

Wellesley College
Calderwood Seminars in Public Writing

External Evaluation of the Program
Constance Cain Hungerford
Mari S. Michener Professor of Art History, Swarthmore College
May 1, 2017

Introduction

As a senior faculty member at a peer institution, as well as provost for ten years and then interim president, I have found it inspiring to participate in this review of the Calderwood Seminars in Public Writing. The program, now concluding its fourth year, is imaginatively conceived and unique in my experience. Working from clear goals, it has been defined in thoughtful detail, tested, and adapted as appropriate to varying disciplines. The seminars have enlisted superb faculty who have shown creativity in course design and dedication to their students in working intensively on their writing without compromising the highest standards for field coverage and intellectual rigor in analysis and argumentation. I believe the program has had a demonstrable impact on the intellectual and social maturation of the upper level students who have taken a seminar. As one of them concluded, echoing many others, "Calderwoods should be requirements at Wellesley – they encapsulate what it means to be a liberal arts student."

The Calderwood Seminar Program in Public Writing was proposed by Wellesley College in 2012 with a view to creating "a suite of senior capstone courses that [would] engage students in a final broad review of their major while fine-tuning their writing skills and preparing them for careers in their field." This has meant that seminars are 300-level, intended for seniors, though also accepting juniors. They are almost exclusively located in individual departments or programs. The distinctive goals for writing are that rather than continuing to hone the ability to present academic scholarship to professionals, a focus since matriculation, featured in term papers and honors theses, students will engage in public writing. They will think in terms of communicating what they have learned at Wellesley to less specialized audiences, for example, in a newspaper account of a conference or recent break-through research first announced in a professional journal. They will draft artist's and curatorial statements and grant proposals; they will review books, films, or TV programs, or conduct an interview and present its substance; they will write opinion or advocacy pieces, Wikipedia entries, and blog posts. Essays will be shorter and, instead of being submitted for a private grade to what one student referred to as "a patient Professor reading a dozen reports per class," will be

developed through a process of in-class editorial review and then rewriting. As the program has blossomed it has also embraced its role empowering students to take more responsibility for what is accomplished in a seminar meeting, to appreciate the processes of giving constructive criticism and resiliently accepting it, to collaborate.

Wellesley has been able to pursue this vision because of the generous support of the Stanford Calderwood Charitable Foundation, which honors Stanford Calderwood's teaching relationship with the college and his long-standing interest in effective writing. Answering an August 2012 proposal, the Foundation in October agreed to provide annual funding for a five-year pilot to run from academic year 2013-2014 through 2017-18, with a review to be conducted in year five. The present review has been conducted in year four instead with a view to smoothing the transition to the next phase of the program, when it is hoped a permanent endowment will assure stable funding.

Assessment Practices

The present report is the culmination of exemplary assessments of the program's impacts, organized from the first year. Quantitative data has documented student and faculty participation, including tracking repeating faculty. From a goal of six-to-eight seminars annually, there have been eight or nine offered each of the four years, with a total of 19 different offerings. Of 20 faculty participants (one seminar was team-taught), 10 have repeated their course at least once (three for four times, three for three times) and several others plan to do so in the future. Such repetition is important because it evidences not only faculty satisfaction with what is being accomplished, but broader departmental approval of using teaching resources for these offerings. (It does help that the program will replace the teaching unit in the instructor's department, if necessary.) Moreover, as seminars become more familiar, the word-of-mouth among students encourages more enrollment. On average 90 students have taken a seminar each year, approximately 15% of the graduating class; a few students have taken more than one.

Equally impressive have been several qualitative assessment measures. Self-reported information collected annually includes the "Reflection," a cover memo with which students preface their portfolios of work (a compilation of five or six pieces they have written, including both first and final drafts). Prompts make these Reflections particularly substantial and pertinent. They are read by the instructor and the program's faculty director, David Lindauer. Faculty also receive feedback from the regular confidential Student Evaluation Questionnaires (SEQs) that all students complete. In addition, during reading period Prof. Lindauer has conducted debriefing sessions with groups of students who have completed a seminar that semester, writing up notes (in years one and two with Richard French, Dean of Academic Affairs, in year three with Provost Andrew Shennan).

