



student-centered programming allowing a structured lower-division and upper-division core consisting of 36 units and an "areas of interest" category from which a student can select 24 units of elective courses. The generic terms common to the earlier concentrations are included among the six areas of interest. The electives will be chosen in consultation with a faculty advisor. (It should be noted that SOC 155, Criminology, shall be retained as a requirement and CRJ 110, Crime and Punishment, shall be added as a requirement.)

- e. Minor in Environmental Studies: Move BIO 160 from the required category to the Biology elective category. Add CHEM 106 and PHYS 185 as electives. Move ENVS 169B from the elective category to the required category. Move ENVS 121 to the elective category. MOVE ENVS 120 from a Social Science elective category to a Natural Science choice category. (These changes were approved with a provision that the Curriculum Subcommittee compose a list of suggestions for further department consideration.)
- f. Health and Physical Education--Strength and Conditioning Concentration: A new concentration established to provide knowledge base and practical experiences needed in the area of the Strength and Conditioning field.
- g. Pre-Credential Preparation: Remove ART 160, Photography in the Arts, as a choice in the Art Subject Matter Program [Pre-Credential Preparation]. Commission on Teacher Credentialing wishes ART 197, Computer art, to be a required component of the teacher preparation program.

#### FS 97-35/CPC, Ex. CERTIFICATES OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposals regarding certificates of academic achievement:

- a. Certificate of Advanced Study in TESOL: Delete the current Certificate of Advanced Study in TESOL, and replace the certificate by 2 new certificate programs (see b. and c. below) with separate requirements. Replace by more coherent new certificate programs.
- b. Certificate in the Foundations of Teaching ESL: Addition of a new certificate program. This program is designed to cover the basic knowledge needed to teach ESL in adult education or outside the U.S.
- c. Certificate in Teaching Academic ESL: Addition of a new certificate program. This program is designed to cover the knowledge needed to teach ESL in community colleges and pre-university language institutes.

FS 97-36/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS--GRADUATE

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposals:

- a. M.S. in Criminal Justice: The graduate degree program's existing course requirement of 15-18 units will be altered by shifting 4 courses to the elective area and replacing courses. The existing elective area is increased from 9/12 to 18 units.
- b. M.S. Degree in Computer Science: Add an option to allow students who wish to focus on network and communication to do so within the Master's degree in Computer Science. This new option, Networks and Communications, will meet the unmet needs of students wishing this increasingly important area of the Computer Science field.
- c. Master of Public Policy and Administration: Increase course work units from 36-39 to 36-42 by changing PPA 500, Culminating Experience, requirement from 3 units to 3-6 units.

## REGULAR AGENDA

FS 97-33/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of November 20 (#5), 1997.

Old BusinessFS 97-22/APC, Ex. COURSE REPEAT/GRADE REPLACEMENT POLICY

*{Note: The Executive Committee, in its discussion of this item, was divided over the issues of 1) whether there should be a cut-off grade above which repeats should not be allowed, and 2) whether there should be a limit to the number of times a student may attempt to repeat a course. It therefore offers no recommendation on these questions.}*

The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the policy on Repeating Courses (pages 79-80 of the 1996-98 CSUS Catalog, shown in **October 30, 1997, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment E-1**; see **October 30, 1997, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment E-2** for Academic Policies Committee rationale), as follows:

Any course taken at CSUS may be repeated one time at CSUS without departmental approval. The number of additional times a student is allowed to repeat the same course may be limited by some academic departments. If a student exceeds the repeat limit established by a department, the department may administratively drop the student from the course, and/or disallow the course if it is presented in fulfillment of graduation requirements. Students intending to repeat a course more than one time should discuss this with their academic advisor and the Chair of the department offering the course to



determine whether specific departmental repeat limits exist and if there are provisions for exceptions.

In the case of a first repeat, only the grade earned in the second attempt (even if it is lower) will be used in the CSUS calculation of grade point average. However, it should be noted that the grade earned in the first attempt remains on the student's transcript and may be used in grade point calculations by other institutions (e.g., medical schools and law schools). Grades earned in repeats after the second attempt (first repeat) will be averaged with the second and subsequent attempts in grade point calculations, even if the student was granted departmental permission to enroll in the course a third or subsequent time.

