

Minutes from the Written Communication 4/16/16

Speaking to the debate of

10 competencies get spread out across the curriculum. What can we ensure go with them from the next campus to the next. Problem is we moved from multiple competencies to one competency.

This is an important discussion, but we need to do what we were assigned to do...

Discussion of campus comments

Look at two attachments to view comments:

1. Spreadsheet in folder and the other is in email that was sent.

Is the written communication competency a problem form the Written Communication Group.

1st comment from CSU Fort Collins

Easy one to resolve.... Content document and there are five things. Organize the competencies hierarchy to address higher level concerns to lower level concerns from the listing of the competency. The group moves to change the ordering for the Content Criteria. Conventions will go to the end of the list.

Art department at MSU Denver is concerned with citation. Documentation and Citation are used interchangeably.

UCD – the issue of students starting in C02, but transferring to C03. Tabled to the afternoon.

Critical thinking and reading components fell away. How can we address this:

Is this stuff in the syllabus for the syllabus review and assessed for in perhaps some statewide assessment. Ian notes there is no interest to develop statewide assessment for the state for the SLO's.

Should we add a SLO or to address reading comprehension.

Growing perception that assessment is driving the bus, however the language in the fall was noted that anything we developed we needed to be prepared to assess the SLO's cited. Individual institutions can then determine assessment practices.

HLC can become impressed with the idea of using state generated SLO's tied to course objectives.

How do we want to address the ideas of reading and critical thinking

1. Add SLO's
2. Could add to reading and content? Ie. Syllabus would need to be revised
3. Developing language that would traverse over the content so that competencies are intersected through the content. And possibly to note as approved by peer review.

Possibly boilerplate language to include over the other disciplines to umbrella over the other competencies.

Ian will develop some boiler plate information on the idea of the Write to Learn and Written communication competencies for other subject areas.

Back to reading and critical thinking...

Why isn't this viewed as not covered... and possibly need to be a bigger conversation? The idea is more a statement of grief, nor strategy forward. How we should we move forward. The conversation seems to be the collapse of the SLO's to one content area per discipline. Everyone is feeling a pressure to focus and the language is creating a problem, not necessarily reflected in what we are doing.'

This can be reinserted within the SLO's to include reading and critical thinking. Why add a written competency tied to reading. How explicit do we want to be with the documents that we have now?

If these change do we have to go through re-review in the fall? What is the timeline? The idea to start the review process is an "idea" It doesn't have to be this way. If there is good reason to take more time in order to do better... we should take the time to do this right.

Do we want to rereview and be done for the fall. The group consensus is that we go forward with this.

How explicit do we want to be with reading and critical thinking? Also – Citation vs. documentation question, but this addressed in the content?

Delineation of C01, C02, C03.

Also – can we live with the 10/29 draft?

The English Department at UCD has a proposal in process to address the C03 issue. At this point, the issue does not be addressed by the group at this time.

The question in terms of reading and critical thinking is how explicit do we want these documents to be:

- Do we want to add and SLO
- Do we want to do both
- Or are we happy the things look right now and we do not want to do either.

One member feels this is addressed in the present content. If we added an SLO, but it seems that this is addressed in the content.

Question: What are the ramifications of this being only in the content?

How many of you reviewed courses? Do you need it more specific?

Concerns:

How would we describe to read competently at CO1, CO2, etc? Little loathed to put it in as this is now the job of the comp person. How do we read rhetorically?

Suggest CO1

Add notation of "Write, read, analyze rhetorical texts, written etc."

Jeri Kraver is changing the forms directly in a different file.

2nd piece is the insertion of the issue of Critical Thinking.

Adopt critical thinking SLO's, or add
Add something to content
Or insert at the top of the content

Add critical thinking to #1

#4 – Critically read and use sources

Sequencing Question.

Two questions that center of the requirement of whether it be a co1, 2, or 3. This is a GE question and we are not dealing with this issue, as it is outside of our scope.

Extensive Research Project –
Noted in no. 4

Citation

Already noted in the content.

The sequencing problem appears to be a non-issue for this group.

Transfer students and sequencing...

Current system – student starts at Co2, co3. What questions are raised. Should student get credit for Co1?

For students starting in Co2, are they exempt from Co1? Is credit awarded for co1? Should it be?

If No, is your institution considering adding a CO2/CO3 option?

How is an student placed in CO2? What is the criteria? Should this be consistent across institutions?

Courses aren't always CO1, CO2, CO3 consistently across the board...

Should ACT scores be the same across the board?

CU-Denver

Reviewers for new content should be the people present in the room on April 15, 2016 for rereview.