



# Public Promises, Hazy Vision: What Program Learning Outcomes Tell Us About Creative Writing as an Academic Subject

---

**Tanya Perkins**  
Indiana University East  
[talperk@iue.edu](mailto:talperk@iue.edu)

**Lisa Marling**  
Indiana University East  
[lmaring@iue.edu](mailto:lmaring@iue.edu)

---

## INTRODUCTION

A recent search on the AWP database identifies more than 700 programs in the US and Canada (including majors and minors) offering undergraduate instruction in fiction, poetry, creative nonfiction, writing for children and screen and playwriting; altogether, this represents dramatic increases in both enrollees as well as scope of curriculum over preceding decades. As Myers (2006) explicates so well in his now classic *When Elephants Teach*, creative writing first entered undergraduate curricula as a way to teach literature or, as he puts it, of “examin[ing] writing seriously from within,” not producing publishing writers (149). The wide range of current programming suggests that original intent has evolved, as has opinion among faculty and writers about the nature of creative writing as a subject and its role within English programs. In considering philosophical questions surrounding the teaching of creative writing, Jordan-Baker (2015) goes so far as to describe the situation as characterized by “tensions, cross-purposes and lack of clarity which relate to competing and often tacit conceptions of what creative writing is” (238). In the UK, the first edition of the QAA Subject Benchmark Statement on creative writing in higher education (2016) described it as “eclectic,” and a “diverse and still developing subject” (4). Yet just three years later, in the second edition (2019), this language was revised to describe CW as “established...an academic subject in its own right” (4).

Our own experience has been more the former than the latter. A few years ago, creative writing faculty (including the lead author) met to revise our own program’s learning outcomes (PLOs). We found ourselves digging into what it was, precisely, that we wanted our creative writing undergraduates to be able to do once they graduated, an exercise in turning aspirational vagaries into verb phrases on which we could, as a group, agree, and that were more or less clear and measurable. But it was a productive session in more than one way. We found that we were writing, not bureaucratic abstractions to be checked off at the end of each academic year, but statements of what we truly valued as poets, essayists and fiction writers, of why we labored as we did for our students’ benefit and growth as writers and thinkers. The process

forced us to ask ourselves—what *are* we teaching and why?

This question became the starting point for this research, leading us to analyze creative writing program learning outcomes from 51 undergraduate programs across the US. The overarching goal was to identify prevailing patterns and themes, in order to understand the institutional/programmatic beliefs and practices about creative writing as a teaching subject. The results offer a bird's-eye view of what creative writing programs (and their faculty) value as the focus of their teaching and what they expect from program graduates. Of course, this is not the first time this question has been raised, in one form or another (see Moxley, 1989; Garrett, 1989; Andrews, 2009; Mayers, 2016; Myers, 2006). But we believe that this is the first time that the focus of study has been programs' own public statements or promises in the form of PLOs.

There are, of course, other avenues to learn about creative writing program content, but PLOs are interesting and useful sources of data for three overlapping reasons. First, they are public statements and thus easily accessible and verifiable. All are taken from institutional websites, usually found on or linked from the creative writing or English department page. As universities increasingly scramble for what will be a smaller and smaller pool of students, publicly stated outcomes become important as authoritative identifiers of what tuition dollars are purchasing for students, most of whom are increasingly burdened with debt, as well as a critical component in maintaining accountability to stakeholders (See Grawe, 2018; Vander-slice, 2012). State and/or federal accreditation bodies also expect measurable outcomes, not just in print or on the school website, but as part of longitudinal documentation of student learning, including meaningful assessment practices. Thus, the second reason why PLOs offer worthy data—they are (or are supposed to be) measurable statements of actual content, that build into evidence that programs are living up to their claims of what students are gaining during their tenure. Third, and also closely related, PLOs are not just reflective of academic progress through a program but of terminal accomplishment meriting graduation, and so can be considered high stakes benchmarks. As the University of Central Florida's assessment handbook from 2005 notes, PLOs articulate "specific abilities, knowledge, values and attitudes" that students will develop with sufficient proficiency to warrant graduation (11). Thus, PLOs are authentic, informative and accessible data sources, not just as measures of learning but as indicators of value and belief.

