

**Minutes of the GVAR Committee Meeting
November 5, 2010
USU 311**

In attendance: Colleen Dunagan (COTA), Susan Platt (Testing, Evaluation and Assessment), Linda Sarbo (GVAR Coordinator), Rick Tuveson (Health and Human Services), Karin Griffin (University Library), Mark Wiley (Academic Affairs), Lori Brown (CBA), Rebekha Abbuhl (Linguistics), Bron Pellissier (Advising Council), and Gary Griswold (CLA)

1. **Welcome Back**
2. **Approval of Agenda: MSP**
3. **Minutes of meetings on October 15, 2010: MSP**
4. **Announcements:**
 - a. Welcome to new Member: Diana Hines (Composition)
 - b. Deadline to apply to the University is November 10th, admitting new freshmen without re-application.
 - c. Music and Dance Concert at CPAC November 19 and 20, 2010.
5. **Plan and timeline for policy revision:**
 - a. Course in major with writing intensive component:
 - i. Which courses would we want to institute this aspect of the GVAR in?
 1. We could use GE capstones, but given enrollment requirements we might want to let people volunteer to have courses as certified as GVAR courses or as Writing Intensive Capstones that would be part of meeting the GVAR. We would need to distinguish between GVAR courses that are working to build language skills versus those that are intensive upper-division writing classes stressing a high level of composition in the discipline.
 2. We have at least two populations to serve and need a simple model that can meet both populations' needs.
 3. In the instance of these upper division courses, the WPE (or alternative) would become more of a placement tool.
 4. Is the WPE the best assessment for this model of course distribution? The WPE accurately identifies second-language learners. What does San Francisco state's assessment look like? Hines has taught a GVAR course (ENG 414) and students who did not pass the JEPET were slotted into this course. The course was taught by composition instructors and did involve work for second language learners. If a student fails they have to keep retaking it until they pass it. Usually, if the student did not pass it, it was because they had significant difficulty with English grammar.
 5. Is there someone on the committee who can investigate what other kinds of writing assessments are out there? It seems we

- iv. How do we certify courses as being writing intensive and what system of oversight will we put in place?

6. Guests: Drs. Lynn Mahoney and Lisa Vollendorf (2:15 Time Certain):

- a. Coming to speak about the Senate recommendations about how to proceed with re-writing the GVAR policy, which includes a recommendation to take into account the recommendations from the Academic Writing Assessment Task Force.
- b. Lisa Vollendorf:
 - i. The writing task force report was presented to Executive Committee of Academic Senate in September. The report provides a roadmap as to how we might move forward. The policy rewrite needs to take into consideration points raised in the report. There are many parts of the report that exceed the GVAR, and the full report needs to go to the Provost, so that he can consider other kinds of initiatives.
 - ii. May we start drafting from scratch? Vollendorf says if we use any of the old policy it is good to still use track changes. She also supports bringing an early version (outline or halfway point) to Executive Committee and getting feedback before finalizing the copy that will go the Senate floor. It's better if readers can track the changes, but it is good to have a clean copy as well. An alternative is to footnote sentences taken from prior policy, if we are discarding most of that prior policy.
 - iii. They suggest that we start with the existing GVAR policy and ignore both of the revisions that were generated last year.
 - iv. Time frame: one committee member suggested we might aim to have a draft done by the end of the academic year. Vollendorf thinks that is fine. So in that case CECP could start to consider the policy revision at the start of 2011-2012.
 - v. CECP council has approved the Leap Capstone but the course name has been changed to Integrated Learning Capstone.
 - vi. How much can our policy rewrite affect courses across the curriculum? The new GE policy is coming to the Senate floor this year, so now is the appropriate time for someone to suggest an amendment to the GE policy that anticipates aspects of our policy revisions for the GVAR. One of us could ask for an amendment that suggests that some Capstone courses be designated as writing-intensive courses that for the purposes of our policy will meet the GVAR. We may need to have a fall back plan. Or maybe we simply need to enforce the demonstration of the writing intensive nature of the courses that are currently capstones and then work with administration to change designations that aren't writing intensive.
 - vii. What are the various groups and constituencies that the GVAR committee might invite input from?

1. Instructors of GVAR courses, Associates Deans, CECP, maybe faculty council just to help disseminate it to campus, Chairs groups, curriculum committees
- viii. They will keep running the GVAR pilot as long as it is working, so we should keep apprised of how it is working. If it is working, then it would be nice to have this policy work in conjunction with it.
- ix. There is an existing policy from the 1970s that addresses specifically international students only and the current GVAR pilot may be in conflict with it. Vollendorf suggested bringing the 1970s policy to the Senate to have it declared outdated/void.

7. GVAR Coordinator's Report:

- a. WPE scores for the September 25th test date were distributed and students have begun making appointments as directed by their letters. Testing is tracking those appointments and which students are permitted to re-test or not. First-run advisors time slots have been filled. CIE has seen about 20 international students so far and will be forwarding to Testing.
- b. Defer to next meeting our request for exception to policy for testing off campus

8. WPE Development Committee Chair's Report:

- a. The WPE Development committee is a subcommittee of this one, so the work has to be approved by this committee. So the roster and the charge is being distributed to this committee with a brief verbal explanation of what it does. Handout distributed.

9. Next meeting is November 19, 2010 from 1:30 to 3:00 PM.

10. Move to Adjourned - MSP

11. Meeting adjourned at 3:05 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen Dunagan

(These minutes were approved on 11/19/10.)