

## **Minutes**

### **GWAR Committee**

**1:30 – 3:00**

### **Meeting Number 10**

**March 1, 2024**

**In attendance:** Nicollette Brant, Lori Brown, Jill De La Torre, Tom Do, Lorenzo Gutierrez-Jarquín, Henry O'Lawrence, Benjamin Perlman, Loretta Ramirez, Deepti Singh, Courtney Stammler, Alexandra Wilkinson

**Call to order:** 1:38 P.M.

### **Approval of Agenda**

Wilkinson moves to approve the agenda, and Brant seconds the motion. The agenda is unanimously approved.

### **Approval of meeting Minutes for February 16, 2024**

Singh motions to approve the amended meeting minutes, and Perlman seconds the motion. The minutes are approved as amended.

### **Announcements**

Brown discusses the student case reviewed at the last GWAR meeting regarding CSU Fully Online. Brown notes that the student was granted approval to have the CSU fully online course count as the GWAR course at CSULB. GWAR advising determined that there was some confusion over the CSU Fully Online course and the student's department. The student has now met the GWAR.

### **Testing Update**

Brown discusses notes from the testing office. Brown notes that the previous GPE has been graded. Scores will be released to the students soon. Brown also notes that one topic had a lower pass rate and will be examined.

### **GWAR Coordinator's report**

Brown discusses the draft GWAR policy proposal. Brown notes that the GE policy is also simultaneously changing. The changes to GE will impact the current draft GWAR proposal. Brown notes that the committee can make changes to the policy now before the changes to GE begin implementation or after GE changes occur. At this time, Brown supports making changes

ahead of time. Brant on GWARC is also the chair of the General Education Governing Committee (GEGC). GEGC will be responsible for drafting a policy on the changing GE requirements.

The new GE changes are titled California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC). This policy aligns the GE pattern transfer requirements for students transferring to a UC or a CSU system. This committee needs to change our draft policy to match the requirements of the new GE policy. The draft of the GWAR policy will be discussed in the Curriculum and Educational Policies Council (CEPC) before the draft of the GE policy. Wilkinson asks when the policy needs to be implemented. Brant states that implementation by law needs to begin by 2025. Rolling it out is another story, but we are waiting on the Board of Trustees to decide whether this requirement will also apply to 1st-year students rather than transfer students.

The component that impacts our GWAR draft proposal includes changes to the lower division writing classes that our current draft policy is calling W classes. The new GE policy will impact A1 courses such as Freshman Composition, which may require a minimum of 5,000 words, of which 4,000 are from final drafts.

There will also be changes to the A2 requirement, which is titled Critical Thinking in the current GE system. This class will be changed to Critical Thinking and Composition and will require a 5,000-word minimum of writing to be completed. GWARC draft policy originally planned course two to be a very open course. However, the policy needs to specify it more. Our definition of W class will also need to change.

Brown notes that other components to be aware of include class caps. Our current policy states that the W courses must be capped at 25. However, Freshman Composition is currently capped at 22 students. Brown suggests having a range of for the class cap. Suggested wording includes "It is recommended that the course is capped at 18 but no more than 22" might work. Singh notes that we should keep it at 18 and not sway because it will most likely end with 22 as the cap.

Wilkinson is concerned about the word increase, especially since 4,000 words need to be from a final product. Ramirez notes that many composition instructors may be overwhelmed, especially considering the final product requirements. Currently, composition classes do not require a word count. Stammler notes that her composition classes meet the 5,000 words. Stammler would like the final product to be clearer. Brown notes that the pedagogical reasons for keeping the classes low may surpass the need to keep finances lower. Do and Stammler note that increasing class sizes would not be welcomed in the English department. Do notes that framing the 5,000 word requirement as something that instructors are already doing rather than something new being introduced will be helpful.

Brant discusses the Cal-GETC policy. Brant also welcomes any suggestions from the committee in drafting the new GE policy. Brant is open to adding the class size limit to the draft GE policy.

Brown would like the committee to have a recommendation about the A2 courses in the new GE policy. Brown discusses keeping the current critical thinking classes on this campus. Should critical thinking and composition remain a philosophy class, or should they be spread throughout

campus? The committee favors having critical thinking courses throughout disciplines rather than in one department.

Brown asks the committee about the 3,500-word requirement that only applies to one upper-division W class in the current draft policy after GE changes. Brown asks the committee if we want to keep this third class at 3,500 words or change it to 5,000 words. Wilkinson notes she is usually in favor of more writing being required. Ramirez notes that she is in favor of upper-division writing courses that could focus less on writing and more on critical reading, discussion, presentations, and other modalities of analysis. It may make sense for the upper-division writing course to focus less on word count. Brown notes that keeping them all the same will simplify the application process.

Brown also discusses the definition of in the discipline and if the upper division should be discipline-specific. Currently, the WI states that it needs to be discipline-specific. The committee has experienced pushback about requiring departments to have their own WI class. Brown asks if it should be simple, such as a social science class can meet the GVAR, or if it needs to be specific such as the Psychology, Sociology, and Anthropology departments all need to have their own WI class. Do mentions that other disciplines may be conceptualizing writing and composition differently from the writing they are doing in their discipline. Do discusses that many instructors may think of composition as analyzing Shakespeare, which is not happening. Do notes that instead composition is very broad and is generally grounded in a discipline. Do is in favor of demystifying what composition is. Brant states that the GE policy states that composition should go beyond literary criticism. Singh agrees that the policy needs to clarify what composition is. Composition can include writing lab reports. Brown notes that there is a fear that they are not writing teachers so they cannot grade writing, but that is not true. Do notes that this policy needs to help shape faculty perception of what composition is. As long as classes include analyzing and writing for a specific audience and a specific purpose, that is writing regardless of the discipline. Brown suggests having samples and descriptions to help ease faculty misunderstanding.

Brown notes the Charter was not well received. This is potentially because the GVAR policy is broader while the UWC (that also had a Charter) is more specific. Brown notes that perhaps the funding of the policy could be moved into the actual policy. Brown also notes that this committee needs to include the modules in the policy.

### **Old Business**

WAC Proposal – Online Module Ideas were briefly discussed in reference to include them in the policy.

### **New Business**

**Adjournment:** 3:06 P.M.

Submitted by,

Alexandra Wilkinson