

MINUTES

Writing Subcommittee

Monday, March 16, 2025

10-11:30am

Zoom: <https://csueb.zoom.us/j/8064316844?pwd=a1Brb1AvamRYRnB4N0p4eINiWXlQZz09>

Meeting ID: 806 431 6844

Passcode: 346365

Attendees: Sarah Nielsen, Katie Bramlett, Susi Ferrarello, Maureen Scharberg, Sara Schupak, Michelle, St. George, Yi He, Kevin Kaatz, Nancy White, Lori Felton

Agenda [[25-26 land acknowledgement + secretary sign up](#)]

1. [Land acknowledgement](#) (Katie)
2. Secretary appointment (Maureen)
3. Approval of the agenda (motion to Sara, 2nd Nancy); Approved by unanimous consent
4. Approval of the [3-2-26 minutes](#) (motion to approve Kevin, 2nd Lori); Approved by unanimous consent
5. Committee updates
 - a. [25-26 CIC 32: CIC Policies and Procedures](#) (still in progress)
 - i. On ExComm agenda for 3/17
 - b. CSU - Adobe for All grant proposal from East Bay (composition and WAC)
 - i. Congratulations to Michelle and Katie – they have now been officially recognized that they have received this proposal by the CO.
 - ii. Michelle noted that a range of proposals received by the CO. Look for a call for proposals.
 - iii. Katie noted that there will be a system-wide professional development meeting with others; hope to build relationships across
 - iv. Sarah recognized how this is great work for our campus
 - c. Updates on welcome letter, request for feedback from writing liaisons
 - i. Sarah is beginning to send out welcome letters.
 - ii. Sarah will send out Google form to our liaison – to get a sense of their efforts; also would they like to have a future workshop; get feedback on charge and responsibilities of the writing liaisons.
 - iii. Katie reached back out to JP.
 - iv. Sarah noted that Ana Almeida did not attend; email exchange and does not need any support right now. Sarah notes that Ana will reach out to Katie in the future; Katie will reach out to Ana.
6. Proposal review using the [Decision sheet](#)
 - a. **GE Area 1B Critical Thinking and Composition Proposals** [[review rubric](#)]
None at this time
 - b. **University Writing Requirement Proposals** [[review rubric](#)]
None at this time

7. Old Business

a. Writing liaison meeting debrief and follow up

- i. Sarah wanted to give some time for follow up as a committee
 1. Sara is excited that we had this meeting with the writing liaisons; hope they felt they are supported. So many things to talk about with respect to writing, especially considering AI. Find ways to support their roles as liaisons, in representing their department; bring ideas to colleagues and to to liaise between faculty and our committee.
 2. Michelle shared her meeting with Sarah and Katie; discussed about building AI literacies that might influence AI policy. Perhaps begin at foundational writing pedagogies and integrate AI (since it can be overwhelming and changing); thus, anchor to our writing pedagogy; share with liaisons to then take back to their departments.
 3. Sarah asked how we will get those foundational writing pedagogies out to faculty?
 - a. Lori suggested offering workshops on peer-group writing and shared writing. This might be areas to help shepherd these writing pedagogies within the writing content, especially in the writing capstones.
 - b. Sara suggested that maybe liaisons come to two meetings and then Katie and/or Michelle could do a writing pedagogy workshop. (listen to audio)
 - i. Sarah noted this might help with the liaisons.
 - c. Michelle noted that CSU San Marcos (. She noted that if we had extra time, create videos. For example, maybe a short video on what we mean by scaffolded writing? She is suggesting ways that we can think about these concepts. Sarah noted that we could refer faculty to these search videos; perhaps we could think of a list of topics. If we had some time at the end of semester, we could develop some short scripts and divide the duties.
 - i. Sarah noted topics may include: Scaffolding assignments, feedback anchored to topic, guidance of peer review, guidance on collaborative review; focus on foundational pedagogy.
 - ii. Sara noted writing pedagogy with AI; basic writing pedagogy, considering AI.
 - iii. Perhaps also “low stakes” vs “high stakes” writing; rhetorical situation.
 - iv. Michelle noted genre, audience

- v. Sarah noted perhaps an overview of the writing process for those who might not have experience with writing pedagogy.
 - 1. For example, MIT research results noting brain activity for using AI for writing.
- vi. Lori noted that evaluating sources might be good to include.

b. Writing classes in certificate programs

- i. Lori brought this up last time. Sarah wanted to know if she had talked to Mitch.
- ii. Lori did ask about certificates in Senate and whether writing was being considered. The response was that in some courses it is needed and some it was not – it depended on the department
- iii. Sarah was wondering that when these proposals came up to CIC, maybe advocate for more writing in these certificates?
- iv. Kevin noted that by the time they come to CIC and CAPR that the design is already done. Maybe contact the departments/programs at the design stage?
- v. Sarah noted that this is something to continue to advocate for both state and self-support certificates.
- vi. Katie noted that perhaps we can give a presentation to chairs at the beginning of the academic year, reinforcing writing across the curriculum, including certificate development. Perhaps send a message to the chairs at the end of AY (Sarah and Katie can work on a message).
 - 1. Kevin noted that the Deans/Chairs monthly meeting would be a good place to present this information.
 - 2. Katie would like to do this.
 - 3. Sarah will work with Katie to determine the points of this meeting and get on the agenda for the chair/deans meeting.
 - 4. Sarah noted that repeated messaging will help.

