

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 3:05 PM

Meeting Number 1
August 26, 2016

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Rebecca Lemme, Deborah Fraser, Nele Hempel-Lamer, Max Rosenkrantz, Jonathan O'Brien, Richard Tuveson, Lori Brown, Jason Deutschman, John Scenters-Zapico, Lori Smurthwaite, Leanne Bergeron, Eve Baker

- 1. Approval of agenda: M/S/P**
- 2. Minutes of meeting on May 6, 2016: M/S/P**
- 3. Announcements**
 - a. September 17th is the first GPE test, with reading on October 1st. GWAR members are encouraged to participate to understand more about the process.
- 4. Elections**
 - a. Nomination and Election of Chair: Rebekha Abbuhl
 - b. Nomination and Election of Vice-Chair: Lori Brown
 - c. Nomination and Election of Secretary: Deborah Fraser
- 5. Discussion of GWAR oversight and policy**
 - a. The GWAR committee is governed by academic affairs and the voting procedures of the GWAR committee. We report directly to the academic senate.
 - b. All changes to the policy, administration, and assessment of the GPE need to be discussed and voted on by this committee.
 - c. GWAR committee duties (section 5.2 of the policy) were presented.
- 6. Roster updates**
 - a. A Student Representative from ASI is needed. Please forward any suggestions to Rebekha Abbuhl.
 - b. Additions to the roster: Max Rosenkrantz, Richard Tuveson, Rebekha Abbuhl
 - c. Changes: Lori Brown's Rank is Associate, not Assistant, Professor
 - d. Ken Kelly will be serving as the testing representative
- 7. Semester goals and topics to address**
 - a. Background information on the difference between the GPE and WPE was presented, along with previous actions of the committee.

1. After the new policy was approved in Fall 2012, the committee focused its energy on creating the writing intensive capstone courses, as this was identified as the primary concern by Lynn Mahoney.
2. The GPE Advisory committee convened in Spring 2016 and created 8 prompts, which were piloted in Summer 2016.
3. The Writer's Resource Lab and the Learning Assistance Center have been debriefed about the nature of the changes, so their tutors can be prepared for the new test.
4. A training session for the table leaders and raters will be held in mid-September.

b. Semester goals were discussed

1. Discussion of urgent need for additional GPE prompts in the database
 1. Currently there are not enough prompts for the extensive, invitation-based computer lab testing. We cannot have extensive, invitation-based computer testing with only a few prompts, as that would compromise the validity of the test.
 2. There are enough prompts to have two prompts for the Saturday paper-and-pencil test and two prompts to accommodate religious needs students and other students who cannot attend the Saturday session.
 1. Motion to use only 4 prompts for the September testing: 2 on the Saturday (face-to-face & DSS tests), and 2 to be used for the invitation-based computer lab testing (religious accommodations and students who cannot attend the Saturday session). M/S/P
 2. Motion to make 4-5 prompts available for invitation-based computer lab testing in November. M/S/P
3. Discussion of need to prioritize limited on-demand spots for students requesting religious accommodation for a non-Saturday test.
4. Discussion that more students may need to be accommodated on the Saturday, which may require extra space, test staff and readers. In recent years, the testing office has accommodated up to 4000 students at the Saturday session.
5. Discussion of impact on departments like Theater Arts where students may have rehearsals/show commitments on Saturdays.
6. Discussion that piloting process for prompts is time consuming and therefore these additional November prompts will need to be completed in a timely manner so they can be piloted. GPE Advisory Committee will work to expand the availability of

prompts for the invitation-based computer lab testing for November, and to build up the test-bank for Spring.

7. Suggestion to incentivize GEAR instructors and GPE readers to write prompts to increase the test bank. Long term need to expand on-demand testing to be discussed in GPE Advisory Committee
2. Discussion of GPE issues with transfer students.
 1. Concern with getting test results in time to enroll in classes. During the Summer, Nele Hampel-Lamer worked with the testing office to decrease turnaround time.
 2. One department (English) has writing intensive GE capstone course in the first semester. Also, one department (Human Development) has a writing intensive GE capstone course in the second semester. In order to be able to make appropriate class decisions, transfer students who test in the summer will need to be able to receive their scores in a timely manner.
 3. GEAR to consider how to streamline this
3. Discussion of possible future directions for the GPE for consideration by GEAR Committee
 1. Make GPE invitation-based all throughout the semester
 2. Hold multiple sessions throughout the year (>4)
 3. Create a large database of prompts
 4. Departments could offer satellite testing for their own students.
 5. Increase the number of students that are able to take the test on a secure computer.
 6. Use of predictive analytics to reduce the number of students taking the GPE
 7. Alternative assessment

8. Adjournment

These minutes were submitted by Deborah Fraser.
(These minutes were approved on September 2, 2016.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 2:50 PM

Meeting Number 2
September 2, 2016

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Max Rosenkrantz, Rebecca Lemme, Deborah Fraser, Nele Hempel-Lamer, Richard Tuveson, Jason Deutschman, Jonathan O'Brien, Leanne Bergeron, Lori Smurthwaite, Lori Brown, Ken Kelly

- 1. Approval of agenda: M/S/P**
- 2. Minutes of meeting on August 26, 2016: M/S/P**
- 3. Announcements**
 - a. Reminder that the next GPE is on September 17th, with reading on October 1st. GWAR members are encouraged to participate to understand more about the process.
 - b. Training for readers is Friday 9th 1:30-3:30pm, PSY201. An additional training session for those unable to make the 9/9 date will be held on Friday 16th 10-11 AM, AS 124B and Friday 23rd 2-3 PM in AS 124B.
 - c. It was brought up that ENG310 has both C/NC and Grade option. The committee saw no problem with this.
- 4. Discussion of request from English department regarding timing of courses**
 - a. The following issue was presented: The English Department has a WI Capstone course, ENGL380, that is a pre-requisite for all majors in the department. It is currently scheduled in the Fall semester. This means that incoming transfer students, or any student in the major who does not have their GPE scores prior to enrollment cannot enroll, which sets them back a semester.
 - b. To deal with this issue for Fall 2016, the English Department has decertified ENGL380 as WI Capstone. However, they have issued permits for ENGL370 and ENGL375 for students to enroll in these WI Capstones who have not yet taken the GPE, which is against current GWAR policy. Current policy only allows for students to take GWAR courses concurrently, not out of sequence.
 - c. The English department is requesting that they be allowed to issue permits to add students to a WI Capstone course even if they have not yet taken the GPE. If these students fail to achieve an 11 or above on the GPE, they request these students be allowed to take the GWAR courses ENGL301A (if score was below 8) and/or

ENGL301B in subsequent semesters. The GWAR requirements would then be met, but the courses would have been taken out of sequence.

d. Discussion included the following points:

1. Arguments for allowing students to take it out of sequence:

1. The numbers of permits needed would be small – Ken Kelly provided absolute numbers from the July testing date, which indicated that only 9.6% of students received a score of 10 or lower. Less than 1% scored a 7 or lower, and of these students only 2 were from CLA.
2. This would not only help transfer students, but also international students who often only arrive right at the beginning of a semester.
3. Prohibiting students who have not taken the GPE from enrolling in a WI Capstone has negatively impacted enrollment in these English WI capstones.
4. However, this may be due to the transition from WPE to GPE

2. Arguments against allowing students to take the WI Capstone out of sequence:

1. If we allow the English department to issue permits, this would have to be made into policy for all departments. This could escalate the problem.
2. History had a similar problem last year, and we would not let them issue permits, but required them to change the sequence of their GWAR portfolio courses.
3. GPE is a placement test, and should be required to be taken prior to a WI Capstone.
4. Why have pre-requisites if you are not going to enforce them? Room for exploitation of the system.
5. If someone takes a WI Capstone and passes, but ends up placing low on the GPE (e.g. 7), this would suggest there may be something wrong with the GPE.

e. Suggestions for how to fix the problem

1. More testing opportunities prior to the start of the semester, and faster turnaround of scores to increase number of students with GPE scores prior to enrollment.
2. Directed self-placement could be used for students to assess if they think they would do well in a writing intensive course.
3. Make it a requirement that transfer students take their GPE before enrollment. Something more than just 'strongly encourage'.

4. Have students who score less than 11 on the GPE take an additional WI Capstone after completing the GWAR required course(s), even if they pass the WI Capstone they are in.
 1. However, this may increase student appeals if you have a course count for a WI Capstone for some students and not others.
5. Discussion whether the ENGL301A → ENGL301B → WI Capstone sequence has to be kept. How important is the sequence? Are the skills learned sequential or are they different enough to take out of sequence?
6. Have departments restructure their schedules so that the first course in the sequence is not a WI Capstone.
 1. This is the fix that the History department made.
 2. Could the English department just move the capstone to the second in the sequence instead?
 1. ENGL380 is an important foundation for all English majors. It explores different pathways/programs in the major. Strong arguments that it has to be taken in the first semester.
7. Have departments certify the second (or later) course to be a WI Capstone
 1. English does not have a specific 'next' course in a sequence that everyone takes. There are a variety of options depending on the student's track. Some of these options are already WI Capstone courses.
8. Have the GWAR Committee help departments decide which classes in a sequence would be best to certify, in addition to providing them assistance to get those classes certified as WI.
9. Have a GPE date closer to start of school and increased turnaround.
- f. GWAR Committee is encouraged to continue to think about this issue

5. Discussion of students who have satisfied the GWAR at other CSUs

- a. Three options for dealing with this issue were presented:
 1. Require them to take the GPE at CSULB.
 2. Waive the GPE requirement, but require students to take a WI Capstone at CSULB.
 3. Allow them to waive all writing requirements at CSULB. Do we want case by case for each university. Do we make a blanket policy.
- b. Discussion included investigating each petition on a case-by-case basis examining each individual CSU campus GWAR policy. It was discussed that GWAR is a CSU requirement and thus satisfying it at any CSU should suffice, but the committee had concerns that by allowing students to waive a WI Capstone requirement would be a problem for students whose WI Capstone was a requirement of their major.

- c. Motion to make it a policy that students who have satisfied the GVAR at other CSUs would not be required to take the GPE, but would be required to take a WI Capstone (option2): M/S/P

6. Adjournment

These minutes were submitted by Deborah Fraser.
(These minutes were approved on 9/16//2016.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 2:55 PM

Meeting Number 3
September 16, 2016

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Max Rosenkrantz, Deborah Fraser, Nele Hempel-Lamer, Richard Tuveson, Jason Deutschman, Lori Smurthwaite, John Scenters-Zapico, Arthur Yao, Tracy Woodard, Margaret Kuo, Carol Comfort and Leanne Bergeron.