Faculty have likewise written “Evaluations” at the end of each seminar, reviewing what worked well and what might be improved. Together with the data, the Reflections and Evaluations have been reviewed in annual reports sent to the Calderwood Foundation, the first commissioned from Prof. Ray Starr (Classics). In summer 2016, Prof. Joseph Swingle (Sociology) was also asked to survey 133 alumni from the classes of 2014 and 2015 about their recollected experiences. His report drew as well on answers from the May 2014 Senior Survey, which asked students’ reasons for taking a Calderwood seminar (the most frequent answers involving topic, professor, and public writing).

As well as such feedback based on participant comments, Prof. Lindauer has initiated several direct assessment analyses. In June 2015, Prof. Wini Wood (senior lecturer in the Writing program) designed and coordinated an evaluation in which a panel of six faculty developed a scoring rubric and used it to rate samples of public writing drawn from student portfolios. They concluded that there was indeed evidence of improvement, a) from initial draft through the final revision, and b) over the course of the semester, comparing an early essay to a late one. Prof. Swingle was again enlisted in Fall 2016 to examine 100 randomly selected Reflection statements submitted between Fall 2013 and Spring 2016. Working with two student researchers, he classified the responses in terms of five recurring themes. These were overwhelmingly affirmative (the Reflection format admittedly biases toward the positive) and confirmed achievement of seminar goals. Students reported: a) improvement in their writing skills, b) deepening or broadening knowledge of their disciplines, c) development of their ability to deal critically with disparate arguments (in texts and advanced by fellow students), and d) understanding how constructive criticism works. Identifying criteria for choosing their best piece of writing (e), they mentioned writing with a personal voice, working collaboratively, and applying their efforts to real world problems.

Wellesley has allocated unusual resources to the Calderwood initiative: funding expert advice in the design and execution of surveys and the rating of examples of student writing, as well as mandating that students and faculty write Reflections and Evaluations. This degree of reporting may be difficult to sustain, but the coherent assessment activities have made excellent sense when focused on the launch and fine-tuning of such an innovative program. They have illuminated successes and helped faculty make positive adjustments and they facilitate both consistency and the sharing of good ideas.

Campus Visit

I was privileged to spend four days on campus in March 2017 (see appended schedule). I attended Prof. Lindauer’s debriefing conversation with students from two Fall 2016 seminars and lunched with several other graduates of previous seminars. Faculty who have taught in the program generously made time to speak with me, individually and in groups, and I later talked by phone with one who had

been ill during my visit; I thank every one for fascinating, rich conversations. I attended three full seminar meetings, Vernon Shetley's on Public Writing on Film and TV, Dan Chiasson's on *The New York Review of Books* at 50, and David Lindauer's on Economic Journalism, and appreciate the welcome extended to me by those classes. I spoke with academic and finance administrators and was pleased to meet with President Paula Johnson.

Insights

As the assessment measures testify, implementation across a wide range of disciplines has resulted in a richer variety than might have been expected: there are seminars in American Studies, Art History, Biological Sciences, Cinema and Media Studies, French, Economics, English, Environmental Studies, Mathematics, Music, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, Religion, Sociology, Spanish, and Writing. Many follow Prof. Lindauer's "common text" model where students address the same readings. Others have adopted a model where students choose a "beat" in which to specialize, then share their expertise with the rest of the class. There is a difference, though, between teaching majors in a subject that is vertically structured, i.e., where everyone has progressed through a common sequence that then serves as a foundation (e.g., Economics and Music), as opposed to subjects where students may have studied varied sub-fields and are unfamiliar with each others' strengths (e.g., Psychology or Religion); they find themselves invited to teach others about their topics. While in some seminars juniors have filled open seats, a necessity in relatively small majors (Philosophy and Sociology), the preference is for seniors for whom the seminar will be a capstone experience. Of the 361 students who have taken a Calderwood Seminar to-date, 75 percent were seniors. There is general agreement that advanced command of the field is a prerequisite for the work the seminar does together, as is the maturity to engage in the editing process. Not surprisingly, there are some kinks are still being worked out, attendant on issues including more multi-disciplinary topics and teaching in a foreign language, where correcting grammar vies with revising for content.

