CCOC -- Meeting
27 September 2013

11:30-1
254 Rose Administration

Draft of Minutes

In attendance --
CCOC Members: Beth Bennett, Kathy Bolland, Kim Campbell, David Cordes, Ryan Earley, Maurizio Godorecci, Dave Heggem, Brenda Hunter, Dixie MacNeil, Luke Niiler, Joe Phelps, Cynthia Sunal, Amy Thompson, Ray White, Liza Wilson, Tom Wilson, Tricia Witte, Z.J. Wu
Student Representatives: Camden Adrian, Sam Creden, William Stephens

1. Beth began the meeting by sharing a note of appreciation from the Department of Philosophy. The department had expressed its gratitude to the CCOC for the review work completed for their 37 courses, along with the hope that "by reviewing so many PHL courses now, you will hear little from the philosophers in the years to follow." She explained that the dessert accompanying the lunch had been provided by that department.

2. The CCOC 2013 review process was summarized to date (see attachment below).
    a. Beth reviewed the overall progress of the 2013 review cycle, emphasizing that despite an abnormal number of technical glitches brought on by the new syllabus tool program the review was actually far along for the end of the September. People had been working hard to complete their work by the end of the month.

    b. She explained to new committee members how courses under review progress from the subcommittee reviews (either returned for re-submission or recommended to the CCOC for approval) to the main committee for review. Most of the courses have moved to the main committee for review.

    c. She also explained how the program worked for re-submissions, as well as how the main committee will review courses and vote officially to renew or to deny core designations.

3. The subcommittees presented their status reports.

Computer Science – Dave Heggem and David Cordes reported that the subcommittee had been encountering typical issues for this designation and had returned some courses for resubmission.
- Beth asked them to talk a little about what typical issues occur for new CCOC members, and they explained that usually the problem is with the required pre-requisite.
- They reported that for most courses, after assuring that the necessary components for a C course are identified on the syllabus, the difficulty lies in the requirement that there be "a specific, identified computer-based pre-requisite for this course."

- They reported that they planned to work with the College of Engineering to help them meet this criterion for their courses.

Math and Natural Science – Z.J. Wu reported that the subcommittee had completed the initial review of its courses, with one course being returned for resubmission.

History and Social and Behavioral Science – Kathleen Bolland reported that the subcommittee had completed review of the courses that had been submitted. One course had been returned for resubmission. Another course, IHP 105, had been passed on for the main committee review because the committee was uncertain about it.

- This course, IHP 105: Culture and Human Experience, she reported, appears to be an excellent course from the Honors College that "is designed to prepare you to more successfully study or travel in another country and/or live and study in the U.S. with people from cultures different from your own." By the end of the course, students "explore ways you can better prepare for future planned encounters via Current Events, Travel Writing, works of Fiction, and Film."
- She reported that while students may be asked to engage in some types of inquiry in the course, it was not clear to the reviewers that the course actually "presents the essential characteristics and basic processes of inquiry and analysis" in social and behavioral sciences. She said they were not sure if that was essential to an SB course and wanted the CCOC to judge.
- Sam Creden, student representative to the HI/SB subcommittee, said that he was in the course and could attest that while it is a valuable course, it does not present itself as a social science course.
- Beth thanked him for providing that insight for the committee and instructed members to review the course and the comments by the reviewers before casting their votes.

Humanities, Literature, Foreign Languages, Fine Arts – Maurizio Godorecci reported that they had encountered a technical glitch in the review program, one which did not record the last comments from one reviewer, so they had not been able to complete one of their course reviews.

- He reported that another course review had been cancelled and a third would not be submitted.
- Beth acknowledged that the gratitude of the Department of Philosophy was probably most appropriately directed to this subcommittee and their review work of the HU courses.

Writing – Beth Bennett reported that as background for the issues occurring in W course reviews, she had distributed at the start of the meeting several documents (see material appended at the end) that explain the action leading up to the CCOC recommendation last November regarding the enrollment cap for W courses.

- The specific recommendation, approved 9 November 2012, essentially gave UA Colleges the flexibility to honor the "spirit" of this criterion, if not the letter itself, as long as they could provide the explanation and justification for what they were doing.