If the original course attempt and first repeat were both courses taken at CSUS, students should file a "Repeat Grade Replacement Petition" with the Office of Admissions and Records in order to initiate a unit and grade point adjustment. In this case, department approval is not required. If a "Repeat Grade Replacement Petition" is not submitted by the student, the unit and grade point adjustment will not be made until the student's graduation evaluation is completed.

However, under the following conditions, students must file with the Office of Admissions and Records, a "Repeat Grade Replacement Petition" approved by the Chair of the department offering the course to initiate unit and grade replacement: 1) the repeated or original course is taken at another accredited institution, 2) the repeated course differs in number or title from the original course. Students are strongly urged to obtain petition approval prior to enrollment in the repeated course since it is possible that the courses may not be considered equivalent.

The repeat grade replacement policy of a transfer institution, if it can be determined, applied to a student's record at the time of transfer to CSUS. If it cannot be determined, CSUS policy will apply.

**Note to Graduate Students:** Grades earned in courses repeated as a postbaccalaureate student may not be used to replace grades earned in a course as an undergraduate student. In addition, grades earned at another institution will not be counted in the postbaccalaureate GPA.

In addition, the Faculty Senate recommends:

Any department that chooses to limit the number of times a student may repeat courses must include such policy in the catalog.

*PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE under discussion [Bold, underscored materials show changes from original motion (FS 97-22). Strikeovers in lines 1-2 = amendments made at November 20, 1997, Senate meeting]:*

FS 97-22A/APC.EX. COURSE REPEAT/GRADE REPLACEMENT POLICY

Any course taken at CSUS, ~~in which the student earned a grade of C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F, NC, U, or I,~~ may be repeated one time at CSUS without departmental approval. The number of **additional** times a student is allowed to repeat the same course may be limited by some academic departments. **[Academic Departments with limits on course repeats will clearly publicize their specific repeat policy.]** If a student exceeds the repeat limit established by a department, the department may administratively drop the student from the course, and/or disallow the course if it is presented in fulfillment of graduation requirements. Students intending to repeat a course more than one time should discuss this with their academic advisor and the Chair of the department offering the course to determine whether specific departmental repeat limits exist and if there are provisions for exceptions.

In the case of a first repeat, only the grade earned in the second attempt (even if it is lower) will be used in the CSUS calculation for grade point average. However, it should be noted that the grade earned in the first attempt remains on the student's transcript and may be used in grade point calculations by other institutions (e.g., medical schools and law schools).

Grades earned in repeats after the second attempt (first repeat) will be averaged with the second and subsequent attempts in grade point calculations, even if the student was granted departmental permission to enroll in the course a third or subsequent time.

If the original course attempt and first repeat were both courses taken at CSUS, students should file a "Repeat Grade Replacement Petition" with the Office of Admissions and Records in order to initiate a unit and grade point adjustment. In this case, departmental approval is not required. If a "Repeat Grade Replacement Petition" is not submitted by the students the unit and grade point adjustment will not be made until the student's graduation evaluation is completed.

However, under the following conditions, students must file a **"Repeat Grade Replacement Petition," approved by the Chair of the department offering the course, with the Office of Admissions and Records** to initiate unit and grade replacement if:

- 1) the repeated or original course is taken at another accredited institution, or
- 2) the repeated course differs in number or title from the original course.

**Under these conditions,** students **must** ~~are strongly urged to~~ obtain petition approval prior to enrollment in the repeated course since it is possible that the courses may not be considered equivalent.

The repeat grade replacement policy of a transfer institution, if it can be determined, **will be** applied to a student's record at the time of transfer to CSUS. If it cannot be determined, CSUS policy will apply.

**Note to Graduate Students:** Grades earned in courses repeated as a postbaccalaureate student may not be used to replace grades earned in a course as an undergraduate student. In addition, grades earned at another institution will not be counted in the postbaccalaureate GPA.

