



Written Communication University Closing the Loop Summary Report

Spring, 2025, V1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This *Closing the Loop University Summary Report* summarizes the discussions, recommendations, and actions being taken as a result of university-wide assessment of written communication by academic and co-academic units to improve student learning and students' experiences at Cal State East Bay.

Background

[Institutional Learning Outcomes \(ILOs\)](#) are those learning outcomes that are expected of every graduate of the institution, both undergraduate and graduate, and are closely aligned with [General Education](#)/breadth requirements. ILO Assessment follows the [2022-2028 CSUEB ILO Long Term Assessment Plan](#) which aligns the schedule of assessment for undergraduate, graduate, and general education assessment.

Following the schedule for the ILO Long Term Assessment plan, Cal State East Bay gathered student learning data in a report titled, University Summary Report: [Assessment of Written Communication Student Learning](#), August 2024.

COLLEGE & UNIT SUMMARIES

College of Business and Economics (CBE)

CBE summary of college discussion

CBE Closing the Loop efforts for Written Communication will focus predominantly on the dimension of "Presentation of Supporting Ideas."

Written Communication Dimension of PRESENTATION OF SUPPORTING IDEAS			
<i>Fully Competent</i>	<i>Competent</i>	<i>Some Gaps</i>	<i>Major Gaps</i>
Presents evidence and ideas that clearly support and develop the central idea(s)	Presents evidence and ideas that generally support and develop the central ideas	Presents evidence and ideas that minimally support and develop the central ideas	Does not present evidence or ideas that support or develop the central ideas

CBE student competency was lowest in the "Presentation" dimension with a "Some Gaps" percentage of 13.8% (compared to the other dimensions - 6.3% in Organization, and 5% in both Language and Purpose). For students in other CSU-EB Colleges, the "Presentation" dimension also exhibited the lowest competency -

Other Colleges = 9.8% (compared to the other dimensions - 8.5% in Organization, 5.3% in Language, and 3.5% and Purpose).

Faculty Assessor Feedback - Written Communication

"Presentation of Supporting Ideas" had the most assessor feedback and lowest scores compared to other criteria with 90% of students meeting or exceeding competency.

" I thought that students could improve more on the supporting evidence. I think this needs to be an important aspect of written communication given the unfortunate trajectory of mass media and disinformation. Students will need to be better trained to use "good" evidence to support their statements and this may be more challenging in the future."

CBE summary of actions proposed/implemented

Overview of Proposed Plan for Closing the Loop for Written Communication ILO

As described above, we plan to focus on the performance dimension of "Presentation of Supporting Ideas" (i.e., evidence that supports and develops the central idea) because CBE students have the most room for improvement on this dimension. We believe that focusing on this one dimension allows us to put forth significant effort that will lead to more meaningful improvements. In other words, our closing the loop plan focuses on "depth" rather than "breadth," targeting the performance dimension on which our students demonstrated the least competence. Furthermore, we intend to follow a practical, evidence-based approach to obtain faculty "buy-in" to the actions we aim to implement.

Details of Plan/Action Items Required to Achieve Meaningful Change

1. Action Item #1 - Provide Faculty with Resources on Written Communication

- a. For example, [Assessment Resources](#), [Using Evidence: Writing Guides](#), [ILO Written Communication Assignment Guide and Rubric 2023](#) and make them aware of [Pedagogical Support](#) offered by the Office of Faculty Development at CSU-EB.
- b. Faculty who revise their courses and/or assignments to incorporate recommendations from the above resources can use this as evidence of Instructional Achievement.
- c. Faculty who revise existing assignments or add new assignments should reflect on if and how student mastery of written communication skills has improved as a result of these changes.

