

## **MINUTES**

GWAR Committee

**1:30 – 3:00**

**Meeting Number 13**

**March 17, 2023**

**In attendance:** Joseph Aubele, Eve Baker, Lori Brown, Jason Deutschman, Navdeep Dhillon, Meghan Griffith, Benjamin Perlman, Loretta Ramirez, Courtney Stammner, Alexandra Wilkinson

### **Approval of Agenda**

One amendment is requested to change the approval of meeting Minutes for February 17<sup>th</sup> 2023 to the approval of meeting Minutes for March 3<sup>rd</sup> 2023.

Aubele moves to approve the agenda as amended and Deutschman seconds the approval. The agenda is unanimously approved.

### **Approval of meeting Minutes for March 3rd. 2023**

One amendment is requested to Change April 15 to April 29<sup>th</sup> in reference to the upcoming in person GPE being offered in the minutes.

Baker motions to approve the minutes as amended and Aubele seconds the motion. The minutes are approved.

### **Announcements**

Brown states that next Tuesday (March 21<sup>st</sup>), Johnson and Brown will meet with Senate Executives for a Q and A session on the draft proposal and policy.

Baker notes that 1900 students are registered to take the GPE in April. The GPE will be offered online April 14<sup>th</sup> and in person on April 29<sup>th</sup>. Estrada sent a letter out to encourage more students to register.

On another note, Estrada will no longer be a part of GWARC, and currently do not have a replacement. Estrada's supervisors Michael Warden and Josh Scepanski will fill in as needed.

Brown asks if this committee could review potential writing prompts for the upcoming GPE. Previously there was a GWAR advisory committee that reviewed GPE prompts, but is not in operation this year. The proposed prompts are initially from 2018 and were piloted. Previous prompts were updated, but Brown and Baker have some hesitations about some of them and would like to share them.

### **GWAR Coordinator's report**

Brown would like to prepare for the quick 5-minute Senate Execute meeting with the assistance of GWARC.

Brown notes that at our last meeting, she recommended reviewing past meeting minutes about the current GPE policy. Mark Wiley was an advocate for WAC and served on this committee for many years before retiring.

Wilkinson notes that adding a sentence or two on the philosophy and why a WAC program matters should be included in the summary. Aubele considers an elevator pitch concept suggesting that what the policy does is move the GVAR from a low stakes test with a 90% pass rate and one writing class to a sustained writing effort across college years. Ramirez notes that much of this is already written in the policy and can be pulled from. Ramirez emphasizes that the WAC plan provides a bridge between freshman comp and the WI course. Ramirez also suggests highlighting the 3 approaches to writing – writing to learn, writing to engage, and writing in the discipline.

Brown states a question was recently proposed to her – What if a student would like to take a WI class instead of a W class? Wilkinson states that this was briefly discussed in a small GVARC meeting and we were in favor of it at the time. If a student wants to take more advanced writing this should be encouraged.

Brown notes that the new potential GE policy involves a critical thinking and writing class. This could be the additional lower division W course that students need to take. However, the policy is still in its early stages.

Stammler foresees confusion around transfer students. Also, what is the rollout if the policy is approved. Brown states that after Senate Executive, the policy will then go to CEPC. After CEPC puts the proposal in policy language, the proposal will go to the Full Senate with more potential changes. The rollout might look very different after it filters through.

Transfer students are addressed in the policy write up. If a student comes in at 60 units, they will only take 2 upper division classes. The upper division courses need to be taken at CSULB.

Brown also asks about funding and will include a brief statement about the program needs to be supported. Wilkinson is supportive of a brief statement without going into great detail unless asked. Brown also considered the idea if the upper division W class is eliminated, then some funding requirements may not be needed. However, removing the second W would be disadvantageous to our students. Even if this were to happen, funding for module development will still need to remain in place. Brown also notes that a budget approximation was added to the policy proposal. Currently testing and students are absorbing many fees.

The draft policy write-up draft is also available to review. This is similar to the draft proposal but written in more specific policy language. Brown wanted to mimic the current GVARC policy to the best of her ability. Brown believes that the policy should note that the entire justification for this policy is based on the state writing policy. The draft proposal in policy form is very specific and goes into detail. The entire draft policy can be reviewed on Beachboard.

The draft policy differs from the other proposal document in that it includes the responsibilities of academic departments. Much responsibility falls on individual departments, which is similar to WI courses currently. The policy also discusses the responsibilities of the WAC committee. Additional people are also added to the GVARC roster. This committee should also include a

member from CEPC and a GE representative. Brown notes that waivers would be limited as the GWAR would be met through courses, but exceptions would come up for this committee if needed. Brown also asks the committee about a potential WAC director and GWAR chair. Other universities combine them, but this can be decided later.

### **New Business**

Miscommunication around the GPE is still a concern.

Stammler states that as GPEs are normally back-to-back, students are concerned that they will not get the results in time to enroll in summer classes. Baker states that scores will be released as soon as possible to allow students to enroll in courses as needed. Stammler also states that students are asking about summer testing dates. Baker notes that if the summer GPE happens, it will land on June 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>.

### ***GWAR Prompts***

Brown shares potential prompts for students during the GPE. In general, students receive two pieces of information. One is normally a news clip and the other is often a graph or chart of some type. One concern Brown has is that some topics elicit a very emotional responses.

Aubele states that the religious belief prompt often gets misinterpreted. The information sources provided may not be incorporated well into the essay. Brown agrees that the question is about religious belief and freedom but instead leads students to take a stand on same-sex marriage.

Stammler notes the religious belief prompt graph does not completely relate to the topic. She also notes that students prefer emotionally charged topics because they are more passionate about them. Adding a better source number two could allow this prompt to be used. Stammler also states that more open-ended questions lead to more flexibility and critical thinking.

The next prompt up for review is about Uber and Lyft. Aubele notes that this topic did not give students enough to work with and students did not find it interesting. If this committee wanted to have an Uber and Lyft prompt include one about current policies to make it more relevant.

Another prompt of concern is the cobalt prompt. The way the question is written only lead students down one path rather than highlighting the creativity and critical thinking of the student. Aubele notes that this question is really asking if students as a consumers are willing to pay more for products if it means they are ethically sourced.

It was determined that the cobalt and religious freedom prompts should be updated but included in some form.

Thank you to Aubele and Stammler for updating the GPE prompts.

**Adjournment:** 3:32 pm

Respectively submitted by,

Alexandra Wilkinson