Because of these unique properties, we were interested in two questions: (1) How do PLOs embody current beliefs about creative writing as an academic discipline? (2) What patterns might emerge as to what undergraduate programs value in creative writing education?

## METHOD

We gathered 271 creative writing PLOs from 51 undergraduate programs across the US,

including creative writing majors, minors, concentrations (as part of an English BA) and BFAs (see Appendix A). A wide range of programs is represented, from large public research universities like the University of Iowa, to smaller private institutions like Goucher College and Belhaven University. Each PLO was then separated into its simplest verb and noun phrases, a challenging task since most were lengthy, complex statements encompassing multiple separate, often independent actions. Verb phrases separated by “or” were kept together, since the learning target could be met by either one of the options and so together counted as a single outcome, while phrases separated by “and” were treated as two (or more) independent outcomes or actions, as described by Levy (2018). For example, the following is a single PLO from the University of Redlands, as it appears on the institution’s website (<https://www.redlands.edu/study/schools-and-centers/college-of-arts-and-sciences/undergraduate-studies/creative-writing/program-learning-outcomes/>):

Technical Competence: Through their own writing and in workshops, students develop fluency as writers, learn to self-edit and identify grammar issues, and recognize that there are resources available to them beyond the ones provided in class. They understand and demonstrate the habits of professional writers, including revision, developing community, public reading, and submission for publication.

This complex outcome was broken into 17 separate single outcomes or actions:

- develop fluency as writers through one’s own writing
- develop fluency as writers in workshops
- learn to self-edit through one’s own writing
- learn to self-edit in workshops
- identify grammar issues in one’s own writing
- identify grammar issues in workshops
- understand that there are resources available beyond the ones provided in class
- understand habits of professional writers
- demonstrate habits of professional writers
- understand the habit of revision
- demonstrate the habit of revision
- understand developing community
- demonstrate developing community
- understand public reading
- demonstrate public reading
- understand submitting for publication
- demonstrate submitting for publication

Although it might be argued that “demonstrate” also implies “understand[ing],” and so would not need to be two actions, it is possible to have knowledge without actively demonstrating it.

Our goal was not to judge the merit or measurability of any PLO but to render each discrete action embedded in the original outcome with as little change and as consistently as possible, no matter how complicated the wording. Rooting our approach in respect for each institution's process in composing their outcomes, the only assumption was that particular verbs and nouns (and relevant modifiers) were chosen with good reason by the original writers (hopefully faculty teaching in the program) and so needed to be treated accordingly.

After outcomes were reduced to their elemental constituents, the separate actions or variables were then placed in as many categories as fit content terms. Content analysis methodology was applied in order to group outcomes that shared key terms or characteristics. Categories were not pre-determined nor mutually exclusive but emerged organically as needed based on the key terms/ideas in each reduced single outcome. Outcomes were replicated across as many categories as necessary in order to capture all content. For example, the variable "Evidence of familiarity with craft in contemporary and/or historical works," from one of Miami University's original PLOs, was categorized under "Craft/Technical Skill" and under "Historical and Cultural Contexts," since the outcome engages both arenas with equal semantic weight. Although placing a single variable in multiple categories is not typical in content analysis, it was important to identify and categorize each content element as richly and consistently as possible; moreover, limiting variables to a single category would require privileging one content area to the exclusion of the other, in the absence of any other indicators. As we analyzed reduced outcomes, we constantly compared between and among categories, letting the data dictate where an outcome should be placed. By being consistent across the reduced variables and by placing all variables in as many categories as the content warranted, we hoped that clear patterns of significance would emerge, as indeed they did.