2. Action Item #2 - Increase CBE's Focus on "Writing in the World of AI."

- a. Students' use of AI to assist them with their written assignments is not likely to subside and there is evidence that AI can improve students' written communication skills.
- b. Students can use AI to help them improve their use of evidence to support their ideas - "ChatGPT... was slightly better [than human expert evaluators] at giving feedback on students' reasoning, argumentation and use of evidence from source materials – the features that the researchers had wanted the writing evaluators to focus on.

- c. CBE is already planning to implement Teaching Roundtables on topics of interest to CBE Faculty. "Writing in the World of AI" would likely be of interest to many of them. Faculty could learn best practices and incorporate them into their assignments.

College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS)

CEAS summary of college discussion

The faculty who participated in the ILO assessment for written communication were invited to provide input on their experience implementing the ILO assessment, their perceptions of student competency as reflected in their classroom interactions and through the assessed work, and to provide recommendations as to areas for improvements to student competency as well as the ILO assessment process. The faculty along with the department chairs for Kinesiology and Hospitality, Recreation, and Tourism, the Associate Dean and the EEC representative were also asked to provide their thoughts on the assessment data for CEAS.

Consistent with prior closing the loop discussions on the ILO assessments, reservations were expressed over the small sample sizes and that CEAS only has two undergraduate programs. There are concerns about the representative nature of the results and their generalizability. Moreover, it is the same faculty engaged in these ILO assessments and for several assessments are drawn from the same courses. One of the courses used was a new course in the kinesiology major that had been approved to meet the university writing requirement. It is still too early to provide substantive feedback on this course as to meeting the writing requirement or its role in the ILO assessment for written communication. One of the faculty engaged in the assessment had retired prior to seeking input further limiting the depth of critical analysis in closing the loop.

Feedback from the faculty highlighted that based on the assignments and their in-class experiences about half of the students demonstrated a basic understanding of written communication, particularly in organization and the ability to structure their ideas well. They are also able to express their thoughts clearly and meet basic competency expectations in assignments. A majority struggled with supporting their ideas effectively, which included selecting credible scholarly sources, properly integrating evidence, and applying critical analysis. Issues with citations, grammar, and clarity of argument were also commonplace.

When asked to highlight effective practices, faculty identified progress when assigning writing tasks that encouraged drafting and revisions. Referring students to campus resources like writing centers and online tools proved effective strategies as were leading discussions on ethical writing practices, including the use of AI tools.

Faculty felt that the rubric aligned well with evaluating critical elements of written communication, such as organization, use of evidence, and clarity. The rubric's clarity and consistency are appreciated, but updates may be needed to reflect evolving standards, including the role of AI in writing. As instructors, it was felt that they needed university guidance on which AI tools are considered (un)ethical and which are acceptable.

Turning to the data and with the limitations noted above, overall students are competent or fully competent regardless of first generation or non-first-generation status, Pell or non-Pell eligible and URM or non-URM. Interestingly, and warranting further examination in the future, were differences between student status (first generation/Pell/URM) when looking at the results from the upper division C4 classes compared to the upper division D4 classes. For upper division C4, students are competent or fully competent regardless of status. Some gaps are present for non-first-generation, non-Pell grant, and URM in the areas of Organization, Presentation and Purpose. In upper division D4, some gaps exist for both first-generation and non-first-generation, URM and non-URM for Language, Organization and Presentation though the size of gaps

decrease for Pell Eligible students. It is unknown if this is a function of the signature assignment used or some other reason. There may also be differences related to majors versus non-majors as the general education classes are open to both majors and non-majors although the KIN 422 is for majors only. The data does suggest that certain students may lack exposure to advanced writing preparation before college.