### New Business

#### FS 97-37/Flr. POLICY ON LEAVES WITH PAY

*[Note: This item concerns implementation of the policy requiring 25% of sabbaticals to be awarded on the merit of the proposal (AS 97-10).]*

#### FS-97-38/CPC, Flr. BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM

*[Note: No decision had been made by the Executive Committee regarding recommending the following, at the time this agenda was prepared.]*


The Faculty Senate recommends that:

1. a final decision on Biomedical Engineering program discontinuation be postponed to Fall 1998;
2. The M.S. degree program in BME be placed on suspension and admissions to the program be closed for Spring 1997, Fall 1998 and Spring 1999; and
3. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee in consultation with the Academic and Administrative Councils of the School of Engineering and Computer Science, the Dean of the School of Engineering and Computer Science and the Associate Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies establish a task force to undertake an intensive effort in 1997/98 to develop a proposal for the continuation of a program in BME that fully addresses the budgetary and enrollment issues that underlie the Engineering and Computer Science Administrative Council's 1996 recommendation to discontinue the program. The work of the BME Task Force must be completed and submitted to the Faculty Senate prior to the beginning of the Fall 1998 semester.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO  
FACULTY SENATE

# Memo

**Date:** November 24, 1997  
**To:** Faculty Senators  
**From:** Thomas Krabacher   
Chair, Faculty Senate  
278-6593; FAX 278-5358  
**Re:** Special Senate Meeting on Writing Requirements

---

Attached is a copy of the draft policy developed by the Curriculum Policies Committee (CPC) dealing with writing requirements in the major. Please read the document over carefully, since it will serve as the starting point for our discussion of the CSUS undergraduate writing requirements at the special Senate meeting on Thursday, December 4, 1997 (3:00-5:00 p.m., Forest Suite, University Union). Based on discussion at this meeting, the CPC will then revise the draft policy for further discussion and action in the spring.

For those who may be unfamiliar with them, the acronyms used in the draft stand for the following:

*CPC* Faculty Senate Curriculum Policies Committee  
*CUP* Council for University Planning  
*GWAR* Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement  
*WASC* Western association of Schools and Colleges  
*WPE* Writing Proficiency Exam

TK;j  
Attachment



NOV 24 1997

## BACKGROUND

Faculty      Senate Received  
413

### Writing

As part of the WASC review CSUS **seniors** took a national writing examination designed for **sophomores**. Our senior students scored about the same as the sophomores. (Consequently, CUP requested that CPC look into the matter.) Last Spring semester CPC did extensive interviews with school curriculum and administrative committees. Those interviews showed that

- (1) faculty appreciate the successful efforts of the current GVAR program (ENG 1A, 20, the WPE, ENG 109, and parallel Learning Skills Center courses ) and
- (2) a near consensus of faculty believe that we should **supplement** the GVAR program with writing skills requirements specific to our majors.

(Opinions regarding the effectiveness of our current Advanced Study requirement were much more mixed.)

### Reading

The 1996-97 Committee did not question faculty about reading; nor do we have any examination evidence permitting comparison of our majors' reading skills with national standards. However, Nancy Tooker of the Learning Skills Center has reported the conclusions of a recent national conference on reading: The conference concluded that most students do little reading except in preparation for examinations — and that many students claim that readings in many courses are not essential to pass examinations. The Learning Skills faculty report that these conference statements correspond to the reports of students using the Center. (See attachment A). In addition, the WPE pass rate has dropped with this semester's inclusion of an important reading component. The Plan outlined below applies to both writing and reading skills — and can also serve to develop critical thinking skills.

The Committee has attempted to devise a flexible plan, one which recognizes the differing needs of majors in our undergraduate programs, the differing goals of programs and the limited resources available for implementation of any plan. **Most importantly, the Committee believes that any requirements adopted should allow major programs to meet those requirements within their existing curriculums, rather than forcing programs to add courses to their curriculums.**

The plan submitted is general. The details of a final recommendation for Senate action will depend on decisions about crucial **variables** (see below), and decisions about how best to administer the program.



## A PLAN FOR DISCUSSION

### I. Standards:

The University shall distribute to major programs the writing standards used in the GVAR program, specifically those used in ENG 20 and 109.

Major programs shall (1) establish writing and reading skill standards and goals appropriate for their disciplines and (2) collect samples of adequate writing in the discipline for their majors' use.

