

ACTION BY ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

RECEIVED BY AA \_\_\_\_\_

SUB COM ACTION \_\_\_\_\_ DATE/REF : \_\_\_\_\_

EPC ACTION \_\_\_\_\_ DATE/REF : \_\_\_\_\_

EFFECTIVE DATE : \_\_\_\_\_

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES**

**COURSE MODIFICATION OR NEW COURSE PROPOSAL FORM**

- 1. **College and Academic Unit** [Identify the College and Department, Division, School, or Program responsible for submitting the proposal.] Department of English, College of Arts and Letters
- 2. **Proposal Type** [Indicate below the type of proposal being submitted.]  
 **NEW COURSE**  
 **COURSE MODIFICATION** [For a Course Modification Proposal replicate the entire existing course proposal and indicate any proposed changes, using ~~strike-through~~ for deletions and underline for additions.]

3. **Catalog Description of the Course** [Include the course prefix, number, full title, abbreviated title (27 characters max, including spaces), and units, followed by any prerequisites and co-requisites. Provide a course narrative not to exceed a limit of 30 words. The 30-word limit does not include prerequisites/co-requisites. If any of the following apply, include in the description: Repeatability (May be repeated to a maximum of \_\_\_ units); time distribution (Lecture \_\_\_ hours, laboratory \_\_\_ hours); non-traditional grading system (Graded CR/NC, ABC/NC). Follow accepted catalog format.]

**ENGL 1050 – Argumentative Writing and Critical Thinking (3)**

**Abbreviated Title: WRITING AND CRIT THINKING**

Prerequisite: ENGL 1005B, ENGL 1010, or equivalent. Instruction in argumentation and critical writing, critical thinking, analytical evaluation of texts, research strategies, information literacy, and proper documentation.

**GE A3**

4. **Mode of instruction**

a. **Staffing Formula** [Information on C/S number and workload can be found in the Curriculum Handbook.]

	Existing					Proposed				
	Units	Hours per Unit per Week	Benchmark Enrollment	C/S #	Workload K-factor	Units	Hours per Unit per Week	Benchmark Enrollment	C/S #	Workload K-factor
Lecture										
Seminar						3	1	25	C4	1.0
Laboratory										
Activity										
Recitation										
Supervision										

**b. Mode of Delivery** [If the course includes non-traditional pedagogical modes or forms of instruction, such as online or field based activities, the proposal needs to address the requirements for such instruction as specified in the Curriculum Handbook.]

**5. Summary of Changes for Course Modifications** [Indicate below which items are being changed in the proposed modification.]

**a. Catalog Description:** \_\_ course prefix, \_\_ number, \_\_ title, \_\_ units, \_\_ prerequisites/co-requisites

**b. Mode of Instruction:** \_\_ instruction type, \_\_ units, \_\_ hours per unit, \_\_ benchmark enrollment,  
\_\_ C/S #, \_\_ workload, \_\_ non-traditional pedagogy

**c. Course Content** \_\_\_\_

**d. Course Title** \_\_\_\_

**e. Student Learning Outcomes** \_\_\_\_

**f. References** \_\_\_\_

**g. Other (Specify)** \_\_\_\_\_

**6. Justification** [For a new course proposal, indicate whether required or elective and provide a justification for the course. For a course modification proposal, for each item checked above, describe the change and provide a justification for the change. Use as much space as necessary.]

This course meets the learning outcomes of two separate courses: one an advanced writing course and the other a critical thinking course (CSU GE A3).

The CSU is the only state university system to require that its students complete course work in critical thinking. These requirements as articulated in EO 1065 are:

In critical thinking (subarea A3) courses, students will understand logic and its relation to language; 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 A3 courses, students will develop the abilities to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas; to reason inductively and deductively; and to reach well-supported factual or judgmental conclusions. (EO 1065)

First-year college writing courses have long emphasized the processes and activities outlined in the above description of critical thinking, and, in fact, virtually all community colleges in the state of California offer a writing and critical thinking course that is articulated to CSU GE A3, and the C-ID common course numbering system identifies ENG 105 as a writing and critical thinking course that satisfies CSU GE A3.

This ENGL 1050 course proposal is based on research that demonstrates that integrating writing and other critical thinking activities into a course increases students' learning while teaching them thinking skills for posing questions, proposing hypotheses, gathering and analyzing data, and making arguments, applicable to any discipline or interest. Quite simply, writing is both a process of doing critical thinking and a product communicating the results of critical thinking.