CEAS summary of actions proposed/implemented

- Explore expanding the number and variety of courses to be used for ILO assessments to better explore potential differences between upper division C4 and upper division D4 classes with regards to student status
- Find ways to incentivize more faculty putting their course forward for an ILO assessment
- Undertake a deeper analysis of the new writing course for kinesiology majors
- Introduce foundational writing courses earlier and make them prerequisites for advanced classes.
- Create scaffolded assignments that develop writing complexity over the course of the semester. Support from instructional designers could help here in the case of online classes.
- Require students to take mandatory workshops or resources on academic integrity, evidence use, and revisions. This seems especially important in the age of AI
- Integrate workshops on evidence-based writing and proper citation methods. It would be helpful to have this integrated with the help of librarians or other writing/research experts, as time spent on these matters in classes can take away from core content analysis
- Increase opportunities for peer reviews and collaborative editing
- Expand the use of rubrics for students to self-assess their work at various stages of the scaffolded writing process that specifically integrate the growing use of AI

College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS)

CLASS summary of college discussion

In reviewing the data for the Written Communication ILO assessment in CLASS, the attendees were able to establish some bird's eye take-aways – overall improvements, strengths and weaknesses of different kinds of students. However, in large part the discussion revolved around the *shortcomings* of the data. And while the data failed to provide us a clear story of achievement in writing, these shortcomings also inspired excellent questions to integrate into our future assignments and our future assessments.

Most notably, we engaged in discussion of the role of *language skills* on a notably diverse campus, prompted in part by how the assessment was organized. The categories by which the assessment was divided – specifically, separating out “language” from “purpose” and “presentation” – revealed provocative trends. For example, there was a clear pattern of excellence in “purpose” among URM students where the “language” performance was not as strong. Does the experience of a bi-lingual or multilingual upbringing mask the ability to communicate effectively? And even more intriguing – in light of emergent technologies, including AI, do we need to focus time on evaluating spelling and grammar when the world in which our students will operate may not need “clean” english as much as compelling argumentation? Are we missing an opportunity to hone our students’ strengths?

The data included about the SCAA and the impact of Writing Associates gave us great hope – at least for a world in which Writing Associates could be placed in a majority of composition-heavy courses. We very much appreciated “hearing” the voices of students in seeing their appreciation of the support service.

CLASS summary of actions proposed/implemented

- Different approach to gathering data. This seems to suggest a larger project that tracks the *progression* of writing ability over time in order to gauge the successes and challenges of teaching written communication. Without dialing in the data by conducting specifically-focused assessments in clearly identified courses, the meaning of the data is difficult to parse. There are a number of factors we felt needed identification in any given pool of artifacts, and we recommend finding ways of clearly signifying the following:
 - How many years of college learning had the students experienced?
 - Were these transfer students or native students?
 - What is the language/s spoken in the home?
 - When during the term was the assignment completed? Had the students received feedback on prior assignments and/or drafts?
 - Was this their first college-level writing course?
 - Did the faculty have a sense of improvement (or not) over the course of the semester?
 - Disaggregating between composition courses (which specifically address and reinforce all areas of the assessment) and upper-division courses where certain writing skills may be assumed?
 - What were the assignments asking? Did they encourage analysis? What did the rubric suggest was critical to success?
 - Was the course in their major field? Was it a major capstone? Or, was it an upper division W? Or an A2 course required of all first year students?
- Sponsor further campus discussions about the use of Artificial Intelligence in writing courses. Does this signify a consideration about the evolution of the way in which written communication is taught? Should course objectives predominantly focus on purpose, strength of voice and argumentation?
- Specific consideration of bilingual/multilingual student body in designing assessments, as well as other factors that may contribute to different learning styles and ways of knowing. Consider the possibility of creating GE courses for our bilingual Spanish-speaking student population.
- Include more reflection and student voice, as we saw with the data about SCAA and the Writing Associates. How are they experiencing the assignments in writing-focused courses? What are they concentrating on? What do they perceive is emblematic of “good writing”?

College of Science (CSCI)

CSCI summary of college discussion

The College of Science held a virtual 1.5 hour meeting to discuss the results of the Written Communication ILO. The entire college was invited. Each department’s EEC representative attended the virtual meeting and a number of other faculty attended as well. The session offered an opportunity to share the overall process of ILO assessment that the university employs, while also providing a forum to share the rubrics, the processes behind the assessments, and the newly created dashboards which summarize the Written Communication results. In addition to the discussion and review of the Written Communication results, departments were encouraged to align their program assessments with university-wide ILO assessments to streamline efforts and improve overall outcomes.

