not always agree with the course texts or with each other: yet this is precisely the reality of a rigorous seminar course. It’s not always comfortable. But I expect each of you to thoughtfully and professionally challenge our texts, each other, and me; I also expect each of you to consider deliberately each challenge directed your way. I will do the same in return.

Class Citizenship grades account for your work in all manner of peer review activities—mock consultations, final paper topic generation, final paper reviews—as well as meeting course requirements such as, for example, an MWC consultation with another Cadet Writing Fellow early in the semester. Class Citizenship also includes completing homework and in-class or for-class assignments in a meaningful, timely fashion; these assignments may not receive individual grades, but arise from and inform class discussion. Your citizenship grade also reflects your overall professionalism in the MWC, including your willingness to complete busy shifts, keeping up with your administrative responsibilities, and representing the WPWP, WFP, and MWC in an accurate and polished manner.

**Appendix: Writing a Cover Letter to Your Assignment**

Written by Dr. Jason Hoppe, Director of the WPWP

A cover letter sets the terms of your reader’s experience; think of this letter as an opportunity for you to specify the kind of feedback you want or need. Your letter initiates a dialogue between us; it provides me with a more educated starting point for evaluating your work. By reflecting on your finished essay—describing how it came to be written and assessing what you see as its strengths and weaknesses—you help me to get a better sense of where you’re at as a writer (what your writing process is like) and, just as importantly, how you’re progressing as a *perceptive reader* of your own writing.

Without this sort of letter, I simply don’t know what *you* think about your essay, which problems you already know about and which you may not be able to see unless I point them out. Without your letter, it’s hard for me to judge which of your paper’s shortcomings are the result of a rushed compositional process (for instance, a lack of time to plan or proofread) and which are actually the result of genuine struggle or lack of know-how (in which cases I’ll be able to suggest new strategies to help). Similarly, it’s useful for me to know which of the paper’s successes came easy to you and which gave you more difficulty; if you let me know where you spent the most time or worked the hardest, I can tell you whether or not I think that labor paid off.

Ideally, as a result of your letter, I’ll be able to address more than the individual paper in and of itself; I’ll be able to speak also to your larger concerns, issues that carry across papers (and potentially, not only papers that you’re writing for this course but others as well). The bottom-line, clichéd as it sounds, is that this letter is an opportunity for you to help me help you—for you to take a lead role in your own development as a writer.

One last thing: don’t be afraid to point out flaws or to render an honest account of exactly how successful (or not) you find your finished essay to be. What you write in this letter doesn’t affect my grading; it just helps me to tailor my comments and analysis to your interests (at least to a degree).

Here, then, are some questions relating to both process and product that your letter might consider:

* What was your compositional process like for this essay? How did the essay come together? How much time did you spend on it? Where did you write it, and over how many sessions? Were any class textbooks or resources particularly helpful to you?
* Did anything change in your preparation of this essay from your normal process? Any experiments here that you’d like feedback on, whether relating to the writing process or particular elements of the paper?
* What do you see as your main idea or point? What idea or point do you feel you’ve made most successfully? least successfully? why? (Point to specific parts in the essay if you can.)
* What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of your essay? Which parts—for example, introduction? body? conclusion? thesis? key terms? organization? transitions? analysis? integrating quotations? style? using commas or other correctness issues?—did you spend the most time on? Which gave you the most difficulty? (Again, be specific.)
* What’s the number one question about your paper that you’d like me to address?
* If you were allowed just a couple more days with your paper, for revision, what would you focus on?

Your letter should be single-spaced and come in at around half a page. It should also be the last thing you write (i.e. you should write it after you’ve finished the paper). I have reprinted two sample letters on the following page.

[ADDRESS]

This compositional process occurred over a few weeks, starting at the submission of the disruptive reflection essay. I was originally very focused on Albert Bandura, but after meeting with Dr. Freitas, I was able to restructure my essay in a way that made much more sense to me, and simply used Bandura as evidence to support my argument. I think that this essay came together much easier for me than usual, especially with the help of the graduate writing fellows. Organizing all of my thoughts together to create a specific outline is usually one of my biggest challenges, but that is exactly what both graduate writing fellows were able to help me achieve. Most importantly, this increased my confidence and enthusiasm when writing this essay. Visiting the writing fellows is also not normal for me; in fact, this was my first two visits to the MWC as a real client. I switched up my writing process like this specifically for this essay because I knew that I needed to try especially hard in order to impress you. While I believe my ideas are significant and thoughtful enough for this class, I was not sure if my actual writing ability was up to par, which is why the writing fellows came in so handy. In this essay, I experimented with an extended metaphor, something I had not done before, and emphasis on creating, defining, and contextualizing key terms. Please let me know how I did in this area!