Calderwood seminars are unusual and challenging to teach. They require extra time for sustained interaction with students over drafts of their writing and helping them actually publish in journals like *The Huffington Post*. Bringing in professionals as guest speakers or interview subjects and leading field trips takes special effort. Teaching may enlist different skills: coaxing some students to make substantial critical remarks about someone else's work and insuring that in-class time feels worthwhile to everyone present. For faculty who come to class intensely "on," it can be hard to step back to let students assume more responsibility for what is accomplished. Just balancing field coverage (the capstone aspect) against reserving perhaps half the time in and out of class for workshopping and revising can be difficult. That highly regarded faculty have become enthusiastic pioneers in the Calderwood program is testimony to the caliber of Wellesley's faculty and their sense of mission in teaching undergraduates. As one stated, "I strongly believe that

these seminars are some of the most innovative, forward-looking, relevant courses we have offered at Wellesley in years.”

The seminars demonstrably have had an impact on students, as the rating exercise and especially their eloquent Reflections testify. Students cite very specifically the ways their writing has improved, from word choice and use of active verbs, to the selective marshaling of statistics, to crafting titles, topic sentences, and flow between paragraphs. Writing concisely, “prioritizing,” “leaving ... out...details that I may find interesting, but [that] are irrelevant to the understanding of the reader,” figures prominently: “sometimes, writers have great ideas that just don’t fit in a given piece.” But Calderwood seminars are not just a final crack at the mechanics of writing. While they may overstate the case against academic writing (“sterile,” “approaching the indecipherable,” with “boring but necessary sentences about methodology,” “cold, hard facts,” “jargon”), students relish discovering their “voice,” being able to “own” their opinion and presentation and they appreciate ways their academic writing can also benefit: “I’ve become much more thoughtful about how I express my ideas. It was a new experience to write with readers in mind, one that forced me to work on the clarity of my writing and making my own ideas and opinions more accessible to others, and I believe that my writing in other classes has improved as a result.” The imperative of writing for an audience defined as non-specialists is key: my seminar “taught me a lot about adopting appropriate writing styles for different purposes, as well as how to consider an audience in my writing.”

Though writing is the major component of the seminar, students are emphatic that they learn content and in ways unlike a regular course, such that they see their discipline in new ways. In “beat” seminars exposing them to each others’ unfamiliar subjects they realize they become “less afraid of tackling and digesting a topic that is alien to me.” They get that to craft an effective piece of writing, one needs “to thoroughly understand the science behind the piece and its applications” and that “often a good indicator of one’s knowledge and confidence about a topic is how well one can explain it to someone else, especially if that person is less familiar with the material.” They want to hold scholars accountable for presenting “the component of the research that has future applications and that a layperson would care about.” And they approach the authorities they are assigned to read with a new critical lens, scrutinizing arguments and the use of evidence more independently, declining to defer just because something is in print.

Students speak to a number of personal or social skills they develop, for some allegedly without much prior opportunity in Wellesley courses. They cite a sense of camaraderie both because of the small format and the frequent editing sessions; once-shy students, “pushed out of my comfort zone,” come to “depend on each other to give honest and helpful feedback.” They speak of appreciating the excellence of others, the workshopping encouraging “a community of mutual respect and constructive criticism.” Said one, “This seminar reconnected me to the Wellesley community, and reminded me of the wonderful intellect and creativity of my fellow students.” They cite growing personal self-confidence, the ability to tackle new

assignments without anxiety; they recognize that they really don't write badly after all. They cite the experience of taking the initiative in choosing topics and seeing them through to public presentation, in setting up interviews – something that may otherwise be reserved for some, but not all students who do research papers and theses. They write of coming to value working in collaboration rather than in isolation. They speak of the pleasure of being an editor, helping others present their ideas effectively. Some begin to feel a sense of mission to release “the literature and research...trapped within the cryptic annals.”

