



for remote proctoring, especially on weekends. Trained students would potentially be able to fill in this gap, thus providing an online test-taking option for students served by BMAC. In addition to the written request, Brown reported on her meeting with BMAC representatives and John Hamilton from testing. BMAC asked for a more sweeping accommodation for its students: allowing them to delay taking the GPE. (Estrada helped review the policy: “native” students must take it when they have between 30-50 hours, while transfer students must take it within their first semester at the university.) Brown and Hamilton refused this request, arguing that it would constitute a change in GEAR policy and could delay timely graduation.

The committee discussed the proposal for remote student proctors. Lindau fully supported Wood’s proposal, trusting BMAC’s judgement of how best to serve their students. Wilkinson agreed, emphasizing that she takes BMAC accommodations very seriously in her own teaching. She and Golden briefly compared and contrasted potential student proctors with Graduate Assistants and TA-ships. The discussion turned to whether undergraduate student proctors could be considered skilled and trustworthy. Hatami argued that Zoom recordings of screens in the proposal would mitigate any temptation to allow unfair advantages. Brown expressed concern that students might lack the specialized training to understand individual students’ needs, but noted that such expertise is in BMAC’s “wheelhouse” rather than the GEAR committee’s. She also expressed concerns about student privacy, and shared that there was some pushback from testing regarding training and paying individual student proctors. Hatami asked whether BMAC needed to have one-on-one remote proctors for each exam, or whether a single proctor could oversee a group exam.

Lindau noted the irony of how increasing the number of testing dates and modalities has led to questions about disadvantaging students. That is, if we provide five options instead of one, a student with only four options will appear to be at a disadvantage. Brown noted the impossibility of 100% equity, and brought up the useful distinction between equitable outcomes and equitable opportunities.

Lindau moved to authorize BMAC to use student proctors for the GPE as the center sees fit. Golden seconded. The committee voted unanimously to approve the request (again, assuming that a quorum was present at this meeting).

Brown announced that a newly formed committee to review the GVAR had its first meeting with the Chancellor's office. (They are scheduled to meet a minimum of three times this semester.) A number of campuses in the system have interesting proposals for showing students' writing proficiency. Cal State Channel Islands is moving toward coursework rather than testing, and it seems inevitable that other campuses will have to discontinue using a test as the sole criterion to meet the GVAR. Our WI courses are make us well-poised to meet these coming changes.

The committee welcomed Chris Padron (Senior in Film), who introduced himself as our new student representative. Padron is also a senator from the College of the Arts. (woot!)

Brown thanked those present for their time, and agreed to look into the quorum question.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Ann Lindau