**WAC Committee meeting
Friday, September 9, 2016**

**Present**: Julia Mason, Joe Su, Rachel Luria, Jeff Galin, Julianne Zvolensky
**Absent**: Fred Bloetscher, Allan Smith, Dan Murtaugh (sabbatical)

1. **Creative Writing (CRW) courses as WAC-designated courses**

The WAC committee re-visited the question about the appropriateness of including CRW courses under WAC’s purview. This matter arose late in Spring 2016, so committee discussion was over email. At that time, the majority determined that the CRW courses in question did not meet the WAC criteria but there was interest in the larger conversation of whether creative writing courses could fulfill the WAC requirements as they currently exist. One of the common questions was how this issue connects to what the general conception of WAC is; that is, in how this relates to what the goals of WAC courses are.

Through the process of conversations with individual committee members last semester, **Galin (JG)** identified some of the complexities of CRW regarding the current design of the assessment process. A new portion of the WAC rubric would need to be built, additional functions on the newly-built WAC assessment interface would need to be made, and strategies for reviewing CRW work would have to be identified for norming assessment raters. The committee would also ask whether the English department would want its CRW courses WAC-designated as well.

**Luria (RL)** presented the perspective for why CRW courses should be able to be considered WAC courses. An idea behind WAC is that writing is broad and all-encompassing, so why should CRW not be included? Practically speaking, including CRW courses as WAC would help encourage students to enroll in CRW courses. Pedagogically speaking, it could help demystify the notion that creative writing is outside the process of presenting an argument and drafting/revising/critiquing as it exists for “traditional” academic writing. **RL** suggested the solution of adding to the courses so that they have a creative portfolio as well as a revised research paper as one of the major assignments. The committee agreed to this. **JG** recommended to make the changes, re-submit the syllabi to the college’s committees and the WAC committee, and when final approval comes up at the UUPC meeting, **RL** might consider attending so that any questions might be addressed.

1. **ENC 1101/1102 syllabus template**

At the last meeting in Spring 2016 (F 3/18/16), the WAC committee discussed the English department’s standard template for ENC 1101/1102 based on some issues/questions that were raised during the department’s 3-year re-certification review.

**Excerpt from the F 3/18/16 minutes:** During the syllabus review process, questions were raised about 1101/2 WAC criteria. Namely how to assess word count when no page/word count is provided; how to assess whether assignments promoted reading of sustained and challenging texts, and analytical writing; and how much of a description of error tracking methods is needed. The committee present reviewed some sample syllabi for 1101/2 that both followed the department’s standard syllabus for the course and that were more individual. Example language that more clearly addressed these concerns was identified in one of the sample syllabi. **JCZ** will summarize the example text and share it with the Writing Program Director to consider for the standard syllabus.

The committee looked at the Fall 2016 semester’s 1101 template that aimed to address some of these concerns, namely the matter of assignment descriptions. There was discussion regarding the challenges of designing and managing syllabi for courses with a multitude of sections and instructors/GTAs. In such cases, the committee is generally OK with assuming that certain elements of the course meet WAC expectations based on knowledge of how the course/program is structured. However, the committee would not be comfortable making such an assumption across the board for all courses.

**While it was commented that the template meets what the committee would consider the bare minimum of the WAC requirements, the 1101/2 template does meet them. The only recommendation/request at this time is that a general page range/assignment length be included somewhere (like with the assignment descriptions) to give a sense of how much writing the students can expect.**

1. **WAC Interface**

**JG** showed the committee some feature of the newly-designed WAC Assessment interface website. This has been a $25K investment. He explained how students and student records are created in the system, how students will submit material, how administrators manage submitted material, and how reports will be generated. Right now, we are working to identify the ways in which we need reports to be generated.

1. **Recertification – “Other”/Miscellaneous course year**

This year’s 3rd year WAC re-certification process will be the “Miscellaneous” category. **JG** thanked the committee for their work over the summer finishing the English department’s recertification. Part of what delayed English’s completion was the large number of syllabi, the small number of committee reviewers, and the questions raised regarding the ENC 1101/2 template. **JCZ** is working on recording all the feedback and communicating it with faculty. She will begin sending out syllabi for this year’s review as soon as she has collected a critical mass.

1. **Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC)**

Over the summer, **JG** and Dean Pratt met with Associate Provost Russ Ivy about the WEC initiative.

(Bio/university role: Ivy serves as the Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Assessment. In this capacity, he is responsible for providing leadership in formulating and administering university policies for student learning outcomes assessment, academic program review, institutional and program-based accreditation, review of new degree proposals, and other projects related to academic programs and curriculum. He leads FAU's Team for Assurance of Student Learning (TASL).)

Dr. Ivy’s main concern at that time was cost and sustainability, but **JG** explain the 8-year model that each department will cycle through and eventually become self-sufficient.

**JG** explained that he was visiting College Deans’ meetings to introduce it WEC to other departments. He has 6-7 meetings scheduled. At this time, the Honors College is not interested in participating because writing is already such a part of its curriculum and it is not organized by departments. This year’s pilot is Sociology and the department is in the process of collecting data. **JG** will follow up with the status of Languages, Linguistics, and Comparative Literatures (LLCL) and Ocean and Mechanical Engineering (OME).