

Minutes
GWAR Committee

1:30 – 3:00

Meeting Number 9

February 16, 2024

In attendance: Eve Baker, Nicollete Brant, Lori Brown, Jill De La Torre, Navdeep Dhillon, Tom Do, Megan Griffith-Pina, Sarvenaz Hatami, Henry O'Lawrence, Benjamin Perlman, Loretta Ramirez, Katherin Toscano, Alexandra Wilkinson

Call to Order: 1:33 p.m.

Approval of Agenda

Wilkinson moves, and Ramirez seconds the motion. The agenda is unanimously approved.

Approval of meeting Minutes for February 2, 2024

Ramirez moves to approve the minutes, and Baker seconds the motion. The minutes are approved.

Announcements

Brown met with the Provost Council recently. Brown also notes that CEPC will be reviewing the proposal again shortly. Brown is meeting with the CLA chair and faculty council next week.

Testing Update

Baker notes that a total of 1127 students tested online, and 382 students tested in person in the last GPE. The 3 prompts created by GPEAC were used, and there are no complaints as of this time. Once the grading is done, Baker will send the grader comments to GPEAC for review.

GWAR Coordinator's report

Student Case and CSU Fully Online

Brown reviews the case that was discussed at the last meeting regarding engineering student HZ43. The student took the GPE and passed with a score of 12. The student told Brown that they became aware of CSU Fully Online and decided to take a class that stated to meet the GWAR at another CSU. The student is requesting that this class count toward their GWAR requirement on this campus. The committee asks if the student discussed CSU Fully Online with an advisor before taking the class. Brown states that the student did have an appointment with an advisor in August. However, no notes were made during this advising meeting. It was later determined that the student was a no-show for the advising appointment. GWAR advising was made aware of the student's situation when the student emailed GWAR after taking the class to inquire about their academic planner not being updated to reflect the completed class.

Brown also notes that she has discussed this matter with an engineering advisor, Deutschman, who previously served on this committee. Brown notes from the conversation that the College of Engineering recommends that engineering students do not take CSU Fully Online classes for GVAR credit. Every CSU campus has its own way of determining how the GVAR is met. It is also noted that one writing course does not necessarily meet the GVAR on every CSU campus. The campus where HZ43 took the writing class happens to require two writing classes to meet the GVAR. Therefore, the student did not meet GVAR at the other university.

Do asks if the student is able to forward the email that they sent to GVAR about taking the CSU Fully Online class to meet GVAR. However, at this time, no evidence is provided by the student. Wilkinson notes that she trusts Deutschman and the College of Engineering to make their own decisions about allowing online classes from other universities to meet the GVAR. Hatami agrees and echoes something she mentioned at the last meeting that the department should be responsible for what classes meet the GVAR. If Engineering is communicating the requirements with their students, then it is the students' responsibility to follow the parameters.

Many committee members are not in favor of allowing the class to meet the GVAR unless the student can produce a communication record of reaching out to the GVAR advising team.

Note: Hatami calls for a vote to approve GVAR credit for the CSU Fully online course, provided that HZ43 can provide documentation that they reached out to GVAR advising with no response.

Feedback from Provost's Counsel

Brown notes the experience of meeting with the Provost's Counsel, which included the Deans of all the colleges and other administrators. Brown notes that the Deans were very receptive to WAC and removing the GPE. However, there were concerns about converting classes, having to hire people, and reducing class sizes.

Brown notes some questions and scenarios she would like to discuss to be prepared for additional meetings. One question included the potential removal of the third writing course. Instead, one suggestion was to absorb the class into several other classes already required by the major. Several classes could be certified and meet certain competencies. This would divide writing up further into more classes at CSULB.

Do is concerned about the competencies translating into actual writing and assessment of that writing. Do notes that any class can state it has goals and but not implement them. This plan also lacks any real oversight. Implementation and effort to reach these goals may be difficult to accomplish. Brown adds that keeping a record of this would be challenging as several more courses would need to be evaluated.

Ramirez notes that the proposal that GVAR has created makes the most sense. Although she loves the idea of more classes addressing writing, she questions the logistics. Ramirez notes that this could be similar to how an ethics component is currently being implemented in one of her courses where one module addresses writing. However, faculty would need to submit multiple classes. Brown notes that it is also possible that classes could meet the same competencies multiple times. Wilkinson is concerned about quality control if the departments are responsible

for determining if students meet the writing competencies. Do agrees that an outside committee will need to be responsible for approval. Wilkinson believes this would be more challenging to implement than one writing class and less effective for our students.

Brown asks another question about senior thesis classes counting as a writing class. For example, students in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics are able to a senior thesis class. Brown notes that the thesis class is only 1-unit. However, it could count as a W class but not a WI, as those need to be at least 3 units according to GVAR policy. Brown is proposing to potentially add a statement such as “or students may take a senior thesis to meet a W class” to the draft proposal. Hatami asks if the thesis is associated with a course. Hatami believes if a faculty member is working closely with the student and training is involved, then yes. However, if the faculty member is not providing training, guidance, and writing instruction, then she does not believe it should count. Brown notes it would need to have quantifiable benchmarks, and there should be an SCO for this thesis course. Hatami also notes that she understands the committee may need to be more flexible. She is not in favor of changing our proposal but is willing to compromise.

Brown also notes that the proposal should state that a student can take two WI classes rather than an additional W class.

Brown also notes that the Provost is thankful for this committee and the work they have been doing.

Brown also discusses the possibility of the third W class being removed from the proposal completely. However, Brown notes that the third class is really the only change as the campus already requires two writing classes combined with the potential change in GE policy to add the second lower division. The committee is strongly against the removal of the third class.

WAC/GVAR Proposal Charter Drafting

The Charter was not discussed at this meeting.

Old Business

WAC Proposal – Online Module Ideas were not discussed at this meeting.

Adjournment: 2:56 PM