1. Approval of agenda: M/S/P

- a. Amended to discuss item 5 (Issues in the rollout of the new policy) before item 4 (Request from English department)

2. Minutes of meeting on August 26, 2016: M/S/P

- a. Ammendment to item 4d) 2.2: to read GWAR portfolio courses, not WI capstones.

3. Announcements

- a. New members: ASI student representative Arthur Yao, Carol Comfort and Margaret Kuo.
- b. The training for readers last Friday and this Friday was completed and went well. Additional training will be held Friday 23rd 2-3 PM in AS 124B. GWAR Committee members are strongly encouraged to go through the training. Email Tracy Woodard if you are interested.

4. Issues in the rollout of the new policy

- a. Websites need to be updated to reflect the new GPE policy
 - a. Testing office website needs updating
 - i. Some updates already completed
 - 1. New GPE prompt added
 - 2. Extended time form updated
 - 3. Petition form updated
 - b. Department webpages need updated links and information
 - i. RA will email departments to provide more consistent information to students.
 - c. Updates need to also reflect name change from Testing and Evaluation and Assessment to Testing and Evaluation.
 - d. GWARC are encouraged to alert website administrators if any additional errors are found.
- b. Some students are having trouble enrolling in the GPE

- a. Website may be confusing
- b. More information about the exact issues may be needed (is it IT related?)
- c. Solutions include
 - i. Send a campus-wide email with instructions for how to register for GWAR.
 - ii. Simplify the process and website language
 - iii. Provide instruction in multiple places
 - 1. WRL website also lists procedure for registering, could be made more prominent
 - 2. Contact LAC and departments (e.g. English) to add links from their website
 - iv. Make sure that Advisors are clear on the process themselves
 - 1. NLH to bring this up to Advisors at the Winter Advising Institute next Friday 23rd September 9-12.
- c. Communication to incoming transfer students the importance of taking the test their first semester
 - a. The new GWAR policy is that incoming transfer students have to take the test in their first semester
 - b. A hold on enrollment will be placed on any student who does not complete this requirement
 - c. This may create a large number of students needing to take the test in November
 - d. This is combined with the Spring transfer students who will also need to take the test in November if they wish to take a WI Capstone their first semester.
 - e. Potential solutions include
 - i. Better communication
 - 1. In the UC system, their GPE equivalent is mandatory in the summer or winter break for transfer systems. It costs \$110. Maybe we need to be more stringent with making students take this test.
 - 2. Motion to add that transfer students should take the GPE to their admission letter: M/S/P
 - a. Wording should very strongly encourage students to take it, and provide students with information on why it is important to take the test in a timely manner.
 - b. NLH to contact Donna Green to see if this is possible
 - ii. Add a test in January, perhaps even during SOAR
 - 1. This would not be early enough for Spring enrollment
 - 2. Tests still need to be scanned to upload scores, which delays results
 - iii. Motion to add tests in December & May: M/S/P
 - 1. Testing office requested weekday test dates since Saturday test dates are difficult to staff

2. Readings for these tests could be performed in January/June
3. Exact dates to be determined
- d. Discussion regarding variability in number of GPE tests that readers grade
 - a. Some readers only get through 20 tests, whereas others can get through 200+
 - b. A range of expected number of tests to be read during the 4 hour reading period is provided at training (80-100, which some consider 'low')
 - c. Those not attaining this benchmark could be removed from future readings.
 - d. Discussion included making sure not to penalize slow readers, but to focus on readers who leave early and do not complete their 4 hour commitment.
- e. Discussion of inequity between transfer student requirements and continuing students
 - a. incoming students are being held to class pre-requisites regarding taking the GRE, but continuing students are not always.
 - b. If transfer students are prohibited from taking the WI capstone that is a pre-req for something else, it can delay graduation 1-2 years.
 - c. Need to improve advising and communication so that students enroll into the courses they need as soon as possible
 - d. Need to make sure there's enough sections
 - i. Could we figure out how many students who have taken the GPE will need a specific course, and provide that data to departments for scheduling?
 1. Can test this after the October reading, and calculate the number of students who need to take ENGL301A.

5. Request from English department regarding timing of courses

- a. Continued discussion from meeting 2, 9/2/2016
- b. Recap

The following issue was presented: The English Department has a WI Capstone course, ENGL380, that is a pre-requisite for all majors in the department. It is currently scheduled in the Fall semester. This means that incoming transfer students, or any student in the major who does not have their GPE scores prior to enrollment cannot enroll, which sets them back a semester.
- c. To deal with this issue for Fall 2016, the English Department has decertified ENGL380 as WI Capstone. However, they have issued permits for ENGL370 and ENGL375 for students to enroll in these WI Capstones who have not yet taken the GPE, which is against current GEAR policy. Current policy only allows for students to take GEAR courses concurrently, not out of sequence.
- d. The English department is requesting that they be allowed to issue permits to add students to a WI Capstone course even if they have not yet taken the GPE. If these students fail to achieve an 11 or above on the GPE, they request these students be allowed to take the GEAR courses ENGL301A (if score was below 8) and/or ENGL301B in subsequent semesters. The GEAR requirements would then be met, but the courses would have been taken out of sequence.

- e. Continued discussion of suggestions for how to fix the problem
 - 1. More testing opportunities prior to the start of the semester, and faster turnaround of scores to increase number of students with GPE scores prior to enrollment.
 - 1. Action items from this meeting include adding test dates in December 2016 and May 2017, to accommodate transfer students. Long term goals are to increase number of prompts to be able to offer increased on-demand and online testing.
 - 2. Directed self-placement could be used for students to assess if they think they would do well in a writing intensive course.
 - 1. This would require a larger discussion and change in policy
 - 3. Make it a requirement that transfer students take their GPE before enrollment. Something more than just 'strongly encourage'.
 - 1. Action item from this meeting include adding the GPE to the transfer student enrollment letter, emphasizing the importance of taking it prior to enrollment.
 - 4. Have departments restructure their schedules so that the first course in the sequence is not a WI Capstone.
 - 1. Example was given from CBA, where transfer students are advised not to take a WI Capstone their first semester. Thus, advising can help alleviate this problem.
 - 5. Have departments certify the second (or later) course to be a WI Capstone
 - 1. Discussion towards ensuring that there are enough WI Capstone courses in English to accommodate students while ENGL380 is decertified.
 - 6. Have the GEAR Committee help departments decide which classes in a sequence would be best to certify, in addition to providing them assistance to get those classes certified as WI.
 - 1. Discussion reiterated the importance of GEAR Committee in advising departments, and facilitating WI Capstone certification.
- f. Suggestion to keep ENGL380 decertified until these new measures to increase online and on-demand testing, and decrease grading turnaround time are implemented. This may be enough to be able to recertify ENGL380 as a WI Capstone course without delaying transfer students.
- g. GEAR Committee is encouraged to continue to think about this issue

6. Adjournment

These minutes were submitted by Deborah Fraser.
(These minutes were approved on 10/7/2016.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 2:55 PM

Meeting Number 4
October 7th, 2016

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Max Rosenkrantz, Deborah Fraser, John Scenters-Zapico, Author Yao, Carol Comfort, Ken Kelly, Jonathan O'Brien, Jason Deutschman, Richard Tuveson, Rebecca Lemme, Margaret Kuo, Tracy Woodard, Lori Smurthwaite, Nele Hempel-Lamer, Leanne Bergeron and Leslie Andersen.

- 1. Approval of agenda: M/S/P**
- 2. Minutes of meeting on September 16th, 2016: M/S/P**
 - a. Correction: Author Yao's first name (~~Arthur~~)
- 3. Announcements**
 - a. The reading for September's GPE was on October 1st. Around 1200 exams were read, twice, in 2.5 hours.
 - b. Reminder that the GWAR Committee reports to the Academic Senate, and regarding GWAR policy, no decision can be made without discussion and approval by this Committee.
 - c. Carol Comfort has offered to take minutes on 10/21 and 11/04.
- 4. Numbers of students at testing sessions, past and predicted**
 - a. Handout 1 – data provided shows a downward trend of number of students testing in recent years. Likely because now they can only take it a single time, and graduate students have the opportunity to self-place into a portfolio class.
 - b. Based on numbers from last year, it suggests that 2500-3000 students will still need to take the test in November/December. However, the number of holds being placed may suggest that more may register for November.
 - c. Prediction is that the reading the essays of 2500-3000 students would take approximately 5 hours to complete.
- 5. Monitoring use of prompts at all testing sessions**
 - a. It is the duty of GWARC to monitor which prompts are used and when.

- b. Standard practice is to only use a prompt once every 2 years. This avoids issues with students sharing prompts on social media, and later test-takers having an advantage in this test.
- c. Currently we have very few prompts in the test bank
 - 1. 2 unused
 - 2. 2 used in September 2016 (homelessness and teen driving)
 - 3. 4-8 additional prompts currently being piloted.
- d. In the September test, due to the lack of available prompts, the testing office decided to use the same prompts on the Saturday date for the additional make-up/on-demand test later that week.
- e. Discussion regarding options for future GPE tests.
 - 1. Need more prompts. Process is slow – need accessible prompts that pass pilot studies and are modified based on student feedback. GPE advisory committee is working on preparing more, but up to 50% are rejected after piloting
 - 2. Funding to pay additional faculty to write prompts for GPE Advisory Committee to review is in process.
 - 3. Prompts from the WPE test bank are also being restructured into GPE prompts to speed up the process.
 - 4. Consider other options beyond GPE, such as evaluations during the first week of classes such as ENGL301 to place students.
- f. Three options for use of prompts were presented:
 - 1. Use of 2 prompts during Saturday testing, of which one would be reused for make-up testing later that week. (uses 2 prompts total)
 - 2. Use of 2 prompts during Saturday testing and an additional new prompt for make-up testing (uses 3 prompts total)
 - 3. Use of 2 prompts during Saturday testing and pilot of one new prompt for the make-up session later that week. Half of the make-up students would do the pilot in a classroom; half would do the pilot in a lab. Both make-up/pilot sessions would use the same prompt in order to directly compare the lab and classroom settings (uses 2 prompts and one pilot prompt)

Voted to approve option (3): **M/S/P**

- g. Proposal that the GWARC keep track of what prompts are used, when and by how many students (Handout 2).
 - 1. Motion that GWARC create a form for tracking, and that the testing office notify GWARC 2 weeks in advance of any test session (whether computer lab, make-up, DSS, classroom Saturday session or other), and include information regarding what prompts they will use, when, and by approximately how many students: **M/S/P**

2. Rebekha will create the form and bring to the next GWARC meeting.

6. Performance of students on paper-and-pencil and computer-lab tests

- a. Handout 3- data shows that students who took the WPE test in the computer lab were significantly more likely to fail than those who took the paper-and-pencil test.
- b. Caveat to this comparison is that different prompts were used for the computer lab and classrooms tests
- c. The distribution of native and non-native speakers was not significantly different across the two contexts
- d. GWAR Committee to collect more control data to examine this further, using the same prompt for both groups, and the same readers.
- e. WRL will mention information at workshops to alert students to the potential disadvantage of using a computer for this test.

