Present: Tiani Akeo-Basques, Charlene Gima, Jennifer Higa-King, Karadeen Kam-Kalani, Jerald Kimo Keaulana, Mike Leidemann, Sharleen Nakamoto Levine, Conred Maddox, Mieko Matsumoto, Lawrence Meacham, Derek Otsuji, David Panisnick, Bed Paudyal, Ron Pine, Cynthia Smith, Fumiko Takasugi, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch

Conducting: Eric Shaffer

I. Eric reviewed current WI certification and recertification numbers. Presently, 29 courses are in the process of being certified and 26 are up for recertification. WI instructors must get their recertification applications in by Thanksgiving to receive provisional recertification for fall. Eric briefly reviewed the process for certification and reminded instructors up for recertification to include in their packets all WI evaluations as well as a reflection on how they will improve their course based in student feedback.

II. Eric highlighted main points in the memo issued by the System-Wide Committee on Written Communication concerning bundling WI and non-WI into a single section. A discussion followed in which members made the following points:
   A. The System-Wide committee has concluded that bundling WI and non-WI courses violates the WI hallmarks, and unless HCC ceases to offer bundled courses by Spring 2014 all WI courses will be decertified.
   B. Marcia pointed out that the System-Wide committee only voted on the motion to enforce the WI enrollment cap to 24 students.
   C. In response, Kara asked if bundled courses could still be offered if they were capped off at 24 students, as stipulated by the System-Wide Committee.
   D. Eric, Ron, and others pointed out that the System-Wide committee’s objections to bundled courses were not limited to enrollment caps only but included pedagogical concerns over delivery and reception of instruction in such classes.
   E. After some discussion, the committee agreed to comply with the mandate to stop bundling WI and non-WI classes for Spring 2014. In the meantime, instructors hoping to offer WI and non-WI classes could gather assessment data to demonstrate that bundling classes in pedagogically sound.
   F. Instructors currently offering bundled classes noted that these classes were created to give students options.
   G. Eric mentioned that there are presently only four instructors teaching a total of six WI non-WI bundled courses.
III. The committee discussed giving D grades in WI courses and individual members made the following points:

A. Students at HCC who earn a D in a WI course do NOT receive WI credit. However, they do receive course credit. The procedure for how this is indicated on a student’s transcript has not been clarified.

B. UH Manoa does offer D credit for WI courses, but HCC does not. Therefore, if an HCC student earns a D in a WI course and transfers UH Manoa, that student will receive course credit but not WI credit for that course.

C. Marcia noted that HCC has the highest WI standards in the UH system.

IV. The committee discussed WI evaluations and individual members made the following points.

A. WI evaluations are important for WI re-certification as well as faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

B. Steve Shigemoto will assume responsibility for running WI evaluations for Spring 2014; however, we need to find someone to do this permanently.

C. Eric suggested five things WI instructors can do to increase student response rates to these surveys: 1) tell students these surveys are important tools for helping instructors improve the course; 2) review the questions with the students, especially questions 6,7,8, and 9; 3) send students at least two email reminders with links to the evaluation site and follow up with reminders in class; 4) take students to the computer lab during class time and have them fill out the survey on the spot; 5) use the beginning of the final exam hour to have students complete the survey; and 6) offer extra credit to the entire class if 90 percent of the students complete the survey. Eric cited his 82.8% response rate as evidence that these methods help improve student response rates.

V. As part of the WI Committee’s and WI instructors’ commitment to and concern with ongoing assessment activities, Cynthia Smith presented data collected on WI course evaluations and knowledge surveys for 2011 to 2013 and made the following points:

A. To close the assessment loop, we as WI instructors need to look at assessment data, identify trends, and take actions to address areas needing improvement.

B. From 2011 to 2013, there has been a steady upward tick in the numerical scores on the following WI survey prompts: 1) “I received helpful feedback on my writing from my instructor”; 2) “I revised my writing based on feedback from my instructor”; and 3) “Overall, I think that my writing has improved as a result of this course.”

C. WI prompts that indicate need for improvement include the following: 1) “I received helpful feedback on my writing from other students in my class”; and 2) “I improved my computer skills in composing and revising my writing.”

D. Knowledge survey responses also show a general positive trend from 2011 to 2013. The weakest areas are 1) grammar and 2) citations and
correct citation format. Each of these requires instructor attention in WI courses.

E. In response to the weaker knowledge survey responses, Cynthia suggested that we build a WI Best Practices resource page in the Intranet. Instructors could go here to download handouts or lesson plans on grammar, citation, or any other writing topic. All instructors are welcome to contribute.

F. Conred noted that the Writing Center webpage already has many such resources on grammar and citation available to faculty. The library also has similar resources on its webpage.

G. Marcia identified the need for a program-wide pre-survey to assess students’ writing knowledge at the beginning of each WI course. That way, WI instructors could get a clearer picture of what students are actually learning and retaining in English 100.

H. Eric said he uses a simple, half-sheet survey in which students list three things in response to the question “What I know I need to know?”

I. Conred emphasized that revision is the key to improvement.

VI. As part of continuing assessment concerns and activities, Eric conducted a norming session and explained the following:

A. In a norming session, anonymous student writing samples are chosen at random and distributed to the instructors who then read and discuss how they would assign a grade to the paper in question.

B. The point of the discussion is not to choose the “right grade” but to listen to how other instructors would evaluate and assign a grade to paper in question.

C. No one “gets normed” in these sessions. Rather, instructors decide for themselves how they will use what they learned in the norming session when assigning grades to their own students’ papers.

D. The norming session lasted for a little more than an hour with all instructors contributing to the discussion, a number of issues concerning grading and teaching addressed, and a thorough examination of the essays completed.

Derek Otsuji, recorder