All these perceived benefits involve intellectual and personal strengths that students will take with them when they graduate, preparing them to translate their academic studies into meaningful engagement with the larger world. Some already appreciate that the Calderwood experience can be an asset in applying for graduate school and employment; some aspire to be journalists. For some it was an incentive to take the seminar, one student enthusing that mention on her CV had drawn favorable attention and another using a Calderwood essay as a writing sample. It will be instructive to trace the relationship to post-Wellesley careers in future assessments.

Faculty Development

In sketching out planned evaluation and dissemination measures the initial proposal in 2012 promised that in addition to creating opportunities for students to engage in intensive public writing and prepare for the demands of the working world the program would “provide new opportunities for faculty for curriculum development and pedagogical innovation.” While this goal hasn't been much discussed, my on-campus visit confirmed strikingly how valuable the Calderwood program has been in this regard. Faculty, often senior and settled into familiar patterns, cited the opportunity to refresh their teaching and to work across departmental lines with fellow faculty, to re-explore their commitment to common goals. In addition to the one-on-one course development sessions with Prof. Lindauer, faculty also cited occasional workshops and lunches, as well as working together on assessment exercises, notably the one supervised by Wini Wood. I also heard from several junior faculty who appreciated the development opportunities, including the chance to learn from more senior faculty.

As faculty Evaluations from later iterations of seminars confirm, prior Evaluations have been useful in reminding of past successes and disappointments, facilitating re-design at a later point. Assessment activities have informed not only Calderwood seminars, but also other classes taught by faculty members, even as they maintain typical emphasis on subject coverage. Reading student evaluations I was struck by comments that their Calderwood seminars were the first or a rare instance of being asked to critique the writing of a fellow student constructively and of learning to receive criticism in front of others without being defensive or feeling hurt. I wondered if faculty reading such comments – about finding one's voice, discovering

collaboration – might not question department curricula that seem to preclude such experiences because of class size limits or an overriding concern with preparing majors for graduate school. When I raised this in faculty interviews, I was assured rightly that many courses do provide some aspects of the Calderwood experience. More to the point, I learned that in several cases faculty are indeed exporting Calderwood practices into other courses, experimenting with ways to give students more responsibility for the learning process, e.g., through occasional workshopping and a range of “public”-oriented assignments.

There remains a major difference, however, between a Calderwood seminar and usual elective. Developing strategies for engaged learning, many college and university courses have integrated “applied” assignments, such as writing a grant proposal. But unless the course is explicitly a writing course, writing usually occupies a smaller proportion of student time than in a Calderwood, where students are writing or revising or critiquing someone else’s effort nearly every week. Moreover, other courses assignments that might seem like a Calderwood task, say a presentation on a book or film, translate the review or summary into academic terms suitable for the framework of the discipline-oriented course, rather than making academic insights accessible to a layperson.

Faculty do seem to be sharing the Calderwood experience with each other. At least one department is going beyond accepting a Calderwood seminar as an option to moving it into the required curriculum. Several new recruits are planning seminars and others have expressed the hope that current Calderwood faculty will spread around the privilege of teaching what may become the departmental Calderwood seminar.

Nonetheless, I am struck by the limited attention that the student responses seem to receive. As I understand it, SEQs are used primarily for reappointment and compensation decisions; they are read by personnel committees and the faculty member, but not necessarily the department chair or anyone else who might start asking not about the individual’s merit as a teacher, but about implications for the definition of the major requirements, the inter-relationships between courses in terms of what they accomplish – from intro., through intermediate offerings, to 300-level work – , the places where students learn intellectual and social skills they will need to function in society. The student Reflections similarly seem restricted in distribution. Granting that there are confidentiality issues, I wonder if it wouldn’t be illuminating to discuss the annual Calderwood reports more broadly, and within departments and programs address some distillation of student opinion as to what they value in their Wellesley educations and where they feel disappointed. The work is being done in gathering the feedback, so the restricted use seems a wasted opportunity.

