

**Minutes**  
**GWAR Committee**  
**USU 311**  
**1:30 – 3 PM**

**Meeting Number 1**  
**September 2, 2011**

In attendance: Lori Brown, Gary Griswold, Susan Platt, Linda Sarbo, Rick Tuveson, Yu Ding, Diana Hines, Colleen Dunagan, Rebekha Abbuhl, Bron Pellissier, Nathan Jensen, Mark Wiley, and ASI Rep – Lucy Nguyen

1. Approval of agenda: MSP
2. Nominations:
  - a. Chair
    - i. Rebekha – nominated and second. MSP
  - b. Vice-Chair
    - i. Gary – nominated and second. MSP
  - c. Secretary
    - i. Colleen – nominated and second. MSP
3. Approval of meeting schedule:
  - a. 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Friday of month at 1:30 pm in USU 311
  - b. MSP
4. Minutes of meeting on May 6, 2011.
  - a. Amendments  
In 3C change “passed” to “pass”.
  - b. MSP
5. Announcements
  - a. Migrated committee organization to the new Beachboard – we should all have access or be added within the next few days.
6. Plan for the semester:
  - a. Last semester considerable headway to revising the policy, but we need to finalize changes and plan visits or communications with various groups to get feedback on the proposed changes.
  - b. The Policy has to go to the CEPC council first. We will all need to review the policy revision, as it exists now, before the next meeting.
    - i. Do we want to meet with people first before sending it forward to CEPC?

- ii. We should get a sense of the timelines of the various committees and find out when we need to get the policy to the various committees. The CEPC meets twice a month.
    - iii. Who would we like to invite to our meetings to discuss the policy revisions?
      - 1. Chris Frazier
      - 2. Lynn Mahoney
      - 3. GEGC Chair – Keith Freeseaman
      - 4. Members of the Senate Executive Committee
      - 5. Eileen Klink– English Department Chair
      - 6. Student representatives
    - iv. We should plan one meeting and bring everyone in at once and have a collective dialogue. We need to be prepared to explain where we went to seek input last year and how the policy revision reflects that feedback. We should circulate it ahead of time, summarize what we are proposing, give them time to consider, and then meet and discuss. However, a concern has been raised that it might be difficult to get everyone at the same meeting.
  - c. ALI is interested in proposing a GVAR course. We probably will be reviewing their proposal this year.
7. GVAR Coordinator's report
- a. Update on the external review of the GVAR
    - i. To be held Thursday, September 29 and Friday, September 30, 2011.
    - ii. Fiona Glade from CSU Sacramento has been asked to be the external reviewer.
    - iii. GVAR policy calls for external review of GVAR program every five years, and the Chancellor's office has instituted a policy that mandates that all academic units be reviewed by Program Assessment and Review Committee. We are combining these two reviews.
    - iv. It looks like Thursday morning will be taken up by required elements of the review required by PARC policy, but the afternoon is up to us. Exit interviews will be required on Friday.
      - 1. Suggestion to organize a forum that includes GVAR committee, Testing, Center for International Education, Chair of GEGC and CEPC, Chair of Academic Senate, GVAR advisors, and GVAR course instructors. The forum could then consist of a moderated discussion about the program: strengths, weaknesses, goals for the future, and policy objectives. Could plan for approximately a 90-minute session. GVAR committee could decide whom to have moderate and generate specific questions.

- a. Concern expressed by committee member about whether or not the reviewer will have time for to speak privately with any of these individuals.
  - b. Suggestion to have the GVAR committee leave and allow others to speak with Reviewer in private.
  - c. Another suggestion to make some kind of electronic contribution available to those outside of the GVAR committee. Provost's office might be able to help with this idea.
  - d. Suggestion to think about how to have better student representation for the reviewer.
  - e. Question about whether reviewer has requested any specific format or list of representatives?
    - i. A list was sent to the reviewer and the reviewer was comfortable with the suggested representatives.
  - f. If we are going to have a forum, do we need to send out a synopsis of what has happened since the last review and of what we are proposing as upcoming changes? The goal of this would be to focus the forum on the task of the reviewer, which is to review the GVAR since the last review.
  - g. Rebekha will draft a one-page summary of what we have done since the last review and send it out for committee to review, make suggestions, approve.
  - h. The schedule of the review process needs to be sent out soon.
2. A suggestion was made to have the reviewer look at things like sample portfolios, sample WPE writing prompts, and the proposed policy revisions. The reviewer has also been asked if she would like to visit a GVAR class, but the reviewer doesn't seem particularly interested in actually observing a class session.
  3. Final Proposed Schedule:
    - a. Forum and list of attendees 60-90 minutes
    - b. Electronic feedback mechanism
    - c. Locate students who have taken a GVAR course and can speak privately with her.
  4. Committee will consider who to have moderate and supply suggestions to Linda Sarbo.
  5. We will send previous review and our year-end synopses to the reviewer and other forum attendees.

6. Moderator choice and synopsis draft to be approved at our next meeting.

b. GVAR Portfolio appeal

- i. Need a subcommittee to review portfolio and it's scoring.
- ii. Gary, Diana, and Rebekha will serve.

8. Adjournment at 2:38 pm

Next meeting to be held in September 16, 2011 at 1:30 pm.

Submitted by

Colleen Dunagan, Ph.D.

GVAR Secretary

(These minutes were approved on 9/16/11.)