

Freshman English Policy Committee Meeting

March 13, 1978

Parlin 8B, 11:00-12:00

Members present: Kinneavy, Trimble, Cameron, Haney, Saldivar,

Ruszkiewicz, Creel, Henry

Guests present: Susan Burton, Susan Wittig

Agenda: (starred items deferred)

Approval of minutes

Report of the Writing Resource Collection

FERA Project

* Reports of standing committees

Course evaluation

Textbook

Variant courses

* Special committee reports

1. The minutes were approved as distributed.
2. Susan Burton filed a written report on the Writing Resources Collection. Discussion of the WRC included the following information:
 - a. ~~The rhetorics were transferred to the AC in 1975.~~
 - b. Kinneavy had hoped for a computerized rhetorical index for instructors and students. Presently, however, the books are arranged alphabetically instead of categorically and are thus physically but not intellectually accessible.
 - c. Books are on third floor of the AC.
 - d. Rhetorics and readers should be included in the collection; in addition, old editions should be kept so that historical differences in emphasis might be traced.
 - e. Literature anthologies and novels should be catalogued into the library proper or sold in a department book sale.
 - f. Maxine Hairston should be contacted about the possible writing resource lab project to see if shelf space may be available there.
 - g. Ms. Burton's recommendation that the collection be catalogued was not acted upon pending further information about the development of Ms. Hairston's project.
3. The following comments were made on participation in the FERA project:
 - a. Cameron explained that he had not written a letter to Meeker because he had gotten additional information about the proposal and about FERA from Susan Wittig.
 - b. Kinneavy commented on design and content of FERA report on women's studies. Haney agreed that the study seemed descriptive rather than evaluative.
 - c. Wittig told of her personal background with FIPSE. She stated that, having served on two committees to investigate student responses to programs, she has been impressed with the quality work FIPSE demands of those it funds. She

pointed out that FERA, now in its second round of funding from FIPSE, having made the cut of 400 out of 1800 applicants, stands a good chance of getting the grant. That money, coupled with the EXXON grant they have already, should give them sufficient funds to enlarge the sample to provide a truly comprehensive study.

- d. Saldivar asked if Wittig would want the lab course to participate even if the regular program did not. Wittig said she would not, because the FEPC should establish policy for the entire program. She said she thought both programs should be involved.
- e. The committee asked Cameron to go ahead and write the letter to Meeker. Some discussion followed on the points to be addressed in the letter.
- f. Trimble especially pointed out some problems in the proposal:
 1. Is the project truly "national" and "comprehensive"? (pp. 1 & 2)
 2. What sources are being consulted to show that the sample truly represents the "state of the art"? (p. 2)
 3. Wouldn't the research be better if it were deferred until after Jasper Neel's report is published? (p. 2)
 4. What is the basis of the "refined research design"? (p. 3) How is it "systematic"?
 5. Is it possible to evaluate writing programs without ~~a more comprehensive design?~~ (p. 3)
such a limited