Further Considerations

1. Encouraging More Students to Take Advantage of the Seminars

While the proposed target of the program was 100 participants, annual totals have ranged between 89 and 92, averaging 90. These numbers are certainly encouraging, especially since Calderwood seminars regularly are offered in a number of small departments and programs that will always struggle to meet the enrollment cap. Even so, it is of some concern whenever spaces go unfilled, especially because the courses are resource-rich, permitting limiting participation to 12. On the other hand, some seminars have waiting lists, suggesting there is unmet demand in those departments. The challenge is matching students with an opportunity that many graduates cite as one of the highpoints in their Wellesley education.

Prof. Lindauer has been energetic in publicizing the Calderwood seminar program on campus. On Wellesley's web site there is a substantial entry on "Writing for the 'real world'" under the "Academics" heading and efforts are afoot to introduce the program into Admissions materials. There have been several features in the 'Daily Shot' gallery. Seminar members now present Calderwood work at the annual Ruhlman Conference celebrating student achievement and for the third year a Calderwood Prize in Public Writing will be awarded in each division (glory and a stipend); seminar instructors may nominate one paper and a faculty committee then selects the recipients.

These steps have raised the visibility of the Calderwood opportunity, but students still rue the fact that many do not know about the program: they sign up, only to learn of the significant time commitment required by the emphasis on writing, subsequently dropping; more often they don't even know what they are missing. Running a seminar more than once does help the option become more widely known, as does the expanding number of seminars, but seniors, the target population, disappear from campus before they can advise younger peers. Efforts at annual publicity need to be unflagging in order to reach new cohorts of students. Students suggested that removing disincentives like restrictions on cross-listing would also help.

The need to enhance familiarity with the program also applies to faculty recommending courses to their advisees and valuing the seminars as part of a major. There seems to exist a tension between coverage of a field, e.g., equipping a student for graduate school, and developing social and communication skills preparing students for non-academic undertakings, whether jobs or community engagement. Yet many faculty with whom I spoke, and students too, were emphatic that the premium on writing clearly and concisely is an asset for professional writing as much as public writing and the ability to work collaboratively, much less think critically and work through conflicting viewpoints is not peculiar to public writing.

2. Sharing the Calderwood Program with Other Colleges and Universities

In approving the five-year grant in 2012, the Calderwood Foundation expressed a desire that the project be replicable, such that it “might inspire other institutions to look more broadly at how they incorporate writing into the curriculum.” This is a greater challenge than the merits of the program might suggest: even for those within the small subset of elite institutions with similar histories and goals, each is distinct, with its own local culture and curricular priorities, as I realized when I explored recommending it at my own institution. Swarthmore already has a program of capped-enrollment writing courses extending beyond the first year, it has a senior comprehensive requirement defined by each major, and it has a signature Honors program entailing small, intensive seminars, theses, and external exams in the junior and senior year. We would be hard pressed to invest in another resource-rich program that would complement or indeed compete with the existing commitments. So the issue in seeking to export the Calderwood model is to identify institutions where the seminars will fill a need that warrants assigning the resources.

Prof. Lindauer has been very energetic in reaching out to likely candidates among both colleges and universities. The program was mentioned in an article on “Integrative Learning from First to Final Year at Wellesley College” in the November 2014 *News* publication of the Association of American Colleges and Universities and in June 2016 he hosted a meeting with faculty teaching courses in public writing at area schools including Boston University, Harvard’s Kennedy School, and Northeastern. At the gathering of the Northeast Deans in early November 2016, Prof. Lindauer gave a presentation, which attracted active interest from several colleges. Bard, Middlebury, and Wesleyan have become serious candidates for partnering and Prof. Lindauer has now visited each to speak with faculty, with encouraging results. These are all colleges where the Calderwood seminars would not duplicate existing programming and would instead meet a perceived need.

