Attended:

Aaron DeRosa

Jessie Vallejo

Jon Phillips

Ashley Ly

Bharti Sharma

Brianne Dávila

Muditha Senanayake

Berit Givens

Denise Kennedy

Jesse Portillo

Jocelyn Chong

Keith Forward

Nick Von Glahn

Rita Kumar

Sara Langford

Christina Chavez-Reyes

Claire Whang

Neil Chaturvedi

Chitra Dabas

OVERVIEW
- Long process (longer than planned due to COVID etc)
- Dealing with curriculum demands
- Expanded ways to reach the 3-unit GWAR req from Chancellor's Office (ex. Activities, service, lab courses; sequenced courses) - Pathways to get units is big change
- Falling back to agreed-upon items with faculty: written communication rubric approved by Academic Senate (and curriculum committee on campus)
- Grading: pulled out, will be determined between Univ Writing Committee and faculty/depts

- Written communication is NOT just discussing grammar/mechanics (Written Communication rubric has 4 different categories and development of ideas, clarity of argument, providing evidence, etc. Are part of the rubric; not just grammar)
- Req of participation: with complexity of depts and making sure students are successful, we require that every dept participates in some way (identifying a course or a pathway, may include GE, keep track of which courses are expected to make sure students can make it through without increasing number of units)

Berit Givens – question – heard in a recent meeting that a 4000 word paper is required

AD: 4000 word requirement may be met in revised writing and in several assignments (or one that is revised); may include self-reflection or peer-reviewed process, etc.

ALSO: one major change to the policy (added to summary above about dept participation)

Jon Phillips – question – approval process for designated required major class?

AD: Policy lays out the process; similar to Area F; University Writing Committee (set up through Senate) will evaluate applications. Initial implementation will be a little different, AD will be helping and as will others to get everything started. Curriculog type of system (Keith Forward said we'll make it work). Depts will need to identify assignments, review rubrics that will, be used, ideally we'll have an easy to check off boxes and

Due date: Fall 2025. We'll aim to get started ASAP depending on how the approval process goes this week with Senate. We have about a year to figure it out. We're also dealing with other state mandates

Denise Kennedy – pedagogical questions – 4000 words / 15 pages

Do we need to revise ECO's to designate class?

> 80% of depts on campus already identify courses that assess this; not all necessarily meet the requirements yet, but a UWC and the univ will coordinate to help depts identify/modify these courses.

> Any number of pathways that includes 4000 words total is fine

Course caps being considered?

> [see below, Page 6 of these notes; basically 28 is cap but some variations may occur if courses are sequential or co-requisites; 28 is within range used across CSUs; no one is required to increase cap to 28 or beyond and this is meant to help protect faculty from being overworked]

Jocelyn Chong – reminded us in the chat of the rubric:

Context and Purpose for Writing - How well the writing addresses the audience, purpose, and context of the project

Organization - How well the writing uses a system to order ideas and concepts. (e.g. transitions, sections, paragraphs, etc.)

Development - How well the writing advances ideas using compelling and relevant narratives.

Clarity and Grammar - How well the writing uses grammar tools to communicate.

Disciplinary Conventions - How well the writing implements rules, expectations, and formats for writing within disciplinary fields. (optional at the university level but very applicable for programs)

https://www.cpp.edu/assessment/documents/written-communication-rubric.pdf

Christina Chavez-Reyes – questions about recertification and Area F revision model

Holds, technicalities, etc. create issues for graduation, faculty and students have to carry load of stress or what additional work may be needed

People from outside the dept may be making decisions on whether or not a class meets requirements of writing in the discipline

What would grace period be for any denials of recertification? What additional work will be required?

KEITH FORWARD: response – pedagogy and knowledge still largely overseen/identified/explained by Dept. / UWC would provide external guidance

For Area F – ethnic studies experts and committee is also unique to state law and the field of ethnic studies; also issues of cross-listing in Area F that GWAR doesn't deal with.

It's better to think of UWC being more like a program review committee, curriculum committee

Discipline-specific will be central, and then future coordinator will help faculty, depts, and committee

Grace period will take into consideration other factors as needed

UWC will be more of a resource and less of a demanding top-down; authority is more of program review and to help make sure certain assessments are happening and there are actually writing assignments

Suggestion: **rephrasing some of the UWC language in policy to emphasize the collaborative nature that Keith and Aaron described**

ADDED/Reworked section 2D a bit: with KF/AD/JV:

SARA LANGFORD: seems reasonable for how this may work for a particular class, BUT if the point of this is assessment, then how is 3e.2. is a mandatory component? This seems more developmental and maybe left to faculty prerogative. If there's a problem with a department not doing their job, that would be revealed in assessment.

