**The University of North Carolina at Pembroke**

**QEP Committee Minutes**

**January 14, 2014**

**1:00 PM**

**Lumbee Hall Room 436**

**Members Present:** Michael Alewine; Mark Canada; Polina P. Chemishanova; Anthony Curtis; Cynthia Miecznikowski; David Nikkel; Elizabeth Normandy (Chair); Marian H Wooten; William Thomas

**Members Absent:** Cherry Beasley; Sherry Edwards; George F. Guba; Anita R Guynn; Timothy Ritter

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.

The Chair announced that Professional Development activities for Spring 2014 will include Chris Anson on Peer Review on April 4 and Kelly Ritter on a topic to be determined at the end of January.

The Committee discussed the problem of improper WE/WD course designations for instructors who have not completed the professional development workshops. The Committee consideredhow might we guide Distance Education students better toward appropriate WE and WD courses.

Committee agreed to provide professional development for WE/WD instructors during fall semesters from now on (instead of both spring and fall), on the assumption that fewer and fewer faculty need training as the program goes forward.

It was noted that in departments where the program is fully online, some transfer have difficulty fulfilling the Writing Intensive requirements without knowing what will be offered online each semester in time to plan. A number of students fail or drop WE courses because they don’t seem to get the message about writing emphasis and writing criteria. It was proposed that closer advising and monitoring mechanisms are needed to ensure that Distance Education students meet the QEP requirement efficiently.

The Chair reported that a review of WE/WD course syllabi using the approved rubric shows that most are exemplary. Not every syllabus provides detailed information about writing instruction. Some don’t articulate clear objectives for writing, but all show that students are guided through the process of writing in the course, and both informal and formal writing are assigned. Thus, the training and approval processes seem to be working. The emphasis on writing has not slipped over time, according to this informal review. This is true of courses taught by adjunct instructors, too.

The Committee discussed how to view student collaboration on writing in WE and WD courses and agreed that students must be assessed on the basis of independent formal writing.

The Committee supported the Chair’s email to all faculty about how WE/WD syllabi should look. Information about syllabus and assignment guidelines and content are helpful and should continue to be provided, including the attachment on informal vs. formal writing assignments and the reminder that a statement about the writing-intensive nature of the course needs to be on the syllabus.

The Waypoint software contract is due for renewal. The Chair reported that the software has yielded useful data; however, the number of faculty using Waypoint last semester was only 50%. Data from Waypoint shows that students are performing at an above average level on writing assignments. The data support an argument for progress.

The Committee discussed preparations for the upcoming QEP Impact Report for SACS and the various ways that might be employed to demonstrate success in student learning. A review of other QEP/SACS Impact Reports might be helpful, including that of Guilford College.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 28, at 1pm.

The meeting was adjourned at2:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Cynthia Miecznikowski

Secretary in Rotation