WRAB III: *Roundtable: 'What is the impact of integrating language and content in higher education (ICLHE)?'*

Recognised under different terms in our respective higher education contexts, the notion of integrating communication development within disciplinary courses has seen increasing application since the late 90s. We talk of WID in a US context, ICLHE in Europe, and CLIL for 'content and language integrated learning' in still other places; here we use the acronym ICL (integrated content and language learning) as a general term for these efforts. This integration is particularly important in the 21st century as writing circulates through professional workplaces formally and informally through digital media. Writing in disciplinary contexts is no longer simply a proposal at the beginning of a project and a formal report at the end; instead, it is embedded in the myriad of emails, texts, chats, and notes that circulate throughout projects across domains. Support for integrating writing development into content area courses draws from the literature in educational development from various points of view, including situated learning (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989), cognitive apprenticeship (Collins, 2006; Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1990), constructive alignment (Biggs & Tang 2007), disciplinary discourse and graduate profiles (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Russell, 2001; Trowler & Cooper, 2002; Ivanič, 2004; Barrie, 2007; Jones, 2009). In addition, there is increasing support for integrated interventions across courses and curricula. Despite this support and the growing importance of ICL, we have not yet established reliable ways of measuring the impact of this integration – the impact, that is, of integrating the teaching and learning of writing with the teaching and learning of domain knowledge. In fact, have we even defined what impact is it that we seek and what didactic approaches we should be comparing with?

To some extent, the wide-ranging literature on writing assessment is relevant to assessing writing in integrated contexts as well, and work by Huot (2002; Huot & O'Neill, 2008), Adler-Kassner and O'Neill (2010), and Yancey (Murphy & Yancey, 2007; Yancey, 1999; Yancey & Huot, 1997) all address the assessment of writing generally and in writing across the curriculum contexts. O'Donovan, Price & Rust (2008), for example, suggest a framework for assessment that implies ICL in its emphasis on the discourse community. Still, this literature does not really enable us to fully explore the impact of the interdisciplinary framework in which integrated content and language learning occurs. The kinds of efforts currently underway are seeking, in a variety of ways, not simply to "add" a writing assignment to a disciplinary content course, but to leverage and build on the ways in which communicative practices in a discipline interact with, contribute to, and are shaped by other disciplinary practices, knowledge, and epistemologies. And in the educational literature, interdisciplinarity has become an increasingly critical framework for exploring student learning and development (e.g., Boix Mansilla; Boix Mansilla, 2005; Boix Mansilla & Duraising, 2007; Boix Mansilla, Duraisingh, Wolfe, & Haynes, 2009; Lattuca, 2010; Lattuca, Voigt, & Fath, 2004). Scholars like Boix Mansilla and Lattuca argue for the ways in which interdisciplinarity – the bridging of epistemologies and values from multiple domains – can enhance student learning. Yet little work to date has considered ICL assessment from this interdisciplinary perspective.

To begin to address this gap, particularly as it affects 21st century writing contexts, in the proposed roundtable, we will discuss a series of questions associated with the assessment of ICL, and invite additional questions from the participants. As we consider the effects of ICL on both

content and language learning, the core questions the roundtable will address include:

- What outcomes and outputs are we measuring?
- What outcomes and outputs should we be measuring?
- How and when do we measure?
- How do we define what an 'effective' intervention is?
- What are the baselines we measure against?

These questions seek to explore both what is happening now in ICL assessment and what can and should be happening as we move forward. They address the kinds of learning outcomes ICL might support for students, the kinds of writing products and textual artifacts we should be examining in our assessments, the ways in which those products and artifacts should be measured and analyzed, and, ultimately, the ends to which our assessment should be directed. How can we begin to understand and identify "effective" when learning to write and learning in a discipline are integrated? At the same time, they raise questions for researchers as we consider the relationships between research and assessment. Should our research questions follow or lead to assessment efforts? How might research and assessment in ICL inform one anothers. How do the wide variety of writing contexts and media?