7. December and May testing sessions

- a. Motion to hold GPE on Friday December 2nd proposed. **M/S/P**
- b. Proposal to not have the invitation-based, computer-lab testing in November & December due to current shortage of prompts. The computer lab will only be used as a make-up/pilot session for students who are unable to take the test during the regular Saturday hours. **M/S/P**
- c. Discussion included:
 - 1. Concern from test office that the on-demand is important to take some pressure away from readers, and this may increase the workload and fatigue of the Saturday test readers.
 - 2. Counter argument is that only 4x27 students can be accommodated during on-demand testing (if 4 prompts are used), which is a minimal reduction to the Saturday test-taker numbers.
 - 3. Suggestions for combating reader fatigue include holding 2 shifts for readers, or splitting the work up over 2 days.
 - 4. GWAR Committee agreed to work on prompts so that the invitation-based, computer-lab testing could possibly be made available to students in 2017.
 - 5. A suggestion was made to have improved enforcement of the non-disclosure agreement students taking the GPE are required to sign, to deter students from publicizing prompts.

8. Updating testing office webpages

- a. Handout 4 - Testing office will make updates

9. Adjournment

These minutes were submitted by Deborah Fraser.
(These minutes were approved on 10/21/16.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 3:00 PM
Meeting Number 5
October 21, 2016

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Max Rosenkrantz, Deborah Fraser, John Scenters-Zapico, Author Yao, Carol Comfort, Ken Kelly, Jonathan O'Brien, Jason Deutschman, Richard Tuveson, Rebecca Lemme, Margaret Kuo, Tracy Woodard, Lori Smurthwaite, Nele Hempel-Lamer, Leanne Bergeron and Leslie Andersen.

- 1. Approval of agenda.** Approved by acclamation.
- 2. Minutes of meeting on October 7, 2016**
 - a. Minutes approved as submitted
- 3. Announcements.** None.
- 4. GPE score results**
 - a. Handout 1: GPE Results for September 2016 (two sessions on 9/17 and two make-up sessions on 9/23)
 - b. 1253 Students tested
 - c. Native speaker pass rate went down 97% to 88%, possibly due to the fact that the "fatuous fours" (the grammatical but content-less essays) are no longer receiving a passing score.
 - d. Non-native speaker pass rate increased from 67% to 88%, possibly because the provision of information helps nonnative speakers craft better responses.
 - e. There was not a significant difference in the scores for the two prompts (homelessness and teen drivers).
- 5. Update: Record sheet for prompts**
 - a. Handout 2: GRE Prompt Record Sheet. The testing office will use this record sheet to keep track of prompt use, and will send the record

sheet to the GVAR committee at least two weeks prior to any planned testing session.

- b. Suggested addition to record sheet: Add a column for "Last Date Topic was Used."
- c. Rebekha will send the updated prompt record sheet to the testing office.

6. Proposals for piloting alternatives to the GPE:

- a. Policy Statement includes wording that the GPE or alternate assessment can be used for determining student pathways for the GVAR. However, no alternate assessment is in place at this time for undergraduate and transfer students.
- b. Other CSUs and Universities have alternatives to a timed writing test:
 - 1. Several CSUs offer alternatives to timed writing (Handout 3) (Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, San Luis Obispo, Los Angeles, San Bernardino)
 - 2. Some campuses have completely eliminated timed writing tests (Chico, San Marcos, Fresno). Los Angeles is considering removing their timed writing.
- c. Reviewing possible proposals for a pilot project:
 - 1. Proposal 1A: Opt out by cumulative GPA 3.0 or higher for transfer students and native undergraduate students at CSULB. Timing: by the time the student reaches 30-50 CSULB units for undergraduate students, or at admission for transfer students. An analysis from April Institutional Research data showed that GPA was a good predictor (90%) of whether a student passed or failed the WPE.
 - 1. Comment: The pass rate for the test is already at 90%; the test is already not making a distinction.
 - 2. If this had been used for April, the number of test takers would have been reduced from 2130 to 975.
 - 3. Concern about grading practices at community colleges.
 - 4. Concern that GPA and the timed writing are not measuring the same things (i.e., GPA does not measure writing).

5. The GPA would not excuse students from the pathways, just from taking the GPE. They would still need to take a writing intensive GE capstone course.
2. Proposal 1(B): Opt out by cumulative GPA 3.5 or higher for transfer students and native undergraduate students at CSULB. Same concerns as with Proposal 1(A).
3. Proposal 2: Option to allow undergraduate and transfer students to either take the test or to enroll directly in a GEAR portfolio course. (Currently this is allowed only for graduate students.)
 1. Discussed need for offering more GEAR portfolio course.
 2. Although there are a very small number of students who test into ENGL 301A (e.g., 16 out of 1936 from July 2016), a question was raised concerning what to do with students who are not prepared to take a GEAR portfolio course. Instructors could strongly suggest that students take ENGL 301A or recommend that they receive help at the Learning Assistance Center.
 3. We could pilot this on a small scale and see how many students choose to enroll in a GEAR portfolio course.
 4. Currently, most graduate students choose to take the test and those who do not pass must then wait an extra semester to take ENGL 301A/GEAR portfolio course.
4. Proposal 3: Undergraduate or transfer students who receive an A or B on an English composition or select critical thinking general education course (or other courses approved by GEAR committee) would not need to take the GPE; they would be eligible to enroll directly into a writing intensive GE capstone course.
 1. List of possible courses to apply to this proposal on handout 3. Most difficult proposal to implement.
 2. Rebekha has contacted Institutional Research to get information on students' WPE/GPE scores and their performance in these courses.
 3. These are foundation courses, and according to GE and university policy, they have to be passed with a C or

better. If you now want to have a different grade (e.g., A or B) for another purpose, it would be nearly impossible to double code it.

4. A concern was raised that passing a freshman-level composition course does not adequately prepare students. A counterargument was raised that a student who could pass such a course would most likely pass the GPE.
5. Proposal 4 (writing across the curriculum) will be discussed at the next meeting: John Scenters Zapico and Mark Wiley will be here to address and explain this proposal.
6. A general discussion was held on the writing test.
 1. Question: Given the fact that the passing rate is so high, is that an indicator that the level of the test is too low? It was noted that the GPE is measuring a basic ability to form grammatically correct sentences and to put them together with some minimal level of coherence. Given what the test is measuring, an overall passing rate of 90% may be appropriate. The test only serves to identify a very small number of students who struggle with the basics of writing, and perhaps there are other ways to identify such students.
 2. A suggestion was made to eliminate the test completely and to simply have one or more courses (e.g., the writing intensive GE capstone courses). If we do that, we would need some mechanism for identifying struggling writers.
 3. Question: Do we have statistics on people who pass the GPE and then go on to take a writing intensive GE capstone course? Note yet, because the writing intensive GE capstone courses are being used for the first time this semester.
 4. A suggestion was made to have discipline-specific writing in the students' majors and to have that satisfy the GVAR.
 5. Side comment: Several graduate students who have not satisfied the GVAR requirement and have not completed 301A/B are able to "Advance to Candidacy" in their respective programs. Holds on registration are placed, but

students register for a GVAR class, then drop, or do not attend. This will need to be addressed in a future meeting.

7. Advertising the December testing session

- a. There will be a December paper and pencil testing session on December 2nd.
- b. Best ways to advertise new dates:
 1. Texting students
 2. WRL tutors will post flyers
 3. Email: Departments can email students in majors
 4. Testing center: information on web site (Registration date and deadline)
- c. A request was made to have the testing office let the GVAR committee know when the registration deadline will be for the December test.

8. Update on updating webpages

- a. Academic Affairs web site updated with new GVAR information.
- b. Rebekha has contacted departments with outdated information and requested that they update their information.
- c. Committee members who see outdated CSULB websites were asked to contact Rebekha.

9. Updating advisors on GPE/GVAR information

- a. Department advisors need to be updated on new GVAR information. Some may be providing students with outdated information.
- b. Rebekha will send out a powerpoint for advisors with the new GVAR information to Nele and Jason, and a powerpoint for students to Lori Smurthwaite.

10. GVAR Coordinator's report: John Scenters-Zapico at conference.

- a. Update from Leeanne: John and Leeanne have been working on E-Portfolios. They will be requesting funding on 11/8. The system should be up and running in the spring.

11. Adjournment at 2:45 pm

- a. Next meeting November 4, 2016

Minutes respectfully submitted by Carol Zitzer-Comfort

Minutes were approved on 11/4/2016.

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 3:00 PM
Meeting Number 6
November 4, 2016

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Leslie Anderson, Leeanne Bergeron, Lori Brown, Jason Deutschman, Kenneth Kelly, Margaret Kuo, Nele Hempel-Lamer, Rebecca Lemme, Jonathan O'Brien, Max Rosenkrantz, John Scenters-Zapico, Richard Tuveson, Author Yao

1. Approval of agenda. MSP.

2. Minutes of meeting on October 16, 2016

- a. Minutes approved with the following revisions to the attendance list: Neither John nor Author were here, but Lori Brown was.
- b. Regarding 6.3 and the writing intensive GE capstone courses, those courses have been in existence for a while, but we don't have information yet as to the relationship between GPE scores and students' performance in those courses.

