

**2016-17 FACULTY SENATE
GRADUATES STUDIES POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

September 20, 2016

Approved: October 18, 2016

Members Present: Bogazianos, Bradley, Cowan, Hembree La Rocco, Lindsay, Newsome, Shimabukuro, Topping, Wassmer

Members Absent: Pinch, Vargas

Guests Present: Michayd, Endriga, Hayes

- a. **Call to order:** Called to order at approximately 8:30 a.m.
- b. **Open Forum:** Topping announced that Engineering has been reaccredited another 6 years. Wassmer asked if we had grad enrollment numbers for this year, for which there was no definitive answer.
- c. **Minutes of September 6, 2016:** Approved.
- d. **Approval of Agenda:** Approved.
- e. **Information Items**

- a. Report from Chair

Bogazianos noted that the Blended Programs Policy was still being debated in the full Senate, and that the Undergraduate/Graduate Degrees Policy had been sent back to GSPC by the Senate Executive Committee because it had been made aware that a number of current policies already exist that might overlap with and contradict language in the proposed policy. Bogazianos stated that this would be new discussion item for GSPC soon.

- b. Report from Graduate Dean

Dean Newsome had previously asked about a possible GSPC rep on the CAT/CIM Committee, but stated that it makes more sense to have GSPC's rep on CPC report back to GSPC on the matter. Newsome also reported that, due to vendor change issues coming from the Chancellor's office, the CSU Mentor product currently in use will not be in use after May 30th, so there will be no grad admissions extensions this AY, and that April 1 will be a hard deadline for all grad applications.

- c. Report from Statewide Senate

Nothing to report at this time.

- f. **Discussion Items**

- a. New Business: Discussion of Grad GWAR

Discussion began with basic background description of grad GWAR—how the WPJ had formerly been used for grad level, but that it wasn't self-supported in the same way as the WPJ for undergrad. Members noted that data from projects piloting changes to grad GWAR would be most useful. Current GWAR coordinator Hogan Hayes, present at the meeting, stated that he believes the GWAR coordinator should be part of the process,

and that he is interested in providing assistance to GSPC in this matter, as well as in collecting data towards that end. Possible variations of how to actually collect writing samples from grad programs were discussed (such as SacCT, which a number of members were less enthusiastic about; Portfolium, a software platform that is free for students now, but will probably increase costs down the road), with no consensus concerning which method to officially adopt in the future. Other suggestions included requiring paper uploads as part of a grad class, and comparing samples from GWI and non-GWI courses. It was also suggested that GEAR policy be made an explicit part of Graduate Learning Goals submitted by programs. While a number of members believed that updating the GEAR was important, Wassmer did note that his program did not have any issues with the current process, and believed that the GRE entry scores currently used by the program seemed to be adequate measures of basic writing proficiency. Wassmer also suggested that more GWI courses be offered instead of updating the whole process.

While no consensus emerged concerning exactly how the GEAR process should be updated (if at all), the Committee did agree that GEAR Coordinator Hayes, working with Dean Newsome (both of whom volunteered), would create a pilot data-gathering project by establishing a writing sample review team, comprised of multi-disciplinary representatives from across the University. Writing samples would be acquired from grad programs by the end of the Fall 2016 semester, and initial data would be ready for discussion by the first GSPC meeting of the Spring 2017 semester. While a number of Committee members were concerned with validity issues regarding the draft rubric (derived from the VALUE rubrics) that will be used in the pilot assessment, the Committee did agree that, at least for the pilot, the current draft rubric will be used. Rubric issues, at both the program and institutional levels, will continue to play a part in future GEAR discussions.

b. New Business: Grad Program Review

Wassmer asked a basic, important question: What is the state of grad program review within regular 6 year department level reviews? Because there wasn't one clear answer to this, it was decided that GSPC invite Dr. Jeffrey Brodd of APROC to have this conversation with the Committee at a future meeting.

Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:10 a.m.

Dimitri Bogazianos, Chair, GSPC