

## **MINUTES**

GWAR Committee

**1:30 – 3:00**

**Meeting Number 10**

**February 3, 2023**

**In Attendance:** Joseph Aubele, Eve Baker, Lori Brown, Jason Deutschman, Navdeep Dhillon, Annel Estrada, Ellien Klink, Meghan Griffith, Sarvanaz Hatami, Benjamin Perlman, Loretta Ramirez, Deepti Singh, Alexandra Wilkinson

### **Approval of Agenda**

Wilkinson makes a motion to approve the agenda with the amendment to include approval of the December 2<sup>nd</sup> minutes, Deutschman seconds. The agenda is unanimously approved.

### **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

#### ***December 2<sup>nd</sup> 2022***

Aubele moves to approve the December 2<sup>nd</sup> minutes, and Baker seconded. The December 2<sup>nd</sup> minutes are unanimously approved.

#### ***December 16, 2022***

Aubele moves to approve the minutes from December 16<sup>th</sup> 2022, and Baker seconded. The December 16<sup>th</sup> minutes are unanimously approved.

#### ***January 20, 2023***

Deutschman moves to approve the minutes from January 20<sup>th</sup> 2023, and Perlman seconds the motion. The January 20<sup>th</sup> minutes are unanimously approved.

### **Announcements**

The first review of the draft GWAR proposal has been received.

### **Wavier request**

QX33 submitted a waiver request for the portfolio class 301 A.

Deutschman briefly provides a background of the situation. The student is enrolled in a satellite engineering program partnered with CSULB. In this program, students do not enroll in courses, instead, the program enrolls students. This program is a cohort program.

Students are able to take the portfolio course engineering 310. However, the student did not score high enough on the GPE to be placed in engineering 310 and should have been enrolled in 301 A instead. The student was enrolled in the wrong course but ended up passing engineering 310. The student is ready to graduate, and 301 A is preventing QX33 from doing so.

Wilkinson asks if we know what grade the student received for the WI. Deutschman states that we know he passed the course, but not the letter grade. Deutschman also states that he does not know exactly what happened, but somewhere along the enrollment process, there was an administrative error for this student.

Hatami asks about the administrative error and if GVAR should be the one responding to this error. Singh states that GVAR would be a better path for the student and hopefully this will not occur in the future. Brown notes that GVAR is the only body that can exempt the student. Aubele states that the student should not be bounced around between the administration and the committee. In general, GVAR is sympathetic to this case.

**Vote:** Brown calls for a vote to approve QX33 waiver request from 301A. The waiver request of 301 A is unanimously approved.

### **GVAR Coordinator's report**

The beginning of the review GVAR C proposal.

Brown submitted the proposal to Academic Affairs first. After this meeting the policy will go to the Senate Executive Committee.

Brown quickly reminded the GVAR committee of the makeup of the policy. The policy begins with explaining the purpose and a description of what writing across the curriculum entails. This is followed by the actual proposal of the four class series and our justification for why this would be better than the process the campus has now. The W courses will have 25 maximum students, 3500 words, and at one half of the final grade based on writing in the course. The WI course will have a 7,000 word request and a lower case cap of 18.

**Comment 1:** The first comment notes that the lower class cap and higher word count may be a challenge for the university and instructors.

Wilkinson states that she understands the challenge of the lower class cap, and this comment is expected. However, I prefer to leave it as is. If writing is important to the university let this be reflected. Ramirez, Klink, Brown and Perlman agree.

**Comment 2** – What if programs or departments are not able to have a discipline specific W or WI course. Will the proposal be okay with students going outside the discipline.

Klink discusses the impact of GE reform bills 927 and 928. Klink believes that having a WI course may save departments. Klink notes that student enrollment remains on the lower side. Changes to the GE system may hurt CLA if they cannot adapt. Brown notes that the committee can leave the policy as a recommendation for every degree program to have a writing course or require them to have one. Brown states that ideally if a student is going to get a degree in a discipline, they should at least be taking one writing class along the way.

Brown states for clarity of the proposal to leave it as a required component and there can always be waivers in the future. Klink also notes the growing desire for interdisciplinary courses. Courses could potentially be cross-listed. Perhaps if departments are going to lose an upper

division GE course, they may be happy to offer WI course to replace it. Ramirez is in support of cross-listing W or WI courses.

### ***Comment 3 – Assessment***

Students must earn a C letter grade or better. If a student fails any of the four courses, they must be paired with a writing tutor. Wilkinson suggests using the word assigned instead of paired.

### ***Comment 4 – Funding***

There is an overall feeling that the funding request is large. However, how important writing is to the campus needs to be considered.

Brown summarizes the budget breakdown. The launch committee is suggested to be 45 people to be inclusive of the many disciplines on the campus. Ramirez discusses the Equity task force she is a part of, which has as many as 80 participations. This task force provides a stipend for general participation and release time for leaders. Brown suggests allowing leads (perhaps 3 per college) for the committee to have release time while other members receive a stipend.

Browns notes that there is a one-time group to launch the WAC program and then reoccurring funding to keep it active. Perhaps these could be combined. Klink notes that with 45 people, they may be at odds with each other. Klink also notes that we can identify people that are already dedicated to writing and recruit people this way. Brown asks if any of the funding groups could be combined for simplicity. Brown notes that this WAC program hinges on the support provided by the university.

### ***Comment 5:***

Funding states that reoccurring Fall workshops would be offered with stipend funding. However, the comment notes that many writing workshops are being offered with no stipend. Wilkinson notes that with the fear that surrounds the teaching of writing offering a stipend should remain. This can always be changed later.

### ***Policy Language***

CPEC will be revising this policy with limited writing knowledge. Therefore, Brown began writing the draft paragraph policy into actual policy language.

One component missing from the current draft policy is the specific responsibilities of the GVAR committee (or replacement name) and the department. Much of the responsibilities lie with the department. Wilkinson asks if departments would need to hire a staff member for this coordination such as a writing liaison. Brown suggests potentially having a detailed procedure and checklist that could lie with the instructors. Hatami notes that this could potentially be with an advisor.

### ***New Business***

Brown discusses the Senate Executive meeting that was attended. Johnson and Goldpaint shared the preliminary GPE data that was shared with the committee recently. Klink notes that the Senate seemed very in favor of keeping the GPE or at least until it could be replaced. Klink

would not be surprised if many other people on campus believe the same with the underprepared students entering campus. The pandemic prevented many students from working on their writing abilities combined with the challenges of artificial intelligence writing apps. Brown and the committee are surprised because of the strong suggestions to remove the GPE over the last year. Brown notes that the Senate members stated that calling the GPE a barrier to graduation is incorrect, instead it is a tool. Brown states that the new proposal that is being sent needs to be supported financially and Aubele agrees.

**Adjournment:** 3:11pm