

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

- 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
- 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.]
- 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 1005A - College Writing I (3)

Prerequisites: English Placement Test (EPT) and completion of directed self-placement. First course in two term sequence (1005AB) focused on reading and writing to develop and communicate ideas. Instruction in strategies for planning, composing, and revising college writing that incorporates authorities, examples, arguments, and facts to write developed, supported texts. Graded A,B,C/NC.

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	20	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 is an intensive writing course assigned a CS number of C4 but proposed with an enrollment limit of 20, not 25. Because students with a wide range of skills and needs will be enrolled in this course, the English Department and the university need to commit to offering this course at a target enrollment that will best serve students.

ENGL 1005A is the first course in a two-term first-year college writing course intended for students who choose to stretch the curriculum of a first-year writing course across two terms rather than attempt the more the challenging pace of ENGL 1010 Accelerated College Writing. Students who complete ENGL 1005A successfully enroll in the second term (ENGL 1005B) of the year-long writing course (ENGL 1005AB). Successful completion of the second term (ENGL 1005B) satisfies the Block A Written Communication requirement.

Both ENGL 1005A and 1005B are along with ENGL 1010 part of the first-year writing program designed and implemented by the Department of English to provide the most effective writing instruction to CSULA students. The first-year writing program is based on the composition program principles of stretch composition and directed self-placement. While non-specialists might not be familiar with the term, stretch composition is over two decades old. First implemented in the early 1990s at Arizona State University, stretch composition is based on a few simple principles:

- Independent developmental courses imply well-defined points that separate one writing course in a sequence from another. This assumption, drawn from other disciplines such as developmental mathematics, does not take into account what the research shows—that writing and language competence develops recursively, not linearly and incrementally.
- Students can be offered different paths to the same end-point. Some paths might involve a single course, others more than one course.
- The most important determinant of the effectiveness of writing instruction is time. Some students need more time to attain basic competency; others can achieve basic competency in less time.

A stretch composition course takes the “content” of a first-year writing class and “stretches” it over two or three terms of instruction. The “content” of a first-year writing course is not so much knowledge or even skills—it is a complex intellectual, social, and cultural activity best developed in communities over time.

The basic outline of the stretch model might be summarized as follows:

Time: Students do better with their writing coursework and feel better about their learning experience when given more time to write, revise, and discuss writing, especially when that experience takes place with a familiar cohort and instructor.

Cohorts: Cohort models, where students stay with the same instructor and same students, lead to effective learning (and writing) communities, and allow the instructor to determine pacing and even curriculum appropriate to a specific cohort of students.

College Credit: College-level work should be rewarded with college-level credit. Since both the stretch version (ENGL 1005AB) and the un-stretched version of ENGL 1010 achieve the same learning objectives, then stretch courses are credit-bearing.

The research that has emerged over the last two decades conclusively supports the effectiveness of the stretch model. Programs that have adopted stretch models have seen a conclusive rise in student retention, pass rates, and performance. These benefits probably derive from these effects of stretch programs:

- Because stretch programs are “college-level,” students are no longer stigmatized as “remedial.”
- Because stretch programs use cohorts, student engagement increases.
- Because stretch programs keep students and instructors together, classes are able to build on content and skills from prior quarters and achieve nearly seamless curricular alignment.
- Because stretch programs remove the label of “remediation” from student transcripts, students look better to prospective employers and graduate programs and the institution looks better to accrediting agencies.
- Because the stretched nature of the courses effectively teaches writing and revision as a task to be completed over time, students will perform better on writing tasks in their majors.

Stretch composition programs offer multiple pathways for students to complete a university’s first-year writing requirement and have been very successful nationwide. The majority of campuses in the CSU offer stretch composition, and the CSULA Department of English has already demonstrated the effectiveness of stretch composition with its own internal pilot programs.

DESIGN OF SEMESTER-BASED FIRST-YEAR WRITING COURSES

The Department of English offers students two paths towards satisfying the GE Block A Written Communication requirement as summarized:

Current	Proposed
Basic Skills	Basic Skills
A1 Written Communications	A2 Written Communications
ENGL 101	ENGL 1010 (formerly ENGL 101) ENGL 1005B

Students would take one of two paths to complete their CSU GE written communication requirement:

ENGL 1005AB—a 30-week course (two semesters)

ENGL 1010—a 15-week course (one semester)

To facilitate scheduling and promote cohorting, the 30-week courses would be offered in the same scheduling block both terms.