[NB: *By this provision the Committee recognizes the diversity of writing goals and standards integral to major disciplines. The GVAR standards are to acquaint major programs with the standards used to judge preparation for and performance on the WPE. Some major programs will, of course, simply improve their majors writing as judged by those general standards, but others will develop different standards appropriate for their disciplines. The proposal does require that all major programs collect samples of adequate writing to guide their students. ]*

### II. Assessment

Each major program shall review its curriculum's current writing and reading components and their effectiveness in achieving the program's writing and reading goals.

Each major program shall, as part of the implementation of its assessment plan in preparation for a program review, assess its majors' writing and reading skills.

That assessment shall involve the participation of at least one faculty member outside the discipline, and shall include some in-class writing and reading tests.

[NB: *The provision for participation by a faculty member outside the discipline will provide major programs with access to other disciplines' experience and with differing perspectives. The requirement of in-class writing and reading tests will serve to test those skills within the limited time often available for course and professional writing. ]*

### III. Plans for Improvement

Each major program shall develop a program for the improvement of the writing and reading skills of students who have deficiencies in those areas, and shall assess the success of those improvement programs as part of its preparation of a self study for a program review.

Each major program shall identify a faculty member with responsibility for its writing and reading program.

#### IV. **ESL Students**

Each major program shall recognize and address the special writing and reading problems and needs of ESL students. (See attachment B)

#### V. **University Support**

The University shall support these major programs by providing

as needed, expert guidance in the development of appropriate standards, assessment techniques and pedagogy;

as resources allow, support for training faculty in the pedagogy of writing and reading; and

special help for students, including ESL students, with significant deficiencies.

#### VI. **Administration**

The administration of the program shall include a University-level elected faculty committee, including representatives from all Schools and from ASI. The Committee shall assist and monitor major programs' assessment, and writing and reading improvement programs. **The committee shall have the authority to approve or disapprove all such assessment and improvement plans.**

Within two years of the inauguration of this program, major programs shall submit preliminary reports of their assessment of their majors writing and reading skills and a preliminary plan for the improvement of those skills.

## **VARIABLES**

### **Advanced Study**

[NB: *The GE& GR Committee is evaluating the current advanced study requirement. The Curriculum Policies Committee believes, however, that major programs should not make advanced study classes in the major the only means of assessing their majors writing and reading skills.*]

## ENG 20

*The current course suffers from the fact that the community colleges do not teach it; consequently, CSUS must provide a large number of sections to meet the second semester of composition requirement. The course might have various connections with major writing and reading programs, e.g., as an upper-division course taught parallel to a major core class, or as a means of remedying skills deficiencies.*

### **Pedagogy**

*CPC has been impressed by the variety of pedagogical (and assessment) alternatives which may serve to meet the goals of this program. For instance, some programs may wish to*

*assign certain core courses responsibility for measuring and improving writing and reading, perhaps seeking University support for the special training of some faculty to meet these responsibilities;*  
*use all of its courses for those purposes;*  
*use adjunct courses;*  
*cooperate with other disciplines in improvement programs.*

*The Committee believes that the administration of the program should include opportunities for faculty to learn of the many ways to integrate writing and reading assessment and improvement into existing major classes.*

### Recommendations for Strengthening Reading Performance in Courses in the Major

- Make curricular choices which establish an expectation for the completion and comprehension of assigned texts as a requirement for successful course performance. Emphasize the importance of critical reading skills as they relate to major requirements, new WPE standards, professional admissions test requirements, and careers.
- Assign readings in all courses and assess students' comprehension at both literal and evaluative and levels.
- Where appropriate, require reading multiple sources of text and expect independent analysis and synthesis of ideas drawn from text.
- Integrate textual support for content literacy into each course:
  - Assist students in organizing for text study by previewing chapters and articles, and modeling annotation, notetaking and summary skills.
  - Build background knowledge and set expectations for reading with a purpose.
  - Provide reading pre-organizers such as text prediction activities and discussions, reading/study guides or vocabulary checks.
  - Focus classroom discussions of content gleaned from text back to the text itself to analyze issues, identify points of support or to substantiate drawing inferences from the text.
- Offer reading/study adjuncts (supplemental instruction) to students in selected courses in the major.