The first round of categorization was done by the lead author, while the second author acted as a second-round checker. The 978 reduced outcomes were replicated as 1640 entries or lines of data (since many outcomes were recorded under more than one category). The two rounds (first and a check) resulted in minimal differences (about 2%) and these were reconciled. Data was organized into a total of 58 categories (see table 1).

Table 1: Categories by Frequency of Outcome

Craft/technical skill	101	Social critique/justice	20
Historical & cultural contexts	92	Editing	19
Genre knowledge/application	82	Interpretation	17
Literary knowledge	74	Writing skills	16
Reading ability	71	Originality/novelty/vision	15
Generation of original creative work	64	Aesthetics	14
Voice/style	60	Traditions	13
Analysis	60	Values	13
Revision	58	Meaning/morality/ethics	12
Personal development/awareness	54	Media/digital technologies	12
Respond to others' work/workshop	53	Creative writing theory	11
Forms/formal elements	51	British/American lit	10
Poetry	50	Vocabulary	10
Fiction	44	Question/raise questions	10
Publishing	39	Screenwrit. & visual storytelling	9
Rules/conventions	37	Habits (of creative writers)	8
Communication techniques	32	Application of knowledge	7
Professionalism	32	Modes	7
Critical thinking	31	Portfolios	7
Spoken language/orality	31	Reflection	7
Creative process/creativity	30	Feedback (receive)	6
Research and source use	30	Practice	6
Collaboration/community	29	Prosody	6
Critical/literary theory	28	Drama/plays	5
Self-assessment	27	Self-expression	5
Language use	27	Worldview	5
Nonfiction	25	Teaching	4
Apprenticeship/learn from others	24	Problem-solving	3
Audience/reader	24	Synthesis	3

## DISCUSSION

In his edited collection, Moxley (1989) summarizes the recommendations of the contributing writers and teachers to offer these areas of knowledge for creative writing students:

- (1) Student writers must be readers—a background in literature and criticism enables student writers to identify and produce creative work;
- (2) academic training in writing must be rigorous and diverse;
- (3) student writers must have an understanding of the composing process and a knowledge of the variety of composing strategies; and
- (4) student writers must master the fundamentals of craft. (xvi)

Thirty years later, these areas—strong reading, ability to generate original work and agility with craft skills—are among the most populated of the 58 categories in our study as well as having among the highest number of contributing institutions (see tables 1 and 2). Foremost is craft/technical skill, with 101 reduced outcomes, such as “Practice writing as a craft with attention to technique” (Univ. of Wisconsin Whitewater). The second, a bit more surprisingly, is historical and cultural contexts, with outcomes such as “Understand creative writing in relation to historical contexts,” (Belhaven University). The third, with 82 outcomes, is genre knowledge, encompassing outcomes like “Be familiar with contemporary examples of genres studied,” (Wake Forest University) and “Apply the devices of particular creative writing genres,” (Coastal Carolina University).

One drawback to our approach, however, was that a single institution could end up with several reduced outcomes all related to a single category. A lengthy and dense PLO, comprised of multiple, related outcomes can potentially skew a category by artificially inflating it beyond what the data as a whole indicated. For example, Goucher College has 24 separate (reduced) outcomes categorized under “Historical and cultural contexts,” making up more than one-quarter of all entries in that category. So, in order to avoid a distortion arising when a single institution over-weighs in any one category, we also analyzed highly populated categories by how many *different* programs (or institutions) contributed to that category.

Thus, in order of number of contributing programs, the top ten categories are:

Table 2: Top Ten Categories by Contributing Programs:

Category	Number of Contributing Programs	Percentage of Contributing Programs
1. Genre knowledge/application	37	74%
2. Generation of original creative work	32	64%
3. Revision	29	58%
4. Craft/technical skill	28	56%
5. Reading ability	26	52%
6. Respond to others’ work/ workshop	24	48%
7. Analysis	21	42%
8. Historical and cultural contexts	20	40%
9. Voice/style	18	36%
10. Literary knowledge	18	36%

By this analysis, “Historical and cultural contexts” drops to 8<sup>th</sup>, compared to table 1. Still, it remains in the top ten most populated categories; in fact, nine of the ten top categories in table

1 remain in the top ten in table 2 in both analyses, confirming that these are areas of critical importance across programs.