ENGL 1000 Support

Key to the new first-year writing courses, both stretch composition (ENGL 1005AB) and accelerated stretch composition (ENGL 1010), is ENGL 1000 (formerly ENGL 100), the one-unit tutorial workshop offered through the University Writing Center. The success of this supplemental instruction program has already been amply documented in a variety of studies, including the campus' most recent WASC review.

The role of ENGL 1000 in the new DSP/stretch composition model can be summarized as

- Recommended for all incoming students (Fall term) who select ENGL 1010 (ENGL 101) as their first composition course
- Strongly recommended for all students (Spring term) moving from ENGL 1005A to ENGL 1005B
- Strongly recommended for all students (Fall and Spring term) moving from ENGL 1004 (non-stretch and non-accelerated composition courses) to ENGL 1010

Directed Self-Placement

Directed Self-Placement (DSP) has been adopted by first-year composition programs throughout the nation, from large research universities like the University of Michigan and the University of Colorado, to comprehensive Master's institutions similar to CSULA, including several CSU campuses. DSP developed primarily as a response to the increasing (or in the CSU ongoing) reliance on standardized testing for placement. Many campuses have abandoned local placement mechanisms in favor, for example, of the SAT/ACT, which research has shown does a poor job of placing students in first-year writing courses. In the CSU, this reliance on testing has become increasingly political. The English Placement Test (EPT), originally devised to identify students who would benefit from more instruction, is now seen administratively as a quasi-admissions test that can be used to "weed out" the unprepared.

In his detailed report on CSU Fresno's pilot study of DSP, Asao B. Inouye identifies three important reasons for adopting DSP at Fresno:

- the need to reduce the program's reliance on an outside, standardized placement test because it is not valid enough for our writing placement purposes (e.g., the EPT, SAT, etc.), and because in spite of their scores, the vast majority of students complete successfully their writing courses when given the right educational atmosphere, pedagogies, curriculum, and responsibilities;
- the need that students have to place themselves and gain responsibility over their educational paths in the university; that is, research shows that when students feel responsible for their own choices, when they've chosen their classes, they tend to be more invested in them, and succeed in higher numbers;
- the need to give students credit for all of the writing courses they take since university credit acknowledges their work, does not penalize students for wanting extra practice in writing, and reduces the institutional and social stigma of "remedial" writing courses (13).

These reasons apply equally to CSULA's students and composition program. DSP is simple both in its premises and principles. As Edward M. White summarizes, "In place of testing students, the institution puts its energy into informing students about the demands and expectations of the composition courses available and how they can meet the writing requirement. Then, students make informed choices, and take full responsibility for those choices, instead of grudgingly accepting the test results and institutional placement" (2003).

Implementing DSP, however, can be a challenge, primarily because DSP requires that the institution clearly define "the demands and expectations" of its composition courses, and perhaps more challenging, effectively communicates this and other important information to prospective students prior to their enrolling. The difference between effective, indifferent, and disastrous DSP depends almost entirely on whether the institution takes seriously the "D" (for Directed") in DSP.

Most studies of DSP find relatively little change in the overall placement distribution. Some students who would have been placed in a stretch composition sequence opt instead for a non-stretch composition course. But an equal number of students are likely to enroll in a stretch composition course even though they might have been placed into non-stretch composition. Most observers erroneously conclude that students, when given the choice between more coursework and less coursework, will always choose less coursework. In fact, what the data suggests is that overall distributions remains either roughly the same (between traditional placement and DSP) or more students choose more coursework rather than less. Most important, students are much more engaged when they have chosen their placement than when it is chosen for them. The data also shows that students in DSP programs achieve comparable competency, pass at the same rate, and are retained at a higher rate than students in non-DSP programs.

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.]

Because writing and language competence develop recursively, the course content for ENGL 1005A is the same as the course content for ENGL 1005B, and both courses taken together are equivalent to ENGL 1010.

