



**Ohio Transfer 36 Guidance Document:
English Composition**



Table of Contents

Introduction.....3
Components of a Submission for Ohio Transfer 364
Tips6
English Composition Submission Specifics7
English Composition Exemplars.....13



Introduction

This document provides an overview of how to prepare course materials for submission to [Ohio Transfer 36](#), which guarantees student transfer of general education coursework among public institutions in the state. As institutions prepare to make submissions in the Course Equivalency Management System ([CEMS](#)), individuals involved in the process (faculty, administrators, and staff) should use this guidance document to become familiar with the steps required for a course to be approved for inclusion in Ohio Transfer 36. This effort entails [collaboration](#) of people in many roles on Ohio's campuses and at the Ohio Department of Higher Education. The ultimate goal is a high-quality, meaningful educational experience for Ohio's students.

If you have questions after reading this guidance document, contact: Michelle Blaney, Associate Director, Articulation & Transfer Policy at mblaney@highered.ohio.gov or Jessi Hart, Senior Director, Articulation and Transfer Policy, Budget, and Constituent Relations at jhart@highered.ohio.gov.



Components of a Submission for Ohio Transfer 36

1. Course Details Form

- This document will help your institution complete the Course Details page in CEMS.
- Be sure that the information on the Course Details Form matches the syllabus and other documentation in the submission.
- Ohio Transfer 36 coordinators should work with faculty subject matter experts to complete Course Details Forms.

2. Learning Outcome Template

- This document will allow faculty who are familiar with the course to provide brief statements that indicate how it fulfills each of the [Ohio Transfer 36 learning outcomes](#).
- Because Ohio Transfer 36 focuses on learning outcomes, please describe what the course requires students to do, not simply the topics the course covers.
- For each learning outcome, CEMS responses should address:
 - A. **the specific course outcomes and related content through which students achieve this Ohio Transfer 36 learning outcome.** What course materials and activities relate to this outcome?
 - B. **assessment of student achievement of this Ohio Transfer 36 learning outcome.** How do instructors determine the degree to which students have met this outcome?
 - C. **key locations in the attached course documents that demonstrate student focus on this Ohio Transfer 36 learning outcome.** Where in the submitted course documents (syllabus, assignments, etc.) can faculty reviewers find content, activities, and/or assessments related to this outcome? Identify several key examples to demonstrate the importance of the outcome in the course. Avoid using only a couple of assignments repeatedly to explain how the course meets all of the outcomes. Include various activities in your explanations to show that the course as a whole emphasizes the OT36 outcomes.
- Please label the parts of each learning outcome response as A, B, and C.
- Responses need not be lengthy. Think of the CEMS responses as guides to the attached course documents, highlighting the most important elements on which reviewers should focus for each Ohio Transfer 36 learning outcome.
- Please avoid copying and pasting material that's available elsewhere in the submission (for example, in the syllabus). The CEMS learning outcome responses are intended to allow faculty to provide clear, concise explanations to other faculty (the members of Ohio Transfer 36 review panels) about how the course supports Ohio Transfer 36 learning outcomes.
- Text entered into CEMS won't incorporate advanced formatting (for example, bullet points, indenting) from word processors, so please use simple text and spacing.



3. Supporting Documents

- Upload **an up-to-date working syllabus** that includes:
 - course learning outcomes. Course learning outcomes should support—but need not be identical to—the Ohio Transfer 36 learning outcomes.
 - information about the course textbook and/or other readings (if applicable). For open educational resources, links are helpful.
 - a detailed calendar of readings and activities. Please provide clear identifying information for the reading assignments on the schedule (authors, book/article/chapter titles, etc.). Dates should be recent but need not be current.
 - a list of graded assignments with points/weights/percentages for each assignment.
- Upload **sample activities/assessments** that demonstrate student achievement of the Ohio Transfer 36 learning outcomes.
- Please limit the number of attachments and use file names that will allow panel members to easily identify each document.
- A master syllabus is acceptable in place of a working syllabus as long as the information listed above is included. Some master syllabi don't include a detailed calendar/schedule for the term.
- A master syllabus (in addition to a working syllabus) is often helpful in outlining the required elements of a course regardless of instructor or delivery method. A working syllabus may provide a representative example of how the course is taught, but the institution should be committed to meeting the Ohio Transfer 36 learning outcomes in all sections of a course.
- If a course has not yet been offered, the submitter should still provide the information listed above so that the panel can evaluate each learning outcome.