Robert Ennis offers this succinct definition: "Critical thinking is reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do." He then offers this list of the characteristics of a critical thinker:

Assuming that critical thinking is reasonable reflective thinking focused on deciding what to believe or do, a critical thinker:

1. Is open-minded and mindful of alternatives
  2. Tries to be well-informed
  3. Judges well the credibility of sources
  4. Identifies conclusions, reasons, and assumptions
  5. Judges well the quality of an argument, including the acceptability of its reasons, assumptions, and evidence
  6. Can well develop and defend a reasonable position
  7. Asks appropriate clarifying questions
  8. Formulates plausible hypotheses; plans experiments well
  9. Defines terms in a way appropriate for the context
  10. Draws conclusions when warranted, but with caution
  11. Integrates all items in this list when deciding what to believe or do
- (Ennis, "A Super-Streamlined Conception of Critical Thinking" (online))

Ennis' summary provides an effective snapshot of the broader goals of ENGL 1050 and the English Department's commitment to developing critical thinking in a variety of general education, writing, and major classes. These characteristics are also the basis for the ways in which this course meets the A3/Second Composition Course student learning outcomes described below.

**7. Course Content in Outline Form** [Describe content relevant to each mode of instruction listed above (i.e., lecture, laboratory), including any signature assignments or other requirements.]

Course content responds directly to the student learning outcomes for this course, which were partially derived from existing courses offered by the English Department as part of general education. This content might be summarized in relation to course SLOs as follows:

- Learn about the difference between knowledge and belief, facts and values, and formal and informal fallacies of language and thought.
- Learn about the range of evidence used to support various types of claims, and common techniques of persuasion.
- Learn the fundamentals of logic and critical thinking and the relationship of logic to language.
- Learn about inductive and deductive reasoning.
- Develop writing and reading skills for logical reasoning and argumentation.
- Use critical reading strategies to understand a range of public and academic writing.
- Practice strategies for meaningful revision and recognize that writing is a recursive process.
- Prewrite, draft, write, and revise a minimum of 6000 words of formal writing. The writing will be in a variety of genres, assume a variety of rhetorical approaches, respond to a rhetorical situation, address a specific audience, address a variety of viewpoints, and articulate a stance. Some of the essays will incorporate outside texts.
- Incorporate textual evidence in writing, when appropriate, through the use of paraphrase, summary, and quotation.
- Investigate the relationships between stylistic options and audience response.
- Discuss ideas and motives in culture.
- Learn about the resources available through the University Writing Center, University Library, and other centers of information.

Course design might take a number of forms to achieve the above course content. Listed below is one schematic representation of course content as based on Lunsford, Ruszkiewicz, and Walters, *Everything's an Argument* (6<sup>th</sup> edition, 2013).

1. Reading and Understanding Arguments
  - a. Occasions for Argument
  - b. Kinds of Argument
  - c. Stasis Questions at Work
  - d. Audiences for Arguments
  - e. Appealing to Audiences: Pathos, Ethos, Logos, Rhetorical Situations
    - i. Arguments Based on Emotion: Pathos
    - ii. Arguments Based on Character: Ethos
    - iii. Arguments Based on Facts and Reason: Logos
  - f. Fallacies of Argument
    - i. Fallacies of Emotional Argument (i.e. Scare Tactics, Either-Or Choices, Slippery Slope, Overly Sentimental Appeals, Bandwagon Appeals)
    - ii. Fallacies of Ethical Argument (i.e. Appeals for False Authority, Dogmatism, Ad Hominem Arguments, Stacking the Deck)
    - iii. Fallacies of Logical Argument (i.e. Hasty Generalization, Faulty Causality, Begging the Question, Equivocation, Non Sequitur, Straw Man, Red Herring, Faulty Analogy)
  - g. Rhetorical Analysis
2. Writing Arguments
  - a. Prewriting and invention strategies
  - b. Classical Oration
  - c. Toulmin Argument
  - d. Reasoning inductively and deductively
  - e. Drafting and revision
  - f. Types of Arguments
    - i. Arguments of Fact
    - ii. Arguments of Definition
    - iii. Evaluations
    - iv. Causal Arguments
    - v. Proposals
  - g. Style and Presentation in Arguments
    - i. Style in Arguments (i.e. diction, figurative language, etc.)
    - ii. Visual and Multimedia Arguments
3. Research and Arguments
  - a. Developing an Academic Argument
  - b. What Counts as Evidence
  - c. Evaluating Sources
  - d. Using Sources
  - e. Academic Integrity
  - f. Documenting Sources

**8. Student Learning Outcomes** [List course objectives (e.g., skills, knowledge, attitudes, including GE outcomes for all GE courses) that will be achieved upon successful completion of this.]

**Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:**

1. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between knowledge and belief, facts and values, and identify faulty reasoning through an understanding of the formal and informal fallacies of language and thought, through writing, reading, and research.
2. Analyze and evaluate a range of evidence used to support various types of claims.
3. Recognize, respond to and use common techniques of persuasion.
4. Understand the fundamentals of logic and critical thinking and the relationship of logic to language.
5. Use inductive and deductive reasoning to reach well-supported conclusions.

6. Identify the assumptions upon which particular conclusions depend.
7. Refine fundamental rhetorical strategies used to produce university-level writing, especially
  - a. modify content and form according to the rhetorical situation, purpose, and audience
  - b. incorporate textual evidence through quotation, summary, and paraphrase into their essays and appropriately cite their sources
  - c. evaluate the relevance, validity, and authority of information, and ethically use and cite that information in their own writing
8. Develop cogent arguments for views on theoretical and practical matters
9. Exhibit knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to voice, tone and style
10. Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling

## General Education Certification

### GE Governing Principles

Requires the practice and evaluation of writing in English, including, where appropriate, library assignments

Provides ample opportunity for students to be active learners in their educational experience

Does not require a non-General Education prerequisite

### Course Meets this Principle Through

As a course offered by the English Department, this course utilizes a wide variety of high impact practices related to writing practice, including the use of informal low-stakes writing assignments as well as more formal writing tasks with opportunities for peer and/or instructor feedback and revision. In addition, students will have the opportunity to write for a wide variety of audiences using both conventional and alternative media. This course also focuses on information literacy. Course sections coordinate with the library staff who offer individualized introductions to information literacy and research skills.

Student-centered pedagogies, small-group work, and the use of technology characterize most offerings in the English Department and promote active and engaged learning.

This course has no non-GE prerequisite.

### GE A3 Student Learning Outcomes

Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between knowledge and belief, facts and values, and identify faulty reasoning through an understanding of the formal and informal fallacies of language and thought, through writing, reading, and research

### Course Meets this Outcome Through

Reading and producing analytical and argumentative texts requires writers to develop the healthy skepticism that is the foundation of critical thinking. Students are continually challenged in their thinking and writing by instructors asking of their claims, “According to whom?” “How do you know this?” “What’s the basis for this claim?” and so forth. Ongoing engagement with student thinking as reflected in discussion, conference, and writing enables instructors to help students develop what both the AAC&U and the Writing Program Administrators *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* call “the habit of mind” of critical thinking. In becoming better producers of arguments students will become better consumers of them. With its emphasis on rhetoric this course

will engage directly and repeatedly with informal fallacies, and with its emphasis on clarity of thought and expression with formal fallacies. More important, students will develop these abilities to judge better the strengths and weaknesses of their own arguments and those of others, as well as learn to ask appropriate clarifying questions.

Analyze and evaluate a range of evidence used to support various types of claims

Class assignments focus on the careful evaluation of evidence both as found in texts and as presented in student writing with emphasis on understanding the rhetorical purposes of evidence and the rhetorical situations that determine its effectiveness.

Recognize, respond to and use common techniques of persuasion

This course like all English Department writing courses is primarily rhetoric-based. Reading assignments, class discussions, writing and revision revolve around careful consideration of the purposes, audiences, and rhetorical situations that govern communicative acts.