- A. Prewrite, draft, write, and revise at least three formal essays (750-1000 words in length each). The essays will be written 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. The essays will incorporate outside texts.
- B. Use critical reading strategies to understand a range of public and academic writing.
- C. Discuss ideas and motives in culture.
- D. Explore through reading, research, and discussion, in order to articulate in writing, the complex relation of the self to society through students' reflection on their lives, goals, and problems in relation to the values, decisions, and beliefs of others.
- E. Incorporate textual evidence in writing, when appropriate, through the use of paraphrase, summary, and quotation.
- F. Investigate the relationships between stylistic options and audience response.
- G. Practice strategies for meaningful revision and recognize that writing is a recursive process.
- H. Learn about the resources available through the University Writing Center, University Library, and other centers of information.

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. Apply fundamental rhetorical strategies used to produce university-level writing, especially
 - a. modify content and form according to the rhetorical situation, purpose, and audience
 - b. appropriately use authorities, examples, facts, and other forms of persuasive evidence to support an argument or position
 - c. vary stylistic options to achieve different effects
- 2. Think critically to analyze a rhetorical situation or text and make thoughtful decisions based on that analysis, through writing, reading, and research
- 3. Develop an effective writing process that includes flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading
- 4. Incorporate textual evidence through quotation, summary, and paraphrase into their essays and appropriately cite their sources
- 5. Develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and style
- 6. Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling
- 7. Use electronic environments for drafting, reviewing, revising, editing, and sharing texts

General Education Certification

GE Governing Principles

Course Meets this Principle Through

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

This course is a writing course and therefore will provide ample opportunities for practice and evaluation of writing.

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

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

Does not require a non-General Education prerequisite

This course has no non-GE prerequisite.

Block A2 Student Learning Outcomes

The Block A2 Student Learning Outcomes adopted by the university as part of its General Education policy were taken directly from the “unstretched” version of this course (formerly numbered ENGL 101).

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

- Beaufort, Anne. “The Question of University Writing Instruction” and “New Directions for University Writing Instruction.” *College Writing and Beyond: A New Framework for University Writing Instruction*. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 2007. Print.
- Bedore, Pamela and Deborah Rossen-Knill. “An informed self-placement: Is a choice offered a choice received?” *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 28.1-2 (2004): 55-78. Print.
- Blakesley, David. “Directed Self-Placement in the University.” *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 25.3 (Spring 2002): 9-40. Print.
- Blakesley, David, Erin J. Harvey, and Erica J. Reynolds. “Southern Illinois University Carbondale as an institutional model: The English 100/101 Stretch and directed self-placement program.” *Directed self-placement: Principles and practices*. Daniel J. Royer and Roger Gilles, Eds. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press (2003), 207 -241. Print.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. “WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition.” 2008. [2000]. Web. < <http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html>>.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles, Laura Aull , Timothy Green, and Anne Porter. “Assessing the validity of directed self placement at a large university.” *Assessing Writing* 15.3 (2010), 154-176. Print.
- Glau, Gregory R. “Stretch at 10: Ten Years of Data on Arizona State University's Stretch Program.” *Journal of Basic Writing* 26.2 (2007), 30-48. Print.
- Glau, Gregory R. “The Stretch Program: Arizona State University's new model of university-level basic writing instruction.” *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 20.1-2 (1996), 79-91. Print.
- Huot, Brian, and Peggy O’Neill. *Assessing Writing: A Critical Sourcebook*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s. 2009. Print.
- Lalicker, William B. “A basic introduction to basic writing program structures: A baseline and five alternatives.” *BWe: Basic Writing e-Journal* 1.2 (1999). Web.
- Royer, Daniel J. and Roger Gilles. “Directed Self-Placement: An Attitude of Orientation.” *College Composition and Communication* 50.1 (Sep 1998): 54-70. Print.

Sommers, Nancy. *Responding to Student Writing*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2013. Print.
White, Edward. *Assigning, Responding, Evaluating: A Writing Teacher's Guide*. 4th Ed. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007. 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).]

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 1005A College Writing I – 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.