Tips

- **Submit early!**
 - Allow yourself an extra review cycle or two before a deadline in case it becomes necessary to do a resubmission.
 - Just because a submission was returned, that doesn't mean that it was rejected by the review panel. OATN staff will sometimes make suggestions for improving a submission before it is forwarded to the review panel, especially if it seems likely that the panel will request missing information.
 - Please don't wait until the submission deadline of a review cycle to send in submissions. You should leave time for OATN staff to resolve any possible issues with the submission while still allowing them to forward it to the review panel on time.
- If you would like OATN staff to review materials before submitting in CEMS, please reach out in advance of the review cycle deadline.
- If your institution would like to connect with an Ohio Transfer 36 faculty review panel lead, please reach out to OATN staff to schedule a meeting.
- If a panel's review comment is not clear, please send OATN staff an email. We may be able to provide additional information.
- If faculty members from your institution serve on review panels, take advantage of their expertise and guidance even if they are not preparing the submission. A list of faculty panel members from your institution can be obtained by sending OATN staff an email.
- Check out the OATN newsletter! There is a section devoted to OT36, TAG, and CTAG submissions. Updates and deadlines are often mentioned in the articles, along with a link to the complete submission and review timeline, to help you prioritize your institution's submissions.
- If you asked CEMS to reset your password and have not received an email from "ATC-Help" within five minutes, please contact OATN staff immediately. CEMS will not tell you if you are using the wrong user ID.
- We are all in this together! If for whatever reason you are stuck, please feel free to contact OATN staff.



English Composition Submission Specifics

The “Core Courses” portion of Ohio Transfer 36 requires at least 3 semester hours of course credit in English composition (First Writing Course, TME 001). If a student completes a Second Writing Course (TME 002), this course will apply towards the “Exploration Foundation” portion of Ohio Transfer 36. Please note, not all Ohio public institutions of higher education require Second Writing in addition to First Writing, so the course may only apply as an elective upon transfer.

Use of the Ohio Transfer 36 Guidelines for English composition was discontinued starting Fall 2012. All English Composition Ohio Transfer 36 courses approved under the guidelines were expired by Summer 2012 and replaced by First or Second Writing learning outcomes only when the course received an approval for either First or Second Writing.

- In order to be considered for First Writing and Second Writing Ohio Transfer 36 courses, each institutional course must meet all of the established learning outcomes. In addition, each set of learning outcomes has recommended credit hours, so that institutions will be able to design, match, and submit courses with a comparable and appropriate amount of credit to fulfill the learning outcomes.
- If your school offers co-requisite or ALP sections of your first writing course (sections in which at-risk students meet with college-ready students and complete identical work, but also attend supplemental class meetings for additional writing practice and review), you do **not** need to develop a separate proposal for the co-requisite or ALP course.
 - If the co-requisite or ALP class has the same course number as the standard class, you do not need to take any additional steps.
 - If the co-requisite or ALP class has a different course number than the standard class, contact the OATN after your first writing course has been approved and ask that the co-requisite/ALP course be added to the list of approved courses.
- First Writing and Second Writing Ohio Transfer 36 courses must focus on the teaching, practice, and evaluation of expository writing and argumentative writing, although the course(s) may include other components. This focus must be reflected in statements of course learning outcomes and evaluation.
- Transfer students who have completed the Ohio Transfer 36 will not be subjected to a diagnostic placement test at the receiving institution unless one is also required of native students who have completed equivalent coursework.

Some Tips for Submitting a Successful Proposal

There are four multi-part outcomes for both the First Writing Course and the Second Writing Course. The outcomes for the two courses have the same titles:

1. Rhetorical Knowledge,
2. Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing,



3. Knowledge of Composing Processes, and
4. Knowledge of Conventions.

However, the specific outcomes for the Second Writing Course are more rigorous than the outcomes for the first.

Below, you will find some advice about developing your proposal, as well as additional information about the differences between the outcomes of the two writing courses.

Minimal Course Requirements

In addition to the four learning outcomes for writing courses, there is a preliminary section called “Minimal Course Requirements.” Although there is no separate text box in CEMS titled “Minimal Course Requirements,” proposers should make sure that their proposals clearly indicate how their courses meet the “Minimal Course Requirements.”

The members of the English Composition and Oral Communication panel developed the minimal requirements in response to questions about how much writing students must complete in an OT36-approved writing course.

We realize that the information in this section is less specific than what some proposers would like—and more specific than what others would like. Some proposers would like us to specify a particular number of formal essays, rather than noting that students must “compose a variety of texts,” while others wish that we would not include minimal requirements.