The 58 emergent categories can be further clustered around central domains representing broader spheres, as follows. This enables us to identify eight prevailing themes, again organized from most to least populated (see Attride-Stirling, 2001). For greater precision, some categories were further subdivided, like “Genre knowledge/application,” which was divided into two subcategories: “genre--writing/applied knowledge,” (eg. “write insightfully in at least two genres”), with 38 outcomes and “genre—reading/general knowledge,” (eg. “know contemporary examples of various genres”), with 44 outcomes.

**1. Craft and applied skills:** Craft/technical skill (101), creative process (30), drama (5), fiction (44), generation of original creative work (64), language use (27), nonfiction (25), originality (15), poetry (50), practice (6), screenwriting & visual storytelling (9), vocabulary (10), voice/style (60), writing skills (16), feedback (6), revision (58), creative writing theory (11), application of knowledge (7), genre—writing/applied knowledge (38), forms/formal elements—applied (30) prosody (6) (618 outcomes)

**2. Literary knowledge:** Brit & American lit (10), critical/literary theory (28), forms/formal elements—knowledge (21), genre—reading/general knowledge (44), historical & cultural contexts (92), interpretation (17), literary knowledge (74), modes (7), reading (71) (364 outcomes)

**3. Academic Skills:** Analysis (60), critical thinking (31), problem solving (3), research and source use (30), rules/conventions (37), synthesis (3) (164 outcomes)

**4. Professional Development:** Habits of creative writers (8), media/digital technologies (12), professionalism (32), publishing (39), editing (19), portfolios (7), teaching (4) (121 outcomes)

**5. Aesthetics and Personal Development:** Aesthetics (14), personal development/awareness (54), reflection (7), self-expression (5), self-assessment (27) (107 outcomes)

**6. Community & Collaboration:** Apprenticeship/learn from others (24), collaboration/community (29), respond to others’ work/workshopping (53), (106 outcomes)

**7. Communication:** Communication techniques (32), spoken language (31), audience/reader (24) (87 outcomes)

**8. Values and Meaning:** Meaning/morality/ethics (12), question/raise questions (10), social critique/social justice (20), traditions (13), values (13), worldview (5) (73 outcomes)

The strongest pattern to emerge is the emphasis on *applied knowledge*, encompassed in concepts of activity, demonstration and production. Central to most programs are (1) Generation of original work in one or more genres; (2) Revision skills, including the ability to revise one’s

own work and to offer thoughtful critiques to and/or analyses of others' work, whether fellow students or professional writers (interestingly, while the ability to *give* feedback is a highly populated category, the ability to *receive* feedback is among the least populated); and (3) Strong literary and critical reading skills, including close reading, "reading as a writer," and knowledge of historical and cultural contexts. Although some of these outcomes overlap, as both *techné* and *epistémé*, together they constitute about one-third of all outcomes in the top ten categories.

Outcomes related to historical, social and cultural contexts are also closely related to reading, evidencing the weight many programs place on students' abilities as emerging writers to understand texts within relevant historical, cultural and social contexts. That said, references to New Criticism appear throughout, with eight programs including the phrase "close reading" in their outcomes, and 23 including references to form, formal elements and/or structure. This is not surprising, given that this lens provides us, as teachers, with a more or less objective vocabulary with which to approach student work, as Bizzaro (2010) points out. However, on the whole, New Criticism is only one of multiple theoretical approaches alluded to, along with what can be understood as New Historicism, Expressivism, and others (though none of these names appear as such). Together, these point back to the original goal of creative writing's introduction in English departments as a new path into literature for undergraduates, a deep and broad knowledge of which is integral to growth as a writer of fiction, poetry, creative nonfiction or other kinds of creative work.

