

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
PSY 320
1:30-3:00

Meeting Number 4
October 19th, 2018

Lethia Cobbs, Rebekha Abbuhl, Eugenia Kim, Lori Brown, Jason Deutschman, John Scenters-Zapico, Eve Baker, Mahdi Yoozbashizadeh, Rebecca Lemme, Eileen Klink

1. Agenda
 - a. MSP
2. Minutes from October 5th, 2018
 - a. MSP
3. Announcements
 - a. Eve Baker shared the GPE Test is coming up with two prompts and 4 piloted prompts.
4. CEPC meeting
 - a. CEPC is not willing to discuss GWARC suggestions until GWAR formally votes on them.
5. Questions
 - a. Does the committee wish to recommend the continued use of the GPE as a placement examination?
Pros:
 - 1) There is nothing else in place to find struggling writers
Cons:
 - 1) Literature on timed writing does not support it
 - 2) Manpower it takes to keep it up (grading, prompts)
 - 3) It doesn't necessarily catch struggling writers
 - 4) Pass rates: 96% for native speakers, 70% (approximately) for nonnative speakers.

A suggestion was made to keep the GPE in the policy, but perhaps modified to include some form of self-directed placement. Will vote next time. Majority of straw poll in favor of some use of GPE in some form.

- b. Does the committee wish to recommend that ENGL 301A and the GVAR portfolio courses be treated as “special instructional support” outside of the 120 units for those students who receive a low score on the GPE?

Pros:

- 1) Writing centers are not equipped to support the number of students that will need help
- 2) Keeping ENGL 301A and the GVAR portfolio courses will allow existing structures to be used

Cons:

- 1) If self-placement is used, it may be subject to mindsets about “remedial” classes and adding units to students’ graduation time

- c. Does the committee wish to recommend that all students be required to take one writing intensive upper division course?

Pros:

- 1) they need to learn how to write;
- 2) discipline specific;
- 3) what we want graduates to leave with;
- 4) transfer students need some writing at CSULB;

Cons:

- 1) Engineering – not all in one class but maybe spread out across courses (suggestion for COE to look at sac state engineering writing intensive)

- d. Does the committee wish to recommend further/alternative approaches for satisfying the GVAR?

- 1) Allowing departments to choose either one WI course or writing instruction across several courses. Lower word count classes would still need to have same requirements for revision.

Pros:

- a) equitable assessment;
- b) avoid different “tracks” for assessment;
- c) graduation proficiency at a certain level;
- d) lots of good courses already here

Cons:

- a) impact timely graduation;
- b) need more courses;
- c) who keeps track?

Suggestion: Both one WI course and writing across the major; guaranteed Writing instruction in writing; for most departments they follow a policy and in some instances where it is impossible, the dept puts together a plan that meets certain parameters.

6. GVAR Coordinator's report

- a. Margaret black in COTA says they are dropping their two portfolio courses. Other intel says they are keeping it. John Scenters-Zapico will look into this.

7. Adjournment

Submitted by,

Lori Brown

(These minutes were approved on 11/2/18)