3. Announcements:

- a. Update on updating advisors: Rebekha sent Nele a powerpoint that can be distributed to the advisors in order to ensure that they give correct information to students. Nele will post it on beachboard. In addition, there is a meeting next week for all advising center directors; Nele will let them know that the powerpoint has been posted on beachboard.
- b. Rebekha will not be able to attend on 11/18. The committee decided to skip the meeting on 11/18 and to have the next meeting be on 12/2.
- c. Update on analyzing information related to the predictive analytics: Institutional Research provided information on students' GPAs, their performance in critical thinking GE capstone courses, and their GPE scores. Rebekha will bring the analysis to the next meeting on December 2nd.
- d. Ken attended a conference for transfer counselors. Ken spoke to them about the GPE and the importance of having transfer students take it before they arrive to CSULB. One of the counselors is going to create a pilot program with their English department to prepare students for the GPE (test prep or writing prep, to be determined).
- e. Nele: Enrollment Services cross-referenced the Fall 2016 transfer students with all those who took the July WPE, the September GPE, and those who are

registered for the November GPE, and that leaves around 503 students from that transfer cohort who have not taken the GPE. An effort will need to be made to advertise to these students to get them registered for November.

4. November registration numbers

- a. As of October 28th, 2016 (the original deadline for GPE registration), there were approximately 2400 students registered for the November 19th GPE, which is what the committee originally predicted.
- b. The testing office extended the deadline past October 28th; the final number of students enrolled for November 19th is 2,463.
- c. The no-show rate for the test is always around 10%, so we should see approximately 2200 students at the November test.

5. December testing session

- a. This committee passed a motion to have a large-scale, paper-and-pencil session in December to accommodate transfer students and other students, and also to alleviate some of the testing load on the November testing session.
- b. The Testing Office stated that November 18th will be the deadline for registering for the December 2nd test.
- c. A question was raised about advertising. To date, the test has not been advertised by the Testing Office. The information needs to be on the Testing Office website and on their door. To target the 503 transfer students, Nele suggested sending them a reminder email (done through enrollment services). Departments can use the texting function through EAB to send out a reminder to students. Lori Smurthwaite previously suggested posting flyers (Rebekha will create the flyers and send to Lori S.); Nele offered to speak with Alex Hoang at the LAC to help advertise the test.
- d. A question was raised as to why the Testing Office requested to have a limit of 1200 students at the December test. Ken stated that there are not as many spaces available on a weekday as there are on Saturday; in addition, the proctors work full time, so they have limited availability on a weekday. The Testing Office will cap the test at 1200 and tell those students who not able to enroll that they will need to take the test in February.
- e. A question was raised as to how the Testing Office could procure more proctors and what the qualifications are for that position. Ken said he would look into this for the next meeting.
- f. A reminder was given the Testing Office that they need to send the record sheet to the GWAR committee two weeks prior to every testing session. As the next testing session is November 19th, this would mean that the deadline would be November 5th (no later than Monday November 7th). On the record sheet, the Testing Office needs to indicate what prompts will be used when and where.

6. Pilot proposal

- a. Introduction: More and more universities nation-wide (including CSUs) are moving towards Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC). This is the GVAR committee's original intent.
- b. John spoke about the WAC alternative proposal:
 1. Outline:
 1. The proposal is to have a pilot in Spring 2017 which would involve 5 departments (self-selected). John would work with these departments to create 4 writing assignments or projects across 3 *different* existing core, required sophomore and junior-level classes.¹ (These classes would become Department Major GVAR Certified Classes.) Students who complete those courses with a C or better would not be required to take the GPE. They would still need to take a writing intensive (WI) general education (GE) capstone course.
 2. The GVAR committee would examine the courses' syllabi to make sure that they have the writing assignments.
 3. To identify struggling students (currently about 10% of GPE test takers), there would be a 1-page writing sample within the first two weeks of the Department Major GVAR Certified Classes. Students whose writing is deemed problematic would receive support from the Learning Assistance Center or other writing centers on campus. Alternatively, they could be encouraged to take ENGL 301A and/or ENGL 301B. Eventually, it would be beneficial to create a center University Writing Center.
 4. The GPE would continue to exist, as would ENGL 301A and the current GVAR portfolio classes.
 5. The pilot would be used for evaluation purposes.
 2. Questions:
 1. There may be a concern that this is changing the curriculum.
 2. A question was raised about the transfer students. Nele noted that transfer and native students have to be given the same treatment.
 3. Lori: There are departments that don't do writing and are opposed to including writing within their curriculum.
 4. There is a misconception that having writing assignments in a class requires instructors to teach writing (and in particular, grammar). Instructors may be under the mistaken impression that they have to spend class time focusing on how to write.

¹ An alternative would be to have 300-level courses or higher. This would allow for equal treatment of transfer and native students. In addition, EO 665 mandates that the assessment be upper division: "All students subject to the degree requirements of the 1977-78 or subsequent general catalogs must demonstrate competence in writing skills at the upper division level as a requirement for the baccalaureate degree" (C. 1).

5. Faculty may be under the mistaken impression that writing must be research papers. However, there are many different types of writing (brochures, flyers, managers' logs, etc.).
 6. The logistics of this (coding) may be complicated.
3. Final thoughts:
1. This is proposal for a *pilot*. Only departments who are interested in participating will participate.
 2. The committee was asked to read John's handout and come ready to discuss this proposal at the next meeting.

7. 2:30 Time certain, Dr. Mark Wiley, Associate Vice President Faculty Affairs

- a. Dr. Wiley spoke to the current GVAR committee about the history of the GVAR.
- b. In the past, all this university had was the Writing Proficiency Examination (WPE). After freshmen year, there was nothing for students in terms of writing instruction. In addition, there was nothing for transfer students. All students could do was pass the test or retake the test until they passed. There was no connection with instruction or concern with helping all students (and not just the struggling students) *develop* their writing skills.
- c. The current 2012 policy represents a compromise. The exam is now a placement examination instead of an exit examination. The WI GE capstone courses were developed to help give students some writing instruction. However, we still do not have a program whereby students are getting consistent writing practice and instruction throughout their academic careers here.
- d. The GPE does not represent the ultimate goal of the GVAR committee. What we need to focus on is writing *instruction* and *practice* not only for the students who "fail" the GPE, but also for those students who "pass." We have a responsibility of helping both groups improve their writing. We need to look at getting students to write in their classes and not just focus on the test.
- e. Dr. Wiley encouraged the committee to continue or work on improving the GVAR and moving towards WAC.

8. Adjournment at 3:00 pm

- a. Next meeting December 2, 2016

Respectfully submitted,
Rebekha Abbuhl

(These minutes were approved on 12/12/16.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 3:00 PM
Meeting Number 7
December 2, 2016

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Jason Deutschman, Carol Comfort, Nele Hempel-Lamer, Jonathan O'Brien, Rebecca Lemme, John Scenters-Zapico, Deborah Fraser, Leanne Bergeron, Lori Smurthwaite

- 1. Approval of agenda. MSP.**
- 2. Minutes of meeting on November 4, 2016. MSP.**
- 3. Announcements:**
 - a. Nele spoke to Academic Technology about the possibility of using the large Horn Center computer lab for testing. They indicated that early next year they will have the platform necessary to create a secure testing environment and that Saturdays would be good days to use it for testing. This space could be available as early as April/May for testing.
 - b. The problem will be having enough prompts to do this. The committee will revisit this issue in the spring.
- 4. November testing cycle**
 - a. 2,463 students signed up for the November 19th test. The committee predicted that there would be a 10% no-show rate as that has remained constant for many years. Nele provided information on testing numbers: 2190 students showed up, for a no-show rate of 11%.
 - b. According to the information Nele provided, three prompts were used (antisocial networking, animal welfare, and banning books) for the three main testing sessions, while two (antisocial networking and animal welfare) were used for DSS.
 - c. 790 were reported to have signed up for the December 2nd testing session.
 - d. The GWAR committee added the testing date in December to address the testing office's concern that there would be an unmanageably large number of students on the November testing date. In addition, the December date was added to help transfer students. Given that there was not a large number of students at the November testing date, and due to the testing office's workload concerns, the GWAR committee can revisit whether December or May sessions are needed.
 - e. Reading for the November test will be 12/3/16.

5. Update on Institutional Research request

- a. Data was requested for WPE/GPE scores, GPAs and grades in critical thinking classes.
- b. However, according to the Chancellor's report, it would not be possible to use a lower division course as a replacement for an upper division writing requirement.
- c. A question was raised as to the success rate of students in English remediation courses and how they performed on the GPE.

6. Graduate student petition

- a. Some confusion exists for international graduate students, many of whom think a degree from anywhere in the world makes them exempt from the writing requirement. The requirement is that the degree needs to be from an accredited university in a country where English is the primary language. The list of countries (developed and approved by the GEAR committee) is on the testing office website.
- b. Wording has been amended on the petition to clarify this, and it was emailed to Nele to give to the testing office. Nele will follow up with the testing office to make sure that it is posted.
- c. Center for International Education has a list of countries for which the English Language requirements is not required. Suggestion that they could assist with providing this information to incoming international graduate students.

7. Academic Writing Assessment Task Force (AWATF) document for review

- a. A question was raised in a previous meeting as to what the committee wants to assess with respect to writing. This issue was addressed in the AWATF document. This document includes a list of learning outcomes for CSULB WI classes (which were then used for the GEAR policy), and recommendations for GEAR Committee.
- b. Document is useful for GEAR members to be familiar with and they are encouraged to read it through.

8. Pilot proposal: WAC alternative

- a. Recap: The proposal is to offer an alternative to the GPE. The proposal would involve 5 self-selected departments working with John to create a series of 4 writing assignments across three classes. Students who pass the classes with a C or better would not need to take the GPE, but they would still need to take a writing intensive GE capstone course.
- b. Issues that were raised previously (11/4/16):
 - 1. Parity: Can we have two completely separate routes for completing the GEAR requirement? Would students complain that we are treating them differently, depending on what major they are in?
 - 2. Payment: Can we require some students to pay a fee while others would not have to?

3. Policy: This would have to go before the academic senate.
4. Complexity: Would this pose registration challenges and thus potential bottlenecks to graduation?
5. Enforcement: Who would enforce this?
6. Control: Would this de facto make some classes required, which are not now currently required? This may be seen as intruding into departments' curricula.

c. Discussion:

1. This would be a small-scale pilot and totally voluntary. Only if departments are interested would they implement this.
2. CSULB has the most complex GWAR system of all CSUs, as many CSUs now only require students to take and pass one course.
3. Regarding payment, we currently have graduate students that can self-place, and are not paying the \$25 fee, so there is precedent for having differences in payment.
4. Regarding enforcement, more control can be given to the departments in terms of making sure their students are achieving their writing requirements.
5. Regarding control, a possible solution would be to help a department get many of their courses certified, so that students would have the same choice as before.
6. Ultimately, even if most departments adopt this alternative model, there will likely still be some departments that will need the GPE (such as those with predominantly foreign language classes).
7. Concern that administration of this WAC would be burdensome to some departments in making sure their students complete the sequence of classes. Implementing in certain departments (like business) may be difficult.
8. Pilot would bring up these and potentially other issues so they can begin to be understood and addressed.
9. Identifying students who need help
 1. The proposal states that the instructor will determine if any students need additional writing instruction. Question was raised about how that would work. Would the Writer's Resource Lab (WRL) be required to provide specific help for individual classes, or would students need to attend a specific writing center? How will instructors determine if a student needs extra help? How could students appeal such determinations? Would such determinations be required or recommended? What would be done with students who do not follow such determinations?

