In our analysis of both the 145 and 101 assessments, we noticed that students rarely mentioned reusing techniques they learned in class in their completion of the assessment.[1] We know that teachers are using uptake genres (proof of learning documents that demonstrate not so much *what* student have learned, but more so ***how they went about learning it***) to get students to examine their own processes and thinking because frequently students mentioned this general work in their post-assessment surveys about the class[2]. However, when it came to articulating specific writing research techniques as they completed the reports for the assessment or as they answered questions about the useful aspects of the course, these same students generally failed to discuss specific practices that they saw as having "repeat value" in their writing practices beyond the course.

To illustrate, the students in the examples below are able to articulate that they transferred skills they learned in class, but they do not describe their processes. Therefore and unfortunately, we have no idea what skills they actually learned. We would like to be able to discern more clearly exactly what students are doing.

Student Responses:
From previous projects done in our English 101 class we were able to properly research the genre and figure out what characteristics make a "good" missed connections ad. We knew what kind of writing style and author persona that missed connections had from doing other genre research projects as well.
Due to this we have plenty of practice on writing emails. Also just this semester our teacher spent an entire class period on how to write a professional email, including things like format and how to address someone so that you do not offend them.

From these types of entries on the assessment, we can see that students in many sections of ENG 101 and ENG 145 are learning writing research skills and specifically producing different kinds of uptake genres in class, but that they may still lack the ability to transfer those skills effectively into different settings. Additionally, they seem to lack awareness of what specific skills they have—and how these skills are specifically employed in order to

---

[1] Students in 145 were more likely to mention a transfer of skills from class to the assessment than the 101 students, but their articulation was not as sophisticated as we had expected. That is, they saw transfer potential mainly because the genres they explored often had direct perceived value to their work as advanced students or professionals. So, in this way, they had more opportunities to see transfer. But they didn't seem more likely (overall) to see transfer value in specific learning activities that they might re-use in very different writing settings.

[2] In the post-assessment surveys, respondents mostly used terms such as "genre analysis," "writing reports," "proof-of-learning," and "CHAT analysis" to refer to these activities.

produce a new, unfamiliar genre. Because the assessment specifically asked students to articulate these skills, we don't think the genre of the assessment could be a major factor (i.e. that the assessment itself somehow failed to elicit detailed responses). Instead, our feeling is that some of the following things are/might be happening:

- Students might be engaging in these activities, but they still lack the language they need to properly express the transfer that is happening. So for them, transfer is still implicit rather than explicit.
- Students may be failing to connect the activities of writing research with their daily, lived experience as writers. This is relates to the discussions in the "Teaching Students to be Writing Researchers" breakout group as well.
- Students may simply not know (yet) how to be extremely descriptive about their practices as writers. Therefore, they may be doing some of these things, but not mentioning them.

While some of the above may apply, overall, our analysis of the assessment reports reveals that students often did not seem to be employing very robust, critically aware analysis of the actual texts they produced. Although most of the groups could fairly effectively analyze the "rhetorical situation," groups began to fail more frequently as they worked to create specific, detailed knowledge about how to produce the genre experiment and how to apply their genre knowledge to the genre production. As a result of our analysis of the responses, we think that students **are** having some kind of difficulty transferring the specific strategies they have learned to new, unfamiliar writing situations—and that this inability is contributing to what we see as a "gap" in their ability to move from genre analysis to production.

This issue presents us with several important questions that your breakout group on "Uptake Genres" (Proof-of-Learning Documents) might want to consider:

- How do we get the students to recognize that they are learning new techniques through completing the uptake genres?
- How can we encourage conscious transfer of those techniques to new settings?
- How can we, perhaps, attend to **grading** in ways that hold students very specifically responsible for articulating learning **in the context** of making actual productions? So the value/completeness of the genre comes back into play not only as a factor in grading, but also within the context of "a writer must **know** why things are happening in the text as well as to be able to articulate those happenings in order for the production to be "A" work."

Assigning and Grading Uptake Genres: Afternoon Panel A & Breakout Groups

- Is it important for us to begin to help students to see that while we value their work in learning to produce effective genres through genre analysis and CHAT practices, they (most of them) are very far from being able to generate productions that would stand up to the rigors of comparison to the actual genres produced by experts and professionals in various writing settings? In other words, does the knowledge of their lack of expertise need to be part of their grade?