

**Minutes
GWAR Committee
USU 311
1:30-3:00 PM**

**Meeting Number 13
April 6, 2012**

In Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Linda Sarbo, Susan Platt, Colleen Dunagan, Rick Tuveson, Gary Griswold, Yu Ding, Lori Brown, and Mark Wiley

1. **Approval of Agenda.** MSP.
2. **Minutes of Meeting on March 16, 201.** MSP.
3. **Announcements:**
 - a. The WPE scores for February were sent out. The WPE Development Committee will look at the results and the readers' feedback on the topics. In April, the new WPE rubric will be rolled out.
 - b. The CSULB Dance Concert will be held April 25-28.
4. **Report from Subcommittee Concerning Portfolio Assessment:**
 - a. At the CEPC meeting, Tom Enders asked why the GWAR portfolio course grade was separate from the assessment of the portfolio.
 - b. The GWAR committee discussed three options at the last meeting:
 - i. Keeping the assessment of the course and the portfolio separate (i.e., keeping the policy as is)
 - ii. Requiring that students receive C or better in the GWAR portfolio class *and* pass the portfolio
 - iii. Requiring that students must receive C or better in class (with the understanding that the portfolio would be included as part of course grade)
 - c. A subcommittee (Linda, Nathan, Rebekha, and Susan) met to develop a list of reasons to support this decision:
 - i. This system provides a system of checks and balances for an important gatekeeping course. By having some oversight over portfolio assessment, the GWAR committee can provide for quality control.
 - ii. By overseeing the assessment of the portfolio (and not the assessment of the class), the GWAR committee maintains an appropriate sphere of oversight.

- iii. Previous reviews of portfolio assessment have allowed the GVAR committee to address inconsistencies in portfolio assessment, thus ensuring a more consistent experience for students across diverse GVAR portfolio classes.
- iv. The GVAR portfolio class serves an important gatekeeping function and thus must be treated differently than writing intensive GE capstone courses. The GVAR portfolio course required more intense monitoring.

d. Committee finds the reasons provided by the subcommittee to be good.

5. Potential Prompts for GPE:

- a. Two sample prompts for the future GPE (one on video game violence and the other on Alzheimer's) were provided to the committee.
- b. It was noted that we need to require students to draw on the information that is provided to them in the prompt. A suggestion was made to omit "from your own experiences" from the prompt and to include a statement that students must use the evidence provided in the prompt in their analysis. We want to assess how well students use the facts given in the prompt.
- c. It was suggested that the video question is better than the Alzheimer's question because it provides clear pro and con sides. The Alzheimer's question has a larger secondary question (should employers be notified) and would require more data.
- d. The glossary is good. What we are looking at now might be seen as a truncated version of the CLA. The CLA has seven different documents and on average students complete it within 70 minutes (it is estimated that we would give our students 90-120 minutes), but Susan has never seen the actual student writing. It was suggested that if we want to develop ours so that it more closely aligns with CLA, then perhaps we should try to see some sample student responses. Susan is going to email to see if she can get some samples from CLA.
- e. It was noted that our proposed GPE is similar to what Sac State already has. We should get a copy of the Sac State rubric, and it may be possible to sit in on a reading at Sac State.
- f. It will take time to develop a bank of these kinds of questions. Since these are more time-consuming to construct, it might take awhile to be ready to start. In order to pilot the new model we would need about a dozen questions. We will need to try to get an increase in the fee in order to cover the test costs (\$40), partially because the tests take longer to develop, the duration of the exam will be increased, it will take longer (potentially) to grade them, and readers will need to be retrained.

6. GVAR Coordinator's Report:

- a. The WPE scores went out on April 2. A flood of students came in for GVAR advising, but the influx of students has begun to taper off already. Linda has the feeling that there is less advising going on, but she is going to check. She thinks the students are beginning to understand what they have to do, which contributes to diminishment of advising needs.
 - b. Two students have been advised to take the WPE by instructors too early in their studies. Linda will speak with the instructors to clarify the purpose of the WPE and how best to advise students regarding the test.
 - c. Next Wednesday, April 11 (held in BH302 from 2 to 4 pm), is the meeting of CEPC. They will be looking at our policy. Some members of our committee will be attending.
7. Adjournment: 2:10 pm

Submitted by,

Colleen Dunagan

(These minutes were approved on 5/4/12.)