2. Concern that WRL already has more students than they can manage. WRL is supported entirely by CLA, but they envisage it in the future being more representative of the entire university. This would need a larger budget and space.
 3. Math department has a model for how this could work. In calculus I they use SEF to provide mandatory tutoring for students who fail their first exam.
 4. In capstone/WI course outlines, students needing help are encouraged to find tutors or help with the WRL, so the need for a centralized university writing center already exists.
 5. Suggestion to investigate if tutors could be found through work-study.
10. Concern with implementing this WAC change. Recoding all these changes will be burdensome on enrollment services.
 11. Important that any model enables transfer students to graduate in 2 years.
 12. Pilot is not just about the test, but also about determining interest and promoting involvement from the wider university. The pilot will also allow us to gather information on more issues than would be attainable through discussion alone.
 13. Ideas :
 1. Go forward with proposal as written (5 departments, number of courses as written)
 2. Scale it back a little (fewer departments, fewer courses)
 3. Continue discussion on December 16th or start of Spring 2017
 4. Table the decision.
 14. Motion to implement pilot on smaller scale, involving 3-5 departments, identifying two courses in a major, and creating/identifying two writing assignments in each of those courses: **M/S/P**
 15. John will begin reaching out to departments in Spring 2017.
 16. At the next meeting, we will discuss logistical issues concerning this proposal.

9. GVAR Coordinator's Report

- a. A student passed ENGL 301B, but failed the portfolio (due to his performance on the impromptu essay). Student was given the GPE, a week to prepare, and was able to pass.
- b. Issue was brought up at GVAR portfolio meeting, of rare case that a student was only interested in passing the portfolio, but was unconcerned with failing the class. Committee was reminded that the GVAR policy states that students must complete the class in order to pass the portfolio.

10. Spring meeting schedule

- a. 1st and 3rd Friday every month (2/3/17 first meeting)

11. Adjournment at 3:00 pm

- a. Next meeting December 16, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Fraser

(These minutes were approved on 12/16/16.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
3-4 PM
Meeting Number 8
December 16, 2016

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Leanne Bergeron, Jason Deutschmann, Nele Hempel-Lamer, Margaret Kuo, John Scenters-Zapico, Lori Smurthwaite, Carol Zitzer-Comfort

- 1. Approval of agenda. MSP.**
- 2. Minutes of meeting on December 2, 2016. MSP as amended.**
- 3. Announcements**
 - a. The committee was thanked for meeting late in the semester and for all of their hard work.
- 4. Update on revised graduate student petition**
 - a. The graduate student petition was revised to address ongoing international student confusion (many sought waivers from the testing office under the assumption that simply earning a degree from anywhere in the world was sufficient for satisfying the GWAR). The petition now reads that if a student has completed a degree from an accredited university in a country where English is the primary medium of communication, her or his petition will be considered.
 - b. The revised petition was sent to the testing office on 11/14 to be posted on their website (<http://web.csulb.edu/divisions/students/testing/gpe>). Nele sent the petition to the testing office in early December 2016, and it hasn't been updated. Nele will ask them again to update their webpage.
- 5. Update on piloting held on 12/2**
 - a. A pilot was held on 12/2 of six new prompts.
 - b. Leanne heard from Cynthia, one of the raters, that the scoring of the prompts from the main reading is occurring today.
 - c. Immediately before today's meeting, Charlotte from the testing office delivered copies of the students' essays written for the pilot. Copies of the students' feedback were also provided. However, we don't have the raters' feedback or the scores. A question was raised as to when that information will be conveyed to the GWAR committee.
 - d. A question was raised as to when the rating of the pilot prompts will be held. A decision cannot be made as to whether these are doable prompts until the scores

and raters' feedback are received. Nele will email Tracy and ask when the rating of the pilot will be held.

- e. 790 registered for the 12/2 test. According to LEEANNE, who heard from Cynthia, about 600 showed up.

6. Logistics of WAC pilot

- a. Last time, we passed a motion to have a small-scale pilot of John's WAC proposal.
- b. One of our responsibilities as a committee is to evaluate the work that we do and to simultaneously explore other options and best practices.
- c. The committee agreed to treat the WAC pilot as a means of exploration and fact-finding so we can obtain feedback from departments and other stakeholders.
- d. At the last meeting, John stated that he would begin his outreach to departments in Spring 2017. As such, nothing would change in Spring 2017. We won't be able to roll this out large-scale for quite some time as it is a complex process.
- e. The committee was asked for their ideas concerning the timing (length) of the pilot. Ideas included:
 - 1. The first semester (Spring 2017) will be John's outreach to departments, which could continue in Summer 2017. At the beginning of Fall 2017, John can report on how many departments he contacted and how many expressed interest in participating in the pilot.
 - 2. In Fall 2017, John can work with a limited number of departments (most likely two) to help them develop the writing assignments. During Fall 2017, the committee can seek feedback from various stakeholders (e.g., instructors of the courses, department heads, students, enrollment office personnel and other administrators, in addition to other stakeholders) to obtain their feedback and insights. At the end of Fall 2017, the GEAR committee can discuss the assignments that were created and review the feedback that was obtained from the stakeholders.
 - 3. In Spring 2018, the same steps that were taken in Fall 2017 can be taken, with the possibility of reaching out to more departments.
- f. The committee will continue discussing a semester-by-semester plan for the pilot at the first meeting of the new year on 2/3/17.
- g. Nele reported on a question raised at a previous meeting, which addressed the potential problem of having one group of students paying a fee to satisfy the GEAR (paying for the GPE test) and another group not having to pay that fee (since they don't have to take the GPE). Nele looked into this and stated that there was no policy that would prohibit us from having such a system.

7. Pilot as exploration: Questions the committee would like to explore in the WAC pilot

- a. The committee was asked to brainstorm questions we would like addressed in the WAC pilot. Questions included:

1. *Students*

1. Are students able to complete this process in a timely fashion?
2. Do student learning outcomes improve because of the pilot?
3. What are students' perceptions regarding the pilot (e.g., time it takes to complete, difficulty, relative utility)?
4. Will students have adequate access to the courses they need?
5. How will information be communicated to the students (internally for continuing students and externally for transfer students)?
6. How can we prevent students from becoming confused, as there will be different methods for satisfying the GWR (e.g., "why is my friend exempt from taking the GPE and why do I have to take it?")
7. Since there are insufficient tutoring resources on campus, we could not make tutoring mandatory for struggling students. How will these students be assisted with their writing if they are not required to take ENGL 301A or a GWR portfolio class? Could students who fail whatever writing assessment instructors give during the first week of the semester be required to take ENGL 301A and/or a GWR portfolio course? Would students have any means of appealing the decision?

2. *Instructors*

1. If an instructor of a WAC pilot course identifies a student as a struggling writer, what steps would need to be taken?
2. How will they determine whether a student is a struggling writer or not?
3. How can we help instructors understand that participating in the WAC pilot does not mean that they will be teaching grammar or composition, but rather for example, helping students "think and write like historians/linguists/ engineers, etc."?
4. Will there be faculty workshops? If so, what will they consist of?
5. What are the perceptions of the instructors who teach ENGL 301A and GWR portfolio instructors? How can we incorporate existing classes and expertise holders into the process?
6. How will information about the pilot be communicated to faculty and lecturers?

3. *Courses (including assignments)*

1. How would the pilot affect existing courses, such as GVAR portfolio courses?
2. Could the GVAR portfolio courses serve as WAC pilot courses?
3. Do students have to pass both the assignments and the course? What would happen if the student passed the class but failed one or more of the target assignments? What if they passed the assignments but failed the course?
4. What criteria would the assignments have to meet in order to be considered to play a role in satisfying the GVAR?

4. *Departments*

1. What are department perceptions regarding the pilot and its impact on curricular control?
2. How easy is the pilot to implement for departments?
3. How will information about the pilot be communicated to departments?

5. *Administrative*

1. How would the pilot impact advising?
2. How will the coding issue with Enrollment services be addressed?
3. What issues does Enrollment Services see with the pilot?
4. What kind of administrative effort will be needed?

6. *Evaluation of pilot*

1. Who will we need to seek feedback from?
2. How will we measure the effectiveness of the pilot?
3. What criteria will we use to determine whether the pilot should be continued?

7. *General considerations*

1. Relative utility: is it an improvement?
2. Workability: is it feasible in long term?
3. Complexity: how difficult is this for advisors to communicate, for departments and students to understand, to implement?
4. Compatibility: how can we make this work with existing structures?

8. The committee was asked to continue thinking of questions over the winter break.

8. GVAR Coordinator's report

- a. A student's request for a waiver was discussed.

- b. A suggestion was made to create an exception to policy form, which would be available on the testing office website. In the past, students wrote to the GVAR coordinator, who then brought it to the GVAR committee. (This, however, was rare.) Rebekha will create an example form and bring it to the GVAR committee on 2/3 for their feedback.

9. Adjournment

- a. The next meeting will be on 2/3/17.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebekha Abbuhl

(These minutes were approved on 2/3/17.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 3:00 PM

Meeting Number 9
February 3, 2017

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Leeanne Bergeron, John Scenters-Zapico, Deborah Fraser, Max Rosenkrantz, Lori Smurthwaite, Lori Brown, Jonathan O'Brien, Jason Deutschmann, Ken Kelly, Richard Tuveson, Margaret Kuo

- 1. Approval of agenda.** MSP as amended.
- 2. Minutes of meeting on December 16, 2016.** MSP.
- 3. Announcements**
 - a. Carol Comfort is on medical leave this semester.
- 4. Update on revised graduate student petition from Ken Kelly**
 - a. KK will make sure the revised petition is posted asap.
- 5. Request for exception to policy form**
 - a. Will be revised and uploaded to website soon.
- 6. Logistics of WAC pilot**
 - a. WAC alternative is a pilot. In departments that volunteer to participate, instead of taking the GPE, students will take 2 courses with 2 writing assignments. In addition, they will need to take a writing intensive general education capstone course. Can also have option for student to take a course in a different department.
 - b. The implementation of the writing assignment option instead of GPE will only be required IF the department wants to make it part of their program. There will still be a GPE option for those departments who do not want to put these writing requirements in their major.
 - c. Last time, we discussed Spring 2017-Summer 2017 outreach to departments to see who is interested in participating in the pilot program.
 - d. Fall 2017 John SZ to work with 2-3 departments to develop writing assignments.
 - e. Feedback from departments and stakeholders will be sought after.
 - f. If the initial pilot goes well, spring 2018 repeat the pilot on a larger scale.
 - g. College of Business is meeting to discuss. From an advising perspective there is enthusiasm for options. Early feedback from history is positive.