> AD: GWAR is not simply an assessment tool; assessment is built in but if it were just a tool, then GWT would be perfectly fine with a benchmark; however, **writing is more of a process/development and this is about instruction**, and depts will need to figure out what that process is. Language in our proposed policy is slimmed down from across CSUs.

> Reminder that UWC will have representation from across colleges/departments.

> SL: Concerns about more regulations and demands (language issue in policy?)

> > AD: There is a CSU that has just one course that is a paid exam within a course and this policy is trying to avoid that situation. We're trying to avoid a top-down approach to what a GWAR course looks like while still providing basic understanding of what goes into a written communication course.

> > ADDED POST MEETING by JV/AD:

> > > In 3e., this is addressed as "*Disciplines are experts on the conventions and standards expected within their fields and writing instruction pedagogy should be adapted to those criteria.*"

> > > Giving examples, discussing assignment, etc., are some ways this could be accomplished.

MUDITHA SENANAYAKE: questions about parallels with Area F – faculty have to be evaluated, too. Will that be needed for writing intensive courses?

AD: in short, no, this won't be like an Area F committee

MS: What about faculty coming in with ESL or faculty training?

> AD: Faculty training is taken seriously in Academic Programs and the policy includes a position (writing in disciplines coordinator) who can work with Assessment, CAFE, faculty, etc to give faculty resources. These decisions may also be handled by the dept to choose who will teach the class in the first place. Resources will be available to help faculty feel confident in teaching these courses.

> MS: And who will make these decisions in the dept? Is this limited in senior year?

> > AD: Upper division (3000 or 4000-level taken at any point). Must be required courses (or a grouping of required courses/options).

Administrative process is in planning stages still, but AD will, be checking in with departments about their curriculum, looking for stipends to help faculty make changes.

JON PHILLIPS: Are we going to receive reassigned time for a Department Writing Coordinator? We have 5 tenure-line faculty and two B.S. programs. Our faculty is spread very thin.

KF: we are one of 7 or 8 CSUs that had a test; a large portion of the CSU has moved toward course-based. We have to invest some resources to build up our infrastructure.

6 WTUs of assigned time next spring (for the start-up of this process and a Writing in the Disciplines Coordinator for Sp 2024, Fall 2024, Spring 2025; still release time possibilities after but will be adjusted, possibly 3 WTUs unless other special projects are required);

series of workshops (stipends to attend) for interested faculty

Working with CAFE to build pedagogy strategies for teaching these courses.

(above = larger investment on front end)

Later continued workshops and help for onboarding new faculty

e.g. Gwen Urey told us at the last Executive Committee – onboarding of new faculty may include several days and workshops to help dept new hires (URP does this)

Plans are to make this a proactive approach. We've met this crossroads several times dealing with GWT, which was implemented in late 1970s. Then in mid to late-1980s, there were issues with students passing, so we implemented more writing on campus in more courses. Then semester conversion, every GE course was required to have this; but then in courses with 120+ students or other situations, not all faculty are giving feedback on writing.

GWAR is meant to be proactive and have more conversations, also to have more ability to adapt, be flexible, and build up resources, artifacts, etc. How does writing change? This can be flexible for that over the years.

In sum: some stipends may be available but we can't promise that at this stage; continuous funding for the coordinator for here on out; will have to respond to demand and figure out on-boarding process of TT and lecturers.

RITA KUMAR: earlier comment from Christina – language on section 2d1: sounds too much like Big Brother. Can we soften it a bit? "at any time" seems especially problematic

Could we soften the tone? (review cycle of 7 years that doesn't always line up with WSCUC or ABET and other accreditation/evaluation purposes) -- but yes, we can adjust this language.

Added post meeting by JV/AD: 2.b.iv referenced again and "at any time" removed to emphasize the supportive/collaborative aspects and soften any "big brother" language.

BERIT GIVENS: question about requirements for pre-requisites – junior standing?

> Could that be changed? Does it have to be satisfied? Maybe it's for EO665 but not all CSUs seem to enforce that. May be an issue for some math classes that could take them earlier as sophomores.

> KF: upper-division course could be fine and in line with policy; however, there's a caveat when we think about assessment and trying to assess near or toward graduation.

> KF: likes to try to get rid of permission codes, add codes, curriculum, etc., to make curriculum more transparent

> AD: For assessment purposes, when do we want our students to jump into a 3000 or 4000-level class? Sometimes this is a problem in GE. These are considerations that could take place in between UWC and Depts. Ideally, we'd want to avoid

BG: For each dept identifying/certifying a course: is it mandatory? Or could we choose an elective and then allow students to pick another course if they'd like to.

> AD: "choose one of X courses" could work; choice is part of the vision of this; but will there be enough sections to offer the course? We want to be able to plan implementation process and preparing departments to provide support if that's what is asked. UWC and Academic Programs would facilitate some of this.