The meeting offered an opportunity to review the CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and the assessment cycle, including the methods and collection timeline associated specifically with the Written

Communication ILO which included UD, UWR, Second Composition and Graduate Studies. The Faculty were introduced to the newly created 2023-2024 CSUEB ILO Assessment: Written Communication dashboard listing the assessment results for Written Communication in the categories of Language, Organization, Presentation and Purpose, i.e., the four categories established in the ILO Written Communication Rubric approved by the Academic Senate 10-11-22. The attendees were allowed to navigate this dashboard for a period on their own during the meeting, and then were queried regarding their impressions:

- Overall, the College of Science showed strong results in developing a purpose statement but could improve in other areas such as organization, presentation of ideas, and mechanical language, akin to a strong ability to develop a hypothesis statement, but struggles in connecting that statement to evidence and reasoning.
- Comparisons across colleges showed that while the College of Science performed well in purpose and thesis development, students from other colleges performed better in some other areas.
- The assessment also looked at equity gaps, such as the performance differences between first-generation students and others. The data indicated that there were small gaps in the fully competent category for non-URM (Underrepresented Minority) students compared to URM students.

The faculty felt that the rubric for the ILO was adequate and could be mapped onto the various disciplines in the College of Science. However, some faculty noted that the rubric called out a category of "Presentation of supporting ideas," which might be construed as counter to the premise of the Scientific Method, another critical component of our institutional ILOs. As was pointed out, for many disciplines in the College of Science writing instruction is centered around a lab report based on experimental results and as such, the Scientific Method includes a "Purpose, thesis or controlling idea," i.e., the hypothesis to be tested in the experiment. The evidence collected, is the data, and students are instructed to ethically analyze their results which can either support or refute the main hypothesis. Thus the Written Communication rubric which only allows for a high score if the evidence "supports" the main idea might be construed as antithesis to the ILO of Critical Thinking and the ethical application of the Scientific Method. This may be a consequence of attempting to find a universal rubric that is equally appropriate to the wide variety of majors.

It was noted that the Written Communication ILO was previously assessed five years ago, and at that point, even without the dashboard to compare, the results, based on the rubric, were "not as good." The faculty were posed the question then, to share what programs in the College of Science specifically, had done or implemented to explain this improvement. The Faculty shared the following details:

- Faculty in many programs had developed scaffolded approaches to writing assignments.
- Iterative feedback on assignments and multiple revisions of drafts with ongoing faculty feedback leads to stronger writing skills.
- Sharing campus resources to help with student writing, i.e., SCAA and the University Writing Center.
- Providing multiple touchpoints across the major, in multiple courses, where writing in the discipline receives greater emphasis.

Faculty also acknowledged challenges and apprehension associated with the recent advent of AI. This steered the discussion to opportunities for action by the university, in that a general consensus was reached that clear policies and communication of expectations with regard to use of AI needed to be developed. Furthermore, it was noted that opportunities to properly use AI as a supporting tool should be encouraged where appropriate

in the curriculum. For instance, Faculty commented on students generally being very capable in Oral Presentations and Communication, and those faculty had leveraged using AI to record, transcribe and “clean up” an oral presentation to assist with the student’s Written Communication assignments.

The other main topic regarding an opportunity for action that was discussed by the Faculty was how to create more opportunities across the major curriculum where students would receive written communication instruction and opportunities to practice. The best practices shared by Faculty included not only embedding discipline specific writing tasks in multiple courses across the students’ roadmap in their major, but also developing university Writing Across the Curriculum W-designated courses.

