

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 2nd minutes, Deutschman seconds. The agenda is unanimously approved.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

December 2nd 2022

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

December 16, 2022

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

January 20, 2023

Deutschman moves to approve the minutes from January 20th 2023, and Perlman seconds the motion. The January 20th 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.

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.

Brown 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 GEAR 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