- Some W courses have been passed on to the main committee for review because although they clearly violate the enrollment criterion, they appear to meet all other requirements for the W designation.
- She asked the committee to look closely at the courses that had been asterisked in the status summary (CE 468, GBA 490, NHM 340, NHM 454) – the enrollment numbers for these courses vary, as do the offered "justification" for over-enrollment.
    - She showed how some courses have been re-structured successfully to handle the growth in enrollment (e.g., GBA 300), while some submissions merely acknowledge their size without offering any plan for resolving the problem.
    - She reported that last year when the problem occurred for Kinesiology, she had held off the vote on those courses until she had a chance to meet with the associate dean for Education. The College agreed to help address the problem for that department.
    - She asked if the CCOC wanted to handle the current courses in that manner.
    - The consensus was that proceeding to vote on these courses now would help provide the necessary pressure needed for College deans to get involved in the issue.
- She then asked the committee to look at CS 499 Undergraduate Thesis Research, which the subcommittee had passed to the main committee with the question – does it matter that the course seems to have students working on only one paper throughout the semester, rather than submitting two or more papers?
    - Since the course comes from his department, David Cordes explained more fully that the course is designed to help students develop and refine a paper suitable for publication; as such, it proceeds through several stages of revision.
    - Tricia Witte offered that they follow a similar process in HES but divide the stages into separate assignments.
    - The consensus was that close revision of student writing, in this manner, could benefit the development of writing proficiency.
- Beth acknowledged that the difficulty in reviewing W courses in judging how much a course is actually helping students develop their writing skills, in contrast with just having them do a great deal of writing ("writing intensive").
    - The main criteria for the W requirement are designed to show reviewers that a course is trying to do that and to be transparent to students about how that will be accomplished.
    - We added in the feature to the program to allow additional materials (e.g., writing assignments, evaluation rubrics) to be uploaded in the course submission for those who did not want to include that information in their syllabus.
    - Tom Wilson asked why people did not want to include that information in their syllabus; various suggestions were offered.
        - Intellectual propriety rights (not wanting to risk them by publishing them with the syllabus)
        - Academic freedom (if published, would be locked into teaching the course in a particular way)
        - Lack of detailed preparation prior to publishing the syllabus, not realizing that the syllabus can (and should be) updated and republished
    - Ray White asked if the CCOC tracked on-line courses differently from traditional courses.

- Beth reported that no difference has been made – that on-line W courses really were only appearing in noticeable number in this cycle.
- He noted that SACS has been raising the issue about on-line courses generally.
- William Stephens, student representative to the C subcommittee, offered his own experience in taking the same course first in an on-line section and then as a traditional course. He reported that though the on-line course had been well designed, it did not offer him the same type of instructional support he received in the traditional course.
- Beth commented that after the CCOC concludes this year's review cycle, we will have finished a complete 5-year cycle and will reconsider the criteria we set up for each designation in the spring. We may very well also want to discuss how we think we should handle review of on-line versions of the designations.

4. Beth reminded everyone that all CCOC members now were expected to review the courses passed to the main committee and to cast their votes, by Friday, 18 October.

   She urged members to take their time, reviewing carefully those courses earmarked by the subcommittees and noting the types of comments made by reviewers.

5. Beth noted that since the committee had completed most of the review already, that we would plan to focus on the general education learning outcomes for SACS in the 8 November meeting. Everyone should now look through the courses his/her subcommittee has reviewed and be prepared to bring common learning outcomes for AGSC Areas II (Humanities, Fine Arts, Literature), III (Mathematics and Natural Science), and IV (History and Social and Behavioral Sciences). Our aim is to have a list of learning outcomes to suggest be piloted in the spring.

Meeting adjourned at 1 p.m.

Remaining Timeline for 2013 Review:

18 October – official vote completed
8 November – CCOC meeting: subcommittee status reports on resubmissions and discussion on remaining courses
6 December – CCOC meeting, if needed: complete official vote and review

CCOC 2013 Review Summary

Current Status on Review Cycle, as of 9/27/2013, 11a.m.

