

## Writing Curriculum Committee



**Minutes of November 6, 2019**

**3:00-4:00 p.m. in SC 206**

<b>WCC REPRESENTATION</b>	<b>ROLE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>In attendance</b>	<b>Term</b>
<b>Writing Program Administrator</b>	Chair	Sarah Snyder	Present	
<b>Faculty – WID Communications</b>	Member	Michael Miller	Present	
<b>Faculty – WID Career and Technical Education</b>	Member	Bertha Avila	Absent	
<b>Faculty – WID Modern Languages</b>	Member	Nancy Blitz	Present	
<b>Faculty – WID Behavioral Sciences (Exploratory AY 2019-2020)</b>	Member	Dubia Zaragoza	Absent	
<b>Faculty – WID Social Sciences</b>	Member	Nik Byle	Absent	
<b>Faculty – WID Natural Sciences</b>	Member	Laura Alexander	Present	
<b>Faculty – WID Math</b>	Member			

<b>Faculty – WID Fine Arts/Extended Campus</b>	Member			
<b>Faculty – WID Physical and Wellness Education</b>	Member			
<b>Faculty – WID Nursing</b>	Member	Emily Adams	Absent	
<b>Faculty – WID Business and Computer Information Systems</b>	Member			
<b>Center for Instructional Excellence Director</b>	Ex-Officio	Joann Chang	Present	
<b>Division Chair of Communications</b>	Ex-Officio	Eric Lee	Absent	
<b>Writing Center Coordinator</b>	Ex-Officio	Clayton Nichols	Present	
<b>Advising</b>	Ex-Officio	Lee Altman	Absent	
<b>Assessment Director</b>	Ex-Officio	Elaine Groggett	Present	

Topic	Discussion	Action
A. Call to order	A. Meeting called to order by Sarah Snyder at 3:05 p.m.	A. Minutes of October meeting were approved as written via email.
B. Sub-committee Reports	<p>B.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elaine, Eric, and Sarah have been working to insert the Writing Intensive outcomes in all WI course syllabi. Proposed adding to Section 2 as course outcomes for the course.</li> <li>2. Sarah gave an update on the campus-wide survey regarding writing. There were 42 responses. In response to Question 7, <b><i>What types of writing do you use in your classes?</i></b> 17 out of 42 (26%) of respondents indicated they already use ‘reflection’ in their courses. The question was posed if all respondents have the same definition of ‘reflection’ that is intended in the proposed WI uniform assessment tool. Question 8 prompted discussion. It was pointed out that the the scale is bad and the metric needs to be improved. Question 9 needs to be revised. This data can be used</li> </ol>	<p>B.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Elaine</b> will make sure this is addressed at the next Curriculum Committee meeting.</li> <li>2. <b>All committee members</b> are to review the results of the survey and bring questions and comments to the December meeting.</li> </ol>

to inform some of our decisions as a committee and parts can be used in the self-study.

3. Common Assignment Workshop recap – Sarah reported that it went very well. There were two Faculty from Social Sciences, two from English, and one from Administration of Justice. It provided attendees with information on how students can look at the Student Learning Outcomes for a class and evaluate for themselves where each SLO has been achieved through which assignment in the portfolio of writing assignments that they have done during the semester. After we move to Canvas, students will be able to use Canvas as the collection point for their portfolios.
4. WI Memorandum – Michael Miller presented the schemata he had developed to help everyone see more clearly how the common assessment tool fits into the overall course, no matter what the discipline. The purpose is to bring students to a metacognitive level how they have met course WI outcomes and why they are significant to the overall content area of the course. Students who can articulate and justify how they have met SLOs are showing higher-level thinking skills. The reflective piece is NOT an independent writing assignment. It is connected to the course's writing assignments for the semester and must refer back to the various assignments connecting where each SLO has been achieved in a particular earlier assignment. In other words, the common assessment tool must be accompanied by the student's portfolio of assignments for that course. The portfolio is the collection back to which students cite examples of where they are showing proof of how they have met the 5 WI Outcomes. Michael concluded by suggesting that now might be the time to make any revisions to the assessment tool.

4. We are not ready to move on making changes. This conversation will be continued at our next meeting.

	<p>5. Writing Program Administrator Consultant Evaluator Self-study of WI – The Committee set the dates we need to meet in the writing of this document. The following Sub-committees assignments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Michael and Nancy – philosophy and goals</li> <li>• Sarah -- Writing Program Administrators / Writing Center Directors / WAC Coordinators</li> <li>• Lee—Courses and Syllabi</li> <li>• Laura – Instructional Methods and Materials</li> <li>• Clayton – Response to and Evaluation of Student Writing</li> <li>• Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes – Sarah</li> <li>• Nik – Status and Working Conditions</li> <li>• Joann – Faculty Development</li> <li>• Elaine – Curriculum</li> <li>• Dubia – Campus Mood</li> <li>• Eric – Campus Systems</li> <li>• Nancy and Bertha – Campus Ideologies</li> </ul>	<p>5. Deadlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• December 4 – first draft deadline</li> <li>• January 4 --Sarah will give subcommittees feedback on what they have written</li> <li>• February 1 – the final draft needs to be submitted</li> </ul> <p><b>Sarah</b> shared this document in the One-Drive with names of those who are responsible for which section.</p>
C. Adjournment	Meeting was adjourned at 4:22 p.m.	

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy T. Blitz, Secretary