CSCI summary of actions proposed/implemented

- Faculty shared that by implementing clearly communicated expectations and providing scaffolded assignments along with concise rubrics have led to improved Written Communication skills for our students.
- Moving forward, faculty will strive to incorporate more opportunities to develop student Written Communication experiences and pedagogy throughout the curriculum in the majors, including developing more W-designated courses in the major curriculum.

University Libraries

University Libraries summary of discussion

The library faculty discussed the results of the Written Communication ILO assessment in one of their faculty meetings in November 2024. The discussion centered around how the librarians can support students campus-wide with the lowest-performing written communication rubric criteria, “Presentation of Supporting Ideas.” One of the faculty assessors for the written communication assessment specifically called out students’ ability to find quality information, stating: “Students will need to be better trained to use “good” evidence to support their statements and this may be more challenging in the future.” This comment directly relates to the work that the library faculty do on campus supporting information literacy – the ability to find, evaluate, and use information effectively. During their discussion, the librarians brainstormed additional ways they may support students in their development of this critical skill.

University Libraries summary of actions proposed/implemented

During the spring 2025 semester, the library faculty are offering a series of workshops focused on supporting students in their efforts to find and evaluate information sources, as well as integrate the information found in information sources into their writing. These workshops are being held in a hybrid format – in person in the CORE building on the Hayward campus, as well as on Zoom. The librarians will be reaching out to faculty teaching “W” designated courses each semester to determine how the library can best support students in those courses. Additionally, the library faculty plan to build online content to make available in Canvas which walks students through the processes of finding and evaluating information sources and incorporating those sources into their writing in an ethical manner.

Graduate Studies

Graduate Studies summary of discussion

Per-program ILO assessment results of graduate programs were provided in program annual reports submitted to CAPR in October 2024. Sixteen of thirty-five graduate programs were aligned to the written communication ILO and provided assessment results. Those results were analyzed in the [Graduate Programs University Summary Report for Written Communication](#), which was posted on the [Graduate Studies Assessment](#) page and linked to the main university assessment site in December 2024.

As discussed in the report, the variation in written communication goals, methods for assessment, rubrics used, etc., among the graduate programs makes direct comparison of results problematic. Perhaps more useful are a number of themes that were identified throughout the ILO assessment reports using AI tools.

- Alignment with Professional Standards - Many programs assess writing and other skills with real-world scenarios, such as case studies, project reports, or policy briefs, ensuring that students meet the professional standards of their respective fields.
- Focus on Writing Mechanics and Clarity - Programs emphasize grammar, spelling, organization, and clarity as fundamental skills, with common gaps identified in sentence structure and technical language.
- Integration of Writing Across the Curriculum - Written communication is increasingly assessed through integration into various coursework rather than standalone tasks or courses.
- Challenges in Evidence and Argumentation - Students across programs struggle with using evidence effectively to support arguments and connecting ideas cohesively.
- Feedback and Iterative Improvement - Iterative feedback cycles (e.g., revisions, peer reviews, and additional assignments) enhance writing quality and are a critical component of improvement plans.
- Technical Writing in Specialized Fields - Programs focused on technical disciplines (e.g., Biostatistics, Chemistry, Environmental Geosciences) emphasize presenting data clearly and integrating narrative-building with quantitative results.

Graduate Studies summary of actions proposed/implemented

In this second assessment cycle, a number of graduate programs took advantage of the new policies in the modified [Graduate Program ILO Assessment Policy](#) meant to eliminate double-assessment of assignments and to rectify mismatches in PLO and ILO assessment schedules. This resulted in a larger proportion of aligned graduate programs submitting assessment results and required less work to do so. That observation suggests that the current ILO assessment process for graduate programs might be made even more flexible in order to generate more results with even less work. Almost all programs already assess a PLO which addresses written communication and report the results of that assessment in an annual report. This is true of the sixteen programs aligned with the written communication ILO but also the remaining nineteen programs. Programs were asked to align with just two of the six ILOs due to the work involved in assessing ILOs. Instead, if programs reported results for written-communication PLOs rather than doing a separate ILO assessment, those results could be pulled from the annual reports of all graduate programs by leveraging AI tools and incorporated into a university report which addressed all programs rather than just those aligned with a particular ILO. This would work well for the ILOs which map to core competencies since most programs would already have specified PLOs to address all core competencies. In the past, very few programs had aligned to the ILOs which did not map to core competencies, and so those results were not particularly useful

