

## WRITING REQUIREMENT FOR GRADUATE CANDIDACY

### FAM 841.97

This Writing Requirement for Graduate Candidacy (WRGC) document outlines the procedures for assessing master's student writing proficiency preparatory to classification or advancement to candidacy, serving as a set of criteria for a CSUSB master's program to determine that a master's student has fulfilled the California State University (CSU) graduation entrance writing requirement for master's candidates.

### Specifications

I. In the following, "the Program" refers to the College, Department or program from which the student will receive the master's degree.

II. This Writing Requirement for Graduate Candidacy (WRGC) applies to graduate students enrolled in master's programs. The writing requirement must be satisfied before a graduate student is classified or advanced to candidacy. (The point at which the WRGC must be satisfied shall be a Program decision.)

III. Programs shall submit to the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) notice of the candidates' satisfaction of the WRGC, and the OGS will maintain a record thereof

IV. The Program shall determine the manner by which a student satisfies or does not satisfy the WRGC by requiring one of the four options below. Students shall

- a) take an existing 306 course and attain a grade of B or better; or
- b) achieve an acceptable standardized test score, such as the Analytical Writing subtest of the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) or the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE), or the CSUSB Writing Requirement Exemption Examination (WREE), as determined by the Program; or
- c) complete a Program-specific writing intensive course with a grade no lower than a B-; or
- d) submit a paper(s) that receive(s) a passing score as described in Point VI below (the Program shall determine which faculty member(s) will evaluate such a submission).

V. If a Program-specific writing intensive course is offered to satisfy the WRGC as in Option IVc above, the Program will file the course syllabus with the OGS for approval. The course syllabus should demonstrate a focus on writing in the discipline of study.

VI. If a Program uses Option IVd above, the following rubric, or similar rubric provided by the Program, shall be used to evaluate students' writing performance. Paper(s) shall be scored

using a rubric (1-3) in each of four areas: A) Integration/Critical Analysis, B) Content/Organization, C) Style/Format, and D) Grammar/Usage, for a maximum score of 12. The minimal acceptable combined score from all of the four (A-D) sections is 8 points. Using this or a similar rubric, a Program may establish a higher minimum score for passing. If using Option IVd above, the Program shall submit a rubric as part of its plan for candidates to satisfy the WRGC, showing how students are assessed in the four areas A-D, and what minimum score is acceptable for satisfying the WRGC.

VII. The Program shall have a remediation protocol for admitted graduate students who do not satisfy the WRGC on their first attempt. The Program shall specify the maximum number of attempts that students may be allowed to satisfy the WRGC.

VIII. The Program shall file its respective WRGC and remediation protocol with the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) for approval. Upon approval, the Program shall provide the OGS with annual aggregate student WRGC performance data.

IX. For candidates seeking to transfer to a different program, the Program to which the candidate is applying has the option of accepting or not accepting a candidate's WRGC from a previous program.

X. The policy will go into immediate effect. Programs that gain approval for their WRGC plan may specify for which admission cycle candidates shall be held to the Program's WRGC.

XI. Until such time as the Program's WRGC is approved by OGS, candidates will be held to the existing Graduate Entrance Writing Requirement (GEWR) policy.

### **Rubric that May Be Used to Evaluate Student Submissions for Satisfaction of the Writing Requirement for Graduate Classification**

#### **A. Integration/Critical Analysis**

3: The submission represents the current state of knowledge for the topic being addressed. Information about the topic is presented in an organized manner, resulting in an orderly discussion of the topic being addressed. Research source material originates from sources appropriate to the discipline such as national and international peer-reviewed journals, and sources are accurately and concisely analyzed and correctly cited in both text and bibliographic citations.

2: There are inconsistencies in the organization and logic of the information presentation, but still clear analysis of the presented materials. Synthesis of various aspects of the topic may show incomplete degrees of development, but overall, the document is well crafted. There is evidence of analysis and correct citation of appropriate source materials.

1: Discussion of the topic is incomplete and the presentation of ideas is poorly developed or lacking. Complex topics and related concepts are awkwardly presented and linkages among topics may be unclear. Analysis is limited to categorizing and summarizing topics. The resulting

manuscript is confusing, with an inadequate number of sources or lack of appropriate use and citation of reference material.

#### B. Content/Organization

3: Follows all requirements for the paper. Topic is carefully focused and the major points related to the topic are clearly outlined. Ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Paper is interesting and holds the reader's attention. General ideas are expanded upon in a logical manner, thereby extending the significance of the work presented beyond a restatement of known ideas.

2: Ideas presented closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Certain logical connections or inclusion of specific topics related to the student's area of study may be omitted. Ideas and concepts are generally satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic and organization are apparent. The reader is suitably introduced to the topic being presented such that the relationship to the student's area of study is obvious.

1: The paper is logically and thematically coherent, but is lacking in substantial ways. The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. Overall, the content and organization needs significant revision to represent a critical analysis of the topic.

#### C. Style/Format

3: Conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. Thoroughness and competence are demonstrated in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper. The writing suitably models the discipline's overall scholarly style.

2: The style and format are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent. There is selection of less suitable sources (non-peer reviewed literature, web information). Weak transitions and apparent logic gaps occur between topics being addressed. The style may be difficult to follow, so as to detract from the comprehensibility of the manuscript.

1: While some discipline-specific conventions are followed, others are not. The paper lacks consistency in style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty connecting to cited sources to the references given. Major revisions would be needed to render the paper comprehensible.

#### D. Grammar/Usage

3: While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions and organizational structures, such as subheadings, are effectively used which help the reader move from one point to another.

2: Grammatical conventions are generally used, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. Effective discipline-specific vocabulary is used.

1: Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure, and/or other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. There is some confusion in the proper use of discipline-specific terms. Writing does not flow smoothly from point to point; appropriate transitions are lacking.