3. The Role of the Director

I have written this report too much in an impersonal voice: “the program...” It would more accurately have made “Prof. Lindauer” the active agent. David Lindauer’s vision and indefatigable attention to detail, his passion for teaching effectively and willingness to share his time and energy with other faculty have been essential to creating this program. He originated the idea of the Calderwood seminars from his years teaching Economic Journalism and has enthusiastically shared his syllabus, assignments, and class strategies with others.

He has coached new faculty in one-on-one sessions, advising on course descriptions and then the development of the syllabus, staying in touch through the semester by email. He has welcomed departures from his model, but spends appreciable time thinking through and helping test alternatives; consistency and adherence to the common goals of reflecting on the major, developing public writing, encouraging collaboration, and writing frequently and then rewriting in response to comments from professors and classmates are vital. He seems to roam the faculty looking for promising recruits, nurturing the seeds of budding interest, hooking newcomers up with the more seasoned. This is an effort that continues as he looks to replace some of the early faculty members whose experience and stature have helped the program succeed and who will retire fairly soon.

He has plunged into publicizing the program on campus and off, as summarized above, and he has thoughtfully organized varied assessment activities that are professionally structured and actually useful. He has stood ready to help with fund-raising efforts, for example participating in a panel for the campaign launch to alumnae ("Innovation in the Liberal Arts," October 23, 2015, on YouTube). He is now becoming a key hands-on advisor in the initiative to export the Calderwood program, prepared to share best practices and closely mentor faculty at the other colleges.

He is thus to be both congratulated and thanked, with resounding applause. It then becomes imperative to be sure that whenever he retires a successor understands the scope of his efforts to maintain the distinctive goals and practices of the program, his readiness to trouble shoot problems, to address quirks posed by differing disciplines. Equally important, the administration must be prepared to support that new director adequately.

Conclusion

The Calderwood Seminars in Public Writing constitute an extraordinary program. They are not going to replace other courses, specifically 300-level offerings that provide an in-depth engagement with scholarship and research opportunities. Rather, the Calderwood Seminars contribute something complementary: the opportunity to book-end introductory courses with a final address to students' studies from a different perspective. For many, this culminating experience rekindles their excitement for a major, makes them active agents rather than weary finishers. With new skills in communicating, enhanced confidence, and a clearer sense of purpose, they are ready to move beyond Wellesley.

As Wellesley affirms its important place in the global 21st century, the Calderwood Seminars could become a signature program. The Seminars confirm for students (and prospective students and parents) the relevance of a Wellesley education to the "real world." Not because they offer vocational training, but rather because they

speaking to the mission that Wellesley proclaims on its web site: "to provide an excellent liberal arts education for women who will make a difference in the world."

I have been greatly moved in hearing and reading student comments that express just this point. One student told me she felt her seminar particularly meaningful because given the state of the nation and the world Wellesley has an urgent responsibility to communicate its extraordinary resources of knowledge to audiences beyond academia. Another provided the perfect conclusion to this report:

"Wellesley and other liberal arts colleges push their students to think about how we can be the next women leaders of the world, citizens in our communities and more importantly make an impact. By learning to write for a public audience, to convey our opinions in an articulate way and to tie in the intellectual complexity of [her subject], we are on our way to be the citizens that make a real difference."