The main point of this essay is identifying an issue of confidence that many novice writers encounter while first delving into the scholarly writing environment and offering a viable, implementable solution for writing fellows to use. I hope I made this point well throughout the paper. I would like specific feedback on my second to last paragraph, which I wrote in order to help define the significance of this method specifically to the writing fellow, why it works, and what they can expect to happen from its application. I felt that this paragraph was necessary to include, but if you feel differently or that I did not incorporate it correctly, let me know! If I had a couple more days with this paper, I would definitely get a graduate writing fellow to look at it again. Unfortunately, a third session on one paper is not allowed, but I have been very impressed by their guidance and experience. At this point, I am proud of my paper and I am not sure how to improve it significantly, but I am sure the graduate writing fellows (or you!) could find something for me to work on. Anyway, enjoy!

[SIGNATURE]

[ADDRESS]

I developed my essay in two general stages. First, I created a relatively detailed outline, a thesis statement (which I ended up revising multiple times), and found rough evidence for my body paragraphs. Second, I sat down and actually wrote the essay. Strangely, I actually wrote a great deal of my body paragraphs before fully developing my introductory paragraph. This is a departure from my normal essay-writing method, in which I go at it in one straight shot in order. I spent about 5-7 hours total time working on the essay I would estimate. I did not consult TS/IS or any other Norton resources for my essay. I did briefly look over the HWE1 tips document that you gave us and the close reading sample. They were somewhat helpful, but I generally found them overwhelming, as I did not attempt to utilize them until too late into my own creative process for them to be very constructive. I had some trouble coming up with my topic for this essay because I have never had to analyze poetry in this manner before. I did end up enjoying it, but it was an uphill battle in the early stages of development.

I am generally pleased with my final product; I think it follows all of the guidelines established in the assignment. The strengths of the essay are its style and syntax; I feel that I do have my own “voice” so to speak, so I feel comfortable writing papers that have a specific tone to them. The weakest aspects of my essay are some of the evidence and developments for the allusion and modernism paragraphs. In retrospect, I should have taken more time to prepare these portions of my essay so that they were more encompassing and better supported my argument. This is not to say that they don’t support it, but they could be improved upon. I had the most difficulty writing the introduction because I was unsure how to start the essay without sounding boring or stereotypical. I ended up opening with a short explanation of my poet’s style as a modernist and how that impacted the poem. I ended up reconnecting with this concept in my last body paragraph, so I feel that it was a nice introduction to some of the larger themes of the poem and my essay. I was also pleased with my analysis of tone and enjambment.

[SIGNATURE]

**The USMA Writing Fellows Program Faculty Mentorship**

Information Sheet for Faculty

In the Writing Fellows Program—a subcomponent of the larger West Point Writing Program (WPWP)—cadets and faculty work together to study high-impact ideas and practices in composition studies and writing across the disciplines. They aim to contribute originally to scholarly conversations and, above all, to enhance the resources on hand to all West Pointers for the development of their critical thinking and writing skills. One of their primary learning forums is the Mounger Writing Center (MWC), located on the second floor of Jefferson Hall, where cadets who have been selected as Writing Fellows conduct peer consultations on every aspect of the writing process. The MWC offers consultations to all cadets and faculty. **Given COVID restrictions at the Academy, MWC consultations will take place virtually in 21-2.**

On entering this program, all Writing Fellows must complete its gateway seminar, WR303: Writing Process and Pedagogy*.* This course is a seminar and practicum that blends (a) rigorous study of relevant scholarship in college writing and teaching; (b) active peer consultations at the MWC; (c) individual mentorships with experienced faculty. **This lattermost element—faculty mentorship—facilitates acute and sustained dialogues about the teaching of writing that benefit faculty as well as the Fellows they mentor.**

**Who are the Writing Fellows?** Writing Fellows are yearlings, cows, and firsties who pursue majors in nearly every academic department at West Point. They are selected on the basis of their superior grade point average in writing-intensive courses and the promise they show as teachers and communicators.