- h. Advantages to students include removing the stigma of having to take remedial classes if they get a low score on the GPE. Instead of focusing on the test as an end point, this ensures everyone gets writing experience and feedback.
- i. Factors to consider:
 - 1. Start conversation with enrollment services on how to implement this (Donna Green/Susan Leigh).
 - 2. Prerequisites – concern that adding 2 required classes to student schedules may delay time to graduation. Suggestion that we consider allowing one of the classes to be a co-requisite with the WI course. It was discussed that the timing of each course would likely have to be developed and set by each individual department.
 - 3. Instead of certifying particular courses for the GEAR, we could ask departments to show how writing is integrated throughout their major. Then, we could say that the major is certified. This may address some of the concerns with coding.

7. Pilot as exploration: Questions the committee would like to explore in the WAC pilot

- a. The committee was asked to think about additional questions we would like addressed in the WAC pilot since those issues brought up last semester.
 - 1. Suggestion to consider how the pilot would affect native English speakers versus non-native.

8. Evaluating the pilot

- a. Is it an improvement? Is it helping students improve their writing?
- b. Feasibility? Is it feasible in the long term on a larger scale?
- c. Complexity? How difficult is this to implement and to communicate to all involved?
- d. Compatibility? Does it fit with existing classes / structures of majors?
- e. Look at impact on time to degree

9. Testing office discussion of computer-lab offerings of GPE

- a. The testing office requested that we discuss the impact of not having the computer offerings of GPE.
- b. Turning over the scores as quickly as possible after large test days is very labor intensive on the testing office.
- c. To alleviate some of this pressure, the testing office would like to revisit computer lab offerings of the GPE.
- d. Discussion:
 - 1. Horn Center computer lab ready could be ready for testing by Fall 2017 (this would introduce an additional 200 test computers).

2. Need to run a pilot half in the lab versus half in the testing office to see if scores are different in the two contexts.
3. The testing office would like the committee to discuss the possibility of re-using the prompts more often than once every two years (through randomization). It was pointed out that this would need a lot of prompts to do.
4. GVAR Committee willing to discuss randomization as an option in the future.
5. Ken Kelly will provide information on other institutions that use random prompts, or even post their prompt topics online.

10. Topics for Spring 2017

- a. Get more information from testing office regarding computer test scores versus handwritten scores.
- b. Did December testing date improve the distribution of students taking tests? KK to determine from staff what the impact was on staff workload.
- c. Decide if and when the May testing date will be.
- d. Other names for WAC alternative
 1. GVAR alternative or GPE alternative suggested

11. GVAR Coordinator's report

- a. A student's request for a waiver was discussed.

12. Adjournment

- a. The next meeting will be on 2/17/17.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Fraser

(These minutes were approved on 2/24/17.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 3:00 PM

Meeting Number 10

February 24, 2017

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Leeanne Bergeron, John Scenters-Zapico, Deborah Fraser, Max Rosenkrantz, Lori Smurthwaite, Lori Brown, Jason Deutschmann, Ken Kelly, Nele Hempel-Lamer.

- 1. Approval of agenda.** MSP as amended.
- 2. Minutes of meeting on February 3, 2017.** MSP.
- 3. Announcements**
 - a. GPE testing session on February 18th had 17% no-shows (952 registered and 789 showed up). Discussion that reminders should be sent to improve attendance, perhaps focusing on those students that will be out of compliance if they do not take the test. Reading for this test will take place on March 4th.
 - b. Next test date is in April.
 - c. 8 prompts were also piloted (life expectancy gap, plagiarism, prison and education, tiny homes, textbook costs, teen sleep deprivation, violent video games and cell phone use in the classroom). 49 students participated (6 students/prompt). Reading for these pilot essays will be March 3rd.
 - d. Nele informed GWARC that there is a mechanism to prevent students from dropping a class automatically, such as 301A or 301B that is necessary for them to take. The mechanism is that students would be required to discuss this decision first with the GWAR coordinator or an advisor, to fully advise them of the consequences of delaying these mandated courses.
- 4. November and December 2016 GPE results: Correction and Update**
 - a. September testing session: no difference between native and nonnative speakers in terms of passing rate
 - b. November testing session: passing rate for nonnative speakers went down significantly. One prompt in particular had a high failure rate (anti-social networking).
 - c. December testing session: similar to November, passing rate for nonnative speakers was down.
 - d. Issue was raised that there is a wide range of failing rates for nonnative speakers over the 7 prompts currently used (ranging from 10% to 33%). For example, was

the high pass rate in September a fluke, or were the prompts too easy? Why was antisocial networking prompt so difficult? GVAR Committee will need to continue gathering data and reworking the more difficult prompts to generate a testing bank with comparable prompts.

- e. Suggested that it might be helpful to collect data on whether students are graduate or undergraduate students during piloting of prompts.

5. Update on revised graduate student petition

- a. The petition is now uploaded on the webpage.
- b. The catalog (under AA) also needs updating to remove reference WPE10 and WPE20 classes in GVAR paragraph. LB will look into this.

6. Questionnaire for students taking the GPE

- a. Suggestion to create a Qualtrics questionnaire for student feedback on the test was discussed
 - 1. John offered to work on questions to comply with IRB format.
 - 2. Discussion of need to formulate a clear objective for this questionnaire. The committee discussed the objective of getting more information from students about why certain prompts were ok, and others problematic.
 - 3. Discussion of how to provide such a questionnaire
 - 1. Link could be emailed to students, or sent via text or beachboard.
 - 4. Suggestion to gather a focus group of students shortly after the test and gather data in person.
 - 1. Willingness to complete a survey after the test or participate in a focus group could be indicated on the test registration form.
 - 2. Could provide participants with a fee-waiver to incentivize participation.
 - 3. Students could be asked for prompt ideas.
- b. Discussion on need for student survey and implementation to be continued next week.
- c. A side point was raised that we need to make clearer to students that they are allowed to ask for extra time in the test. Wording on registration form is not clear.

7. Update on WAC pilot

- a. Engineering and Liberal Studies are interested in participating in the pilot. Family and Consumer services are not. Will also be presented to College of Business.

8. Question of students who fail ENG301A or a GVAR portfolio course twice

- a. A 3rd attempt at a course needs permission from the College Dean through an appeal process.

- b. Students not passing ENG301A is usually due to not doing the work or plagiarism. Students wishing to take a course for a 3rd time need to have a discussion about the importance of passing the class.
- c. Opened up a general discussion on the need to get students into the right classes as soon as possible after taking the GPE.
 - 1. We can follow up with students that test into 301A, to make sure they sign up. Any bottlenecks of classes like 301A need to have additional sections so that all students who need it can take it. Suggestion to consider offering 301A in the summer and promote it to everyone who needs to take the class.
 - 2. Enrollment management for GVAR classes need additional strategies to reach out to students to make sure they enroll at the right time.
 - 3. Discussion of students who were permitted into WI-course but dropped from 301B because they failed 301A. Need better steps in place to ensure that this deviation from the sequence is not possible.

9. Testing office discussion of randomizing prompts

- a. Deferred to next week

10. May testing session

- a. Deferred to next week

11. GVAR Coordinator's report

- a. Deferred to next week

12. Adjournment

- a. The next meeting will be on 3/3/17.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Fraser

(These minutes were approved on 3/3/17.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 3:00 PM

Meeting Number 11

March 3, 2017

Members in Attendance: Lori Brown, Leeanne Bergeron, Deborah Fraser, Max Rosenkrantz, Lori Smurthwaite, Ken Kelly, Maggie Kuo, Rebecca Lemme.

- 1. Approval of agenda. MSP**
- 2. Minutes of meeting on February 24, 2017. MSP.**
- 3. Announcements**
 - a. none
- 4. Questionnaire or focus group for students taking the GPE**
 - a. KK provided the pre-test form students currently use for reference.
 - b. Discussion
 1. We could use a similar form for a post-test to be distributed to students
 2. First need to decide exactly what we are trying to achieve with the questionnaire.
 3. Suggestion to start with a focus group to discuss student opinions on the problematic prompts and get feedback
 4. Request for data from the pilot of these prompts to see if the non-native English speakers did well or not.
 5. Currently students who missed the deadline to sign up for the regular test are recruited for pilots, which means there is currently no control of population demographics. Perhaps pilot groups need to be more intentionally chosen to include a mixture of native/non-native speakers. At the very least, need to consider this data when evaluating prompts (e.g. if all 10 students in pilot are native English speakers, then that would need to be re-piloted with non-native speakers if possible).
 6. Suggestion to try to increase numbers in the pilots, so that data would be more reliable.
 7. Good idea to be proactive and look at why some prompts were problematic for non-native students to try to avoid this in future.

8. General agreement that some focus groups would be a good idea, particularly since the GPE is a new format of test. Students would be asked about specific material, general format, incorporation of charts/pictures etc.
9. Suggested to add a link to register for a focus group to the email letting students know their score after the test, particularly those who received a score less than 11. This requires more discussion of who would be running the focus group, and might require providing an incentive to students who participate.
10. Suggested focus groups could be run in certain classes (ENG301A, portfolio) at the beginning of the semester.
11. Suggested that purpose of this should be beyond just figuring out why those 2 prompts failed, and should include assessment of the success of GPE prompts in general.
12. Lori B. suggested gathering a group of volunteers for a focus group from students who visit the WRL. In coordination with the testing office, she will collect Names, ID, phone and email for volunteers. Students would be offered a fee-waiver for a 20min focus group. If the students score lower than 11 it would also be offered for them to take GPE again at next testing date.

