1. Announcements
   HIPs certification for writing intensive courses scheduled January 29th

2. Updates and current status on UWSR proposal
   review proposal sent to Academic Senate May 13 (attached)
   report on possibility of adding results of GWAR certified courses to grade reporting
   review policies for second-tier courses to distribute to departments interested in creating

3. Second-Composition policies
   who will be responsible for overseeing second comp?
   review existing criteria and outcomes for English 1002 and national first-year composition
   review GE outcomes and university mission statement

Attachments:
UWSR Semester Recommendations (May 13)
WPA Outcomes
English 1002 Description
CSU GE-Breadth Area A and IGETC Area 1
Communication in the English Language & Critical Thinking

Area A emphasizes development of students’ communication and reasoning skills. It requires coursework in “communication in the English language, to include both oral communication and written communication,” making these the only courses in the GE pattern that must be taught in English.

From Executive Order 595:

A minimum of 9 semester units or 12 quarter units are required in communication in the English language—to include both oral communication and written communication—and in critical thinking, which shall include consideration of common fallacies in reasoning.

Instruction approved for fulfillment of the requirement in communication is to be designed to emphasize the content of communication as well as the form and should provide an understanding of the psychological basis and the social significance of communication, including how communication operates in various situations. Applicable course(s) should view communication as the process of human symbolic interaction focusing on the communicative process from the theoretical perspective: reasoning and advocacy, organization, accuracy; the discovery, critical evaluation and reporting of information; reading and listening effectively as well as speaking and writing. This must include active participation and practice in written communication and oral communication.

Instruction in critical thinking is to be designed to achieve an understanding of the relationship of language to logic, which should lead to the ability to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas, to reason inductively and deductively, and to reach factual or judgmental conclusions based on sound inferences drawn from unambiguous statements of knowledge or belief. The minimal competence to be expected at the successful conclusion of instruction in critical thinking should be the demonstration of skills in elementary inductive and deductive processes, including an understanding of the formal and informal fallacies of language and thought, and the ability to distinguish matters of fact from issues of judgment or opinion.

English is the language of instruction for Area A1 and Area A2.

Outside of Areas A1 and A2, there is no CSU policy requiring that the course be taught in English to be incorporated into a GE-Breadth certification.

However, in Areas A1 and A2 the CSU has granted GE recognition only for courses taught in English for two reasons:

⇒ California Education Code Section 30 provides that “English be the language of instruction in all schools”

⇒ Community colleges have been urged to encourage prospective transfer students to take courses taught in English, to develop better the command of academic English that is required for upper-division study in the CSU.
A1 Oral Communication (IGETC Area 1C)

Courses must include faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in communicating orally in the physical presence of other listeners. Rhetorical principles must be covered (study of effective communication in formal speeches or social interaction is appropriate, for example). The CSU Communications Departments have asked that for courses submitted for IGETC Area 1C or CSU GE-Breadth Area A1, the “methods of instruction” and “methods of evaluation” sections of the outline be very specific about how instruction and evaluation are conducted so that it may be determined that student presentations will be made in front of faculty and other listeners (not online or recorded).

Interpersonal communications courses are not a natural fit in Area A1, but a few have been made to work by incorporating significant faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in speaking with others and at least a small component of traditional rhetoric.

Typical reviewer comments applying to Area A1/1C

“The revised outline will need to specify methods of instruction.”

“Course must include faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in oral communication presented in front of other listeners (not online or recorded).”

“Rhetorical principles must be covered (study of effective communication in formal speeches or social interaction is appropriate, for example).”

“This course is accepted with reservations about the extent of faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in oral communication. Reviewers suggest revising the outline.”

Additional Criteria for IGETC: Area 1C Oral Communication

The UC system doesn’t require Oral Communication, so no additional criteria apply.

Area 1C has been set aside under the IGTEC pattern so that evaluators can see whether students transferring into the CSU have met this graduation requirement, but the review standards are identical to those for Area A1 Oral Communication in the CSU’s GE-Breadth pattern.
A2 Written Communication  

Written Communication courses need to be conducted in English. They may be designed for speakers of other languages, but the courses must lead to achievement of the same “freshman composition” objectives as courses for native speakers of English. Courses should explore rhetorical principles independent of the application of writing to a specific profession: an advertising department’s course in Copy Writing or a journalism department’s course in News Writing would not be suitable for Written Communication.