Understand the fundamentals of logic and critical thinking and the relationship of logic to language

Because ENGL 1050 is a writing class focused on analytical and argumentative writing, students by definition are required throughout the term to develop an understanding of the fundamentals of logic (*logos* in rhetorical terms) and critical thinking—a major feature of invention—and to attempt to express their own thinking in writing. The struggle to write is continually a struggle with language that is both too constricting and too permissive and that repeatedly betrays its seeming inability to express the supposed purity of thought. In fact, of course, writing courses prove that the old adage “clear thinking produces clear writing” does not itself represent very effective critical thinking. Writing is not the mere act of translating thoughts into language. Writing is thinking through the language we have. Composition pedagogy instantiates this key distinction by differentiating between ‘transactional’ (or rhetorical) writing and ‘expressive’ writing: “Writing to communicate--or what James Britton calls ‘transactional writing’--means writing to accomplish something, to inform, instruct, or persuade. . . . Writing to learn is different. We write to ourselves as well as talk with others to objectify our perceptions of reality; the primary function of this ‘expressive’ language is not to communicate, but to order and represent experience to our own understanding. In this sense language provides us with a unique way of knowing and becomes a tool for discovering, for shaping meaning, and for reaching understanding. (Fulwiler and Young, *Language Connections: Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum*, x). Writing classes with their twofold emphasis on transactional and expressive writing help students develop both the ability to express their thoughts in language and the ability to think that is only possible because of language.

Use inductive and deductive reasoning to reach well-supported conclusions

Students in their writing often make frequent and effective use of inductive and deductive reasoning, though, usually without any awareness of the distinction between the two or their differing uses and rhetorical effectiveness depending on context. In developing critical thinking through reading and writing, students will be repeatedly asked to reason backwards from conclusions through the chain of thought that produced the conclusions. In this way, students will be constantly engaged in considering and evaluating the reasoning behind conclusions, both the well-supported and weakly-supported.

Identify the assumptions, biases, and prejudices upon which particular conclusions rely and understand how they may erode sound arguments

As rhetoricians, we have less confidence in the existence or even possibility of “sound” arguments and their potential erosion. Arguments are primarily effective or ineffective. Outside of the *Critique of Pure Reason* all arguments (sound and unsound) are riddled with assumptions, biases, and prejudices upon which particular conclusions rely. In the ideal writing class students would learn to live with imperfection and imprecision, with incomplete data and evidence that is always evidence of something. Rather than emphasizing the possibility of the “sound” argument or the “bullet-proof” case, students in writing classes through reading their own and other students’ writing develop both a solid skepticism of the “right” argument and a willingness to critique the “sound” argument to see the assumptions, biases, and prejudices that inform it.

Refine fundamental rhetorical strategies used to produce university-level writing, especially

- a. modify content and form according to the rhetorical situation, purpose, and audience
- b. incorporate textual evidence through quotation, summary, and paraphrase into their essays and appropriately cite their sources
- c. evaluate the relevance, validity, and authority of information, and ethically use and cite that information in their own writing

In this writing class, students will have the opportunity to develop their writing skills in a wide variety of rhetorical situations with the goal of improving their critical thinking and writing. Emphasis on multiple drafts and opportunities for feedback and revision in response to feedback will help students understand the important effect of purpose, audience, and convention on what they produce and how it is consumed. Furthermore, with an emphasis on critical reading of texts, students will develop the ability to “join the conversation” and see their writing as intervening and responding to an ongoing conversation. Through class readings and research, students will learn how to incorporate the words and ideas of others to improve the effectiveness of their arguments while not diminishing their authority as writers. The use of the words and ideas of others will develop alongside the ethical awareness of what is owed to others and what belongs to self.

Develop cogent arguments for views on theoretical and practical matters

This course focuses on analytical and argumentative writing on a wide variety of topics. While each course section might be focused on a different “theme,” students in all sections will work on their ability to develop effective arguments on both theoretical and practical matters. In fact most writing tasks ask students to do both simultaneously—either extract the theoretical from the practical or apply the theoretical with the practical.

Exhibit knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to voice, tone and style

Students will write in a variety of genres for a variety of purposes and to a variety of audiences. The differing demands of genres of writing related either to discourse communities and their conventions or to media will help students develop greater recognition and greater control of appropriate structure, voice, tone, and so forth.

Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling

Peer review, instructor feedback, and heightened self-awareness will help students improve the clarity and correctness of their expression. Fundamental to this approach is helping students see the rhetorical impact of imprecision and error—the writer’s *ethos* suffers as readers lose confidence in the writer’s abilities.