at a university level in any case. This possible modification to the Graduate Program ILO Assessment Policy will be discussed at the Educational Effectiveness Committee and the Graduate Advisory Council.

General Education

General Education summary of discussion

General Education and ILO assessment have worked together to have parallel assessment projects running at the same time. Because of this, the ILO assessment of Written Communication contained many GE courses. The [dashboard](#) results make it easy to separate out the GE courses. When the UWR courses are separated from the UD-C and UD-D courses, there are some differences. In general, the UD-C and UD-D combined scores are lower than the UWR scores. This is not surprising as the UWR courses are focused on the writing process itself, as opposed to the UD-C and UD-D courses, which focus on writing in their respective topics. However, despite having lower scores than the UWR courses, the combined UD-C and UD-D courses still performed at a competency rating and above in all categories. Overall, more students scored “Fully competent” in the UD-C courses than those in the UD-D courses in all categories. Other trends show that more first gen and Pell students scored “Fully Competent” in UD-C courses than UD-D courses. This was not the case with our URM students.

General Education Summary of actions proposed/implemented

Almost all the lower division GE course learning outcomes have been updated in the past two years, with many of the learning outcomes focusing on the writing process. It is hoped that focusing more on writing will improve the upper division assessment of our GE courses. We have also combined Critical Thinking with Composition, and again, this should strengthen the writing skills of our first and second year students and help them better prepare for their upper division GE courses. The Office of General Education will continue to work closely with the Institutional Learning Outcome subcommittee on the assessment process.

Office of Faculty Development (OFD)

Office of Faculty Development summary of discussion

The OFD has taken an active role discussing the implications of the written communication assessment results in EEC meetings, in Writing Subcommittee meetings, and in planning discussions in support of ILO Subcommittee assessment and related activities. Key themes that have emerged from these discussions include concerns about quality of writing instruction in online asynchronous classes; concerns about the impact of AI on students’ development of independent written communication skills; the importance of tracking completion rates and equity gaps for the new GE Area IB, Critical Thinking and Composition, and for University Writing Requirement courses; and the need to provide more training via multiple modalities related to Writing Across the Curriculum approaches for faculty teaching writing-intensive courses.

Office of Faculty Development summary of actions proposed/implemented

In collaboration with the ILO Subcommittee, OFD co-sponsored a workshop in the fall term on effective assignment design principles to support faculty in providing students with opportunities to demonstrate their success in meeting learning outcomes at the course, program, and/or institutional level. Although this session did not focus exclusively on written assignments or assessing writing, many of the recommendations (e.g. using low-stakes assignments to provide feedback and scaffold high-stakes assignments) were applicable to writing instruction and assessment in all instructional modalities. In collaboration with the Composition

Program and the Writing Across the Curriculum Program, OFD also co-sponsored two end-of-semester socials/debrief sessions in fall 2024, one in person and one on Zoom. These sessions provided an opportunity for writing instructors across disciplines to share their challenges, successes, and ongoing needs in writing-intensive classes. Other collaborations related to written communication include a presentation on developing strong University Writing Requirement course proposals at the annual Back to the Bay conference on campus as well as fall and spring workshops on the same topic. OFD secured internal funding for four faculty working groups related to AI applications in education: AI-infused assignments, specialized AI chatbots, AI accessibility, and faculty AI survey and focus groups. These working groups will develop campus resources, which will be shared with the campus community at the end of spring semester 2025.

