

GWAR Committee Minutes
USU 311
1:30 – 3 PM
Meeting Number #10
February 17, 2012

In attendance: Gary Griswold, Linda Sarbo, Rebekha Abbuhl, Colleen Dunagan, Susan Platt, Yu Ding, Rick Tuveson, Jose Espeleta

1. Approval of agenda: MSP
2. Minutes of meeting on February 3, 2012. MSP as amended.
3. Announcements:
 - a. The committee welcomed our new student representative, Jose Espeleta.
 - b. Brenda Dixon Gottschild is speaking about her new book and signing texts – Thursday, February 23, 2012 3:30-5 pm in LA3-110.
 - c. There is a WPE administration tomorrow with 1600 students. Six new topics are being piloted. When these essays are read, it will probably be the last time that the old rubric will be used.
4. Policy draft:
 - a. Section 2.2 was changed. MSP.
 - i. Old version: “Native undergraduate students shall take the GPE or alternate assessment when they have completed between 30 and 50 units.”
 - ii. New version: “Continuing undergraduate students shall take the GPE or alternate assessment when they have completed between 30 and 50 units.”
 - b. Section 3.1.1.2 was changed. MSP.
 - i. Old version: “Students with a mid-range score on the GPE must successfully complete the following:
 - A GWAR portfolio course; and
 - A General Education capstone course certified as writing intensive by the GEGC. (This course may be taken concurrently with a GWAR portfolio course.)
 - ii. New version: “Students with a mid-range score on the GPE must meet the following criteria:
 - Complete a GWAR portfolio course, including the submission of a portfolio that earns a passing score; and
 - Successfully complete (with a C or better) a General Education

capstone course certified as writing intensive by the GEGC. (This course may be taken concurrently with a GEAR portfolio course.)

c. Section 3.1.1.3 was changed. MSP.

- i. Old version: “Students with a low-range score on the GPE shall first successfully complete English 301A or equivalent. After the successful completion of this course, students shall successfully complete the following:
 - A GEAR portfolio course; and
 - A General Education capstone course certified as writing intensive by the GEGC. (This course may be taken concurrently with a GEAR portfolio course.)
- ii. New version: “Students with a low-range score on the GPE shall first successfully complete (with a C or better) English 301A or equivalent. After successful completion of this course, students shall meet the following criteria:
 - Complete a GEAR portfolio course, including the submission of a portfolio that earns a passing score; and
 - Successfully complete (with a C or better) a General Education capstone course certified as writing intensive by the GEGC. (This course may be taken concurrently with a GEAR portfolio course.)

d. Section 3.2.1 was changed. MSP.

- i. Old 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 GEAR”
- ii. New version: “Unless a graduate student is exempt from the GPE as specified in 2.4, his or her score on the GPE shall determine which of the following pathways the student must complete to fulfill the GEAR”

e. Section 3.3 was added. MSP.

- i. Addition: “Students with a mid- or low-range score on the GPE must begin their pathway within two semesters of taking the GPE and make satisfactory progress toward fulfilling the requirement thereafter.”
- ii. Discussion: How do we enforce the completion of writing requirements? It was noted that we do not need to specify in the policy how we will enforce this, but it is a discussion we need to revisit. Suggestions included holds and disenrollment if students fail to complete the GEAR requirement within two or three semesters of taking the GPE. For students who are not successfully completing requirements, we could require them to complete paper

enrollment that must be signed by the GVAR coordinator (instead of online enrollment).

- f. Section 4.3 was changed. MSP.
 - i. Old version: “One representative from Testing, Evaluation and Assessment (ex-officio); One representative from Disabled Student Services (ex-officio)”
 - ii. New version: “Director from Testing, Evaluation and Assessment (or designee); Director from Disabled Student Services (or designee)”
- g. Section 5.2 was changed. MSP.
 - i. Old version: “Approve professional development processes developed for faculty who will teach portfolio and intensive writing courses approved by the GVAR committee”
 - ii. New version: “Approve professional development processes developed for faculty who will teach portfolio courses and intensive writing courses”
- h. Nathan emailed a list of countries that use English as a primary form of communication; this was shared with the committee. It was noted that we should revisit which countries are on the list at the next meeting.
- i. The committee is ready to forward the draft policy to CEPC. MSP. The committee was thanked for their hard work on the draft, and Rebekha will send the final draft (based on today’s discussions) to the chair of the CEPC committee, Chris Brazier, today.

5. Portfolio submission policy:

- a. Discussion was revisited as to whether or not attendance can affect students’ ability to submit portfolios in GVAR courses.
- b. Attendance will obviously affect the ability to complete a passing portfolio when first drafts and other drafts of essays are required in class.
- c. It was decided that matters of student attendance do not need to be specified in the policy and that this is an implementation matter.

6. GVAR Coordinator’s report:

- a. Linda and Lynn received a draft of the PARC report; they provided corrections of fact. The report is on the PARC agenda for 7 March. After the report is presented to the full committee, it will be sent to Cecile Lindsey, who will then provide us with a memorandum of understanding.
- b. PARC has recommendations – divided into three sections – GVAR program, College and Administration, and the review program.
 - i. PARC recommends that the WPE should be a diagnostic test aligned to kinds of writing required in upper division courses

- ii. The GVAR Committee should consider the implications of using the WPE as a diagnostic (e.g., 301B and other portfolio courses may not be the best option for all students who fail the WPE).
 - iii. There should be a third reader only when the first two readers differ by 2 pts. The GVAR Committee might consider developing further training for assessors to help avoid biases.
 - iv. The GVAR Committee should continue efforts to assist students with implementation of pathways and to assist international students in meeting GVAR.
 - v. The GVAR Committee might consider establishing a goal of writing across the curriculum and developing a plan for how that might implemented over time and which might require instituting certain larger changes:
 - 1. Faculty development in writing assessments
 - 2. Consideration of development of how to sequence skills from lower division to upper division
 - 3. Establishment of a means for quality control in upper division portfolio courses.
 - vi. Recommendations for college and administration – the University should provide more support in the form of assigned time to the GVAR coordinator.
- c. It was noted that many of these items have already been accomplished and that others (e.g., writing across the curriculum) are either not feasible or not part of our charge.

7. Adjourned at 2:50 PM

Submitted by
Colleen Dunagan
(These minutes were approved on 3/2/12.)