Meeting of the Academic Senate
Tuesday, October 9, 2018
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 pm

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Orientation for new senators
B. President's Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA:
G. ASI:

IV. Special Report:
A. University Update by President Armstrong.

V. Consent Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRP 338 Digital Cities (4), 4 lectures, GE F (existing course proposed to be offered online)</td>
<td>Reviewed 5/10/18; additional information requested from the department. Recommended for approval 5/31/18.</td>
<td>On the 10/9/18 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCI 502 Research Methods and Data Analysis (4), 3 lectures, 1 laboratory</td>
<td>Reviewed 5/17/18; additional information requested from the department. Recommended for approval 5/31/18.</td>
<td>On the 10/9/18 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCI 550 Advanced Environmental Science (4), 3 lectures, 1 activity</td>
<td>Reviewed 5/17/18; additional information requested from the department. Recommended for approval 5/31/18.</td>
<td>On the 10/9/18 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCI 590 Advanced Environmental Management (4), 3 lectures, 1 laboratory</td>
<td>Reviewed 5/17/18; additional information requested from the department. Recommended for approval 5/31/18.</td>
<td>On the 10/9/18 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCI 596 Environmental Sciences and Management Project (5), 5 lectures</td>
<td>Reviewed 5/17/18; additional information requested from the department. Recommended for approval 5/31/18.</td>
<td>On the 10/9/18 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. **Business Item(s):**
   A. **[TIME CERTAIN 4:30 p.m.] Resolution on Course Criteria for GWR-Certified Upper-Division Courses Across the Curriculum:** Dawn Janke, GWR Task Force Chair, first reading (pp. 3-8).

VII. **Discussion Item(s):**

VIII. **Adjournment:**
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-__-18

Resolution on Course Criteria for GWR-certified
Upper-Division Courses Across the Curriculum

Background Statement:
The California State University Chancellor's Office established an upper-division writing assessment mandate for its 23 campuses in 1978, and the requirement was more recently codified in 1997 as Executive Order 0665, Determination of Competence in English and Mathematics. Two key points of EO 0665 are as follows: 1) Certification of writing competence shall be made available to students as they enter the junior year; students should complete the requirement before the senior year; 2) Certification of graduation writing proficiency is an all-campus responsibility.

The Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR) at Cal Poly currently invites students to fulfill the mandate via one of two pathways: earn a passing score on a two-hour, handwritten essay exam, the Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE), which is offered two or more times each quarter; or, earn a passing score on a timed, in-class essay exam and earn a C or better in a GWR-approved, upper-division, quarter-long English course.

During any given quarter, there are over 9,000 students eligible to fulfill this requirement. Generally, each year about 4,000 students complete the requirement by passing the WPE, and about 1,500 students complete the requirement in a GWR-approved English course.

In spring of 2015, in response to a 2014-15 GWR Task Force report, a senate resolution passed (AS-809-15) that outlined actions the university should take to address the issue of timely GWR completion, including the recommendation that "programs/departments develop a concrete action plan so that their students take the GWR during junior year."

Issues with the GWR program extend beyond students' timely completion, however. Whether students take the WPE or a GWR-approved, upper-division English course, there is a disconnect between what the GWR requirement tests and what experts in the field of writing studies advocate. In General Education (GE) A1 and A3 courses, as well as in lower- and upper-division English courses, students are taught that writing requires an understanding of audience and purpose; students are also taught the process of drafting, revising, and editing. The GWR as presently conceived, however, does not test for careful and intentional writing; rather, it tests for extemporaneous writing skills on an unannounced topic.
A 2015-17 GWR task force report (AS-839-17) suggested alternative approaches to the GWR for the university’s consideration. Above all, the task force recommended replacing the current exam-based approach by 1) expanding GWR-approved upper-division course options beyond those currently offered through the English Department; 2) enhancing the writing instruction and assessment practices in GWR-approved upper-division courses; and 3) ensuring that instructors of GWR-approved courses are sufficiently prepared for and supported in the delivery of writing instruction and assessment.

The task force recognized that the shift from an exam-based to a course-based approach to GWR completion should happen incrementally, with the final phase being one in which the WPE is necessary to support 10% or fewer students on campus.

The task force further recommended that the administration establish a GWR advisory board with representation from across colleges and chaired by the Writing and Rhetoric Center director, who coordinates the GWR, to oversee GWR practices and support writing and writing education across campus. The task force believed the GWR advisory board should partner with the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) and the General Education Governance Board (GEGB) in oversight of GWR-approved upper-division courses.

