

Writing Emphasis Committee Meeting 10/25/21 at 3:30 PM EST

Agenda:	Members (Present in Bold):
Open Meeting	Eman Arafa
Approve Minutes from 10/04/21	Linda Cahir
Redraft and Discuss Charges	Linda Cifelli
Propose Ideas for Next Meeting	<i>Min-Chung (Amanda) Han</i>
Adjourn Meeting	Marshall Hayes
	<i>Kathryn Inskeep</i>
	Lucas Kirby
	Agie Markiewicz-Hocking
	Brian Oakes
	<i>Byeonghwa Park</i>
	Ray Viglione
	Darion Washington

Notes: Dr. Han and Dr. Park communicated in advance that they had scheduling conflicts and would not be able to attend this meeting.

We should confirm whether Kathryn Inskeep remains on our membership roster.

Minutes:

Linda Cifelli (Chair) and Agie Markiewicz-Hocking (Vice Chair) convened the meeting at 3:30 PM once a quorum of voting members was present.

Links were shared to our common Google Drive folder and to the minutes from last meeting. The deadline for submitting our finalized list of charges to Craig Donovan was confirmed as November 15. Darion made a motion to approve the minutes from last meeting, seconded by Lucas. Minutes were approved for the record (8 yeas – 0 nays – 1 abstention).

We opened discussion to consider the draft of charges in our shared Google Doc. Agie encouraged us to consider merging certain points as we discussed and creating subpoints as needed. Linda Cahir suggested a wording change to use infinitives consistently when introducing bullets. Ray made the comment regarding the poor quality of writing in his mathematics courses and thus emphasized the need for student support.

We raised the idea of whether we have a clear understanding of our directives from the University Senate, given that we have not been able to find any historical documents. Agie has compiled a range of documents from other campus WAC/WEC initiatives on other campuses, for us to use as guidance. We also agreed to focus on producing a draft list and then using the next few weeks to finalize our language.

We then discussed the categorization of Writing Emphasis courses, how they are defined in terms of common expectations and how routinely they are internally audited. Darion suggested that we look into the timeline and overall process for these designations, and also proposed structuring our list of charges according to examples of other committee charges.

Focus of the discussion turned to wording related to assessment, and to whether or not our charges and responsibilities might overlap with those on other University Senate committees (such as Assessment and Curriculum). We suggested modifying our language to so as to leave specific mentions out, to avoid interfering with the primary roles of other committees, and perhaps to include as subpoints of our charges, to consider acting in coordination or in support of these other committees.

Agie mentioned a recent meeting with the Provost, and discussions within the context of curricula, that we should try to emphasize communication across curriculum, not just in written form, but also including numerical literacy, computation and technology. This is part of a larger effort to be working together across the curriculum, and in one respect, writing as can be thought of yet another mechanism for thinking and learning.

Darion and Linda Cifelli discussed adding a few sentences, a paragraph or preamble at top of our document to remain consistent with the formatting of documents from other committees. Darion shared link to previous versions of committee charges, for us to use as an example. Agie then asked for any additional comments regarding this first step in approving our committee charges.

Linda Cahir raised an important point about us obtaining a list of courses listed as Writing Emphasis courses (per Agie, we have the Registrar's list). Linda proposed that we should review the courses, evaluate whether they are currently meeting expectations, and communicate the intent of Writing Emphasis to professors. The point would be to evaluate the legitimacy of courses, to determine whether they are currently aligned with expectations, and to identify whether faculty members are aware of these expectations. Linda questioned whether we should be reviewing courses on the Registrar's list that we have, to make sure that the labeling is correct. Linda recommended that we also consider how the initial WE designations are made, *i.e.* according to what criteria.

Darion raised the example of recent transmittals to UCC or GE committees, and seconded the idea of querying instructors, confirming the meeting of WE expectations. He also make the point that some people have inherited courses without guidance as to expectations. Lucas share his experience working on the Ecology course, and mentioned never being told what the WE designation meant. There was general consensus, based on this part of the discussion, in support of providing clear guidelines to faculty regarding WE course requirements. We will work to emphasize this in a specific bullet point, after researching what the WE designation truly means.

We made a motion to table the list of charges, as updated according to the current discussion. We will then revise and meet again on Monday, November 8 at 3:30 PM to finalize. Agie will make further revisions, and then confer with Linda to circulate the most up-to-date language. Motion was seconded and approved (9 yeas – 0 nays – 0 abstentions).

Marshall made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Darion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:09 PM (9 yeas – 0 nays – 0 abstentions).