In attendance: Gary Griswold, Linda Sarbo, Rebekha Abbuhl, Colleen Dunagan, Diana Hines, Susan Platt, Yu Ding, Lori Brown, Nathen Jensen, Leslie Andersen

1. Approval of agenda: MSP
2. Minutes of meeting on December 9, 2011. MSP as amended.
3. Announcements: None.
4. Review the changes to the GE policy that were approved by the Academic Senate on 1/26:
   a. Linda Sarbo reported on the Senate’s vote on the GE policy. The entire GE policy was approved, but it has not yet been approved by the president. Once he approves it, a copy will be available. We need this copy in order to make sure that our own language is not in conflict with the GE policy.
   b. Revisions were made to the GE policy by the senate. They mandated a cap of 35 on all writing intensive courses. They also amended language describing “a substantial writing component.” New language includes: “Instructors shall integrate a substantive writing intensive component that meets the student writing outcomes established by the GEGC.” They also amended the policy to say that all students must take a writing intensive course. The amendments were all overwhelmingly supported. Some speakers were even in support of a 25 cap but in the end the 35 cap was determined to be more economically viable.
   c. Keith Freesemann emailed Linda asking for the student writing learning outcomes that we have adopted and she sent the most recent version of our draft policy, so she believes GEGC will adopt the outcomes we have listed in the current draft of our policy.
   d. Mark Wiley believes that the new GE policy will be phased in by Fall 2013 or Fall 2014, but he is not sure.
   e. The GE committee needs to approve all GE courses. The GWAR committee would monitor enrollment caps. Therefore, we shouldn’t have language in our policy stating that we are the ones who approve the courses.

5. Policy draft:
   a. Sections 1.2 and 1.3 were changed. MSP.
      i. Old version: “In its report dated XX/XX/10, the AWATF identified the following student learning outcomes that CSULB
upper division writing-intensive courses should teach and assess:

1.3 In their writing, students should:

ii. New version: “In its report dated XX/XX/10, the AWATF identified the following learning outcomes that CSULB students should acquire by the time they complete their degree programs.” The opening sentence of 1.3 was deleted and 1.3 was merged into 1.2.

b. Section 2.3 was changed. MSP.

i. Old version: “Transfer students shall complete the GPE the summer before they enroll at CSULB.”

ii. New version: “Upper-division transfer students shall complete the GPE preferably before they enroll at CSULB, but no later than their first semester of enrollment.”

c. Section 2.4 was changed. MSP.

i. Old version: “Graduate students who have previously received degrees from United States institutions are exempt from the GPE. All other graduate students shall attempt the GPE in their first semester of enrollment.”

ii. New version: “Graduate students who have previously (1) received degrees from accredited colleges and universities in the United States; or (2) received degrees from a regionally-accredited non-US institution located in a country where English is a primary language of communication; or (3) attained a score of 5 on the analytical writing component of the GRE are exempt from the GPE. All other graduate students shall take the GPE in their first semester of enrollment.”

d. Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 were deleted from the draft. MSP. Language concerning the deferment of the policy is not needed, as there will be an implementation plan. Language concerning what is “writing intensive” is in the GE policy. We will just indicate that writing intensive courses will be certified by the GEGC. We will continue to discuss our criteria for writing intensive courses with the GEGC.

e. Section 3 was renamed from “Writing Intensive Courses” to “Pathways.” MSP.

f. Section 3.4.1.1 was changed. MSP.

i. Old version: “Students with an upper range score on the GPE shall successfully complete (with a C or better) a General Education capstone course certified as writing intensive by the GWAR committee.”

ii. New version: “Students with an upper range score on the GPE shall successfully complete (with a C or better) a General
Education capstone course certified as writing intensive by the GEGC.”

g. Section 3.5.1 was changed. MSP.
   i. Old version: “Graduate students who have previously received a degree from a United States institution of higher education shall be exempt from taking the GPE. A graduate student’s score on the GPE shall determine which of the following pathways must be completed to fulfill the GWAR:”
   ii. New version: “Unless a graduate student is exempt from the GPE, his or her score on the GPE shall determine which of the following pathways must be completed to fulfill the GWAR.”

h. Section 3.5.1.1 was changed. MSP.
   i. Old version: “Students who are exempt from the GPE and students with an upper range score on the GPE shall successfully complete a writing intensive course or activity within the student’s major as determined by the student’s department.”
   ii. New version: “Students who are exempt from the GPE and students with an upper range score on the GPE shall meet writing requirements specified by the student’s department.”
   iii. Amend 2.4 to read “shall take the GPE in their first semester of enrollment.” MSP.

i. Sections 3.5.1.2 and Section 3.5.1.3 were changed. MSP.
   i. Old version: “A writing intensive course or activity within the student’s major as determined by the student’s department (this course may be taken concurrently with a GWAR portfolio course).”
   ii. New version: “Writing requirements specified by the student’s department (this may be done concurrently with the GWAR portfolio course).”

j. Amend numbering of items in section 3. MSP.

k. Amendment regarding entire document: change all mention of “certified as writing intensive by the GWAR Committee” to read “by the GEGC.” MSP.

l. Section 4.3 was changed. MSP.
   i. Old version:
      • GWAR Coordinator
      • Six instructors with experience in writing instruction and writing assessment, three of whom have taught a GWAR course, and one of whom has knowledge of effective writing assessment of speakers of other languages
• One representative from Testing, Evaluation and Assessment
• One representative from Disabled Student Services

ii. New version:
• Six instructors with experience in writing instruction and writing assessment, three of whom have taught a GWAR course, and one of whom has knowledge of effective writing assessment of speakers of other languages
• GWAR Coordinator (ex-officio)
• One representative from Testing, Evaluation and Assessment (ex-officio)
• One representative from Disabled Student Services (ex-officio)

m. Section 4.4 and 4.5 were changed. MSP.
   i. “Members” were changed to “Elected members.”

n. Section 5.2 was changed. MSP.
   i. “Approve writing intensive and GWAR portfolio courses” changed to “Approve GWAR portfolio courses.”
   ii. Add: “Coordinate implementation of capstone writing intensive courses with GEGC.”
   iii. Add: “Approve alternate assessments other than the GPE for placement into GWAR pathways.”

6. Portfolio submission policy:
   a. Discussion was held as to whether or not attendance can affect students’ ability to submit portfolios in GWAR courses.
   b. Rebekha contacted Lynn Mahoney about his, and Lynn stated that “as the grade in a GWAR course and the portfolio are independent, I don’t think instructors may do this [prevent a student from submitting a portfolio based on attendance].”
   c. A motion was made for the policy to include language that all students can submit a portfolio regardless of attendance. Vote postponed.
   d. If the motion passes, the COTA GWAR course outline will need to be amended.

7. GWAR Coordinator’s report: None at this time.

Adjourned at 3:00 PM

Submitted by
Colleen Dunagan
(These minutes were approved on 2/17/12.)