Generalized academic skills, including analytic ability, research and source use, are also valued by many programs. While analysis might not be the first thing that comes to mind when thinking about creative writing, it appears in both tables 1 and 2, with 21 programs including at least one outcome related to analysis, such as "analyze themes that appear in literary texts," and "demonstrate working vocabulary for critical analysis." Though creative writing courses are sometimes (mis)perceived as an "easy A," inclusion of analysis and related academic skills gestures toward the serious cognitive work that goes into plying an art, unsurprising to anyone who has exerted the considerable mental toil to complete work worthy of publication in a competitive venue. More surprising, however, is the frequency of outcomes more suited to high school English such as "Write problem-free sentences," and "Acquire a strong, deliberate command of grammar." Although such foundational skills are necessary to all writing activities, creative or otherwise, they are more of a means to an end, rather than an end in itself, as PLOs are (as further discussed below). As such, they seem out of place as named goals of a creative writing program, especially since "problem-free sentence," to use the same example, is a shifting, even idiosyncratic, concept in a creative context.

While workshopping has been criticized as a classroom practice for a variety of reasons, especially at the undergraduate level, (see Shelnutt, 1989; Barden, 2008; Nguyen, 2017), it continues to be integrated into programmatic goals. Twenty-four or almost half of the programs include workshopping, either by name, in PLOs such as "Employ aesthetics in workshops"



(Univ. of Redlands) or more obliquely. This aligns with Donnelly's (2010) survey of 167 creative writing instructors, 50% of whom use some form of the workshop approach in their undergraduate creative writing courses.

The question becomes, then, what is the purpose of workshopping? Workshopping as part of PLOs places it as one of the realms of student achievement, as a purpose or end in and of itself, rather than a means to an end, which is the ability to self-assess, to develop a sense for what is successful in one's writing and, of course, to be able to revise one's own work in a purposeful and productive way. This offers a useful vantage point from which to reflect on the differences between teaching methods and terminal goals (for students), since frequently PLOs were more descriptive of pedagogical strategies than "students' knowledge, skills, and capabilities upon completion of the program" (Hunter College, 2020). When it comes to assessment, what is taught is not synonymous with what is learned; PLOs are meant to represent the latter, in terms of what students are actually able to do once they complete a program and so encompasses how a student makes sense of a concept and how it transfers to a student's personal application. There may be multiple ways to help a student achieve a learning goal and so a PLO need not contain *teaching strategy* within itself. But the presence of workshopping as a PLO has other implications, assuming that it is named deliberately. For what post-graduation scenario would successful workshop skills, in the traditional (Iowa-model), be suited? Likely, it would be suited for transition to a graduate program, either an MFA or PhD in creative writing, where workshopping is used even more predominantly than in undergraduate programs. To be clear, inclusion of such a PLO contemplates a particular trajectory for a particular group of students. The question then becomes, not whether this is a "good" or "bad" PLO but whether it is useful to students in the program, an issue to which our discussion will return.

Creative writing history and theory does not appear to play a significant role in any program, with the phrase "creative writing theory" or allusions to it only appearing 11 times in three programs (IUPUI, Bowling Green and Ohio University). References to CW history do not appear at all as a phrase, though the subject may be taught as part of historical and cultural contexts and/or literary knowledge, but that is speculation. Similarly, CW theory may be present in other guises, as Camoin (1994) observes, "[I]t's often suppressed, disguised as craft or common sense..." (5). Creative writing faculty, who are usually themselves published poets, essayists, novelists and so on and who have emerged from MFA and Ph.D. programs in CW, are ideally situated to articulate more concretely the theoretical foundations of this academic subject, which would further solidify CW as an established discipline in the academy. All too often, when "theory" is used in reference to CW, it ends up referring to literary theory. Berry (1994), for example, calls CW itself the most "influential theory of literature since World War II" (75) but bases this position on the idea that writers model their work on established forms. Locating the practice of CW within a tradition of literature places the focus on the end-product, rather than on the process, the generative (how) and exigence (why) of what it is that we do when we write creatively, an alternative that would be at least as useful (if not more so) for emerging/

student writers. It is difficult to find any trace of CW theory from this perspective in the PLOs studied but, as Camoin points out (above), that doesn't mean it's not there.

