**WAC Committee meeting
Monday, Sep 27, 2021**

Present: Fred Bloetscher, Jeff Galin, Jamie Granger, Clevis Headley, Rachel Luria, Julianne Zvolensky

Absent: Jason Sharples

Discussion Items:

1. **WAC Sustainability Indicator assessment**
	1. We did this two years ago
	2. Was based off of JG’s sustainable WAC book project
	3. Did not collect data last year because of everything going on with remote working/courses and other things going on
	4. Need to send the survey out to faculty to complete
		1. No need to revise the survey questions at this time
2. **Benchmarking process for annual student writing assessment -- Jeff’s updates**
	1. Business Communication department satisfied with its results from the most recent assessment
	2. JG will be discussing LIT 20XX scores/benchmarks with English’s Writing Committee at its next meeting this afternoon
		1. Specifically, to point out that the benchmarks for the ENC 110X courses are higher than the LIT 20XX courses
		2. JG will update next meeting if need be
3. **Recertification of English department**
	1. Letter JZ will send to faculty (draft): [Did not discuss the letter to faculty] <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1XJlQCPznoNak5rUTLt22O650tWeUCkN308iDZf8J9hw/edit?usp=sharing>
	2. Working in teams? Currently there is an odd number of WAC members (5)…
		1. Yes, the committee had voted last year to work in teams where each person reviews syllabi, the team compares notes, then submits a single result for approve or revise for a single syllabus.
		2. JG is seeking new committee members from either Communication or Social Work. Waiting to hear back from those departments.
	3. English Department’s year -- lots of syllabi, so only plan to review Spring, Summer, Fall of 2021.
		1. If we review ALL fall/spring/summer versions, there will be ~123 syllabi.
		2. If we do not review summer as special cases of a fall/spring version, there will be ~96 syllabi.
		3. If we only review Fall 2021 and do not review summer duplicates of fall/spring courses, there will be ~69 syllabi
		4. These numbers assume all the files are in FAU’s credentialing server.
	4. Related questions:
		1. **Should we treat Summer syllabi as unique because the semesters are sometimes shorter?**
			* 1. That is, If an instructor has a fall/spring version and a summer version of the same course, does the committee want to review both versions, or just the most recent?
				2. There are 21 faculty who have a Fall/spring AND Summer version of the same course. Some summer courses may be the full term and not just the six week term; JZ did not code for specific summer terms when identifying courses for review. If the committee wants to review both versions of the same course for a given faculty, it will add 21 syllabi to the pool.
				3. The committee discussed whether summer and/or shortened summer classes should be reviewed; often faculty teach summer in similar ways as fall/spring but sometimes in the accelerated summer semesters, courses might fall short of the WAC criteria.

JG and JZ will take a look at reviews from the past to see if there is a difference in review results from summer courses…

If we don’t see any serious concerns, then we could try to narrow the scope of the re-certification assessment by not reviewing a summer version of a course if it is also being taught in the fall/spring version.

Or the committee could review summer every other year or something.

JG: If we do not review summer syllabi, a difference of 20-25 fewer syllabi to review now is not significant, but excluding the summer versions of syllabi and the possible erosion of WAC criteria as a result may add up over time.

Or JZ could only include summer courses that are the short Terms 2 or 3 in the review and not the full-length Term 1 summer courses.

Nothing was decided; JZ will have to look at material to determine how much of an impact this might make beyond just the number of syllabi in the review.

* + 1. **PhD students teaching LIT courses:** We’ve generally only reviewed full-time faculty for English’s re-certification because the majority of GTAs teach ENC 1101/2 and thus use the Writing Program’s standard syllabus template for those courses. Keep this practice the same? [Did not discuss; because this pertains to so few syllabi and because there is not a “standard syllabus” for the LIT 20XX courses, JZ will include syllabi by PhDs teaching LITin the recertification review.]
			1. Special considerations:
				1. There is one Sr Instructor from LLCL teaching one 110X course in English for Fall 2021.
				2. There is one adjunct teaching one 110X course in English in Fall 2021.
				3. GTAs in the Comparative Studies PhD program are sometimes invited to teach LIT 20XX, which is usually a course set that only full-time faculty teach; MA GTAs are not eligible to teach these courses.

Does the committee want to include syllabi for LIT 20XX courses taught by PhD GTAs in the review? [see above note bracketed in blue]

If yes, JZ thinks we should only do those for Fall 2021.