Reviewers look for evidence of assigned and graded student writing, both in class and as assigned homework. There is no minimum word count, but some number of words should be specified in the course outline.

The course must carry an appropriate prerequisite, such as an SAT score or placement score, distinguishing it from a remedial class.

Typical reviewer comments applying to Area A2/1A

“Courses in this area must be conducted in English.”

“Courses designed exclusively for the satisfaction of remedial composition cannot be counted toward fulfillment of the English composition requirement.”

“A revised outline should include specify the approximate total number of words (counting only final drafts) that students are expected to write, and should specify writing assignments required in class and outside the classroom.”

“Courses in news writing and reporting are excluded from Area A2.”
A3 Critical Thinking

Executive Order 595 is unusually specific in calling for student competencies “in elementary inductive and deductive processes, including an understanding of the formal and informal fallacies of language and thought, and the ability to distinguish matters of fact from issues of judgment or opinion.”

In practice this means critical thinking courses should include explicit instruction and practice in inductive and deductive reasoning or identifying formal and informal fallacies of language and thought. Literary criticism courses are typically not accepted in this area.

Reviewers look for courses that develop students’ ability to think systematically and identify faulty reasoning, such as:

- hasty generalization
- non sequitur
- false analogies
- post hoc arguments
- attacks ad hominem
- bandwagon appeal
- tautology/circular reasoning
- either-or fallacies

Over the past several years of review cycles, community colleges have developed courses to meet these student learning outcomes.

Unlike IGETC Area 1B courses, CSU GE-Breadth Area A3 courses do not have to have a prerequisite or instruction in writing.

Typical reviewer comments applying to Area A3/1B

“The content section of the outline does not provide enough detail to determine whether all elements of critical thinking required by CSU E.O. 595 for Area A3 are present (e.g., whether students will be able to advocate ideas effectively and to reason inductively and deductively.”

“This course does not appear to include sufficient explicit instruction and practice in inductive and deductive reasoning or identifying formal and informal fallacies of language and thought.”

“Area A3 courses must include evaluation of information.”

“Journalism courses are excluded from Area A3.”

Additional Criteria for IGETC: Area 1B Critical Thinking-English Composition

The two-system IGETC pattern combines critical thinking with a second semester of composition. So Area 1B criteria include all those for Area A3, above, plus:

- a minimum writing requirement of 6,000 words, not including revisions
- an explicit prerequisite course, which has been approved under IGETC Area 1A
  English Composition

Reviewers can verify course prerequisites by consulting collegesource.com.
WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (v3.0)  
(adopted 17 July 2014)

Introduction
This Statement identifies outcomes for first-year composition programs in U.S. postsecondary education. It describes the writing knowledge, practices, and attitudes that undergraduate students develop in first-year composition, which at most schools is a required general education course or sequence of courses. This Statement therefore attempts to both represent and regularize writing programs’ priorities for first-year composition, which often takes the form of one or more required general education courses. To this end it is not merely a compilation or summary of what currently takes place. Rather, this Statement articulates what composition teachers nationwide have learned from practice, research, and theory. It intentionally defines only “outcomes,” or types of results, and not “standards,” or precise levels of achievement. The setting of standards to measure students’ achievement of these Outcomes has deliberately been left to local writing programs and their institutions.

In this Statement “composing” refers broadly to complex writing processes that are increasingly reliant on the use of digital technologies. Writers also attend to elements of design, incorporating images and graphical elements into texts intended for screens as well as printed pages. Writers’ composing activities have always been shaped by the technologies available to them, and digital technologies are changing writers’ relationships to their texts and audiences in evolving ways.

These outcomes are supported by a large body of research demonstrating that the process of learning to write in any medium is complex: it is both individual and social and demands continued practice and informed guidance. Programmatic decisions about helping students demonstrate these outcomes should be informed by an understanding of this research.

