## MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Freshman English Policy Committee

From: Susan Jauratt

Date: February 6, 1984

The FEPC will have its first meeting of the spring semester on Friday, February 10 at 2 p.m. in Parlin 214. The following items will be on the agenda:

- I. Requiring in-class writing: further consideration of the Westbrook proposal
- II. Tertbooks: the Myers report

III. Grading seminars: the Ruszkiewicz report

1. 2106/20b

Swed for grading tenden

Λ ...

Gooding Standards: Stowen Janatt Jolleffe

Aunouncements

1. \$106/206 has been concelled by Dean't higher ups. - confirmy the Dean's earlier opinion.
2. \$ 306 5. ummer syllabor will be presented shortly

3. Major work should be new grand's standards.

## FRESHMEN ENGLISH POLICY COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

## December 5, 1983

Attending: Ruszkiewicz, LeClercq, Myers, Simon, Westbrook, Daniell,

Jarratt, Jolliffe, Trachsel

Absent: McMurrey, Underwood

I. Call to order; approval of minutes

- II. The report of the E106/206 subcommittee was distributed but not discussed. The statement will be discussed in January after the committee has read it, and after the status of the course has been clarified.
- III. Jolliffe distributed the revised AI Evaluation Proposal and summarized the changes. After adding wording indicating that the choice of an evaluator is contingent on the approval of the chairman, the committee passed the proposal.
- IV. Mr. Ruszkiewicz presented an Appendix on Quoting and Paraphrasing to the Revised Scholastic Dishonesty Statement, but explained that attaching it to the statement might make the package cumbersome and expensive to produce.

We decided to include in the announcement a statement that the appendix would be available through the instructor and argued about whether it should be above or below the signature.

Although we voted in favor of distributing the statement without the appendix to instructors on a protest/no protest basis. Mr. Ruszkiewicz said that if possible, the additions would be included.

V. Mr. Westbrook presented a statement suggesting that 2-3 in-class essays be required in E306. Mr. Ruszkiewicz pointed out that the syllabus already suggests 3 in-class assignments. Ms. Daniell asked for a definition of "in-class," objecting to the idea of writing on random, "impromptu" topics. Mr. Westbrook explained that he usually assigned an essay or story prior to the timed writing, but that the topics were new to the students. Mr. LeClercq, Mr. Ruszkiewicz, and others responded that they usually had students do more preparation out of class for an in-class writing. While most of the committee members supported some in-class writing, the main issue seemed to be whether to require in-class essays. Mr. Westbrook complained that he gets too many students who have made A's and B's in freshman and sophomore courses—some of them the products of unnamed "master composition teachers"—who can't write in class. Moreover, in-class writing is

the best way to avoid plagiarism. Ms. Daniell observed that, although in-class assignments are a good check on plagiarism, she can determine and prevent plagiarism in other ways. Others concurred. Mr. Myers and Ms. Jarratt felt that changing the suggestion to a requirement would cause resentment and wouldn't necessarily guarantee cooperation from E306 teachers.

Mr. Ruszkiewicz maintained that in-class writing was a methodology and that we didn't want to dictate methodology in a department characterized by the wide variety of its approaches to teaching composition. Mr. Westbrook would rather see the requirement as insuring a variety of approaches within the syllabus, rather than restricting teachers to one.

Mr. Westbrook offered his version of the history of the issue. Formerly all freshman writing all over the country was done in class (10 essays a week); the practice was changed as a concession to students during Vietnam protest days.

We decided to table the issue until next semester.

VI. We adjourned for the semester. The next meeting will be in early January.