5. Testing office discussion of randomizing prompts

- a. Current prompts are still new, so this would dilute the data that is generated from testing
- b. Suggested we consider reducing the hold time from 2 years to 1.5years
- c. Discussion of how many prompts are needed to randomize efficiently
 1. Agreed that more than 6 was necessary.
 2. 10 prompts randomized was generally considered a good number
 3. Suggested to use number of prompts proportionate to the number of students taking the test.
- d. Discussion that by June we should have used at least 9-10 prompts, so these could be used in randomized studies if needed.
 1. General consensus that GWARC would be open to trying randomization in June, especially given that these are usually populated by transfer students, who may be less likely to have heard about prompts.

5b. Testing office discussion of using Computers for testing

- e. This would streamline the process significantly for the testing office.
- f. Time could be extended if necessary, however this would require extra personnel from testing office to moderate.
- g. This would require randomization, because multiple testing times would be needed to fit all the students in.

6. May testing session

- a. Testing office believes that much of the backlog has been cleared, and that a May test date may no longer be necessary.
- b. Motion to cancel the May session: M/S/P

7. GVAR Coordinator's report

- a. None

8. Adjournment

- a. The next meeting will be on 3/17/17.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Fraser

(These minutes were approved on 3/17/17.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 3:00 PM

Meeting Number 12

March 17, 2017

Members in Attendance: Leeanne Bergeron, Deborah Fraser, Max Rosenkrantz, Lori Smurthwaite, Eve Baker, Jason Deutschman, Richard Tuveson, Cynthia Pastrana, Margaret Kuo, Rebekha Abbuhl, John Scenters Zapico, Danny Helmy.

- 1. Approval of agenda. MSP**
- 2. Minutes of meeting on March 3, 2017 as amended. MSP.**
- 3. Announcements**
 - a. Welcome Danny Helmy and Cythnia Pastrana to GWAR
- 4. All GWAR retreat**
 - a. April 7th 9:30 – 1:30 at BACC
 - b. This is for GWAR portfolio writing instructors – time will be spent looking at SLO, syllabi and course materials to bring them up to required guidelines.
- 5. Students who fail ENGL 301A twice**
 - a. Currently one student has a hold on registration
 - b. College Dean can give permission for student to take the test for a 3rd time, but GWAR need to come up with a set of guidelines for this scenario in future.
 1. General agreement to review each on a case by case basis
 1. Not very many students fall in this category (1 currently)
 2. Recommend they meet with GWAR advisor first, and have them provide a letter of support
 3. CP will write a letter for the current student.
- 6. Results from February 2017 GPE (main Saturday test)**
 - a. 801 students tested, 89.6% pass rate overall, which is usual
 - b. Handout provides information on breakdown of scores
 - c. Failure rate for non-native speakers (NNS) for all of the GPE prompts (September 2016-present) is ranging from 10.1% - 33.6%
 1. Range of fail rates for NNS is problematic

2. Pass rate of native speakers is very high

- d. Suggested that information on how the tests are graded could be provided to students on the website, but it was also noted that this information is covered in the training that the testing office and WRL provide.

7. Results from February 2017 pilot

- a. GPE advisory committee will go over student and rater comments from these tests.
- b. Still small numbers in pilots, which makes analysis of the data difficult

8. Piloting the GPE

- a. Piloting prompts in both computer lab and paper-and-pencil settings
 - 1. Proposed to hold a pilot where some students take the same test on a computer and others in a paper-and-pencil setting, to gather data to investigate if the contexts are comparable.
 - 2. Testing office indicated they would be willing to do this test for the April test
 - 3. Send an invitation to students who sign up for testing as well as recruiting via the WRL.
 - 4. Students will be randomly selected for computer vs. paper test
 - 5. M/S/P
- b. Review of non-native speaker performance on past prompts
 - 1. From limited amount of data it's difficult to make any conclusions
- c. Purposeful sampling of pilot participants
 - 1. For data analysis need better distribution of native and non-native speakers in pilots
 - 2. Suggested to target LAC conversation lab or ESL tutoring to actively recruit non-native speakers for pilots
- d. Increasing sample size of pilots
 - 1. Pilots are a lot of work, so maximizing efficiency while still generating meaningful data is important
- e. Increasing time of pilot from 75 to 90 minutes
 - 1. Concern that it would take longer to type than write, so students may need additional time if we move to computer.
 - 2. Students' feedback suggests they would like longer time.
 - 3. Discussion that longer time would require additional personnel hours to run, and may not improve scores.
- f. Implementing Lori Smurthwaite's suggestion to use WRL volunteers

1. WRL is actively recruiting for the pilot during prep sessions
- g. Other suggestions for improving piloting

1. GWARC urged to continue to think about this

9. Focus Groups

- a. Suggested to add a link when registering for GPE for participation in a focus group after the test.
- b. Or provide a link in the email to students when they get their scores asking for feedback
- c. Implementing the GPE was a big change in writing assessment on campus, so student feedback is important.
- d. Students may need incentives to participate in a focus group (e.g. pizza!)
- e. Suggested that we might want to try focus groups with students before they get their scores to avoid biased responses
 1. Students could be asked at the end of the test if they want to join an immediate focus group.

10. Review Process for GEAR portfolio courses

- a. GEAR charge is to approve and continue monitor GEAR portfolio courses every 3-5 years
- b. Suggested to take time to look over and review all the current GEAR portfolio courses. JSZ to organize how best to do this.
 1. Around 30 courses
 2. Move to improve efforts in monitoring: M/S/P

11. GEAR appeal and waiver process

- a. Suggested we investigate why so many students are put on hold, needing release to register for classes.
 1. Is it a lack of classes?
 2. Are the students not getting their scores on time?
- b. Create an FAQ page to help students find the information they need more quickly
 1. Leanne will create a draft for the GEARC
- c. Would help if students who take GEAR portfolio courses are unable to drop this class without seeing the advisor.
- d. This will be further discussed at the next meeting.

12. Advertising GPE workshops

- a. Postponed to next meeting

13. Discussion of randomizing prompts

- a. Articles on prompt reuse on Beachboard

- b. Postponed to next meeting

14. GVAR Coordinator's report

- a. GVAR retreat will be held
- b. Meeting participants will brainstorm the types of modules that work with GVAR portfolio courses to provide extra assistance to students that need it.

15. Adjournment

- a. The next meeting will be on 4/7/17.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Fraser

(These minutes were approved on 4/7/17.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 3:00 PM

Meeting Number 13

April 7, 2017

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Deborah Fraser, Max Rosenkrantz, Cynthia Pastrana, Danny Helmy, Jason Deutschman, Richard Tuveson, Lori Brown, Kenneth Kelly, Leslie Anderson, Leeanne Bergeron, John Scenters Zapico, Nele Hempel-Lamer.

- 1. Approval of agenda. MSP**
- 2. Minutes of meeting on March 17, 2017 as amended. MSP.**
- 3. Announcements**
 - a. Next GPE test is 15th April, 3 prompts will be used.
 - b. 2125 are registered for the main test, 44 at DSS, 19 non-Saturday = total 2188
 - c. Staffing is an issue that weekend due to Easter weekend. Therefore pilots will be carried out at a different time, on a rolling basis, sometime before the June test date.
 - d. Previous discussion determined a need to run the pilot with some students in a classroom, and some in the computer lab to directly compare the 2 contexts. General agreement that increasing numbers of students taking each test (increasing the sample size) would increase the power of the data.
 1. Important because no information is available about students participating in the pilot groups upfront. Pilots are currently offered to students who enquire about taking the test but did not register on time.
 2. Discussion that we could also promote the pilot with ALI and LAC to improve participation of target groups of non-native English speakers.
- 4. All GWAR retreat**
 - a. April 7th 9:30 – 1:30 at BACC
 - b. 12 instructors participated and reviewed policies in GWAR guidelines. Participants went over their course proposals and recertification forms. Instructors worked to make sure that their classes were within the guidelines. Instructors have approx. 2 weeks to complete the forms and submit for GWAR Committee to review.
- 5. WAC Alternative Pilot**
 - a. 2 departments have volunteered to pilot this.

- b. Materials have been submitted by the departments for GVAR Committee consideration
- c. Administrative issues need to be addressed regarding which entity will check that students in this pilot are satisfying the alternative requirement.

6. Outreach communication to transfer students

- a. Importance of taking GPE needs to be communicated to transfer students early. We want to test as many incoming transfer students as we can before SOAR (last chance this summer would be June 24 GPE test date).
- b. Currently, within a transfer student's acceptance letter there is a link with information for newly admitted transfers, which includes a link to GVAR requirement
- c. An exclusive GVAR email will also be sent out at a later date.
 - 1. The GVAR email sent last year created some confusion, resulting in a number of calls to the testing office and NLH.
 - 2. KK to determine what major source of confusion was for the students that called in, so that it can be addressed.
 - 3. Suggested to remove phone numbers from email, and leave links to informational websites.
 - 4. Suggested to change the subject heading from "important" to "urgent".
 - 5. LB has worked on a draft of FAQ to assist confused students, to be circulated GVARC for review.
- d. Suggestions to improve communication of the GVAR requirements to incoming transfer students:
 - 1. Importance will be highlighted in the online module students have to take before SOAR
 - 2. Students could be automatically enrolled to take the next available test, and make it an opt-out rather than opt-in process.
 - 3. Email reminders could be sent to the first cohort of students that have already declared their intent to transfer to CSULB. This can encourage them to sign up for the June testing date.
 - 4. Connect with local community college advisors. Could coordinate with University Outreach who have contacts in all local colleges to make sure that GVAR requirement is something they emphasize with incoming transfer students.
 - 5. Highlight the importance of timely GPE in SOAR.
- e. Request to have GVARC reconsider having a May test in the future for the transfer students

7. Focus Groups

- a. Suggested we provide a link in the email to students when they get their scores asking for volunteers willing to provide feedback in a focus group.
- b. Alternatively, an email address could be written on the board during testing, to invite students who want to provide feedback to a focus group.
 - 1. Suggested a piece of paper would be better.
- c. A Qualtrics survey was offered to students who took the test in March, but no responses so far.
- d. Suggested we hold students for 5 minutes after the test to complete an electronic / phone based feedback quiz in addition to focus group.

8. Advertising GPE workshops

- a. Testing and Evaluation office and WRL both offer workshops, but there is no cross-promotion between offices. KK agreed to have the testing office communicate about workshops with WRL.