Also noteworthy are scant PLOs related to digital media and related technology. In the introduction to their edited collection, *Creative Writing in the Digital Age*, Clark, Hergenrader and Rein (2015) observe, "Creative writing remains more doggedly reliant on, and rooted in, print culture than almost any other discipline...hesitant to join other writing disciplines...that have recognized the importance of digital influences" (2). The truth of this statement is borne out by the presence of a mere 12 reduced outcomes under "Media/digital technologies," representing only five programs out of 51 or 10% of surveyed institutions. Southern Utah, Bowling Green State, Full Sail, Univ. of Iowa and Hamline were the only programs with any PLOs related to digital media or technology in any context whatsoever. Judging from most PLOs, it is like the Internet never happened and yet the move to digital platforms and media has had significant impact on submitting, publishing and promoting creative work. Admittedly, these issues may still be discussed as part of a program's outcomes related to publication or professionalization; nevertheless, it was noteworthy how infrequently these key terms appeared in PLOs.

Much of what has been written about CW programs has focused on graduate levels; less or little on the undergraduate program. However, it is here that some of the pitfalls of CW as a teaching subject, often (mis)perceived as subjective and lacking rigor, might be addressed. If the rise of undergraduate creative writing courses created a "clientele" for MFA programs (Myers, 2006), then perhaps it is at the undergraduate level that students should be prepared for the in-depth work of a graduate program. In contrast, one of the patterns identified in this study was the prevalence of PLOs that seem more career or vocationally oriented; the domain, "Professional development," includes 121 outcomes from numerous programs, such as "Demonstrate knowledge of editing and revision techniques, the world of publishing, and other career-related aspects of writing" (Purchase College). Thirteen or 26% of programs include PLOs related in some way to professional development, outcomes that are strikingly similar to those of MFA programs, such as producing a publishable body of work and to "demonstrate the professional habits of creative writers [in]...submitting for publication" (Seattle University). While it is undeniably useful to introduce undergraduates to professional practices, it does raise the question of how much an undergraduate CW program should seek to mimic graduate programs, or whether it is better situated to root students in broader fundamentals such as critical approaches and literary history, helping them to read widely and deeply and engage with a variety of genres. After all, it is within the CW undergraduate program that the strengths of a liberal arts education can and should be unabashedly recognized.

At the same time, the fact remains that not all undergraduates are able or even desire to move on to graduate studies. For this reason, among others, Vanderslice (2012) calls for "a less specialized, more taught curriculum that includes not only genre-specific workshop courses but also broader introductions to the realm of creative writing studies and to professional and new

media writing” (14). Ultimately, it is CW faculty themselves that need to understand and implement outcomes best suited for the kinds of students that come to their program. Like so many other issues in teaching, one size does not fit all—nor should it, as the next section will discuss.

## CONCLUSION

To be clear, our findings are meant to be descriptive rather than prescriptive, a bird’s eye view of broad patterns within undergraduate creative writing programs at the end of the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, based on published PLOs. While our analysis does offer some answers to the original questions regarding program content and values, it ultimately resists a cohesive or singular vision. And that’s not a bad thing. Why?