CONNIE HUNGERFORD
FINAL SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS, MARCH 6-10, MARCH 20

MONDAY, MARCH 6		
6:00	Dinner with Andy Shennan and David Lindauer	Andy's house in Wellesley
TUESDAY, MARCH 7		
8:45-9:45	Jeannine Johnson, Director of the Writing Program	Wellesley College Club
10-10:45	Cappy Lynch, Dean of Faculty Affairs; Ann Velenchik, Dean of Academic Affairs	Green 345
11-12:00	Don Elmore* (CHEM)	Pendleton East, 429
12-1:15	Lunch: Karen Ossen, Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations	Pendleton East, 429
1:30-4	CLASS VISIT: CAMS 327, Public Writing on Film and TV, Vernon Shetley**	Pendleton East, 430
4:20-5:30	Meeting with Calderwood Students from F'16	Pendleton East, 349
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8		
9:50-12:20	CLASS VISIT: ENG 390, <i>The New York Review of Books</i> at Fifty, Dan Chiasson**	Green 136A
12:30-2:30	Lunch: Dan Chiasson** (ENG), Barry Lydgate** (FREN), Marty Brody* (MUSIC)	
3-3:45	Joe Swingle* (SOC)	Pendleton East, 332
4-4:45	Carlos Vega* (SPAN)	Pendleton East, 429
THURSDAY, MARCH 9		
9-10:00	Paul Fisher* (AMERICAN STUDIES), Lynne Viti** and Wini Wood (WRITING PROGRAM),	Pendleton East, 429
10-11:00	Jay Turner* (ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES), Tracy Gleason* (PSYCH), Martina Koniger* (BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES)	Pendleton East, 429
11-12:00	Erich Matthes* (PHILOSOPHY), Steve Marini* (RELIGION)	Pendleton East, 429
12:15-1:15	Lunch: Calderwood students from 2016-17: Clio Flikkema, Amal Cheema, Kathryn Sweatman, Christina Phelps, Caroline Guild	Pendleton East, 325
1:30-4	CLASS VISIT: ECON 335, Economic Journalism, David Lindauer**	Pendleton East 430
5:30-6:15	Paula Johnson, Wellesley College President	Green Hall 350
>6:30	Dinner: David Lindauer	
FRIDAY, MARCH 10		
8:30-10	Breakfast and Wrap-up meeting: Andy Shennan	Wellesley College Club
MONDAY, MARCH 20		
11-11:30	Karen Lange** (MATHEMATICS)	Phone call

* Faculty who have taught a Calderwood Seminar.

** Faculty currently teaching a Calderwood Seminar.

List of Materials Reviewed

1. Original proposal and the Calderwood Foundation's Response
 - a. Richard G. French to John Cornish and William Lowell, Trustees, August 1, 2012
 - b. John M. Cornish to Richard French and David L. Lindabuer, October 15, 2012

2. Annual Reports to the Stanford Calderwood Charitable Foundation
 - a. Year 1, 2013-2014: Richard French and David L. Lindauer to John Cornish and William Lowell, Trustees, June 30, 2014
 - b. Year 2, 2014-2015: Richard French and David L. Lindauer to John Cornish and William Lowell, Trustees, July 7, 2015
 - c. Year 3, Andrew Shennan and David L. Lindauer to John Cornish and William Lowell, Trustees, July 18, 2016

3. Special Internal Reports on Focused Topics
 - a. Ray Starr, "Calderwood Seminars in Public Writing, 2013-14," October 14, 2014 (evaluation of the first year)
 - b. Wini Wood and David L. Lindauer, "Calderwood Seminars in Public Writing: Evaluation of Student Writing," September 2015 (rating of writing by faculty panel)
 - c. David L. Lindauer and Joe Swingle, "Calderwood Seminars in Public Writing: Student Perspectives," January 2017 (alumnae survey)
 - d. Joe Swingle, with David L. Lindauer, Dylan DiGiacomo-Stumm '17 and Amy Johnson '17, "Calderwood Seminars in Public Writing: A Qualitative Analysis of Student Perspectives," February 2017 (scoring of 100 student Reflection memos)

4. Faculty Materials
 - a. Seminar syllabi (approximately 18)
 - b. End of semester Faculty Evaluations (approximately 30)

5. Student Materials
 - a. Student Reflections on their Writing Portfolios (7 semesters, through Fall 2016)
 - b. Summary of end-of-semester meetings with CSPW students