1 WHEREAS, The ASCC; the GEG; the Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT); and the University Writing and Rhetoric Center (UWRC), which coordinates the GWR, believe Cal Poly students will benefit from a writing-enriched curriculum in both lower- and upper-division courses; and

2 WHEREAS, The ASCC, the GEG, the CTLT, and the UWRC believe the university should offer a broad range of GWR-certified upper-division courses in both GE and major degree programs; and

3 WHEREAS, Writing instruction and assessment should become a formalized part of GWR-certified upper-division courses across the curriculum; and

4 WHEREAS, Writing pedagogy within GWR-certified upper-division courses should be aligned with nationally recognized best practices as expressed by experts in the fields of writing across the curriculum and writing in the disciplines; and

5 WHEREAS, Writing instruction within GWR-certified upper-division courses also should be aligned with expected GWR outcomes; and

6 WHEREAS, The instructors who teach GWR-certified upper-division courses should be supported accordingly; and

7 WHEREAS, Departments in all colleges should see value in proposing and offering GWR-certified upper-division courses in General Education and major degree programs; and

8 WHEREAS, The criteria presented for GWR-certified upper-division courses presented here are based on best practices for writing instruction; therefore be it
RESOLVED: That the university take an incremental approach to approving proposals for GWR-certified upper-division courses in both GE and major degree programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the university adopt the following procedure for certifying GWR upper-division courses across the curriculum; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the university adopt the following criteria for GWR course certification; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Provost establish a GWR Advisory Board, which includes the Writing and Rhetoric Center director, who serves as GWR coordinator; the TT/tenured English faculty member who serves as first-year composition coordinator; and the CTLT writing instruction specialist; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Executive Committee appoint one faculty member from each of the six colleges and one representative from Professional Consultative Services, each of whom is familiar with writing for audiences across the disciplines, to serve a two-year term on the GWR Advisory Board chaired by the Writing and Rhetoric Center director; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Associated Students, Inc., appoint one student representative to serve a one-year term on the GWR Advisory Board chaired by the Writing and Rhetoric Center director; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the GWR Advisory Board work with the ASCC and the GEGB to approve GWR-certified upper-division course proposals; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the GWR Advisory Board oversee GWR-certified course-related faculty support and GWR program assessment.

Proposed by: Dawn Janke, Writing & Rhetoric Center
Dianna Winslow, CTLT
Brenda Helmbrecht, GEGB
Greg Bohr, ASCC

Date: September 25, 2018
Criteria for GWR-Certified Upper-Division Courses Across the Curriculum

A.) Course Capacity
   The recommended course capacity for all GWR-certified upper-division courses is 25 or less, with a maximum capacity of 30, as currently practiced in GWR-approved English courses. Any GWR-certified section of a course with a history of being scheduled with a capacity over 30 will lose its GWR designation.

B.) Enrollment Eligibility
   Students must have junior class standing\(^1\) and have completed GE Area A with grades of C- or better in order to be eligible to fulfill the GWR in a certified upper-division course.

C.) Course Proposal Requirements and Process
   • All proposals for GWR-certified upper-division courses shall express commitment to two or three of the GWR-related student learning outcomes as listed under the newly developed GWR category in the curricular management process, and an explanation of how those outcomes will be met in the course must be included in the proposal;
   • Proposals for GWR certification in online upper-division courses shall follow guidelines and standards as outlined in the Resolution on eLearning Policy (AS-750-12) and consult with both the CTLT writing instruction specialist and an online instructional designer about best practices for teaching writing courses online;
   • The workflow process for attaining GWR course designation will be similar to the process adopted by the new USCP committee: proposals will be reviewed by the GWR Advisory Board and, if approved, then will move in the workflow to the GEGB or, for non-GE courses, the ASCC;
   • Proposals for GWR-certified upper-division courses will be approved by ASCC in all cases following recommendation from the GWR Advisory Board, and the GEGB when applicable.

