**WAC Committee Meeting F 2/28/14 9:00-11:00**

**Present**: Jeff Galin, Daniel Murtaugh, Allen Smith, Joe Su, Fred Bloetscher, Joy McClellan (for Ellen Ryan), Julianne Curran

**Absent**: Julia Mason, Rachel Luria, Ellen Ryan (sent Joy McClellan as liaison)

1. **Revisions to WAC Assessment Rubric**
   1. The committee reviewed WAC assessment rubric revisions based on norming conversations during the 2013 assessment. The committee discussed changes to the rubric at the 1/31/14 meeting, but had not reviewed the comparison document of the old 2012 version with the new 2013 version. The committee approved sending the new rubric to the UUPC for approval for continued use.
   2. The committee suggested language for the UUPC rationale memo to explain the seemingly obvious description in “Reasoning” that states that a paper “does not make discriminatory comments.” Committee discussion included how a goal of writing is to introduce students to complex conversations that ask them to identify their assumptions and consider how cultural terms influence and impact people. The committee suggested the following alternative language for the rubric: “Students are able to demonstrate and express their views without discriminatory, socially offensive, or illogical thinking.” The rationale for this change to the rubric is to emphasize for students that the goal is not to change how people think, but to show them that there are more defensible ways to engage with what might be uncomfortable or controversial issues. **JC** will make the revisions and present them at the 3/21/14 UUPC meeting.
2. **Recurring issues with Philosophy PHI 2010 course**
   1. There is concern that PHI 2010 GTAs do not feel prepared to enter the classroom when they do, and they feel limited in the ways they are told to respond to student papers. A criteria checklist is offered, but the rubric elements do not offer GTAs ways to respond to students’ critical thinking. GTAs do not want to disrespect IOR by straying from the provided criteria, but feel students are not getting the feedback they need.
   2. This situation speaks to a failure in terms of the writing program. An option would be to “de-certify” the course, but technically the 2000-4000 level WAC criteria say that a WAC syllabus will “include explanation of how they will receive substantive feedback.” This statement is problematic because it assumes there will be substantive feedback in the course. The perception is that the substantive feedback aspect is lacking in some sections of PHI 2010, which goes against the spirit of the WAC program.
   3. **JG** would like to speak to Anthropology/Philosophy chair about some of the recurring issues with PHI 2010 with Dean Pratt and seeks the committee’s advice in handling the matter.
   4. The Committee discussed issues involved, including the fact that several faculty members teach the course. The Committee suggested that **JG** present the department with a letter from the WAC Committee identifying the issues and giving the department the options of de-certifying the course, not allowing faculty who do not support the spirit of WAC to teach the course, or of maintaining the WAC classification by addressing in writing how the problems will be resolved. Thus, the decision of how to approach the issues and the larger implications for the department will be the chair’s responsibility. The Committee advises to avoid direct confrontation, but feels that the issues should be documented in writing.
   5. **Update: JG and Dean Pratt met with the department chair of Anthropology/Philosophy to discuss the issues. It was resolved that data will not be used from the PHI 2010 course selected for the Spring 2014 assessment process.**
3. **Writing Enriched Curriculum update**
   1. **JG** will send the WEC description packet to department chairs this afternoon and will hopefully be making follow up phone calls to schedule meetings with interested departments.
   2. For the WEC description memo to the Provost, the Faculty Learning Community suggested citing national data sources that link well-versed writing skills and the ability to obtain a job or that cites the specific kind of writing skills that employers are looking for in job applicants. **JG** has added such data to the memo. The data he added was taken from the “Culture of Writing” QEP proposal that cites data from the FAU Faculty and Alumni QEP surveys and a 2009 study by the Association of American Colleges and Universities.