To return to the scenario described at the beginning, four of us—a poet, a fiction writer and two memoirists—sequestered in a conference room, armed with dry erase markers and whiteboard, found our discussion centering on our own students, those that find their way to a small regional public campus on the border of Indiana and Ohio. Many are first generation college students reliant on financial aid, who somehow manage school amid daunting financial, health and family challenges. Many have lived in the local area all their lives; the majority will continue to do so post-graduation. We discovered ourselves talking about what we wanted for *them*, not students as an abstraction, or students at an elite research institution. As a result, the PLOs we developed ended up including, for example, measurable activities related to engaging with the world beyond the self, akin to Greg Light’s (1995) description of a new writer’s awareness of readers in “concrete, cultural situations” (11). And so, while we asserted earlier that faculty are the best ones to articulate theoretical foundations of CW as an academic subject, we would argue that they are also the best ones to develop content suited to the *particular environment* of their own programs, their own students. Institutional data, including post-graduation surveys and other alumni statistics, can offer further useful insight into local graduates’ trajectories which, in turn, can help shape the program.

We also suggested, earlier, that CW undergraduate programs embrace the strengths of a liberal arts education and that so-called professional readiness should reside at the graduate program. Now we’re going to backpedal a bit and offer a recommendation or, at least, a consideration. One of the more startling findings to come out of this project is the scant reference to digital technologies within PLOs, as discussed earlier (and in the name of transparency, this includes our own program). Yet the reality of today’s world is almost entirely digital, like it or not, and COVID-19 has only accelerated this shift. Stephanie Vanderslice (2012) offers the phrase “a creatively entrepreneurial mindset” as a way of thinking about possibilities for our students beyond traditional routes, possibilities that will inevitably be shaped by digital technologies (35). One such possibility is through development of innovative, interdisciplinary degrees which fuse new media technologies and traditional creative writing skills, such as digital media

and storytelling, a hybrid program currently underway at our own institution. The idea is that students will use creative writing skills in diverse paths, like marketing, social media content, development and production, or journalism. While purists may shrink back at the vocational slant, programs like this offer our students opportunity for a creative livelihood, one somewhat more likely than scoring a big publishing contract with Random House. This is just one avenue; there are likely others out there, innovative opportunities for students to keep growing and developing as creative beings beyond graduation. And isn't that what we, as writers and writing teachers, ultimately want for them?

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, Kimberly. "A House Divided: On the Future of Creative Writing." *College English*, vol. 71, no. 3, 2009, pp. 242-255.
- Association of Writers & Writing Programs. "AWP Releases its 2015 Survey of Creative Writing Programs." March 2016. [https://www.awpwriter.org/magazine\\_media/writers\\_news\\_view/3989](https://www.awpwriter.org/magazine_media/writers_news_view/3989)
- Attride-Stirling, Jennifer. "Thematic Network: An Analytic Tool for Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Research*, vol. 1, no. 3, 2001, pp. 385-405.
- Barden, Dan. "A Rant Against Workshops." *Poets & Writers*, March/April 2008. [https://www.pw.org/content/workshop\\_rant\\_against\\_creative\\_writing\\_classes](https://www.pw.org/content/workshop_rant_against_creative_writing_classes).
- Berry, R.M. "Theory, Creative Writing and the Impertinence of History." *Colors of a Different Horse: Rethinking Creative Writing Theory and Pedagogy*, edited by Wendy Bishop and Hans Ostrom, NCTE, 1994, pp. 57-76.
- Bishop, Wendy and Hans Ostrom, editors. *Colors of a Different Horse: Rethinking Creative Writing Theory and Pedagogy*. NCTE, 1994.
- Bizzaro, Patrick. "The Workshop: An Ontological Study." *Does the Writing Workshop Still Work?* Edited by Dianne Donnelly, Multilingual Matters, 2010, pp. 36-51.
- Camoin, Françoise. "The Workshop and its Discontents." *Colors of a Different Horse: Rethinking Creative Writing Theory and Pedagogy*, edited by Wendy Bishop and Hans Ostrom, NCTE, 1994, pp. 3-7.
- Clark, Michael Dean, Trent Herganrader and Joseph Rein. *Creative Writing in the Digital Age*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- Donnelly, Dianne. "Introduction: If it Ain't Broke, Don't Fix it or Change is Inevitable except from a Vending Machine," *Does the Writing Workshop Still Work?* Ed. by Dianne Donnelly, Multilingual Matters, 2010, pp. 1-26.
- Garrett, George. "The Future of Creative Writing Programs." *Creative Writing in America: Theory and Pedagogy*, edited by Joseph M. Moxley, NCTE, 1989, pp. 47-62.
- Grawe, Nathan D. *Demographics and the Demand for Higher Education*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018.
- Haake, Katherine. "Teaching Creative Writing If the Shoe Fits." *Colors of a Different Horse: Rethinking*