> KF: Another caveat is that we don't want to elongate the path to graduate and 120 units or required units. Class should be identified somewhere on the roadmap and curriculum charts. Also work for transfer students. The hope of this being in the discipline is essential and key to the pedagogical purpose of this (rather than just creating writing courses).

Bharti Sharma: discussion in department (see also emails)

SFRs and class size:

4000 words – clarified but what about grading related to class size and workload?

Could we collaborate with GE courses to help satisfy requirements for students?

> Ideally students should be assessed in science; but if they're not prepared to be successful earlier on (lower-division courses, first and second years) - how do we actively think about our programs and get our faculty to come together to reimagine writing in the discipline

> KF: this is culture change we're trying to create and build the ideas and values of writing in our disciplines

BG: Questions about cap and will anyone be expected to enroll over?

AD and KF: no one will police this and it needs to be up to the dept and faculty to decide on enrollment caps, who's teaching, hidden work, etc.

CAPS – 28 – more in line with lower-division writing courses; most CSUs are in 20-28 range, only 1-2 we know of have higher (30) caps with caveats.

I spoke about the dept coordination efforts in Music (subcommittee)

Aim is to have a flexible policy enough that we can address most dept and faculty concerns

Policy currently allows flexibility in enrollment but based on discussion and if it will be viable.

Also the alternative ways to get course cap with co-reqs, sequences/pre-reqs etc. (where is writing component evaluated/graded and where will that labor reside?)

Writing spread across multiple courses/sequences also helps alleviate some of the enrollment cap concerns

BG: Planning for department faculty meeting:

Do we want to talk about X class or some electives or other classes be designated?

How can we know if there'll be a viable option in another dept or UD GE courses?

AD: Some departments are intending, but UWC could help coordinate.

e.g, recreating a grant writing course, technical writing course in EML (but make sure it's on a curriculum sheet and they can anticipate FTEs)

Some

Could Math consider creating an UD GE course? Faculty may need to meet with GE committee?

KF: UD GE courses should be scaffolded based on other GE courses (less from major courses). Could Calc III be based on Calc I (a GE course in LD) and then coordinate perhaps with other disciplines and broadening. Needs a balance. But then also this is meant to support writing in the discipline, so a careful balance between these three concerns needs to be made.

Culture change and embedding graduation requirement in majors – this is a decent job to try to thread the needle across different competing concerns across campus. *There will be support in this process.* Departments will be able to decide how active they'll be in this. Policy is meant to guide/support/be open to an evolution of writing in the disciplines rather than dictate what writing is.

GWT

10-12 CSUs (CSULA, Fullerton and most of our peer institutions) have writing in the disciplines

> Depts and disciplines are unique and should be recognized as such to value the writing we all actually do in our fields.

6-7 have a list of courses that are UD GE or additional grad req and then a fee; but this assumes that a type of essay that most students won't write in their professional lives after graduation is the best way to evaluate them.

GWAR as a graduation requirement or a major course will determine if they satisfy enough reqs to graduate

CHITRA DABAS: GWAR assignments and classes

> Administratively, students just need to pass the class; req is tied to course so a student cannot get a C- on the class and B+ on writing and still get credit for GWAR (more like American Institutions requirement in this respect)

> Do we have language in the policy about minimum course grade? What about departments with a D- or C- as passing?

>> KF: grade needs to be designated above current minimums. Could be questioned. There is a conflict of value of 2.0 grad requirement vs. D-...but 2.0 as C or better as standard is more in line with general univ-wide expectations.

> CD: Or what about students who do poorly on writing but pass the class?

>> AD: Part of our balancing act. According to written comm rubric at or near graduation.

>> Title V sets up A,B,C,D, & F for grading scale, but institutions can have the +/- (.3 of a grade unit); not used across CSUs and other institutions. There are inequities if they transfer straight across; we want to treat transfer students more equitably. KF will check into other CSUs use of +/-. How can we communicate several different standards across campus? Sometimes students satisfy all requirements but have less than a 2.0.

>> BG: suggested "CR" as meaning C- or better?

> Added by JV/KF after meeting: Might be able to promote writing req in multiple classes and majors – as long as students take any of the WI courses and pass with minimum grade of C, the GWAR will be satisfied; DPR coding – will have a bucket of writing intensive courses, one with the C or better will satisfy the requirement.

> AD: Group assignments – Aaron DeRosa made some theoretical assignments that could be made (e.g., grant, peer assessment, assigned roles, evaluate a manager's timeline, org chart, analyst's

reflection, etc.). Flexibility within group assignments is possible. See examples in shared folder for different tasks and ways of assessing writing in class.