9. GEAR appeal and waiver process

- a. Further discussion of the need for a mechanism to prevent students from dropping a WI course that they are required to take. This is because students are signing up for courses to remove a hold, but then dropping that class.
- b. Suggested that students need more stringent rules to sign up for GEAR courses. Otherwise students get 2 semesters after the date they get the scores, which can be up to 3 semesters after taking the placement test.
- c. Suggested to have group advising for students who have not yet signed up for the GEAR course they need. This would be useful to explain how important it is that they start taking GEAR courses as soon as possible.
- d. Important to get students to register at least on a waitlist for the class they need so that we can assess if more sections are needed and plan accordingly.
- e. Discussion of student needing to take 301A for a third time. Suggested that NLH could provide the signature for removing the hold for students needing to take a GEAR course for the 3rd time. This alternative to requiring the Dean's signature will be explained to the Dean of CLA by NLH.
- f. Motion proposed to let this particular student take ENG301 a third time with additional advising requirements, a signature from NLH, and provision of resources for success of this student: M/S/P

10. Discussion of randomizing prompts

- a. Articles on prompt reuse on Beachboard
- b. Postponed to next meeting

11. GEAR Coordinator's report

- a. Postponed to next meeting

12. Adjournment

- a. The next meeting will be on 4/21/17.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Fraser

(These minutes were approved on 4/21/17.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
Learning Assistance Center classroom
1:30- 3:00 PM

Meeting Number 14

April 21, 2017

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Deborah Fraser, Max Rosenkrantz, Cynthia Pastrana, Danny Helmy, Leeanne Bergeron, John Scenters Zapico, Margaret Kuo, Lori Smurthwaite, Nele Hempel-Lamer, Jason Deutschman, Lori Brown, Rebecca Lemme, Tracy Woodard.

- 1. Approval of agenda. MSP**
- 2. Minutes of meeting on April 7, 2017 as amended (BAAC not BACC). MSP.**
- 3. Announcements**
 - a. RA is unable to be at the GWAR meeting on 5/5/17 if it held in the afternoon. Need an alternative chair if Lori Brown is unavailable.
 - b. Reminder from Danny that ASI are holding a book and supply drive in early May.
- 4. Testing Statistics from April 15th testing session**
 - a. 3 prompts were tested. 2188 students registered, with around 10.1% no show rate.
- 5. Focus group/questionnaire update**
 - a. Need to start recruiting for focus groups earlier than 2 weeks prior. Testing office requests that they email Eve Baker directly to sign up.
 - b. Low level of feedback responses from questionnaire, however the opinion is that it will be worth continuing to request feedback.
 - c. One student providing feedback raised a concern regarding the political bias of the question
 1. Suggested to add wording to GPE tests that their opinions are not being graded, solely their writing skills.
- 6. FAQ for GWAR students**
 - a. LB has reviewed the reason for students making GWAR appointments to identify areas which could be addressed using an FAQ to streamline GWAR advisor appointments.
 - b. Updates to website have been prepared to better inform the campus about GWAR requirements.

- c. Final draft will be prepared this week for uploading to GVAR webpage, testing office webpage and also advising websites. Danny will look over the draft to provide a student perspective.

7. WAC Proposals

- a. Lively discussion of pilot proposal from History & Liberal Studies
 - 1. Current proposal form provides information needed to determine if courses meet GVAR requirements for WAC classes.
 - 2. For purposes of evaluation, GVARC requested a checklist of requirements. These were determined to be:
 - 1. 2 or more classes must be taken each with at least 2 writing assignments.
 - 2. Students must learn at least 4 different genres of writing during their curriculum.
 - 3. Assignments must be worth >10%, but <30% of total weight of the course.
 - 4. 1 assignment in each class must include instructor feedback and the opportunity to revise.
 - 3. Benefits of WAC GPE alternative were reiterated, including providing options for students to take approved writing classes outside of their major, which may speed up time to graduation.
 - 4. Concern regarding approval of single courses since this could lead to burdensome administrative issues such as
 - 1. Who would be in charge of deciding if students have satisfied the 4 different genres?
 - 1. Discussion if 4 different genres is necessary was referred back to previous vote of GVARC on this issue.
 - 2. Would advising offices/departments have to track this information?
 - 5. Suggestion that courses could be certified in a 'package' instead of certifying single courses. This would ensure students get a varied exposure to writing genres and improve administrative issues.
 - 1. Concern that this would only work for departments, like History, with a defined series of courses that all students take in order.
 - 2. This may not work for majors that have a wide variety of potential writing classes they could take in multiple combinations.
 - 6. Suggestion that departments could be give autonomy in the question of which combination of classes provide a broad enough range of writing genres.
 - 1. Does not address who will track/administer that the requirements are met.

- b. NHL requests that the GWARC use the pilot to really assess the impact that expanding this option to more majors would have on administration (enrollment services, advising offices etc.)
- c. Motion to approve the currently submitted proposals from history and liberal studies, pending discussion with enrollment services to work out administrative issues: M/S/P

8. Third attempts at GWAR courses

- a. Postponed to next meeting.

9. Students who applied for graduation but were (or are about to be) denied because GWAR not satisfied

- a. Postponed to next meeting.

10. Cross-campus GWAR questions

- a. Question as to whether a student can take a GWAR course at SC State and have it satisfy the GWAR here
- b. Question as to whether a student can take ENGL 301B at CSULB and have it satisfy the GWAR at another campus
- c. Postponed to next meeting.

11. Communication to incoming transfer students

- a. Postponed to next meeting

12. Discussion of randomizing prompts

- a. Articles on prompt reuse on Beachboard
- b. Postponed to next meeting

13. GWAR Coordinator's report

- a. Request for waiver for student.
- b. Motion to allow GWAR requirement waiver for this student: M/S/P
 - 1. 1 opposed, 1 abstained.

14. Adjournment

- a. The next meeting will be on 5/5/17.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Fraser

(These minutes were approved on 5/5/17.)

MINUTES
GWAR Committee
LA1 308
9 AM – 11:15 AM

Meeting Number 15
May 5, 2017

Members in Attendance: Rebekha Abbuhl, Max Rosenkrantz, Cynthia Pastrana, Danny Helmy, LEEANNE BERGERON, John Scenters Zapico, Jonathan O'Brien, Leitha Cobb, Rebecca Lemme, Rick Tuveson, Tracy Woodard.

Guests: Eileen Klink, Gary Griswold, English Department

1. **Approval of agenda M/S/P**
2. **Minutes of meeting on April 21, 2017** deferred no quorum at the start of the meeting.
3. **Announcements**
 - JSZ announcement that CSULB is in the preliminary stages of creating a University Writing Center (UWC). The Center will serve as a campus-wide writing resource for students and instructors. Its focus is to assist students with their writing needs, while also working with instructors to add and enhance writing in their classes. The Center would serve as the central hub and other smaller spaces on campus as The Center satellites. Writing tutoring (small group and individual) will be coordinated from the UWC. Already underway, 10 writing modules are being developed in collaboration with learning and tutoring entities across campus (Library, Learning Assistance Center (LAC), Writers Resource Lab (WRL), American Language Institute (ALI), Engineering Writing and Communication Resource Center (WCRC), Information Technology Services (ITS).
 - The Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Program is pleased to announce the 1st Annual Teaching Writing Fellows Program (TWFP) at CSULB for academic year 2017-2018. Six faculty, one from each college, will be selected to become a WAC Fellow (this is already funded and will begin summer 2017). In addition to other projects, these WAC Fellows will work in The Center and serve as recruiters for undergraduate and graduate tutors to work in The Center.
4. **Pending decision from Chancellor's office regarding elimination of GWAR.** A decision will be announced "mid-summer."
 - a. How to promote writing across the curriculum (WAC) post GWAR – UWC, WAC Fellows, GE Capstone WI courses, Supplemental Instruction (SI), and directed self placement are options suggested.
 - b. Impact of pending chancellor's office decision on WAC pilot – pilot on hold.
 - c. Impact of pending decision on GWAR committee actions – GWARC will continue with current committee actions while the GWAR is still in effect.
 - d. Impact of pending decision on students – GWARC will continue with pending decisions on students while the GWAR is still in effect.

Discussion from the English department - Eileen Klink announced that the English Placement Test (EPT) will also be eliminated. Focus on what are the possible alternatives

to evaluate student writing proficiency in the absence of EPT and GPE. Generally, ESL/ELL students are challenged. The campus can look for partnership pathways, including Early Assessment Program (EAP), American Language Program (ALP), Center for International Education (CIE), American Language Institute (ALI). EK also suggested that the GEAR Coordinator visit CSUSF and CSUSJ that have ESL tract courses.

.....
Although the GEAR may not exist in the fall, there are unfinished items the committee needs to address (in case it does continue):

5. **FAQ for GEAR students** – completed and final draft sent to Nele for publication on the GEAR webpage and Testing & Evaluations webpage.
6. **Checklist for evaluating WAC proposals from departments** – form was approved by the GEARC in December 2016. The Approval Form for Department Major GEAR Certified Classes was submitted by History and Liberal Studies.
7. **Administration of WAC pilot** – History and Liberal Studies departments will be advised that implementation of the WAC alternative is suspended pending official notification about the GEAR status.
8. **Third attempts at GEAR courses** – third attempt petitions will be submitted to the V.P. Undergraduate Studies & Academic Affairs.
9. **Case of student enrolled in GEAR portfolio course who is not eligible** to take that course – RA will contact the GEAR instructor to review the eligibility policies for permitting students into GEAR courses.
10. **Students who applied for graduation but were (or are about to be) denied** because GEAR not satisfied – LB will notify the major advisors for these students
11. **Cross-campus GEAR questions:**
 - a. Question as to whether a student can take a GEAR course at SC State and have it satisfy the GEAR here – No
 - b. Question as to whether a student can take ENGL 301B at CSULB and have it satisfy the GEAR at another campus – Not CSULB decision.
12. **Communication to incoming transfer students** Email outreach to transfer students will not include a telephone number for T&E, just the email address. Email has not been sent; enrollment services is waiting for Nele's final draft. June 24 GPE deadline has been extended to June 9th because transfer students have until June 1st to accept admission.
13. **Discussion of randomizing prompts** – discussion on hold pending status of the GEAR
 - a. Articles on prompt reuse on BeachBoard
14. **GEAR Coordinator's report** – CSULB will have the ePortfolio through D2L, which is vertically integrated with BeachBoard. Timeline for the ePort pilot has not been determined.
15. **Adjournment** – no date was set for the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Leeanne Bergeron

(These minutes were approved on 8/24/17.)