D.) Curricular Requirements
   All approved GWR-certified courses must be at the 300- or 400-level and must include the following:
   • A minimum count of 3,000 total written words for the quarter
   • Opportunities during the course for both low- and high-stakes writing (minor and major writing assignments):
     o Low-stakes writing opportunities may include but are not limited to blog posts, journal entries, and short (potentially ungraded) in-class written responses to help students make meaning of course concepts;
     o High-stakes writing should require more sophisticated uses of language and should elicit instructor feedback that addresses both the form and the content of the student's work. High stakes assignments should ask students to engage in complex rhetorical tasks that build on Area A courses, such as

---

\(^1\) At Cal Poly, any student with 90 completed units has junior class standing; in the case of fulfilling the GWR, if a second-year student has 90 or more completed units, that student is eligible to fulfill the requirement.
synthesizing information, developing evidence-based arguments, catering a
text for a specific audience, etc.;

• The equivalent of at least two hours devoted to overt writing instruction that could
include combinations of any of the following:
  o Applying key rhetorical concepts into course content, such as those with
which students are familiar from A1 and A3, to assignments (e.g. rhetorical
appeals, logical fallacies, etc.);
  o Explaining the purposes and expectations of a writing assignment;
  o Discussing the disciplinary conventions and contexts of an assignment;
  o Examining models of written work to help students understand how best to
successfully complete an assignment;
  o Assessing a wide variety of sources and navigating the library’s research
tools;
  o Learning and following specific citation style guidelines (MLA, APA, Chicago,
etc.) for research-based assignments;
  o Identifying and accommodating the needs of a specific audience;
  o Reading and commenting on peers’ works with instructor guidance.

• One major writing assignment with a word count between 1,250 and 1,750 that
incorporates a process-oriented approach including the submission of one or more
drafts upon which students receive feedback during peer review (recommended)
and/or from the instructor (required) and are given an opportunity for revision;
Note: An in-class essay exam may not be used to assess writing proficiency for GWR
certification;

• Partnership with the UWRC Center to encourage student use of peer writing
tutoring during the revision process and/or to embed writing tutors into the course
on a one-time or ongoing basis (optional);

• The following course policies for end-of-term GWR Certification:
  o Students must earn a C² or better on the major writing assignment, and
  o Students must earn a final course grade of C or better with at least 35% of
the final grade based on the cumulative grade of all writing projects.

E.) Instructor Requirements
After the GWR designation is approved for an upper-division course, the department
scheduling a GWR class will ensure that assigned faculty adhere to the following:

• Completion of a CTLT-designed workshop series on best practices in writing
instruction prior to the start of the course and/or a department-designed workshop
series in consultation with the CTLT Writing Instruction Specialist (Note: All
instructors who currently teach GWR-approved courses will be required to
complete an information session and will be invited to offer insights on best
practices during CTLT workshops for other instructors);

• Adoption of all GWR-certified curricular requirements and course policies, including
the following:
  o Commitment to enriching the course with writing practices that support
writing as a process to learning and meaning-making, as outlined above;
  o Writing assignment evaluation methods aligned with GWR outcomes;

² This is driven by CSU policy guidelines.
• Clear communication about GWR requirements and policies to students (e.g., students must have 90 completed units in order to be eligible to fulfill the GWR in a course, and 2) students are aware that GWR completion is dependent upon a grade of C or better both on the designated writing assignment and in the course);
• Timely submission of grade rosters for all GWR-certified upper-division courses to the UWRC with clear notation of students who have completed/not fulfilled the GWR in the course

F.) Requirements for Ongoing Course Review
• All scheduled GWR-certified upper-division courses may be audited by the campus-wide GWR Advisory Board at any time (but at least every 4-5 years) to ensure that outcomes continue to be met;
• Instructors of GWR-certified upper-division courses will be expected to participate in aggregate assessment of student performance periodically, on a random basis, by the campus-wide GWR Advisory Board in an effort to inform continuous improvement of course design, foster ongoing professional development, evaluate the GWR program, and ensure alignment between the GWR and the assessment of writing as a core competency;
• Instructors of GWR-certified upper-division courses will be expected to engage in CTLT-designed renewal/refresher workshops and/or department-designed renewal/refresher workshops offered in partnership with CTLT on a regular basis.

G.) Implementation Plan
• Upon Senate approval, six or more of the upper-division courses from across the curriculum proposed to certify the GWR will be approved as part of Phase I of the incremental rollout to offer GWR certification across a broad range of upper-division courses;
• All courses selected for Phase I will be required 1) to engage in discussion during and at the end of the quarter with the GWR Advisory Board, and 2) to submit students' major writing assignment to the GWR Advisory Board at the end of the quarter, both of which will inform any necessary revisions to the workflow, professional development program, and/or course criteria;
• A timeline will be established to approve additional courses as resources allow.