The roundtable conveners will share very briefly some examples from their respective contexts to begin to set the scene for the roundtable. The panelists bring experiences in Swedish and U.S. ICL programs that include integration at both the course and curricular level, and have been engaged in exploring, developing, and implementing a range of ICL assessment approaches for a number of years. Their discussions will highlight not only successes, but also failures and challenges, with particular attention to the demands posed by the increasingly diverse modes and contexts in which disciplinary writing occurs. The session then provide time for participants to collaborate in small groups, guided by roundtable panelists, to interrogate the questions above more closely as they operate in individual contexts. Following time for the small groups to report out, the panelists will synthesize the findings and conclusions that emerge from the discussion and highlight promising future directions.

References

Adler-Kassner, L., & O'Neill, P. (2010). *Reframing writing assessment to improve teaching and learning*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Barrie, S. C. (2007) 'A conceptual framework for the teaching and learning of generic graduate attributes'. *Studies in Higher Education* 32(4), 439–458.

Becher, T & Paul R. Trowler. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines.* Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.

Biggs, John & Catherine Tang. (2007). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University: What the Student Does*. Third edition. Maidenhead & New York: McGrawHill, SRHE & Open University Press.

Boix Mansilla, V. *Interdisciplinary Understanding: What counts as quality work?* Harvard University. Boston.

Boix Mansilla, V. (2005). Assessing student work at disciplinary crossroads. *Change - The Magazine of Higher Learning, 37*(1), 14-21.

Boix Mansilla, V., & Duraising, E. D. (2007). Targeted Assessment of Students' Interdisciplinary Work: An Empirically Grounded Framework Proposed. *Journal of Higher Education, 78*(2), 215-237.

Boix Mansilla, V., Duraisingh, E. D., Wolfe, C. R., & Haynes, C. (2009). Targeted Assessment Rubric: An Empirically Grounded Rubric for Interdisciplinary Writing. *Journal of Higher Education, 80*(2), 334-353.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated Cognition and the Culture of Learning. *Educational Researcher, 18*(1), 32-42.

Collins, A. (2006). Cognitive Apprenticeship. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences* (pp. 47-60). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, S. E. (1990). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 453-494). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Huot, B. (2002). *(Re)Articulating writing assessment for teaching and learning*. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Huot, B., & O'Neill, P. (2008). *Assessing Writing: A Critical Sourcebook*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins.

Lattuca, L. R. (2010). *Interdisciplinary competence: a learning goal for students - and faculty?* Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Teaching and Learning Innovations Conference, Guelph, Canada.

Ivanič, R. (2004). 'Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write'. *Language and Education*, 18 (3) 220–245

Jones, Ann. (2009). 'Redisciplining generic attributes: the disciplinary context in focus'. *Studies in Higher Education* 34 (1), 85–100.

Lattuca, L. R., Voigt, L. J., & Fath, K. Q. (2004). Does Interdisciplinarity Promote Learning? Theoretical Support and Researchable Questions. *The Review of Higher Education, 28*(1), 23-48.

Murphy, S., & Yancey, K. B. (2007). Construct and consequence: Validity in writing assessment. In C. Bazerman (Ed.), *Handbook of research in writing: History, society, school, individual, text* (pp. 365-386). New York: Erlbaum.

O'Donovan, B., M. Price and C. Rust. (2008). Developing student understanding of assessment standards: a nested hierarchy of approaches. *Teaching in Higher Education 13* (2), 205-217.

Russell, David R. (2001). **'**Where Do the Naturalistic Studies of WAC/WID Point? A Research Review', in McLeod, Susan, Eric Miraglia, Margot Soven, & Chris Thaiss (eds), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs.* Urbana: NCTE: 259–298.

Trowler, Paul & Ali Cooper. (2002). 'Teaching and learning regimes: Implicit theories and recurrent practices in the enhancement of teaching and learning through educational development programmes', in *Higher Education Research and Development 21*(3): 221–240.

Yancey, K. B. (1999). Looking Back as We Look Forward: Historicizing Writing Assessment. *College Composition and Communication, 50*(3), 483-503.

Yancey, K. B., & Huot, B. (Eds.). (1997). *Assessing Writing Across the Curriculum: Diverse Approaches and Practices*. Greenwich: Ablex Publishing Corp.