Main Committee

Course	Core	Status	
AEM 349	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
AEM 451	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
AEM 461	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
AEM 468	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
AMS 407	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
ARH 368	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
ATR 458	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
CE 220	SB	Pending Committee Review	☐
CE 401	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
CE 403	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
CE 404	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
*CE 468	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
CIP 200	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
CJ 100	SB	Pending Committee Review	☐
CS 345	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
*CS 499	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
CSM 401	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
CSM 441	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
CSM 441	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
CSM 445	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
CSM 447	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
CSM 447	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
CTD 255	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
CTD 353	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
CTD 422	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
CTD 427	C	Pending Committee Review	☐

Course	Core	Status	
CTD 447	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
ECE 332	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
ECE 333	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
GBA 300	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
*GBA 490	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
HY 111	HI	Pending Committee Review	☐
HY 112	HI	Pending Committee Review	☐
HY 113	HI	Pending Committee Review	☐
HY 114	HI	Pending Committee Review	☐
IHP 105	SB	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 110	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 112	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 113	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 115	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 121	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 125	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 126	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 145	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 146	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 227	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 237	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 238	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
MATH 247	MA	Pending Committee Review	☐
ME 349	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
ME 360	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
ME 372	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
NEW 360	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
NEW 407	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
*NHM 340	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
*NHM 454	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
NHM 491	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
NUR 308	W	Pending Committee Review	☐

Course	Core	Status	
NUR 319	C	Pending Committee Review	☐
NUR 328	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
NUR 329	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
NUR 348	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 100	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 104	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 191	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 211	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 212	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 215	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 221	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 223	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 230	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 234	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 240	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 241	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 242	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 243	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 256	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 260	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 264	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 281	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 291	FA	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 292	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 312	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 332	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 333	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 343	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 360	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 362	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 364	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 366	W	Pending Committee Review	☐

Course	Core	Status	
PHL 370	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 381	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 387	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 392	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 393	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 428	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 440	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 448	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
PHL 489	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
RHM 303	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
RHM 377	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
RHM 420	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
RHM 425	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
RUS 252	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
RUS 252	L	Pending Committee Review	☐
SAN 101	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐
SAN 102	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐
SW 205	HI	Pending Committee Review	☐
SW 351	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
SW 355	W	Pending Committee Review	☐
SWA 102	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐
SWED 102	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐
THAI 101	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐
THAI 102	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐
TURK 101	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐
TURK 102	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐
UH 106	HU	Pending Committee Review	☐
URDU 101	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐
VIET 101	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐
VIET 102	FL	Pending Committee Review	☐

W Subcommittee – Courses Under Review

Course	Core Type	Status

Course	Core	Type	Status
AEM 495	W	Application	Under Review by Subcommittee
CE 402	W	Application	Under Review by Subcommittee
NUR 522	W	Application	Under Review by Subcommittee
WS 342	W	Application	Submitted / Pending Review

Other Subcommittees

Course	Core	Type	Status
CE 331	C	Application	Under Review by Subcommittee
CE 401	C	Application	Under Review by Subcommittee
CE 402	C	Application	Under Review by Subcommittee
CE 403	C	Application	Under Review by Subcommittee
CE 404	C	Application	Under Review by Subcommittee
ECE 370	C	Application	Under Review by Subcommittee
SWED 101	FL	Application	Under Review by Subcommittee
CSM 458	C	Application	Submitted / Pending Review

Completed

No completed applications or reviews for this cycle.

Awaiting a Submission

Course	Core	Type	Status
ECE 383	C	Application	Cancelled
SWA 101	FL	Application	Cancelled
AEM 120	N	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
CE 320	W	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
CE 378	C	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
CSM 116	MA	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
CTD 415	W	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
MATH 301	W	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
ME 460	W	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
MTE 252	C	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
MTE 353	C	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
MTE 445	W	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
MTE 481	W	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
NUR 309	C	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
SPE 100	SB	Application	Asked to Resubmit by Committee
CE 270	N	Application	Not yet started
CHE 255	C	Application	Not yet started
CHE 305	C	Application	Not yet started
CHE 320	W	Application	Not yet started
CHE 324	C	Application	Not yet started

Course	Core	Type	Status	
CHE 482	W	Application	Not yet started	
CHS 442	W	Application	Not yet started	Delete
ENGR 191	N	Application	Not yet started	
HY 115	HI	Application	Not yet started	
NEW 410	W	Application	Not yet started	
NEW 416	W	Application	Not yet started	
URDU 102	FL	Application	Not yet started	Delete

Core Curriculum Oversight Committee Recommendation

For Issues Related to W-Designated Courses
In the UA Core Curriculum

Approved 9 November 2012

Rationale:

In reviewing W-designated courses for renewal of that designation in the UA Core Curriculum, the Core Curriculum Oversight Committee has sought to apply both the spirit and letter of the following:

> All UA students are required to take 6 semester hours in 300- and 400-level courses, preferably in their majors, approved for the writing (**W**) designation. The (**W**) designation indicates that one of the conditions for a passing grade is that students write coherent, logical, and carefully edited prose in a minimum of two papers, at least one of which will be graded and returned before midsemester. All (**W**) designated courses are taught and graded by instructors who have at least the master's degree and preferably are limited to an enrollment of no more than 35 students. The (**W**) requirement must be satisfied with courses taken at UA.