This would mean 3-4 syllabi for LIT 20XX by PhD GTAs for Fall 21 in the pool

* + - * 1. The committee decided last year to require PhD GTAs to participate in the WAC faculty training because they teach the LIT 20XX courses (i.e. courses beyond the ENC 1101/2 GTA training and standard syllabus).
		1. **Determining review procedures**
			1. Using Google folders and forms helps keep all the information in one place for Julianne to work with and ultimately download into the WAC server drive.
				1. We will continue facilitate the process in Google Drive
			2. Proposed process:
				1. Complete individual syllabus reviews
				2. Team discusses individual reviews and makes adjustments and decisions about the syllabus’s final approval
				3. One final review is submitted for the syllabus
			3. If we go that route, Julianne can set things up so that each team can see their individual reviews in a Google spreadsheet…
			4. How does everyone want to do it?
				1. FB emphasized that no matter what the method, there needs to be a clear process and a means to have the other person’s reviews/notes available to discuss.

JZ can set up the Google Drive material so that folks can access each other’s reviews.

* + - * 1. Committee discussed perhaps arranging courses into groups by course, such as an 1101 folder, 1102 folder, etc.
				2. The committee briefly discussed the timeline for the review. The goal is for it to be completed by spring. JZ has begun to download and organize syllabi; needs to download the remaining files and look into the past material Re: summer versions of syllabi. Once she has downloaded everything and created the Google review forms, she will send it to the committee. This will probably take a couple weeks/month to do.
1. **Writing Enriched Curriculum**
	1. Linguistics status?
	2. Political Science has dropped out and returned the unused funds.
	3. Architecture expressed interest in developing a “Communication Enriched Curriculum.” They are currently trying to identify a liaison.
	4. Long term fate of the WEC program?
		1. WEC has never been officially certified by the university as a program
		2. If we move forward, JG would revise the financial structure of it to be able to work with two departments a year instead of one department to be able to scale more.
		3. It would be probably a $30-40K commitment from the university.
		4. Thoughts?
			1. CH many students are 1st generation/working class. This kind of program could help connect them to the idea that writing is important.
			2. FB This is a “vision” issue i.e. “vision” for the university. Challenges related to retiring dean of undergrad. PArt of the question is whether the university sees WEC/writing as part of its “vision” for the university. Students need to learn how to write, but if the university doesn’t see it as part of the university vision, then we need to know and figure out what to do with that info
			3. JG the recommendation from WAC is to talk to Dean undergrad and see what he has to say about the WEC project long term, moving from pilot to program phase.
			4. CH raised the idea about the business model of tuition fees. JG acknowledged the idea but pointed out that this model may not be viable
			5. RL another obstacle -- everyone agrees that writing is important and want students to write well, but writing instruction is labor intensive and time consuming and faculty or department try to outsource it. So how do you frame it as investing more now to reap the benefits later.
			6. JG part of the benefit of the WEC concept is that it does not create writing courses and distributes the writing across the major. That kind of incremental change is more manageable than setting up a WAC course in the upper division that later get abandoned because they can’t get faculty to regularly teach them. Some depts have capstones, but not all. One of the biggest limits in this program is that we do not have any dept with any useful assessment. Departments seem to be disinterested in this portion but it is probably one of the most important activities of the projects. JG will keep working on them and see where it goes.
			7. If we do get Architecture involved, JG is open to re-designing things
2. **Seat cap exception for EDF 2085: Introduction to Diversity for Educators**
	1. The 2-3 sections for this semester are capped at 40 students
	2. There are GTAs assigned to the sections, but not in the traditional “GTA-led discussion section” model
	3. Excerpt from email: *The cap was raised this semester (fall 2021), but quickly rolled back to 27 for spring 2022 and beyond. For this semester, we will utilize GTAs to assist with providing the required writing instruction and feedback in a WAC course.*
	4. Note to committee from department chair received Sept 24 is copied below.
	5. JG and Committee decided that since this is a one semester change and that the cap will be returned to 27 next semester, that this exception is fine.
		1. JG wants to look at a version of the course syllabus since this description doesn’t mention revision.

The Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry (newly combined department) is home to the course, **EDF 2085 Introduction to Diversity for Educators**. The student capacity for this course was raised from 27 to 40 for the fall 2021 semester. This cap has subsequently been lowered to the appropriate 27 and will remain at 27 from here forward. There are three sections of the course for fall 2021. The plan to address the WAC requirements based on the student cap for all three sections is below.

* Students will receive an orientation to requirements of the American Psychological Association 7th ed. style guide.
* Students are required to write a report detailing the results of a curriculum analysis, construct an annotated bibliography of culturally relevant practices, and develop a series of lesson plans.
* Once assigned, students have class time available to ask questions and clarify content and writing requirements.
* Individual sessions are scheduled. In these sessions, students are provided individual feedback on assignment content.
* Small groups (5 to 6 students) are then formed. A graduate assistant meets with the small groups. These small groups with graduate assistants provide direct instruction and assistance with the conventions of writing. There are two sessions scheduled outside of class to accommodate the many small groups required to meet with each students across all three sections.

Although there are three sections of the course, the same plan described above is used for each section.