Minutes

GWAR Committee

1:30 - 3:00

Meeting Number 13

May 3, 2024

In attendance: Lori Brown, Eve Baker, Jill De La Torre, Megan Griffith-Pina, Lorenzo Gutierrez-Jarquin, Ben Perlman, Loretta Ramirez, Deepti Singh, Courtney Stammler, Alexandra Wilkinson

Call to Order: 1:36 P.M.

Approval of Agenda

A quorum is not in attendance at the time. If a quorum is met before the end of the meeting, Singh moves to approve the agenda, and Wilkinson seconds. The agenda is approved if a quorum is met.

Approval of meeting Minutes for April 19. 2024

A quorum is not in attendance at the time. If a quorum is met before the end of the meeting, Baker motions to approve the minutes, and Perlman seconds the motion. The minutes are approved if a quorum is met.

Announcements

Ramirez notes that GPEAC just completed a session and approved three prompts for circulation.

Testing Update

Baker notes that the Summer Exam is Scheduled for May 31st, and June 1st. Baker notes that in April, a total of 2096 students took the GPE. Of those 2096, 1598 took the test online and 498 took the exam in person.

GWAR Coordinator's report

The GWAR Coordinator's report was not discussed at this meeting.

GWAR Policy Proposal targeted review

Ramirez notes that the policy proposal is currently with CEPC. It was previously put on hold because the new Cal-GETC policy was being discussed. However, Cal-GETC has been mostly resolved at this time. Ramirez states that the original GWAR policy proposal included two lower-division writing classes. More specifically, the classes would include composition and a critical thinking course in line with Cal-GETC. However, the critical thinking composition component is no longer mandatory for this campus under Cal-GETC. This will impact the

GWAR policy proposal, and the second lower-division writing class will likely be lost. Wilkinson notes that could change, but it could not.

Ramirez asked the group for their opinion on potentially losing the second lower-division writing class and about having the second WI course required in the student major. However, Ramirez notes that there has been a lot of pushback on this requirement.

Stammler asks if the committee can vote on the policy changes previously discussed and send the proposal to the Academic Senate. Wilkinson notes that it is still being discussed in CEPC before going to Senate. Wilkinson states that the committee has been working on this proposal for a long time and understands that GWARC does not want to compromise any more than it already has. Wilkinson also understands that it is not possible to please all stakeholders. Stammler asks if it could be up to the college rather than the departments. Wilkinson notes one possible solution could be for colleges to designate students to take a particular class by requiring that class as a major requirement already. While other colleges and majors could leave it open if they prefer to. Singh notes frustration about losing the writing courses and does not want to lose any of them. Perlman notes that losing the lower division W course is not ideal but favors putting resources into preserving the upper division WI classes. Gutierrez-Jarquin notes that it is valuable to ensure students develop writing skills early in their college careers. This will ripple into all other classes they take later.

Ramirez understands that the committee wants to keep all four proposed writing classes. Wilkinson notes that ideally, the committee wants all four classes but is willing to compromise with three writing classes if it is more likely to pass. Gutierrez-Jarquin suggests that keeping the two lower and only one upper division could be more beneficial. Wilkinson states that the transfer students would be left out of this equation. Gutierrez-Jarquin asks if transfer students could be required to take the lower division writing courses once they transfer. Wilkinson states that they could not be required to do so.

Brown thanks the committee for all the hard work they have done. Brown also notes that most people are in favor of the writing proposal. However, the pushback the policy has received is mostly from the implementation and budget. Brown continues that this is an academic policy and should be considered an academic proposal without discussing all the components the committees have no control over. If the policy passes, then it is up to the university to provide some form of funding. Brown notes that if this policy does not pass, it is up to the university to develop another option. Brown also notes that very few amendments have been put forth by members of CEPC at this time.

Brown continues the discussion about the WI class being in the discipline. Brown is in favor of keeping the WI in the discipline. Brown notes that some people seem receptive to changing the definition to include in the discipline or in related discipline. Brown notes another possible solution is to have one WI from any discipline and the other that can be in the discipline or related. Wilkinson is in support of compromising. Wilkinson also notes that some students may want to take a WI class in their minor instead of their major. Wilkinson also asked how discipline-related would be defined. Brown envisions that each discipline would get a form to fill out to determine what class qualifies for which disciplines. Brown notes that this committee would not determine whether a class qualifies as discipline specific. This would be left up to the

disciplines. Brown states that either way, this campus will have to double the number of WI classes. Ramirez agrees with Wilkinson that allowing students to explore in one WI class can be beneficial while having another a more discipline-specific WI. Brown states that she can support this.

Stammler notes that if this campus removes the GPE then we need the writing to occur in the classes. Stammler adds that to have a valuable degree from this university, the degree must include writing.

New Business

New business was not discussed at this meeting.

Adjournment: 2:57 P.M.

Submitted by, Alexandra Wilkinson