

Minutes
Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement Committee
Meeting 2
September 19, 2025
1:30pm-3:00pm

In attendance: Nicollette Brant, Lori Brown, Tom Do, Lisa Fascia, Katherine Guerra, Henry O'Lawrence, Loretta Ramirez, Deepti Singh, Courtney Stammler, Maiyoua Vang, Alexandra Wilkinson

Approval of Agenda

Wilkinson motions to approve the agenda, and Brant seconds the motion. The agenda is passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes (September 5, 2025)

Brant motions to approve the agenda, and O'Lawrence seconds the motion. The minutes from September 5th are approved unanimously.

GWAR Coordinator's Report

Brown discusses some questions that were asked in the previous GWAR meeting.

The first question discussed was about the external review process. Brown notes that last year, Ramirez put together a report for external review. Brown states that this usually happens more frequently, but as GWAR was in flux, the report was postponed. The external review will be on November 6th and will be a full 1-day review. Jody Cormack will be in charge and is putting together a schedule for that day. Brown states that the day will consist of an entrance interview, an administration perspective, possibly a discussion with Brown and Ramirez, student interviews, WI instructor interviews, and GWARC member interviews. Brown states that GWARC will receive a report and use it to shape the future of GWAR on this campus. Brown states that it would be helpful if committee members are available on November 6th at some point during the day.

Brown moved on to question number 2. This question addressed the future of GPEAC. Brown states that since the GPE is suspended, there is no need for the GEPAC to be filled or hold meetings. Brown also notes that the GPE is not officially canceled, nor has it been removed. However, the Provost directed that it be suspended. The main purpose of the GPEAC is to advise the GWAR committee on the GPE.

Do asks about the online modules referring to the modules written into the draft GWAR policy currently under review in the Senate. Do asks who will be responsible for creating the modules. Brown states the online modules are still being discussed in the Senate and does not know which committee on campus will be responsible at this time. Ramirez notes that what sparked this

question was a call to fill the GPE committee. Brown notes this is most likely a mistake since the committee is not officially dissolved.

Brown discusses question 3 from the previous GWARC session about AI and GVAR. Brown notes that an AI Amendment has been submitted to Senate for review. This amendment suggests that the draft GWARC policy include a complete ban on AI from all WI courses. Brown states that in her department, instructors are allowed to set the pace for how AI will work with a certain amount of writing assignments. The Senate has asked Brown for the working statement for a counter-amendment. A certain level of discretion could be allowed for instructors. Ramirez notes that her department will be developing a new WI class, and the faculty member is updating the syllabus as changes with AI occur. There will be discussions on how AI might enhance our work and how it has taken away our voice within the course. Brown hopes for some support and wording about AI within the GVAR policy, but not an all-out ban.

Brown moves on to question 4 from the last GVAR session regarding the campus-wide WASC accreditation that is coming up in 2030. In our last assessment, there was a desire for more program assessment, which would include GWARC. Ramirez and GWARC will need to link with Sharlene Sayegh to devise a program assessment for GVAR outcomes. Brown does understand that this will need to wait until a new GVAR policy is voted on.

Brown discusses Question 5 on the WI recertification process, and that the GVAR committee will be leading the recertification. There may be a GE template out there that Brant may be able to locate. This committee will need to develop a procedure for assessment.

Finally, Brown moves on to question 6, which discusses fully online courses for GVAR. Brown notes that the only absolute requirement for GVAR is passing one upper-division writing course, which is our WI class. Many campuses require only one class. There are many other campuses that have a WAC program requiring two or more classes to meet the GVAR. GVAR on this campus has been struggling with whether to accept fully online classes. Brown notes that this committee may need to rethink accepting them in the future. How colleges are meeting the GVAR is consistently changing and difficult to track.

Continued Discussion on Writing Intensive (WI) Requirements

Ramirez pulls up the current WI handbook created by a subcommittee of GWARC in 2021. The committee begins a discussion on the components required and important criteria to be considered for a WI class. Ramirez goes through the criteria and opens up the discussion to the committee.

The first component discussed is the 5,000-word requirement. Ramirez notes that when the committee first created a draft of a new policy, they requested that WI classes have at least 8,000 words. However, this has since been removed from the policy in Senate. Do asks if this requirement includes the drafting requirement or only the final draft. Ramirez states that it includes process work. Do asks that there are concerns from WI classes about teaching content versus the writing process. Do suggests clarifying that the word count includes multiple drafts and revisions. Stammeler states that this was a common question in the GVAR portfolio classes.

Stammler clarifies that if a first draft is 800 words, a second draft is 1000 words, and a third draft is 1500 words, these would all be added together. Brown notes that this is a part of reviewing the course, and the application is very granular. The GVAR committee can come back and ask additional questions and make suggestions on a class-by-class basis. Generally, we want to share that pre-writing activity counts. Brown notes that the reason this application is written in this manner is that GVARC was specifically instructed to adhere to the WI definition, and we did not make any changes to that definition. This was a continuation of the definition of the WI rather than a revision. If this committee were to change the definition, other entities on campus would also have input.

Ramirez notes that many instructors may struggle with writing assignments accounting for at least two-thirds of the grade. Brown states that it is also out of fairness to students in WI classes. If students are going to put in effort to write 5000 words, they should be rewarded and valued for their writing. Ramirez notes there may be some confusion on the invention piece of the WI requirement.

Stammler notes that the feedback requirement appears to be very vague. For example, when a student chooses a topic for a paper, they receive approval. Would this count as feedback? Brown notes she can only speak to the intention of the feedback requirement, and that was to make sure teachers are engaging with the students' writing. Brown also notes that the way feedback is submitted is important for review. Perhaps in the future, the application could ask what kind of feedback is provided. Defining feedback might be limiting since WI classes are campus wide. Stammler suggests refining the requirement that instructors must provide ongoing feedback.

A discussion occurs about the GVAR learning outcomes. Brown notes that these outcomes were decided as the most important for various departments at the time. Stammler notes that it is a good list, but the outcomes are more applicable to a lower division writing class. Perhaps more sophisticated learning objectives could be provided since it is an upper-division writing class. Do suggests having discipline-specific objectives. Do notes that many upper-division writing courses require students to incorporate concepts and create new knowledge. Brown notes that the campus may hesitate to adopt discipline-specific objectives.

Ramirez notes that in future meetings, this committee will continue to review the current WI application and consider the Impact of AI.

Next Meeting: October 3, 1:30–3:00 PM

Remaining Meetings: Oct. 3, Oct. 17, Nov. 7, Nov. 21, Dec. 5, Feb. 6, Feb. 20, Mar. 6, Mar. 20, Apr. 17, May 1

Save the Date: Thursday, November 6 – On-campus visit with external reviewer Mary Adler (CSU Channel Islands)

Adjournment: 3 pm

Submitted by: Alexandra Wilkinson