**Who may serve as a faculty mentor?** Anyone who has completed at least one year of teaching at USMA and is currently teaching a course that has a significant writing component is eligible. We seek enthusiastic mentors at every level of the faculty and from any department.

**How long do faculty mentorships last?** Formal mentorships coincide with the duration of WR303—so just one semester.

**What does faculty mentorship involve? How much time does it take?** See next page. Altogether, faculty mentorships entail about four hours of additional work over the course of the semester. To safeguard the time of participating cadets and faculty alike, we spell out exactly what mentorship requires: 1) four individual thirty-minute meetings in which you and your mentee discuss different approaches to teaching writing and its place in your course; 2) four class visits that your mentee makes to one of your sections. At the term’s end, you’ll write up a short paragraph that assesses your mentee’s overall achievement, effort, and engagement within your partnership and decide on a letter grade that best reflects them (15% of their final grade for *WR303*).

**Faculty Mentorship Responsibilities**

The following guidelines safeguard the time of faculty and cadets alike while also ensuring that conditions exist for rich and productive partnerships. Please observe them, so far as possible. Route any questions to Dr. John Sampson (john.sampson@westpoint.edu).

**1. Individual Meetings (4):** All one-on-one meetings should involve substantial discussion of writing and teaching (~30 minutes). Cadet Fellows are responsible for initiating their scheduling. You are welcome to arrange these meetings as you prefer, though virtual meetings on Teams are encouraged. Some guidelines about whatthese meetings might involve:

i. **Introductory**: Get acquainted with your Fellow; share your interests and experiences with writing in academic and professional settings. Consider talking about the role of writing in the course you’re teaching and how you intend to assign, support, and evaluate Cadet writers. Look over your syllabus, even a writing prompt if you have one. Ask about the MWC! Schedule some of the forthcoming meetings and ‘in-class visits’. (See #2 below.)

ii. **Midterm #1**: Discuss a major writing assignment for your course, specific areas of concern you have about cadet writing, your approaches to feedback or the revision process. What should Fellows look out for at the MWC? If you have some sample cadet writing from the semester, you and your Fellow could analyze it together and discuss options for revision, comparing the different approaches that come to mind. You could also ask your Fellow about the writing he or she is seeing in the MWC and how consultations are going.

iii. **Midterm #2**: As above, in Midterm #1. Use one of these midterm meetings to plan how your Fellow will contribute to one of your class sessions. (See #2.iii below.)

iv. **Concluding**: Review the overall arc of the term and mentorship experience; perhaps check in with your Fellow about his or her written research project for WR303.

**2. In-Class Visits (4):** You and your Fellow should schedule four class visits (virtual or in-person, as suits your course plan) to one of your sections. Keep in mind that two of these visits require the Fellow to make brief presentations and one involves his or her significant participation. **Please do not record the Fellow’s presentations or lessons; this is for their privacy.** Route any concerns about this policy to Dr. John Sampson.

i) **Introductory**: Have your Fellow come to one of your sections and introduce him or herself as well as what the Writing Center is all about—whenever that works best for you both. Set aside 3-5 minutes for the Fellow to brief your cadets on how the Writing Center can help them develop as writers. (Relay the information he or she communicates to your other sections!)

ii) **Observational**: Have your Fellow observe one of your class sessions—whenever is best for you both. Preferably, this class would involve substantial talk about student writing (e.g. guidance on an upcoming event, active drafting or revising, or a review of recently graded work).

iii) **Participatory:** This is the most open-ended of the class visits; it requires significant discussion and coordination. You should enable your Fellow to participate in one of your class meetings in a prominent, meaningful way. Some possibilities include having the Fellow a) work though reading for the day and help lead discussions about how one might write about it, b) assist in leading a writing workshop, peer review, or small group work, c) give a discrete mini-lesson on some aspect of the writing process. The bottom-line is it’s up to you and the Fellow to decide what best suits your shared interests and the design of your course. **Given the extraordinary pressures of this semester, this lesson should require no more than 3-5 hours of work for the Fellow, inclusive of communication, prep, and execution).**

iv) **Final:** Set aside 5 minutes during one of these final lessons to have your Fellow to speak briefly about either a) unique challenges that timed writing events (like TEEs) pose, or b) some concrete tip about preparing a final project or presentation (whichever is more relevant to your course).