

Called to order at 1:00pm

Members in attendance: Kristin Bock, Kate Freedman, Herman Fong, Judy Goodenough, Travis Grandy (Minutes), Haivan Hoang, Dani Kodess, Molly Lehman, Deb McCutchen, Dina Navon, Evan Ross, Michelle Trim

- I. **Review of the Minutes from December 12, 2014** (passed without amendment)
- II. **Approval of Annual Report** (passed without amendment)
- III. **Best Text Contest**
 - a. Kate spoke about the kinds of submissions (short, long, nontraditional). Instructors should encourage students to apply. Haivan mentioned that there are cash prizes. The deadline is typically at the end of the calendar year, and winners are invited to read at the annual Celebration of Writing, April 12, 2015.
- IV. **Workshop:**

Cross-Disciplinary Approaches to Junior Year Writing Course Design
Monday, March 2, 2015 at 12:00 pm to - 1:30 pm
2601 W.E.B. DuBois Library
- V. **JYWP QQ Reviews**
 - a. [#1680, Computer Science 305 - Social Issues in Computing](#)
 - i. Discussion: Reviewers felt that it easily met all the requirements, it had a great description of how it meets discipline specific writing, lots of flexibility, and lots of opportunities for revision. The course has 5 sections per year with a class size of 25. The committee might also recommend a cap on the class size.
 - ii. Decision: **Approved**, Michelle Trim abstaining
 - b. [#1689, Physics 381 - Writing in Physics](#)
 - i. Discussion: Reviewers felt that the assignments fit well with the profession, however there are still questions about the grade point conversion. The class was well-presented and relevant to the discipline but lacking in descriptions of assignments. Because they're using contract grading, which is more descriptive about expectations, that's why there's not point to grade conversion. Possibly we could suggest that they refine the rubric to be more descriptive about expectations. The committee deliberated about how much detail they wanted to require for describing, and so the committee has to decide whether the form clearly articulates a rationale for the writing in the class.
 - ii. Decision: **Approved**.
 - c. [#1657, Food Science 391C - Junior Year Writing](#)
 - i. Discussion: Reviewers felt it met all requirements including our recommendations. The syllabus does not explicitly list the writing assignments. Perhaps we should recommend that they share a list of assignments as part of the syllabus (if they don't already).
 - ii. Decision: **Approved**.
 - d. [#1652, MicroBiology 360 - Writing in Microbiology](#)
 - i. Discussion: Reviewers felt that the documents didn't create a very clear picture of how these parts fit together to form the course. On the forms and the assignment sheets, but there was definitely discipline based writing for a variety of audiences. The page requirements were not consistently listed. It may not be explicit because the students are being encouraged to do creative things with formatting. Reviewers had questions about the course schedule and guidelines and the level of detail is somewhat sparse. Might it be useful to encourage a more thorough document that can provide students with an idea of the arc of the class.

- ii. Decision: **Approved with request** to clarify the page requirements for the written assignments, required, and clarify that the writing handbook is mentioned on the syllabus as a required text.
- e. [#1479, Astronomy 301 - Writing about Astronomy](#)
 - i. Discussion: Reviewers really appreciated how the class places importance on writing. Some of the details were unclear, but they submitted a revised version. It does not provide deadlines for assignment descriptions.
 - ii. Decision: **Approved**.

VI. **Reminder:**

Please review for next meeting

["Special Report of the Academic Matters Council Concerning a University Writing Program"](#)

(http://www.umass.edu/senate/fs_docs/SEN_DOC_NO_82-057_WRITING_PROG.pdf)

Next meeting will be on 3/13 in Bartlett 256.