

MINUTES

GWAR Committee

1:30 – 3:00

Meeting Number 15

April 21, 2023

In attendance: Joseph Aubele, Eve Baker, Lori Brown, Jason Deutschman, Navdeep Dhillon, Eileen Klink, Loretta Ramirez, Deepti Singh, Courtney Stammier, Michael Warden, Alexandra Wilkinson

Approval of Agenda

Aubele moves to approve the agenda and Baker seconds the motion. The agenda is approved unanimously.

Approval of meeting Minutes for April 7. 2023

Baker moves to approve the minutes from April 7th, 2023 and Deutschman seconds the motion. The minutes are approved unanimously.

Announcements

Michael Warden is one of the directors of UCUA and is filling in until a replacement is found. Welcome Michael!

Michael and the other UCUA director are meeting with students as needed but will always refer to the college advisors. Interviews are being wrapped up this week, and a new GWAR advisor should be here soon.

Stammier notes that the upcoming GPE will be on April 29, and in-person. Brown notes that testing may need more scorers. If anyone is interested, they can email Baker for more information.

Stammier discusses her time as a scorer for the GPE. Scorers are divided into tables with a table lead. Training occurs beforehand, and you are able to ask questions as needed. Everyone remains until all GPEs are scored and this time varies. It is generally enjoyable and recommends it.

Klink notes that she has extensive experience as a scorer. She notes that you meet faculty across campus, and you understand what writing looks like on this campus. Klink also notes that the campus is seeing student dual enrollment of high school students. She notes that students are coming in from high school with multiple units and predicts more of it. Klink also notes that there will be issues with the evolving Chat GPT.

Baker notes that the test last week on April 14th had over 1798 students take part. However, several problems arose, such as students getting kicked out or internet issues. Baker notes that testing accommodated everybody who contacted them. Tests were re-opened, or students were

moved to the June test. The next test is on April 29th in person with over 852 students planning to test. Scorers will be reading about 300 papers each from the online test. Thank you, scorers!

Aubele notes that when he started as a scorer, he was intimidated, but the training day was helpful. He recommends beginning with the in-person version. Baker notes that in-person readers come in over two days between 9 am and 12.

Brown states that the summer test will continue as scheduled. There will most likely be a test in Fall. Therefore, we need to reconstitute the GPE advising committee. Senate does fill this committee; however, it has not been filled for a couple of years. If anyone wants to be on this committee, you are welcome. This committee advises the GEAR committee and creates prompts for the GPE. Stammler asks how many people serve on this committee. Brown believes there are 6 to 9 people. It does need to go through Senate. However, they are more flexible with approving people for this committee.

GEAR Coordinator's report

Brown notes that there is still miscommunication around the GPE. Students also need to know there is an order to meeting the GEAR. Students take the GPE and then enroll in either a WI or a portfolio class as needed. However, students are still getting into WI classes without taking the GPE.

Brown notes a recent case with a student from Cal State Fresno. Fresno has a new policy with no test and one writing course. The writing classes similar to our WIs are newly implemented, but they used to have only a test to pass the GEAR. However, although Fresno has eliminated its test, this does not mean CSULB will be doing so at this time. Brown states that everyone on campus (administration, faculty, counselors) needs to be unified about the GPE. Right now, the GPE is in place, and as long as it is in place, we need to follow the policy. All the other options should not be discussed with students at this time because it creates confusion. Brown also recommends avoiding phrases like the GPE is under review. Although a new policy is being proposed, we do not know how long this process will take.

Brown also notes other situations have occurred including advisors and instructors writing on behalf of students not to take the GPE or to take another class somewhere else. However, this committee does not adjudicate students' writing. We interpret and implement policy.

Old Business

WAC Proposal – Online Module Ideas

Brown displays module policy write-ups from Wilkinson and Hatami for the committee to review. Both proposal documents are available on Beachboard for a more detailed view.

Wilkinson provides an overview of the proposed policy. In general, Wilkinson proposes that every undergraduate student must complete the online writing modules by the time they graduate. Students will work on the modules throughout their time at CSULB. Modules should be short and engaging. Modules will be graded through quizzes. Instructors can also assign

writing modules for course credit. Modules are a tool for instructors and students to enhance writing.

Klink notes that many freshmen students are coming to campus already having their English requirement completed. Klink notes that students are earning credit through ERWC. Klink also states that GVAR is an upper-division requirement. Therefore, it may be more efficient to require modules for upper-division students rather than start freshman year. This will keep the modules unified among students. Brown agrees that transfer students are complicated. Initially, we are trying to bridge freshman comp and the WI class. However, there will be many students that will not start until junior year. Klink states that students are still struggling with writing even if they are already meeting the English requirement early. Another concept Klink discusses is that students may be required to take a service learning or internship course. However, this is only in the discussion phase.

Brown highlights that the expert created modules would be a tool for instructors and take away some of the burden of teaching writing. Brown asks if there is a college suggestion or campus policy for Chat GPT and Discord. Klink agrees that there needs to be a university policy. There is talk about an honor code for students to sign. Wilkinson notes that Turnitin now detects AI writing with a 98% confidence interval.

Stammler recommended that students can self-pace through the modules. This way if students need more time, they can take it, or students can take them early if they prefer. Klink states that, ideally, this is combined with a WI class, and students can even complete them in class. Klink worries that students are cheating more because they are working long hours and taking too many units. Brown notes that the definition of cheating may have changed. Students may view it as being resourceful. A policy from the university will be helpful.

Brown reviews Hatami's proposal. This proposal notes the importance of quizzes. Every student at the university would have access to the Canvas course from their start at the University. Brown is more inclined to have modules be part of the WI course rather than be free-standing. Within a course, it supports the instructors. The Canvas course site would be shared with all W and WI classes. This proposal also notes that quiz questions will be randomly assigned to students. Brown may submit the two module ideas as supplementals to the proposal. Currently, the proposal has not moved to CEPC.

New Business

Adjournment: 3:00 pm

Respectively submitted by,

Alexandra Wilkinson