



2013

April 2, 2013

Writing Implementation Committee, Illinois Wesleyan University

---

### Recommended Citation

Writing Implementation Committee, Illinois Wesleyan University, "April 2, 2013" (2013). *Minutes*. Paper 16.  
[http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/writing\\_mins/16](http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/writing_mins/16)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Ames Library, the Andrew W. Mellon Center for Curricular and Faculty Development, the Office of the Provost and the Office of the President. It has been accepted for inclusion in Digital Commons @ IWU by the faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@iwu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@iwu.edu).

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

## **Writing Committee minutes 2 April 2013**

Present: D. Mendez-Carbajo, C. Sweet, M.A. Bushman, J. Haefner, L. Kunce, E. Kelahan, K. Schmidt

Convened: 4:04 p.m.

The meeting began by reviewing two applications for grants to revise existing courses. One of these grants the committee decided by consensus could be used as a model application, pending consent from the applicants.

We then briefly discussed how to promote course and assignment grants for the upcoming academic year.

The committee then moved into a broad discussion of how we might support, using Mellon grant money, department efforts to generate Writing in the Disciplines and Information Literacy outcomes statements for their majors. It was generally acknowledged that last June's workshop, wherein four departments were funded to work on outcomes statements or rubrics associated with some student work assessment did not work particularly well. Chris Sweet proposed "multiple pathways" for departments to generate these outcomes. One model might be "intradepartmental," where departments would propose their own structure and timetable for producing outcomes statements (ideally linked with assessment efforts and/or rubrics), and a "workshop" model, where departmental faculty would convene at a designated time and work towards an outcomes goal with guidance from on-campus or off-campus facilitators. We also mentioned the need for leadership synergy from the Provost and the University Assessment Committee; Diego also floated the idea of division-specific workshops aimed at developing outcomes statements for writing or information literacy.

We turned then to questions of assessment. Mary Ann noted that we have been charged with "assessing the Gateway," but she also observed that the Gateway's goals include many objectives outside of writing, and that we as a committee are responsible for writing across General Education. Chris added that the model that is emerging from University standing committees is very similar to the outcomes assessment program we have pursued for five years, and that hence the writing program is ahead of the assessment game. Mary Ann expressed concern that the feedback loop from assessment to impact on teaching isn't as effective as we would like. We discussed several ways of trying to broaden the impact of our assessment data on actual teaching practices: non-orgs, workshops, receptions, brief announcements at a faculty meeting or the fall faculty conference, short presentations at department meetings.

Adjourned: 5:01 p.m.