The following is a description of freshmen students' perceptions of the importance of reading assignments summarized in a recent article on the reading/study strategies of at-risk college students:

"For all of these students, the purpose of reading text materials and studying was to prepare for a test....If students had determined that it was not necessary to read a text in order to prepare for a test, they did no reading. Most of these students reported that it was common for professors to assign a book and then teach the material contained in the book during lectures, making it unnecessary to read, or even buy, the book. Other professors required books but took most test questions from lectures, and tests could be passed simply by studying the lecture notes. Again, there was no reason the use the required text." (Barksdale et al, *Qualitative Assessment in Developmental Reading*, Journal of College Reading and Learning, 28 (1), Fall 1997, p. 43.)



RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SERVING ESL STUDENTS  
IN COURSES IN THE MAJOR

Robby Ching  
ESL Coordinator  
Learning Skills/English Departments  
CSU Sacramento

- \* Make advising of ESL students a department priority. Make sure transfer students begin the courses recommended by the English Diagnostic Test (ESL placement test) immediately.
- \* Develop criterion-based grading standards for writing as a department (see ESL WPE Criteria).
- \* Develop a complete set of range-finders (typical papers at each level) for both native speakers and ESL students. This should reflect a consensus within the department; the discussion could be school-based.
- \* Use a multidraft approach and give students feedback on both global (rhetorical) and local (grammar/mechanics) matters.
- \* Balance in-class and out-of-class writing. Build in incentives for students to do their own writing.
- \* Develop expertise in responding to ESL papers and teaching "ESL grammar". Draw on the expertise of ESL faculty.
- \* Develop expertise in designing curriculum that is accessible to multicultural students. Build background knowledge for students on topics that are culture-specific.

## CSUS Writing Requirements and Expected Outcomes and Competencies

- **Freshman Composition:** Entering freshmen must take the English Placement Test. Students who are designated as students with English as Second Language (ESL) also take an English Diagnostic Test on entering. Freshman Composition is a graduation requirement for all CSU students. English 1A is for native speakers, and English 2B is the ESL equivalent course. (Students who do not qualify for Freshman Composition take one or more basic writing courses before taking English 1A/2B. Students completing these courses are expected to write academic essays of 3-5 pages. The essays are to be expository, to respond to assigned readings, and to address increasingly complex writing assignments. Students should be able to summarize, critique, explain and respond to the points of views of others, establish a thesis of their own, and develop their ideas logically with examples and illustrations and data from outside sources. Students should be able to draft papers, evaluate their writing and that of others, and revise their papers with a clear sense of purpose and audience. The finished product should be focused, clear, organized, developed, and mechanically sound.
- **Sophomore Composition:** All CSUS students must take a second semester of composition (English 20) or an accepted Community College transfer course (English 1B or 1C) as a graduation requirement. Students completing these courses are expected to write academic essays of 5-10 pages. Students are to demonstrate the ability to comprehend full-length and shorter texts in a variety of genres; the texts are to be more sophisticated and challenging than those mastered in freshman composition. Students should demonstrate ability to research a topic, draw on several sources, cite sources accurately, and effectively integrate several texts into their thinking and writing. As in freshman composition courses, students are expected to form their own thesis, though now to more complex topics, to develop and support their ideas, though now with more use of outside sources, and to draft and revise their papers, emphasizing purpose, audience needs, thesis, focus, development and mechanical correctness.
- **The Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement:** All junior level students must pass a writing proficiency test (WPE) or, if they fail the exam after two attempts, must take and pass an additional writing course (English 109W for native speakers, English 109E for ESL students). The WPE was designed to meet the CSU Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement, which is met variously on different CSU campuses. The requirement is considered by CSU a test of basic proficiency of upper division students, and it must be met in the junior year. To pass the current WPE, a student must demonstrate the ability to respond in a timed exam to a general prompt with an essay that has a thesis, a sense of organization, specific examples, and a basic command of standard written English. If students fail the exam twice, they must take and pass a writing course (English 109W/E). Students in this course must demonstrate the ability to work with a variety of essays on a single topic, summarizing the essays, developing a thesis in response to them that draws from the texts, and revising their work for clarity, cohesion, and mechanical correctness. Demonstrating these competencies is a pre-requisite for Advanced Studies.
- **Advanced Studies:** After passing the WPE or English 109W/E, all students take an Advanced Studies course, a writing-intensive course in one of several disciplines. In most cases, the course is taken outside the student's major, though some departments allow or require the student to take the course within his or her major. Advanced Studies courses require 5000 words of writing, spread out over the semester in a number of assignments with instructor feedback on each. Students should demonstrate the ability to write in a specific discipline and to meet the requirements established by the instructor in the course.

