

MINUTES

GWAR Committee

Meeting Number 6

December 3, 2021, 1:30 – 3:00

In attendance: Eve Baker, Lori Brown, Jason Deutschman, Navdeep Dhillon Annel Estrada, Noah Golden, Christina Goldpaint, Meghan Griffith, Sarvenaz Hatami, Kerry Johnson, Elizabeth Lindau, Henry O'Lawrence, Chris Padron, Cynthia Pastrana, Benjamin Perlman, Loretta Ramirez, Alexandra Wilkinson

Brown began by announcing a last-minute addition to the **agenda**: a proposal for the approval of Linguistics 375 as a Writing Intensive course. Brown had an opportunity to review the document in advance of the meeting, but the WI subcommittee had not. With this change incorporated, Golden moved and O'Lawrence seconded approval of the agenda. The committee unanimously approved the agenda.

Deutschman moved and Wilkinson seconded **approval of the minutes** for the meeting of November 19, 2021.

The committee was joined by Kerry Johnson and **Christina Goldpaint, who presented data on the GWAR Placement Exam (GPE)**. Johnson explained that Lizzet Rojas, the data analyst who has joined us in many meetings over the past couple of years, has left CSULB for a PhD program. Goldpaint is carrying on Rojas's work. In particular, Johnson asked Goldpaint to consider alternative methods for placement in the event that we can no longer use the GPE. Goldpaint is thus exploring whether COMP 100B might be used as a placement tool.

Goldpaint examined data gathered between September 2016 and February 2020. She discovered the following trends:

- Of the roughly 21,000 students who took the GPE during this period, nearly 19,000 earned a score of 11 or higher. 1,600 (less than 8%) scored between 8-10, and a very low number scored 7 or below.
- 87% of the students who scored 7 or below on the GPE were transfer students.
- Most students pass the GPE even if they earned Ds or Fs in 100B.
- Some students were enrolled in multiple WI courses in a given semester.

- Not all students take COMP 100B. (Transfers often do not.)

The committee discussed Goldpaint's findings. The data suggest that GPE scores do not predict performance in WI courses. Brown provided context for this. Students who don't pass the GPE have an "intervening event"—they take a portfolio course. Their success in a WI course could be attributed to this additional course.

Hatami challenged the "Logistic Regression Analysis" slide, which concluded that 100B predicts success in WI course, but the GPE does not. She warned against comparing a course to a one-time writing exam taken under time constraints: these are two very different assessments.

Several committee members asked for more data. Estrada asked about Directed Self-Placement (DSP)—asking students to reflect on their writing experiences in high school. Johnson replied that COMP 100A can be recommended to students, but very few of them take it, as it adds units on the front end. Deutschman asked about students who do not take composition because of AP credits. Johnson replied that that data is not available, but agreed to look into it.

Ramirez asked about the relationship between GE composition courses and the new Ethnic Studies requirements.

Hatami asked whether there are any course similar to 100B that virtually everyone takes, and how they predict success. (Many committee members praised this question.) Deutschman suggested looking at the courses fulfilling the Oral Communication and Critical Thinking requirements.

Deutschman asked about looking at GPA as a predictor. Every transfer student has to take GPE. If there are some students who fail 100B and quit school altogether, then this might be skewing the data.

Brown noted that Composition 100 and the GPE both have high pass rates. She concluded by arguing that the GPE pass rate is probably *too* high, and that the exam has little predictive value.

The committee considered **Linguistics 375 for WI approval**. The discussion began with the course pre-requisites, which must be correct in order to pass CEPC. The course is required to be Upper-Division, and students need to have completed their GE foundations courses. Deutschman shared the precise language in chat:

“Prerequisite: G.E. foundation courses; score of 11 or higher on the GVAR Placement Examination or successfully completed the necessary portfolio course that is a prerequisite for a GVAR Writing Intensive Capstone.”

The committee went into breakout sessions to discuss the proposal

Group 1: Hatami, Perlman, Ramirez

Group 2: Deutschman, Golden, Padron, Pastrana

Group 3: Estrada, O'Lawrence, Wilkinson

Group 4: Baker, Dhillon, Lindau

After reconvening, the full committee discussed the proposal's merits. Perlman expressed concerns about the number and timing of drafts and revisions. He was concerned that the paper drafts were due too late in the semester. Both he and Ramirez asked for clarification on whether the “literature review” was draft material. This discussion led Golden to remark with his characteristic pedagogical insight on the challenges of “content-heavy classes” involving writing. It is often necessary to expose students to a wide variety of topics and material as preparation for a final paper. Students need to become well-versed in the key concepts of a course topic before they're fully equipped to draft a paper. Hatami concurred with Golden, and noted that page 9 of the proposal clearly indicates that the 5 analytical projects are part of the course's final paper. Based on this, she concluded that it meets requirements.

Golden moved, and Lindau seconded that Linguistics 375 be approved as a WI course. The committee voted to approve.

Brown announced that the meeting would likely be the semester's last. She asked members to keep December 17th open in the event of a student waiver request.

The meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Ann Lindau