The Core Review Committee (CRC) met in special session on Thursday, October 27, 2005 in Breiseth 208 to discuss the Writing Across the Curriculum proposal submitted to the committee by Provost Maravene Loesché and formatted by Marianne Rexer. Present were Ellen Flint (non-voting ex officio representative from the Office of the Provost; recorder), Susan Hritzak (ex officio representative from the Office of the Registrar), Arthur Kibbe, Andrew Miller, Gina Morrison, Marianne Rexer, Philip Simon, Diane Wenger, and Brian Whitman (chair).

The meeting was called to order by the chair at 12:02 p.m.

Minutes of the October 12 meeting had been distributed to committee members via e-mail, and the reading of those minutes was suspended. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Art Kibbe and seconded by Gina Morrison. Minutes of the October 12, 2005 meeting were approved as submitted without discussion.

OLD BUSINESS

A motion to approve the WAC proposal as formatted by Marianne Rexer and distributed to CRC members via e-mail was made by Art Kibbe and seconded by Diane Wenger. [see attached, original proposal]

Chair Whitman noted that, if the proposal were to be approved by the CRC on Oct. 27, there might not be enough time to collect the necessary signatures (of chairs, deans, and the Provost) in time to submit the proposal by the next scheduled meeting of the Curriculum Committee (November 1, 2005). This challenge should not, however, deter the CRC from moving ahead with discussion and a vote on the WAC proposal.

Ellen Flint stated that the Provost urged the CRC to select one of the two options for moving to the WAC model as presented in the original proposal. A motion to amend the original proposal was made by Art Kibbe and seconded by Philip Simon. The amendment required the deletion of text—“Departments will encourage. . . . OptionTwo:”—found on page 2 of the original proposal [see attached, revised proposal]. The motion to amend the original proposal was approved unanimously.

Discussion regarding future assessment of the WAC models designed and implemented by programs was discussed. A statement pertaining to assessment within the context of the five-year program review was added to p. 2 of the document. Additional textual additions to the original proposal and to the template for submission were suggested and incorporated into the revised proposal [see attached, revised proposal]. It was also suggested that the current WI Guidelines should be forwarded to all department chairs and program directors for informational purposes. The motion to
approve the WAC proposal (with textual corrections, additions, and deletions) carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:51 p.m.

[The next meeting of the CRC is scheduled for Thursday, Nov. 10, 2005; place TBA]

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen R. Flint