## 9. References [Provide 10-15 references in bibliographic format on which this course is based.]

- Bean, John. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001. Print.
- Beaufort, A. *College Writing and Beyond: A New Framework for University Writing Instruction*. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 2007. Print.
- Carroll, Lee Ann. *Rehearsing New Roles: How College Students Develop as Writers*. Carbondale: SIUP, 2002. Print.
- Chaffee, John. *Thinking Critically*. Tenth Edition. New York: Wadsworth, 2011. Print.
- Columbo, G., Coleman, R., & Lisle, B. (1989). *Rereading America: Cultural Contexts for Critical Thinking and Writing*. New York: St. Martin’s Press. Print.
- Haswell, Richard. “Documenting Improvement in College Writing: A Longitudinal Approach.” *Written Communication*, 17 (3), 307-352, 2000. Print.
- Hillocks, Jr., George. *Research on Written Composition*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1986. Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea, John J. Ruszkiewicz, and Keith Walters. *Everything’s an Argument with Readings*. Sixth Edition. New York: Bedford/St. Martins, 2013.
- Ramage, John D., John C. Bean, and June Johnson. *Writing Arguments: A Rhetoric with Readings*. Ninth Edition. New York: Pearson Longman, 2011. Print.
- Rottenberg, Annette. *The Elements of Argument*. Tenth Edition. New York: Bedford/St. Martins, 2011. Print.
- Salmon, Merrilee. *Introduction to Logic and Critical Thinking*. Sixth Edition. New York: Harcourt, 2012. Print.
- Sternglass, Marilyn S. *Time to Know Them: A Longitudinal Study of Writing and Learning at the College Level*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1997. Print.
- Walvoord, Barbara, and Lucille McCarthy. *Thinking and Writing in College: A Naturalistic Study of Students in Four Disciplines*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1990. Print.
- Yagelski, Robert P. *The Informed Argument*. Eighth Edition. New York: Thomson Wadsworth, 2011. Print.

## 10. Faculty [List Faculty Qualified to Teach this Course.]

All English Department faculty

**11. New Resources Required** [Indicate if new resources are required in any of the following categories.]

- a. Computer, audio visual, broadcasting needs, other equipment
- b. Library needs
- c. Facility/space/classroom needs

**12. Frequency** [Indicate projected offerings, annually or bi-annually.]

**Fall and Spring**

**13. Cross-Listing** [If this course is cross-listed with any other departments, arrange simultaneous submission of all cross-listed proposals. Describe the agreement reached among the cross-listed departments regarding the allocation of course teaching, sharing of FTES, and sharing of costs.]

**14. Program Modification** [If this proposal will alter any degree, credential, certificate, or minor program, include a statement about how the affected programs will accommodate the proposal if approved (either by submitting accompanying program modification proposals or arranging for global catalog substitution).]

**15. Articulation** [If this is a course modification and the course is articulated with a course from another campus, do the proposed changes require that the current articulation agreement be reviewed? If this is a new course, should articulation agreements be developed? (Information on current articulation agreements can be found at [www.assist.org](http://www.assist.org)).]

This course satisfies CSU A3 (critical thinking) general education requirements and CSULA university writing requirement for a second lower division composition course. It should articulate to C-ID ENGL 105.

**16. Consultation** [To be handled by College Curriculum Dean]

- a. Attach as a single-page summary, the consultation responses from all Colleges, Library, Information Technology Services (if necessary), with printed copies of any objections from affected departments, divisions, or programs.
- b. If any objections were not resolved, list below the name(s) of the college(s), school(s), department(s), division(s), or program(s) raising an unresolved objection.

## Electronic Signatures

College: Arts & Letters
Academic Unit (Program, Department, Division, School): English Department
Proposal: (example: BA Program Modification History, or GEOL 360 Geological Mapping – new course) ENGL 1050 Argumentative Writing and Critical Thinking – new course

Proposer of Course/Program: James M Garrett	Date: 2/1/2014
Department Curriculum Committee Chair: Aaron Sonnenschein	Date: 3/7/2014

**NOTICE: This document is to be forwarded by the Department/Division Chair named below to the Associate Dean of the appropriate College, who then initiates an “Electronic” Consultation of Proposals process (ECOP). In transmitting this document, the Chair certifies the validity of the departmental “electronic” signatures.**

### Approvals

Program, Department, Division, School Chair: James M Garrett	Date: 3/14/2014
College Curriculum Committee Chair: Henry Mendell	Date: 6/30/14
College Curriculum Dean: Lena M. Chao	Date: 6/30/14

**NOTICE: In transmitting this document, a college Associate Dean College certifies the validity of all “electronic” signatures.**