## ENGLISH 1A GRADING CRITERIA

### A - Excellent

- 1) Addresses assignment directly with clear, ambitious thesis.
- 2) Demonstrates strong sense of thematic purpose and audience awareness.
- 3) Demonstrates logical analysis and clarity of thought in discussing complex issues raised by assignment.
- 4) Demonstrates clear, focused, unified, coherent organization and development.
- 5) Supports generalizations with fully developed, effective evidence, including specific details and concrete examples.
- 6) Demonstrates excellent use of language, syntax, sentence variety, and conventions of SWE.

### B - Superior

- 1) Addresses assignment directly with clear, well defined thesis.
- 2) Demonstrates clear sense of thematic purpose and audience awareness.
- 3) Demonstrates logical analysis as well as narration and description in exploring salient issues raised by assignment.
- 4) Demonstrates clear, logical organization and development.
- 5) Supports generalizations with reasonably clear, effective evidence, including specific details and concrete examples.
- 6) Demonstrates superior use of language, syntax, sentence variety, and conventions of SWE.

### C - Adequate

- 1) Addresses assignment subject and central issues directly with identifiable, relevant thesis.
- 2) Demonstrates at least minimal sense of thematic purpose and audience awareness.
- 3) Demonstrates clarity of thought in addressing issues but may rely on fairly brief, rudimentary analysis to explore and support contentions.
- 4) Demonstrates reasonably clear, if somewhat inconsistent and/or formulaic, organization and development.
- 5) Supports generalizations with reasonably clear, sufficient evidence but may lack elaborative details and/or examples.
- 6) Demonstrates adequate use of language, syntax, sentence variety, and conventions of SWE to avoid serious distraction or confusion.

### D - Inadequate (not passing)

- 1) Thesis may not address assignment directly, clearly; may distort or wander from assignment; may be oblique or confusing.
- 2) Thematic purpose and audience awareness may be insufficient to provide general clarity.
- 3) Analysis may be simplistic, generally ineffective, or may be replaced almost entirely by narration and description.
- 4) Organization and development may be simplistically formulaic, random, confusing, or almost entirely absent.
- 5) Generalizations may not be supported by reasonably clear, sufficient evidence, or supporting evidence may not be directly related to general statements.
- 6) Language, syntax, sentences, and conventions of SWE may be generally weak or specifically flawed.

### F - Unsatisfactory (not passing)

- 1) Demonstrates serious deficiencies in some or all areas listed under "D" grade.

## *ENGLISH 20 GRADING CRITERIA*

### **A - SUPERIOR**

- .Addresses a complex topic analytically**
- .Evidences a thorough engagement with multiple texts**
- .Shows mastery of texts with multiple points of view**
- .Shows substantial depth and complexity of thought**
- .Reflects a clear purpose and an awareness of audience
- .Is sharply focused on a clear thesis or point of view
- .Is fully developed and supported and effectively organized
- .Shows superior control of written English standards

### **B - STRONG**

- .Approaches the A paper in all or most categories, especially those noted in bold print above. The paper might reveal some minor lapses, such as occasional need for additional sources, analysis, or detail, and it might engage multiple sources with less complexity than does the A paper.

### **C - ADEQUATE**

- .Shows evidence of ability in the skills of an A or B paper, but shows only adequate control of those skills. For instance, the paper might develop some points clearly, but others less clearly; it might draw on multiple texts, but sometimes not effectively or clearly; it will be thoughtful, but sometimes the ideas will need further analysis; it might show patterns of grammar or punctuation errors, but not so serious as to slow the reader or impede understanding.

### **D - SERIOUSLY FLAWED**

- .Reveals a pattern of serious rhetorical problems or mechanical errors, which might include not addressing or losing focus on the topic, merely describing or summarizing instead of analyzing, not drawing adequately or effectively on other texts, organizing haphazardly, exhibiting errors that slow the reader or impede understanding.

### **F - INADEQUATE**

- .Demonstrates serious inadequacies in several of the areas necessary for English 20 level writing.