Student Center for Academic Achievement (SCAA)

Student Center for Academic Achievement summary of discussion

The Student Center for Academic Achievement (SCAA) is a comprehensive learning center with tutoring and academic skills coaching initiatives, situated within University Libraries. One of the SCAA's core functions is to support writing skills development, which is provided to students in the forms of 1:1 appointments and course-embedded tutoring. A focus area is support of Area A courses, English Language Communication & Critical Thinking.

Student Center for Academic Achievement summary of actions proposed/implemented

The SCAA has made efforts to streamline and improve the user experience through recent appointment-scheduling advancements. Through a new scheduling platform, students engage seamlessly with Writing Tutors in-person and online, and they can also request feedback asynchronously through a paper submission system. Same-day appointments are now available. Additionally, Writing Associates (WAs) are enrolled students embedded within courses for one semester to assist faculty and students in writing assignments that encourage engagement in the entire writing process, including feedback and revision. The SCAA partners with faculty on WA placements (by request) to individualize support for any course with a significant amount of writing.

Students from all four CSUEB colleges visited the SCAA, demonstrating that students are engaging with the writing process across the curriculum. In Fall 2023, 223 unique students completed 623 writing tutoring appointments, and the average number of writing tutoring visits per unique student increased from 2.69 visits (F22) to 5.6 visits (F23). 46% of Fall 2023 writing tutoring participants were underrepresented minority (URM) students. So far in AY 2024-2025, 283 unique students have completed 756 writing appointments (Fall 2024 semester data; includes 125 asynchronous paper reviews). *More information can be found on the [SCAA Impact webpage](#).*

Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) Subcommittee of CAPR

ILO Subcommittee summary of discussion

The ILO Subcommittee had several discussions about the ILO Written Communication assessment results. Much of the discussion centered around the improvements in student learning from the previous assessment in 2018-19 at both the lower and upper division across the student writing experience at CSUEB. This was attributed to a number of curriculum design and instructional improvements as well as enhanced co-curricular support. There was also discussion about the growing use of artificial intelligence (AI) including the ethical student use of AI in completing assignments.

ILO Subcommittee summary of actions proposed/implemented

The first of several actions from the ILO Subcommittee was the committee chair conducting a workshop in the fall, 2024 Back to the Bay on providing straight-forward approaches faculty found from 10 years of assessing that help all students demonstrate their best learning in assignments. ILO committee members also conducted a workshop in the fall term on strong assignment design principles to meet student learning outcomes and sent all faculty tips on effective assignment design through the Academic Affairs newsletter. Additionally, the committee sent a request to the CSUEB statewide senator for Statewide Academic Senate to create a CSU-Wide framework for the use of artificial intelligence in teaching and learning given the significant impact that AI will continue to have on every level of teaching, student demonstration of learning, and assessment. Further, committee members discussed the strength of the written communication rubric and would like to see it used more by faculty designing curriculum mapped to a writing outcome or completing their program review.

Writing Subcommittee (WS) of CIC

Writing Subcommittee summary of discussion

The three discussions of the University Writing Requirement (UWR) assessment results centered around the promising results not only of UWR courses compared to the total university sample, but also for improved and equitable learning outcomes in these courses for PELL eligible, first generation, and other historically underserved students for 3 of the 4 rubric dimensions compared to the total university sample.

Writing Subcommittee summary of actions proposed/implemented

WS co-chairs will finalize the actions to be further discussed and implemented at the February 3, 2025 WS meeting. Potential actions include development of a writing liaison program supporting implementation of UWR courses in specific departments, an analysis of the UWR dashboard results created by IER, and a checklist of elements to guide faculty developing UWR courses and committee members in their review of UWR course proposals. WS members are in the process of developing a writing instruction webpage and a writing instruction collaboration and resource hub in Canvas, the campus learning management system. The WAC program coordinator with support from other WS members has already implemented Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) informal chats scheduled throughout AY 24-25 to support faculty teaching UWR and other writing-intensive classes.