**WAC Committee meeting agenda/minutes
Wednesday, November 10, 2021**

**Discussion Items:**

1. **Welcome to new committee members!**
	1. Rina Bousalis, College of Education
	2. Atensia Earp-Bowen, School of Social Work
	3. Huzzah! :)
2. **How did this semester’s WAC Faculty Training seminars go?**
3. **Benchmarking process for annual student writing assessment -- Jeff’s updates (if need be)**
	1. Jeff was scheduled to discuss last year’s assessment results with the English department’s Writing Committee meeting that was the afternoon of our last WAC committee meeting on Sept 27, 2021…
	2. In particular, he wanted to tell the Writing Committee that the benchmarks for the ENC 110X courses are higher than the LIT 20XX courses
	3. At this time, English is satisfied with the status of its scores/benchmarks
4. **WAC Sustainability Indicators survey**
	1. No need to revise the survey at this time.
	2. Need to send it to faculty.
5. **Re-Certification of English department**
	1. Letter JZ will send to participating faculty about Re-certification (draft): [Did not discuss the letter to faculty at Sept meeting; not necessary to do so in Nov meeting, but just in case committee wants to see it] <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1XJlQCPznoNak5rUTLt22O650tWeUCkN308iDZf8J9hw/edit?usp=sharing>
	2. Based on our last conversation as to whether to include Summer 2021 courses in the review if the faculty member is teaching the same course in Fall 2021, Julianne reviewed the courses in the different summer terms.
		1. There were ~30 sections of WAC courses offered by different faculty in Summer 2021
		2. Only one of those ~30 was a full semester/Term 1, which would make it similar to the Fall/Spring term duration.
		3. Because the majority of courses were Terms 2 and 3 (6 weeks) it is probably best that the committee review them separately from the Fall/Spring version of the faculty’s same course.
	3. Julianne discussed the new procedures for the recertification process – each syllabus will have two reviews like always. Each person will conduct an individual review (same as always). Then, the two reviewers will discuss any discrepancies in their individual reviews, make a final decision for the syllabus, and submit a single, final review/approval status for that syllabus (new procedure)
		1. Everyone will have a partner
		2. Folders of syllabi will be arranged by teams
		3. Team folders will have 1000 and/or 2000 level folders of syllabi inside as well as the appropriate review forms (individual review, team/final review, course levels)
		4. Results spreadsheets will have separate tabs for Individual reviews 1000-level, Individual reviews 2000+ level, Final review 1000-level, Final review 2000-level
	4. **The committee discussed common issues with the syllabus review process, mainly the fact that sometimes the WAC criteria are difficult to find because faculty often do not use the syllabus template provided by the Provost’s office. Perhaps if the issue continues to be pervasive, WAC might consider brining it up at the Deans Council. WAC could report that we do a regular syllabus review, ask whether Deans/Chairs are supposed to enforce the template, and ask about whether WAC material could be added to the Provost’s template.**
	5. **Conversation turned the order of the WAC criteria on the review forms. The committee decided to re-order some of the WAC criteria to help make the review responses more intuitive. Julianne will revise all the associated materials.**
	6. **The committee identified that some of the WAC criteria are difficult to assess. It may be that the language of the item needs to be revised next year.**
		1. **Example: In the 1000-level course criteria, a WAC item is:**
		2. **All WAC courses should offer writing assignments that encourage students to recognize and examine intellectual and/or cultural assumptions that emerge in the readings and in the student's own writing.**
		3. **How can the review assess whether such “assumptions” are examined? By the titles of the reading list?**
6. **Writing Enriched Curriculum**
	1. Political Science has withdrawn from the WEC program and returned unused funds.
	2. Linguistics?
	3. Sociology?
	4. Architecture decided not to participate due to trouble identifying a liaison and other departmental complexities.
	5. Jeff has spoken to Dean Pratt/Undergrad Studies about suspending the WEC program and developing a Center for Visual and Digital Communication.
	6. Use WEC money to propose center for digital and visual scholarship….as part of AI institute? The center is design to foster research in AI. AI researchers need to be able to use images etc in rhetorically. It would be great to collaborate if the center and its donors would let us. We could potentially bring $50 to the project. A program director with course release. 5-8 consultants across disciplines to work there. It is meant to support all students at the university, not just the departments. This was one of the pieces of Jeffs QEP.
	7. **Update: There was little interest in the “Center for Visual and Digital Communication.” Instead, Jeff is going to propose to develop a center for expanded service for non-native English speakers.**
	8. **Along with the conversation WAC criteria that are in need of revision, Jeff mention that next year the committee should consider the item about error-tracking in light of current discourse surrounding anti-racist teaching and related issues of acquiring dominant discourse. How there is a differnce in learning how to proofread for “accidental” versus “intentional” patterns of error.**
7. **Jeff’ will be on sabbatical in Spring 2022.**