As we near the completion of the fourth round of the first five-year cycle of UA Core Curriculum course reviews, we find that we have been discussing W-designated course issues for over two years. A summary of those discussions was reported to the Office of Academic Affairs, in Spring 2011 (see attached). In this year's review, significant enrollment problems have halted CCOC decisions on four courses. Though the CCOC review process has brought accountability to the Core Curriculum, we believe enrollment problems, as well as issues related to how writing proficiency should be taught throughout the institution, cannot be resolved by the CCOC review process. Accordingly, we aim to offer a recommendation for handling enrollment management and other issues related to W-designated courses. Our official recommendation intends to respect the spirit and letter of the CCOC Guidelines, while advising how those guidelines may be operationalized in the management of W-designated courses. The CCOC review process will continue to hold all UA programs accountable for meeting the published CCOC Guidelines.

Recommendation:

Each College should be held responsible for developing standards and policies for managing the W-designated courses offered by its programs for majors in that division. Specifically, without changing the guidelines for W-designated courses, each College should be given the opportunity to operationalize those guidelines variously as best meets the needs of students majoring in the programs in that College. To do so, the College may submit to the CCOC for approval its policies for 1) *Maintaining the Enrollment Cap* and 2) *Teaching Writing Proficiency* within its programs. In the absence of any different policy, the CCOC will continue to review the W-courses in that College by the letter of the CCOC published guidelines.

Issues and Suggestions for the W-Designation

Core Curriculum Oversight Committee Report
Spring 2011

Introduction

After having completed the first two rounds of course reviews in the five-year cycle of review for all UA Core Curriculum courses, the Core Curriculum Oversight Committee is now preparing for the third round, to be conducted in Fall 2011. In our discussions of the review process this year, issues related to W-designated courses have emerged which committee members regard as appropriate to report to the Office of Academic Affairs. Herein, we provide a report of those issues, along with suggestions for consideration, in hopes that early in Fall 2011, we can meet with the Provost to discuss them more fully.

Issue #1 -- Maintaining the Enrollment Cap

As specified by the UA Core Curriculum guidelines and review requirements, W-designated courses are to be limited to 35 or fewer students. Members of the CCOC have spent some time discussing this enrollment cap in connection with optimal class size for quality writing instruction. Position statements from the **National Council of Teachers of English** (refer to http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/whyclasssizematters and http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/classsizecollege) support the views of CCOC members that 35 students is not optimal for W courses and that the enrollment cap should probably be reduced to 30 or even 25 students, if we are concerned with learning outcomes for writing proficiency. However, without a comprehensive picture of student demand for W courses and of available resources for meeting that demand, the CCOC is not suggesting a change in the cap at this time.

Rather, because members of the CCOC firmly believe that maintaining the current enrollment cap is crucial to the quality of instruction provided in W courses, the cap has been programmed into the current review process. Banner now holds departments accountable for the enrollment they permit in their W courses. The problem is that even though we now know what courses are exceeding the 35 student limit, the CCOC has been reluctant to vote against those courses for two main reasons.

1. We do not have a comprehensive view of how increased enrollment has influenced student demand for W courses.
    - For majors in individual programs, especially graduating seniors
    - For minors and double majors
    - Use of *DegreeWorks* by undergraduates is still not sufficient to provide that information.

- Data reports supplied from OIRA have provided only pieces of information, not a comprehensive view of program needs.

2. We do not know what administrative support exists for various programs to enable holding enrollment at that level.
    - Some department heads have been told to exceed the limit to facilitate graduating seniors.
    - Some faculty have the impression that administration gives priority to filling classroom space and accommodating student demand, rather than to maintaining the enrollment cap for the quality of education in W courses.

Suggestions:

We suggest that, if possible, enrollment for all W courses be automatically capped at 35, in the Banner system. Any exceptions would have to be justified officially and made available when the course came up for review.

We also suggest that a feasibility study be conducted, with the goal of reducing class size, which investigates how well existing W courses are meeting overall student demand and specific individual program needs.

