**WAC Committee meeting Thursday, January 31st 2019**

**Present:** Fred Bloetscher, Julia Mason, Jerry Haky, Jamie Granger, Carol Tessel, Jacqueline Fewkes, Jeff Galin, Claudia Amadori, Julianne Zvolensky

**Preliminary items:** Introduce Claudia Amadori, Julianne Zvolensky’s interim replacement while on leave; Introduce Jacqueline Fewkes, the new representative from the Honors College.

1. **Mission statement – can we post on WAC website?**

The committee agreed yes, the new/revised Mission Statement from the program’s self-study could go on the WAC website. **UPDATE:** **JCZ has posted the new Mission Statement and program goals online.**

1. **Re-certification of English department – how is going? Ideally this can be done before Julianne** **leaves around the time of spring break**

At the time of the meeting, the re-certification review for the English department was about one-third completed. The committee discussed the new online format for re-certification review. Some benefits include that reviewers could use the “search and find” function of Word to identify certain WAC criteria items and enter information into the Google Form as needed and that **JCZ** could have a better sense in “real time” of how many reviews have been completed and how many syllabi were approved/need revision/not approved. The committee discussed the matter of whether some syllabi met the requirements outlined in the Provost’s Guidelines for syllabi. However, the WAC Committee should not be the body responsible for checking this. It is possible that at the conclusion of the department’s re-certification review, the matter of the Provost’s Guidelines could be mentioned in a summary memo to the department chair.

1. **Continue to operationalize sustainability indicators; approve revisions that Jeff & Julianne have made**

The committee discussed the need for context and clarification throughout the entire document (i.e. things like parallel structure for each indicator). For some items, there was discussion about whether an indicator was worded appropriately or whether it was asking for the information that WAC actually wants to learn.

**Current version of the document:** <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1awlfnYOITHHsY73qSiE30GNImYACvv46hNGFwkRmO68/edit>

**\*\* NOTE:** If you wish to make comments or suggestions, please use the “Suggesting” function of the Google Doc. This can be found in the top right corner of the Doc:



1. **Association for Writing Across Curriculum (AWAC) institutional memberships – we have four available…**

**Jeff Galin** explained this new organization and its goals. AWAC will hold workshops and offer a variety of WAC-related resource materials as well as offer other kinds of support for WAC programs. FAU WAC paid for an institutional membership for 6 faculty, 1 adjunct, and 1 graduate student. Some of the slots are already claimed; is there any interest within this committee?

The committee discussed possible interest in becoming members of AWAC and proposed that there could be a fair case for interest for **JG** toseek an unlimited institutional membership such as OURI has done with the Council for Undergraduate Research.

**JG** will speak to Dean Pratt regarding the possibility of this.

1. **WEC liaison working group and Political Science WEC update?**

**JG** gave context for the WEC Working Group. Essentially, the goal is for all the WEC departments to identify how to get better assessment results. Assessment data needs to serve the needs of the specific department, but there also needs to be a way for WEC as a program to compare data. Without at least some kind of universal assessment or comparable assessment processes, there is no way for us to show upper administration results to justify financial support for the program. Currently, we are at the maximum number of departments that we can sustain financially.

1. **Making an exception about *in lingua* courses counting as WAC-certified in the case of HC Spanish (and other language) DIS/theses**

The committee discussed some of the complexities of an exception like this. Previously, the committee’s stance on special cases such as the situation a few years ago with CRW/Creative Writing courses was that such special kinds of situations could not be certified as WAC. This was because there was not a way to include them in the WAC program’s existing assessment process. There were too many limitations of the rubric and whether raters could be trained/normed to assess that kind of work.

**Questions posed to the committee were:**

* Should the ability to assess the writing prevent certain kinds of courses from being WAC-certified?
* Should thesis projects be assessed? We’ve tried to in the past, but due to the complexity of norming/applying the rubric we do not. So then why shouldn’t we allow theses written in lingua to count as WAC courses?
* What are the limitations of exceptions to certifying courses as WAC?

**Some committee members were “PRO” making this exception, while others were hesitant about possible implications.**

**The committee raised and discussed matters including:**

* the original purpose/intention of WAC and how it defined writing. **JG** noted that the goal was to help develop good *academic* writing.
* The matter of how/whether in lingua courses could be assessed.
* If WAC certifies in lingua thesis courses, there may be some political opposition.
* Whether allowing in lingua courses to be WAC-certified would require a “change in program” submission to the UUPC.
* What kind of language was there at the state level surrounding the requirements of Gordon Rule?
	+ The committee reviewed language for Florida’s Gordon Rule and debated whether it encompasses all writing (lingua or not) or if it assumes that the writing is in English.
* The matter of assumptions surrounding language
	+ Such as the differences between orthographic systems and the assumption that “if a person can write well in one language, they can write well in another.”
* How did this issue arise? Was it student-driven? Faculty-driven?
	+ It was clarified that it was mostly a matter of “symbolic disparity,” that in the interest of the students, a DIS thesis written in lingua should get the same kind of treatment as a DIS thesis written in English. In both cases, students are engaged in an intensive writing process, and non-lingua faculty would respect the judgment of in lingua faculty confirming that a student has done quality work. The issue seems limited in application (i.e., there are likely not a significant number of students to whom this situation applies).

**Resolution/Actions:** The committee did not make a decision about this exception in this meeting. **Jeff Galin** asked **Jacqueline Fewkes** from the Honors College to get some more context for the issue (i.e. how did the issue come up? How many students would this affect? What is the HC faculty input?). **JG** will make some phone calls to the state Re: can in lingua “count” for Gordon Rule and/or are there other implications of this that FAU WAC should consider.

1. **Other?**

None at the time of the meeting.