As students move beyond first-year composition, their writing abilities do not merely improve. Rather, their abilities will diversify along disciplinary, professional, and civic lines as these writers move into new settings where expected outcomes expand, multiply, and diverge. Therefore, this document advises faculty in all disciplines about how to help students build on what they learn in introductory writing courses.

Rhetorical Knowledge
*Rhetorical knowledge* is the ability to analyze contexts and audiences and then to act on that analysis in comprehending and creating texts. Rhetorical knowledge is the basis of composing. Writers develop rhetorical knowledge by negotiating purpose, audience, context, and conventions as they compose a variety of texts for different situations. -

*By the end of first-year composition, students should*

- Learn and use key rhetorical concepts through analyzing and composing a variety of texts
- Gain experience reading and composing in several genres to understand how genre conventions shape and are shaped by readers’ and writers’ practices and purposes
- Develop facility in responding to a variety of situations and contexts calling for purposeful shifts in voice, tone, level of formality, design, medium, and/or structure
- Understand and use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences

---

1 This Statement is aligned with the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, an articulation of the skills and habits of mind essential for success in college, and is intended to help establish a continuum of valued practice from high school through to the college major.
• Match the capacities of different environments (e.g., print and electronic) to varying rhetorical situations

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn
• The expectations of readers in their fields
• The main features of genres in their fields
• The main purposes of composing in their fields

Critical Thinking, Reading, and Composing

Critical thinking is the ability to analyze, synthesize, interpret, and evaluate ideas, information, situations, and texts. When writers think critically about the materials they use--whether print texts, photographs, data sets, videos, or other materials--they separate assertion from evidence, evaluate sources and evidence, recognize and evaluate underlying assumptions, read across texts for connections and patterns, identify and evaluate chains of reasoning, and compose appropriately qualified and developed claims and generalizations. These practices are foundational for advanced academic writing.

By the end of first-year composition, students should
• Use composing and reading for inquiry, learning, critical thinking, and communicating in various rhetorical contexts
• Read a diverse range of texts, attending especially to relationships between assertion and evidence, to patterns of organization, to the interplay between verbal and nonverbal elements, and to how these features function for different audiences and situations
• Locate and evaluate (for credibility, sufficiency, accuracy, timeliness, bias and so on) primary and secondary research materials, including journal articles and essays, books, scholarly and professionally established and maintained databases or archives, and informal electronic networks and internet sources
• Use strategies--such as interpretation, synthesis, response, critique, and design/redesign--to compose texts that integrate the writer's ideas with those from appropriate sources

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn
• The kinds of critical thinking important in their disciplines
• The kinds of questions, problems, and evidence that define their disciplines
• Strategies for reading a range of texts in their fields

Processes

Writers use multiple strategies, or composing processes, to conceptualize, develop, and finalize projects. Composing processes are seldom linear: a writer may research a topic before drafting, then conduct additional research while revising or after consulting a colleague. Composing processes are also flexible: successful writers can adapt their composing processes to different contexts and occasions.

By the end of first-year composition, students should
• Develop a writing project through multiple drafts
• Develop flexible strategies for reading, drafting, reviewing, collaborating, revising, rewriting, rereading, and editing
• Use composing processes and tools as a means to discover and reconsider ideas
• Experience the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes
• Learn to give and to act on productive feedback to works in progress
• Adapt composing processes for a variety of technologies and modalities
• Reflect on the development of composing practices and how those practices influence their work

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn
• To employ the methods and technologies commonly used for research and communication within their fields
• To develop projects using the characteristic processes of their fields
• To review work-in-progress for the purpose of developing ideas before surface-level editing
• To participate effectively in collaborative processes typical of their field

Knowledge of Conventions
Conventions are the formal rules and informal guidelines that define genres, and in so doing, shape readers’ and writers’ perceptions of correctness or appropriateness. Most obviously, conventions govern such things as mechanics, usage, spelling, and citation practices. But they also influence content, style, organization, graphics, and document design.