- Creative Writing Theory and Pedagogy*, edited by Wendy Bishop and Hans Ostrom, NCTE, 1994, pp. 77-99.
- Hunter College Office of Assessment (2020). "Program Learning Outcome Assessment." <http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/academicassessment/HowTo/AssessMyAcadDeptProg/IdentifyPLOs>
- Jordan-Baker, Craig. "The Philosophy of Creative Writing." *The International Journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative Writing*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2015, pp. 238-248.
- Levy, Joe. "A Brief Guide to Creating Learning Outcomes." National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, March 2018, pp. 1-7. <https://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/A-Brief-Guide-to-Creating-Learning-Outcomes--Presence.pdf>.
- Light, Greg. "How Students Understand and Learn Creative Writing in Higher Education." *Writing in Education*, no. 7, Winter 1995/6, pp. 10-15.
- Mayers, Tim. "Creative Writing Studies: The Past Decade (And the Next)." *Journal of Creative Writing Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2016, pp. 1-7. <https://scholarworks.rit.edu/jcws/vol1/iss1/4/>.
- Moxley, Joseph M., editor. *Creative Writing in America*. NCTE, 1989.
- Myers, D.G. (2006). *When Elephants Teach: Creative Writing Since 1880*. University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Nguyen, Viet Thang (2017). "Viet Thanh Nguyen Reveals How Writers' Workshops Can Be Hostile." *New York Times Book Review*. 26 April 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/26/books/review/viet-thanh-nguyen-writers-workshops.html>.
- The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. *Subject Benchmark Statement: Creative Writing*, 2016. <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements>
- The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. *Subject Benchmark Statement: Creative Writing*. 2nd ed., 2019. <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements>.
- Shelnutt, Eve. "Transforming Experience into Fiction: An alternative to the Workshop." *Creative Writing in America: Theory and Pedagogy*, edited by Joseph M. Moxley, NCTE, 1989, pp.151-167.
- University of Central Florida. *Program Assessment Handbook*. Operational Excellence and Assessment Support, 2005. [https://oeas.ucf.edu/doc/acad\\_assess\\_handbook.pdf](https://oeas.ucf.edu/doc/acad_assess_handbook.pdf)
- Vanderslice, Stephanie. *Rethinking Creative Writing in Higher Education: Programs and Practices that Work*. Kindle ed., Frontinus Limited, 2012.

## APPENDIX A.

Agnes Scott College  
Antioch University  
Belhaven University  
Bowling Green State University  
Brigham Young University  
California Baptist University  
California State Monterey Bay  
California State University Northridge  
Canisius College

Chapman University  
Chatham University  
Coastal Carolina University  
Colorado State Univ. Pueblo  
Cornerstone University  
DePaul University  
Eastern WA University  
Emory College  
Full Sail University  
Goddard College  
Goucher College  
Hamline University  
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis  
IU South Bend  
Miami University  
Missouri State University  
North Vermont University  
Ohio University  
Pacific University  
Penn State Behrend  
Pepperdine  
Purchase College  
Seattle University  
Southern Utah University  
University of Arizona  
Univ of Colorado, Boulder  
University of Hawaii—Hilo  
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign  
University of Iowa  
University of Mass—Lowell  
University of Missouri Kansas City  
University of Oregon  
University of Redlands  
University of West Georgia  
University of Wisconsin Eau-Claire  
University of Wisconsin Green Bay  
University of Wisconsin Whitewater  
Utah State  
Utah Valley University  
Wake Forest University

Webster University  
Wittenberg University

