

University Writing Committee

Friday, May 02, 2014

MINUTES

Present: Bartone, David; Cheung, Alice; Eckler, Regan; Grandy, Travis (Minutes); Hoang, Haivan; Holmes, Judy; Hutton, Sarah; Lorimer Leonard, Rebecca; McCutchen, Deborah; Ware, Susan; Chris & Bob from CESD

1. CESD engineers Q&A on QQ Review Software
 - a. Haivan asked about reviewing proposals and whether we the recommendation status should change when we submit the review form? CESD said they can do this as long as we'd like that to happen.
 - b. Deb asked whether users would be biased if they see other reviewers' recommendations first. Haivan said she like having the comments visible to help new reviewers.
 - c. Judy asked about the reviewer forms, making the numbering consistent.
 - d. Judy shared an email from Kate where the she was having problems downloading zip files. CESD explained their rationale for structuring file attachments. Users only upload files once, but you see it listed on multiple parts of the site.
 - e. Haivan asked if we want materials listed in multiple places or just in one place. CESD described that this is something they're using for course proposals for other committees that are using the system. Since multiple committees use the same system, they have to customize for the needs of each committee but it affects all committees.
 - f. Sarah asked if it would be possible to edit a review. CESD said they would change it so people can more easily edit their review form.
 - g. Susan asked about why proposals that aren't assigned to her appear on the "My to-do list". Haivan thought it would be helpful to have these removed from the to-do list since the committee will be summarizing proposals. CESD said that it would still be possible to view proposals that aren't assigned.
 - h. David asked about how he's able to see the form to assign reviewers, and he's also listed as a possible approver. Only the chair and proxies should have this, and once this is corrected, it will streamline the interface for reviewers.
 - i. David asked about the home page, and how we can view all proposals before the committee. CESD will add a category for JYW proposals that way we can easily see a list of proposals.
 - j. David asked whether proposals will stay in the to-do list until they're approved, not just reviewed? Yes, in case you want to make changes.
 - k. Haivan asked that future comments be funneled through Haivan or Deb.
2. Approve minutes from last meeting (April 18, 2014) **APPROVED**
3. QQ Review of Education & Engineering JYW Syllabi:
 - a. Education: Deb, Haivan, Judy, Travis, Kate, David, Rebecca, Alex **APPROVED with recommendations**
 - i. Deb asked about pre-requisites for College Writing and suggest that they add this.

- ii. Judy noted that the syllabus doesn't include bibliographic information of the readings in the schedule. Haivan suggested we could use a "Contingent Approval" button where we want them to adjust some small things, so we would need to take this to CESD. Judy said that it's appropriate for the committee to advise on things that aren't required. Standards for Information Literacy are online. Judy mentions that this is an opportunity for dialog between the committee and departments.
 - iii. Deb asked about how they interpret "information literacy". Sarah noted this as well, but since it's only recommended, perhaps we should communicate this? Rebecca said that the Learning Commons committee would like to see Information Literacy required for JYW next year. Haivan suggested that perhaps the language on the JYW is clarified. Regan thought it might be helpful to have links for criteria that are in context on the proposal form.
 - b. Engineering: Deb, Haivan, Judy, Matt, Christiane, Betsy, Reagan, Susan **Approved** with recommendation.
 - i. Haivan described the course for Engineering Majors. 18-22 sections, 3 lecturers (from English), with a common syllabus. Types of assignments listed on the syllabus
 - ii. Judy is hesitant because while it lists kinds of assignments, this varies depending on section and this doesn't add up to at least 20 pages. She was also concerned that about the consistency of how this is interpreted across sections. Haivan was looking at the max page numbers and it works out to be about 23 pages plus a visual presentation. Judy withdraws comments about assignments.
 - iii. Judy had a question about instructors being from the English department, but they don't have interaction with the Engineering faculty, and this might be something to communicate directly to department chairs. Rebecca agrees that something should be communicated to the department. David thinks perhaps the proposer misinterpreted the question to get them to speak to the disciplinary writing of Engineering. Deb liked how the syllabus represents transfer skills but is also worried about how the class represents the discipline. Deb suggested that the instructors are training/supporting each other. Judy wants to support communication between writing instructors and faculty that way it's not Balkanized. Haivan would like this communicated separately from the approval. Rebecca agrees strongly and thinks it would work to have a face-to-face conversation about this. Susan asked why this isn't required. Haivan said that we can't dictate how departments operate, so our role is to motivate better support. David said that this will happen again in 5 years, so this is an opportunity to help them develop into the future. Haivan wants to evaluate whether courses meet the baseline and have this separate from outreach so that we can be more persuasive for faculty involvement. Deb asked whether we can share these as models.
- 4. Review of UWC Policy on Accepting JYW Courses Taught Outside UMass (Judy) **Not discussed because of time**
- 5. Other Business **Not discussed because of time**