WRITING COMMITTEE MINUTES  1.24.2011

Present:  Chris Sweet, Becky Roesner, Mary Coleman, Carmela Ferradans, Mary Ann Bushman, Joel Haefner (ex officio)

Convened at: 4:03 p.m.

Mary Ann discussed the external review process and the report from our external reviewers. She noted that we needed to complete the process by drafting and approving an action plan, and that she and Joel would work on that.

There was discussion about what next to do with the Program’s Learning Outcomes Statement. Mary Ann contacted Carolyn Nadeau, but no one is exactly sure what the process should be. Should CC submit it to a faculty vote? Departments don’t necessarily vote on learning outcomes statements. Mary Coleman suggested we decide which of two results we seek: a mandate or dissemination, although the two are not mutually exclusive.

Discussion shifted to the General Education goals and criteria for the Writing Intensive flag, a topic which came up during the self-study workshop on the WI flag, the notes of which were distributed to the Writing Committee. Joel pointed out the discrepancy between the catalog description of the flag and the General Education Handbook description. Mary C. observed that there was unanimous agreement among those present at the WI workshop that the Handbook criteria was inadequate.

Chris suggested we seek certification of our learning outcomes statement first, then re-visit the Handbook copy. Mary Ann suggested we re-draft the WI flag language and send it to CC. In general, Mary Ann said, the Writing Committee needed to become more policy-setting. Becky asked if we could send the LOS to CC for approval; Mary Ann noted that CC did not respond to a request for approval. Mary observed that since CC is working on the other two flags, they would probably be happy to have the Writing Committee work on the WI flag.

Mary Ann suggested that the Writing Program should have a section in the catalog, and that the Study Abroad program might be a good paradigm. Becky said that the Writing Program description could go after the Majors and Minors section of the catalog.

Mary Ann summarized some of the tasks facing the Writing Committee. She indicated we need to publish our assessment results and get Gateway faculty to discuss how to address the perceived weaknesses in student outcomes. In terms of institutional documents, the WC should 1) revise the Writing Intensive flag criteria and goals and 2) seek CC approval for our learning outcomes statement through the consent agenda. In terms of institutional structure and administration, Mary Ann suggested we write out our functions (some of which should be administrative) and get on the Nominating Committee’s regular agenda, particularly since the
Writing Committee is appointed, not elected, and that the name of the committee should be officially changed from the Writing Implementation Committee to the Writing Committee.

Mary Ann noted that the title of Writing Coordinator had been internally altered to Writing Center Director. She also discussed briefly the proposed Writing Program budget she sent to Acting Provost Boyd, and promised to send the proposal to Committee members.

Two subcommittees were formed: one subcommittee, comprised of Chris, Mary, Mary Ann, Joel, and Diego, were charged with revising the WI criteria and goals and met on Feb. 3. Another subcommittee, comprised of Carmela and Becky, was charged with outlining administrative functions of the Writing Committee to be forwarded to the Nominating Committee.

The next meeting was slated for Monday, February 14, Valentine’s Day and Mary Ann’s birthday, from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Adjourned: 5:03 p.m.