8. New Business

- a. UWR recertification and assessment planning
 - i. [GWAR Policy](#) (for reference)
 - ii. [2025-26 GE Framework](#) (for reference)
 - iii. [Long-term ILO Assessment Plan](#) (for reference)
 - iv. [Brainstorming document](#)
 - 1. Kevin (along with Nancy) described his brainstorming ideas in this document
 - a. Assessing course or assignment?
 - b. Rubric?

- c. Started with assessment; wrote down process on how assessment process occurs; how assignments are collected, etc.
- d. Talks about how individuals are selected as assessors and how they are assigned to the assessment.

2. Recertification:

- a. With UWR classes, could we work with those faculty who are assessing ILO Written Communication?
- b. Kevin noted that coordinating with Ana (ILO subcommittee) might work for “double-dipping” and assurance of getting good data.
- c. Maureen noted that it makes sense to conduct the UWR assessment with ILO Written Communication.
- d. Katie noted that she agrees, but because these classes are doing so much, it would be interesting to see how these assignments are meeting all outcomes and how the instructors are coordinating all these outcomes.
 - i. Katie is curious on what this all looks like. Maybe interviews are more of an option? How are instructors navigating these outcomes and are students experiencing it?
- e. Kevin replied that we are assessing an assignment vs a process (like writing scaffolding)
- f. Sara wondered if we could conduct research (random sampling)? Or the context behind an assignment?
 - i. Maybe how we support these courses?
 - ii. Wonder if this is part of the recertification?
 - iii. Maybe investigating a promising practices?
- g. Sarah noted that we will have a lot fewer recertifications in 2028 (go to audio)
 - i. Could we make recertification a supportive process?
- h. Michelle stated that it is a lot of work for these processes. During recertification, make it more supportive, included checklist, scaffolded activities (see on syllabus); wondering make this part of recertification process. Maybe request two scaffolding assignments? This becomes a question of what to ask for – see what led to the assignment.
 - i. Sarah requested clarification and Michelle noted that it would be part of recertification but might be separate from ILO.
 - ii. Michelle thought there might be a way to collaborate with ILO.

- iii. Sarah noted that they are asking for prompts and maybe it would be easy to ask for the scaffolding activities.
 - 1. Would need to check with Ana to make sure it is not too much extra work.
- iv. Kevin noted that it would be easy to ask for the background information – could incorporate into rubric noting scaffolding and assignment.
- v. Sara liked what Kevin stated, noting the recertification of the process vs. the end product, noting the students' growth of their writing process.
- vi. Sarah will type something up for us to review; in terms of recertification.

3. Recertification:

- a. Kevin noted that curriculum is set up for recertification. Might want to attach GE recertification with UWR recertification: just might want to think about it for alignment.
 - i. Even would be possible if the course was not GE...
 - ii. Would have to watch for the early time deadlines.
 - iii. Noted that the 5-year assessment schedules will need to do this.
 - 1. Sarah noted that it would be good to align ILO Written Communication assessment with UWR recertification and GE/non-GE to start to initially align and start our recertification.
 - a. Want to avoid more work...
- b. Sarah asked Kevin when IB will be assessed. He noted that they are collecting data now, so it might be the end of the semester or next semester.
 - i. Maybe WS can borrow these IB assignments?
 - ii. It could be a pilot project?
 - iii. Sarah asked when the IB recertification is scheduled for? Kevin noted it is for 2028-29.
- c. Sarah will update our thoughts so we can figure out which policies to amend.
- d. Kevin will send Sarah an invite to the ILO subcommittee to work on the alignment.

b. [Writing@CSUEB website](#)

- i. Additional sample materials
- ii. AI guidelines, resources [[resource repository](#)]
 - 1. Sarah noted new resources.

2. Sarah asked if we can post some additional articles on the website?
 3. Sara noted that we might need a statement on AI – just to frame the articles in some way as how it might be associated with writing.
 - a. Sarah will write something.
 - b. Sarah will upload the articles.
 - c. Katie has created a page for WAC development – would make a link to these articles?
 - d. Sarah thanked Katie for the WAC chats.
 - iii. Yi shared that the marketing faculty teaching the W class told her that this website is super helpful! YAY!
9. Discussion
- a. Checklist revisions
 - i. Sarah wanted to confirm that our checklists are updated? Feels that we did do this??
 - ii. Michelle found the [UWR checklist](#).
 - iii. IB? We might need to do the IB for the composition part.
 1. If we do not have it, Sarah can create a draft. Sara is happy to help.
 - b. UWR waitlists/advocacy
 - i. Sarah asked if anything would be helpful to help Katie on the waitlists.
 1. Need more W class – better to have interdisciplinary conversations – writing in the discipline.
 2. Katie and Maureen will try to work on interdisciplinary science/technical writing.
 - c. Priorities for 2026-27

REMAINING SPRING 2026 MEETINGS

April 6

April 13 (if needed)