Issue #2 – Teaching Writing Proficiency

Apart from the issues related to class size, the review process has revealed issues related to trying to assess whether courses are actually teaching writing proficiency. The guidelines for the W designation in the Core Curriculum provide flexibility for programs throughout campus to determine what counts as writing proficiency for their students, but in reviewing actual W courses, we have found there is a lack of consensus among committee members – much less throughout campus -- on what an ideal W course should have in terms of writing standards or quality instruction.

2.1: Disciplinary Differences in Writing Standards

In developing the review template for W designated courses, the CCOC accommodated disciplinary differences in academic writing by adding the phrase “within the discipline” to the required stipulation for the W designation. The required statement for W courses now reads: “**writing proficiency within this discipline is required for a passing grade in this course**."

Although we recognize that the original assumption about the W designation was to allow students to cultivate writing proficiency specific to their major discipline, through upper level courses in their majors, committee members acknowledge that frequently students are taking courses in other departments to meet the W requirement.

- In some cases, individual programs offer few or no W courses for their majors, expecting their students to meet this requirement elsewhere.
- Some programs prefer that their students take W courses in other programs.
- For many students, the common belief is that Core requirements are to be met outside of the major.
- In fact, some students are confused about whether they are actually permitted to take the W within the major.

Regardless of the reason, the failure of students to take W courses within their majors creates problems for reviewing learning outcome design and assessment standards for W courses.

1. Should W courses be designed to be accessible for all core curriculum students, or should they be designed for the specific needs of majors, regardless of whether some students enrolled are not majors in that program?

2. Besides challenging learning outcomes, this practice of students routinely taking W courses elsewhere creates problems for departments that do offer W courses.

    - Their own majors may not be able to enroll in departmental W courses.
    - Enrollment demand figures may not be related to whether or not a department is meeting the needs of its own students.

Suggestions:

We suggest changing the way in which the W requirement is worded in *DegreeWorks*, so that it is clear to students that the expectation is for them to take courses in their major to meet this general studies requirement.

We also suggest that OAA investigate what programs routinely advise their students to take W courses elsewhere and consider how resources can be fairly distributed to accommodate those students.

2.2: Quality Instruction for Writing Proficiency

The review process requires program heads to indicate that the instructor of their W course is "willing and able to teach writing skills as needed to assist students in meeting the writing requirements of the course." Furthermore, the course syllabus must indicate that student writing will be "graded and commented on" for the purposes of building writing skills sufficient to the normal standards of the discipline. The syllabus must inform students that "A student who does not write with the skill normally required of an upper division student will not be given a passing grade, no matter how well the student performs other course requirements." These requirements have generated at least three questions in reviewing W courses.

1. When the program head does not indicate the qualifications and willingness of a course instructor, how should the competency of the course instructor for teaching writing be understood?
   a. Apart from the M.A. degree, determining competency in writing instruction is subjective.
   b. Departments often have difficulty finding qualified instructors for existing W courses.
      - Some departments want to be able to offer more sections or courses for their students but lack enough instructors qualified to teach more W courses.
      - Others do not have faculty who are qualified to teach specific content in existing W courses, so those courses do not get offered.
   c. Qualified faculty members often are not interested in submitting their credentials for teaching writing – such courses are much more difficult for faculty members to teach well.

2. What normal standards or criteria of writing should we be expecting W courses to cultivate in students?
   a. General "across the curriculum" academic writing standards
   b. Specific practical application standards
   c. Discipline specific academic writing standards

3. What types of writing assignments should be acceptable in W courses for demonstrating that students have achieved writing proficiency sufficient to the normal standards of the discipline and to warrant a passing grade?
   a. The guidelines for W courses clearly specify "at least two written, individual assignments are required; group writing assignments or group reports are not appropriate."
   b. Nonetheless, what is being assigned in W courses, which CCOC members did not agree were acceptable, are such exercises as the following:
      - Two stages of a single written project
      - Sample exercises of written applications, e.g. professional letters
      - Written essay exams

Suggestions:

Luke Niiler has offered that, under the auspices of the Writing Center, all W course instructors for the Fall be invited to a series of faculty wine/cheese receptions, where they can be thanked for their willingness to support the writing mission of the Core Curriculum and they can be informed about W guidelines and expectations, as well as about available instructional tools and resources, prior to the start of classes.

We also think we need to open a general discussion among all program heads about the W requirement for students. We suggest planning a workshop for program heads next summer

(2012), where discussion about how to promote quality instruction for writing proficiency could be held. Resources from the Writing Center could be reported, and experts from other programs could be asked to facilitate the discussion.