

Longwood University
GENERAL ACADEMIC PROPOSAL/POLICY COVER SHEET

This cover sheet is intended to provide information to members of the Education Policy Committee (EPC) about a new proposal/policy or about revisions to an existing proposal/policy.

If you are proposing a new policy, then attach the text of the policy to this form. If you are proposing a change to an existing policy, then attach the text of the current policy with any deleted language marked by a strikethrough and with new language marked by an underline. If you are deleting a policy, then attach the text of the policy to be deleted.

PREPARER: (Originator, Department, or Committee that authored or sponsored this proposal)

An ad hoc committee that reviewed writing intensive course syllabi in fall 2013 and the General Education Committee

TOPIC: Writing Intensive Course Policy

BACKGROUND (Provide a brief statement describing the origins of this proposal, the nature of the problem it addresses, and the work completed to devise the proposal):

In the fall, Gordon Van Ness (coordinator of the written communication competency assessment), Linda Townsend (assessment coordinator), and several members of the General Education Committee, supported by a grant from SCHEV, conducted a review of syllabi of courses designated as writing-intensive. In their report (enclosed), the group found that:

- WI course syllabi do not largely adhere to the present writing-intensive course requirements; and
- Faculty rater discussion and evaluation of the review process revealed that there is inconsistent understanding of the current writing-intensive requirements.
 - The writing-intensive course policy is ambiguous as exemplified by the general statement saying “must” while individual criteria say “should.”
 - Discussion between the paired groups and within the pairs demonstrated the diverse viewpoints in regards to the specific requirements, for example, what constitutes “informal writing.”
 - A more clearly worded and concise rubric is needed; however, it was recognized that the current rubric criteria were extracted directly from the Longwood WI policy statements. Therefore, clarity of the WI criteria is needed prior to revision of the rubric.

The group subsequently proposed to the General Education Committee revised criteria for the writing intensive policy. The General Education Committee reviewed the proposal and discussed the proposed criteria at two meetings. After making several changes, some based on the University of Minnesota’s policy, the General Education Committee voted to approve the proposal for revised criteria (see below) and to submit it to the EPC.

SUMMARY OF NEW POLICY OR PROPOSED CHANGES OR DELETIONS TO AN EXISTING POLICY (Provide a brief list or statement describing the content of the policy or the proposed changes or deletions):

The revised policy

- is more prescriptive (using “must” instead of “should”);
- provides commentary for explanation and justification;
- specifies that writing intensive courses are capped at 20.

RATIONALE FOR THE POLICY OR PROPOSED CHANGES (Provide a brief statement as to why the new policy, the changes, or the deletion is needed):

The revised policy responds to the shortcomings identified by the committee that reviewed the syllabi of writing intensive courses (see above) and will clarify for instructors and departments the expectations for writing intensive courses.

**GENERAL ACADEMIC PROPOSAL/POLICY COVER SHEET
SIGNATURE PAGE**

- 1. Educational Policy Committee _____
- 2. Faculty Senate _____
- 3. *VPAA _____
- 4. *BOV/SCHEV - VPAA will submit materials for approval
- 5. Date received by Registrar _____

*Substantive change (see definition and consult EPC chair prior to submitting materials)

All curriculum proposals/changes are processed in the date order received. In order to be included in the next academic year’s catalog, all paperwork must be submitted no later than:

**February 1st to the College Curriculum Committee
March 1st to the Educational Policy Committee (EPC)**

Submission within the deadlines does not guarantee processing in time for the next academic year’s catalog.

Revised June 2012