Conventions arise from a history of use and facilitate reading by invoking common expectations between writers and readers. These expectations are not universal; they vary by genre (conventions for lab notebooks and discussion-board exchanges differ), by discipline (conventional moves in literature reviews in Psychology differ from those in English), and by occasion (meeting minutes and executive summaries use different registers). A writer’s grasp of conventions in one context does not mean a firm grasp in another. Successful writers understand, analyze, and negotiate conventions for purpose, audience, and genre, understanding that genres evolve in response to changes in material conditions and composing technologies and attending carefully to emergent conventions.

By the end of first-year composition, students should
• Develop knowledge of linguistic structures, including grammar, punctuation, and spelling, through practice in composing and revising
• Understand why genre conventions for structure, paragraphing, tone, and mechanics vary
• Gain experience negotiating variations in genre conventions
• Learn common formats and/or design features for different kinds of texts
• Explore the concepts of intellectual property (such as fair use and copyright) that motivate documentation conventions
• Practice applying citation conventions systematically in their own work

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn
• The reasons behind conventions of usage, specialized vocabulary, format, and citation systems in their fields or disciplines
• Strategies for controlling conventions in their fields or disciplines
• Factors that influence the ways work is designed, documented, and disseminated in their fields
• Ways to make informed decisions about intellectual property issues connected to common genres and modalities in their fields.
ENGLISH 1002: COLLEGE WRITING II (RHETORICAL ANALYSIS, ARGUMENTATION AND RESEARCH)

Description: This final class in the composition series focuses on critical reading, rhetorical analysis, argumentation and research.

Prerequisite: Students must have successfully completed English 1001: Expository Writing I with a grade of “C” or better.

Units: 4

Grading: A B C D F CR/NC

Objectives:
1. Review and refine writing skills that pertain to process, including audience awareness, prewriting, thesis generation, outlining and essay organization, effective sentence generation, paragraph development, effective proofreading and revision;
2. Become familiar with various models of argumentation, including the Classical and Rogerian;
3. Master the Toulmin model of rhetorical analysis, including terminology such as “claim,” “evidence,” “warrant” or “assumption,” “backing,” and “logical fallacy”;
4. Refine critical reading skills;
5. Critically read, discuss, and evaluate the rhetorical effectiveness of a written argument in terms of ethos, pathos, and logos, (inductive and deductive reasoning), audience appeal and strategies of support;
6. Deepen familiarity with the conventions of academic writing, including demonstrating command of various documentation styles, such as MLA and APA.
7. Generate well-reasoned and authoritatively supported argumentative essays in the form of rhetorical analyses of a range of texts, including argumentative essays, speeches, op ed pieces, advertisements, film, and some literature;
8. Become familiar with primary and secondary research methods and protocol, including personal interviews, surveys, library searches, on-line searches, documentation format, note-taking, and annotated bibliography;
9. Assert a position on a debatable issue (e.g., political, social, or cultural issues) and persuasively support it with authoritative evidence acquired through research;
10. Show evidence of awareness of differing points of view and be able to address those points of view;
11. Engage in the process of generating a major argumentative research essay.

In this class students will perform the following tasks:
• Review the components of different types of argumentative essays;
• Read various assigned texts;
• Keep a reading journal;
• Explore vocabulary usage, especially as it pertains to rhetorical analysis of Toulmin, Classical, and Rogerian modes of rhetorical analysis and argumentation;
• Improve critical reading and argumentative writing skills by discussing essays, written by both students and professionals;
• Practice incorporating secondary sources into their own writing;
• Write and revise out-of-class rhetorical analysis essays and/or write and revise out-of-class argumentative essays supported with well-researched evidence;
• Write in-class reading responses;
• Write in-class mid-term and final exams;
• Work in peer revision groups;
• Engage the process of producing a major argumentative research essay.

**Methods of Instruction:** Four hours of classroom instruction per week. Classes may include guided and independent reading and writing, peer editing, small group work, and discussion of topics related to the readings.

**Average Minimum Writing Requirement:** 6,000 word minimum, not counting drafts and revisions separately, which may consist of 2 rhetorical analysis essays (4-6 pp., 1,000-1,500 words) with required full revisions; an in-class mid-term and final; a final research essay (8-12 pp, 2,000-3,000 words).