

Minutes
GWAR Committee
USU 311
1:30 – 3 PM

Meeting Number 5
November 4, 2011

In attendance: Gary Griswold, Mark Wiley, Linda Sarbo, Rebekha Abbuhl, Colleen Dunagan, Rick Tuveson, Diana Hines, Yu Ding

1. Approval of agenda:
2. Minutes of meeting on October 21, 2011:
 - a. MSP – with amendment
 - i. 5.4 : Change “we” to “We” in third sentence.
3. Announcements
 - a. Nancy Sommers is giving a half-day workshop/presentation on composition on Friday, November 18th at 9:30 am.
 - b. Rebekha has tried emailing other universities to get their assessment methods and integration of writing requirements but has not received any responses.
 - c. The new rubric for the WPE that allows for greater differentiation in grading organization, content, and grammar has been tried and seems to shift the scores slightly but produces results that are largely consistent with previous norms.
4. Policy draft:
 - a. Capstone courses: Report from sample of CSULB capstone courses
 - i. Rebekha emailed Van Novack to get information regarding enrollments in the capstone courses, but getting the information for all of the capstone courses is not possible, so she emailed Lynn Mahoney to get results for 5 of the biggest enrollments.
 - ii. Range from 81%-98% in passing with a C or better.
 - iii. Example enrollments include the following:

1. One section is at 212 (Pagan Culture) is the largest enrollment.
 2. One section is at 27 (comic Spirit).
 3. One section is at 165 (Buddhism).
- iv. There are between 15 and 20 courses that are capped at 39 students.
- b. On the topic of if we should we just say that passing with a C or better in capstone courses equals meeting the GWAR, Lynn Mahoney contributed the following:
- i. Creating a subset of writing intensive capstone courses might be most effective.
 - ii. Lynn thinks we will need approximately 6,000 seats per year, but the current number of courses at 35 or below are serving approximately 5500 per year.
- c. Methods for dealing with the “overlay” issue:
- i. Rebekha suggested that the committee needs to deal with this issue. She asked if the committee as a whole is in support of working to modify some existing GE Capstones to them writing intensive.
 - ii. Rebekha would like to come up with a plan to ease the confusion created by overlapping requirements within the GE policy (i.e. overlay). She would like us to think strategically about how to achieve our plan. Nathan’s proposed amendment (as seen in next item) is one way of addressing this problem.
 - iii. Nathan stated that there is a possible amendment to the GE policy in which the idea would be to move all of the capstones into their own category and thus eliminate the overlay of capstones (by removing them from the GE subject area categories). There are six units of elective in GE and 12 units in area D, so if we take those elective units plus 3 from D and make those units the capstone requirement, the change would not add units to student loads.
 - iv. Cecile Lindsay will be putting forth an amendment to remove the 35 student cap enrollment language from the GE capstone policy and enforcing it only on the writing intensive courses. This amendment would include the creation of a subdivision of writing intensive courses.
 - v. Linda Sarbo provided additional information regarding current strategies for shaping the GE policy in relationship to writing. Keith Freesemann has brought up the issue that

there may be some resistance to removing the writing requirement entirely from the other capstones. He feels like introducing the amendment requires a sentence that explains the logic of the change. Since he can't refer to our policy (as it doesn't exist), he will need to refer to the results of the Writing Task Force. The only thing that GE policy will address is the enrollment cap and a minimum number of words, and Linda has been pointing out to Freeseemann et al that those two criteria are not the only ones that our committee wants to put forth.

- d. Rebekha made a new draft of the policy, modifying what we had previously drafted with the addition of our writing intensive criteria and the pathways discussed with Lynn.
- e. This Committee discussed the importance of presenting these ideas to the Senate in a manner that explains to the Senate how the majority of these courses are already honoring the enrollment caps.
- f. Placing enrollment caps and a word minimum in GE policy makes those two pieces the responsibility of the GEGC committee in terms of oversight. That would leave the GEAR committee in the place of following through on our definition of writing intensive.
- g. Nathan is concerned that if the GE policy includes a statement about writing intensive courses and we create a separate category (differently defined) of writing intensive courses it will create another overlay issue.
- h. Are we comfortable losing some of our six criteria for writing intensive courses if the GE policy passes with only the two criteria and then we are not able to make additional changes?
 - i. Apparently, the suggestions for how to revise the new policy is not reduce requirements for GE course down to those two criteria, instead it is to simply take all of the GE language regarding the GE capstones and move it to apply to only the writing intensive capstones.
- i. Rebekha wants to make our language is as close to the GE policy as possible in order to facilitate the passing of the policy.
- j. What are the real differences between our definition and what exists in the GE policy? The parts of our policy that are additions are the use "shall" in #2, the inclusion of 2000 words finished prose in #3, and #6.
- k. Committee seems in agreement that we just try to get all of the language in all at once.

- l. There is no language in any policy regarding how the statute of writing intensive is implemented or applied. It could just be implemented via departments
 - m. Next step is to contact Keith and set up a meeting to discuss the wording of his amendment. Subcommittee is going to attempt to set up a meeting for Tuesday, November 8 between 10 am and 11 am. Subcommittee = Nathan, Mark, Dinah, Gary, Linda, and Rebekha.
 - n. Nathan question – the classes that are likely to be designated writing intensive, what categories are they in now?
 - o. Motion to approve the draft Rebekha handed out as the basic concept/plan that we want to move forward with: MSP.
5. GVAR Coordinator's report
- a. The external review report was submitted to PARC, and it was shared with Linda, and she shared it with Rebekha and Lynn. They and she were asked to correct any factual errors. There were a couple but they were mostly about attendance issues (who was present at what meeting). Linda is composing a letter to Fiona regarding errors and Fiona has chance to amend report before submitting it the PARC.
 - b. PARC has received that first draft of Fiona's report and PARC will review it; then there will be an opportunity for Linda and Rebekha to provide comments, and then it will go to Cecile Lindsay.
 - c. Overall the draft Linda has read seems relatively positive and supportive of the kinds of policy changes we have been discussing.
 - d. The WPE scores for the December test were sent out yesterday. Students have been contacting Linda regarding test results. Holds on registration have been set for students for Nov/Dec 2010, and in Feb 2011 those who have not yet done what they were required to do will have holds on their accounts.
 - e. Enrollment services has set automatic WPE score prerequisites for the GVAR courses. They are set only for those GVAR courses that are exclusively GVAR courses. The only manual component that remains is the C or better in 301A.

6. Adjournment

- a. 2:38 pm

Minutes submitted by,

Colleen Dunagan

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