Our goal in drafting the “Minimal Course Requirements” was to indicate the degree of rigor expected in an OT36-approved writing course *without prescribing a specific number of writing projects*. We believe that the members of an institution’s writing program should determine precisely how students will meet the “Minimal Course Requirements.” Students at one school might be required to compose and revise eight 625-word essays over the course of the semester to meet the recommended “minimum of 5000 total words of text that has been revised and copyedited for applicable rhetorical situations,” and because those students are completing one essay every-other week, most of their low-stakes writing might be early drafts of their final essays. However, at another school, students might compose and revise only three 1750-word writing projects to meet the recommended 5000-word minimum, and while working on those longer writing projects, those students will no doubt also be composing a variety of low-stakes writing, such as single-draft reading responses and in-class writing.

The “Minimal Course Requirements” section is the only section that is identical for both the First Writing Course and the Second Writing Course. However, that does not mean that your courses need to mirror each other. For example, a school might require all students in the First Writing Course to compose and revise five writing projects and complete a wide range of low-stakes writing, while requiring students in the Second Writing Course to compose and revise four writing projects and complete a narrower range of low-stakes writing.



Learning Outcome 1: Rhetorical Knowledge

The first outcome for both courses is the most general. It overviews writing **and** reading experiences students should have in a writing course.

The First Writing Course introduces students to a variety of genres and a range of rhetorical situations, and at most schools, students learn about these genres, in part, by reading nonfiction articles that were originally published in a variety of popular forums (such as magazines and newspapers published either in hard copy or online). However, institutions—particularly those that require students to take only one writing course—may require students to read scholarly articles as well.

These reading assignments are typically paired with other class activities designed to help students learn about various rhetorical strategies used by published authors. Thus, the readings should help students begin using these strategies, as appropriate, in their own writing.

The Second Writing Course focuses on scholarly discourse. The learning outcomes for the Second Writing Course specify that students must “read academic texts and understand how disciplinary conventions shape the texts they read,” so reviewers look for evidence that students develop the reading skills they need to analyze scholarly sources such as peer-reviewed journal articles. (Note: Typically, college students need guidance in order to critically read peer-reviewed journal articles. Therefore, the review committee looks for activities and assignments that support students’ reading of scholarly texts, rather than a simple reference to the fact that students use scholarly texts as secondary sources in some writing projects.)

The expectations for writing in the Second Writing Course are less specific than the expectations for reading: Students “compose texts that respond to the needs of appropriate audiences, using suitable discourse conventions to shape those texts” and “use academic conventions of format and structure when appropriate.” The Second Writing Course is offered at various levels at different schools (e.g., it may be a second-semester course at one school and a junior-level course at another), and the writing assignments will reflect the level of the course. At a school where students take the course early, one major writing project may require students to analyze a journal from the discipline they plan to major in and tell other new majors about that journal. At a school where students take the course much later, writing projects may require students to engage in more primary research and employ the disciplinary conventions of their majors when writing about their research.

Page 4 of this guidance document includes Learning Outcome Template instructions. These instructions explain that proposers should include three items in each of the CEMS outcomes text boxes: Proposals should indicate (A) what course materials relate to the outcome, (B) how student achievement is assessed, and (C) where in the attached course document(s) reviewers can find more information. For writing courses, reviewers will be best equipped to review a course if the Rhetorical Knowledge section of the CEMS proposal:



- A. **Indicates how many writing and reading assignments are required and what the range of assignments is.** This is probably the best place to specify how students will meet the Minimal Course Requirements described in the preliminary material, e.g.: “Students will compose four, 1250-word essays, each representing a different genre, and prepare an end-of semester portfolio. They will read one textbook chapter about rhetoric every-other week, read one published writing sample every week, and further explore these readings through short written responses and in-class activities.”
- B. **Indicates how these various writing and reading assignments are valued.** In response to later outcomes, you will provide specific information about how student work is assessed. At this point, it is often appropriate to simply give reviewers the “big picture,” perhaps noting how various assignments are weighted when determining a course grade.
- C. **Specifies where reviewers can find additional information.** Tell reviewers which attachment provides pertinent information about how students attain the first outcome. If you attach several supporting documents, you can help reviewers locate the ones connected to this outcome by using meaningful filenames (e.g., “sample syllabus” and “assignments for major writing projects,” rather than “ENGL101att1” and “ENGL101att2”). If you attach one large PDF that includes a master syllabus, sample syllabus, sample assignments, and grading standards, consider telling the reviewers on which pages they will find pertinent information.

Learning Outcome 2: Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing

In response to Learning Outcome 2, provide reviewers with information about the common reading (the readings assigned to the whole class), about students’ secondary research, and about how this reading will be reflected in student writing.

Reviewers will be best equipped to review a course if the Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing section of the CEMS proposal:

- A. **Describes how common readings are used and indicates the course research requirements.** Reviewers need to see (1) how critical reading skills are fostered and made relevant to student writing and (2) what kinds of researched writing are expected in the class. A thorough description of these two course components is probably too detailed for the CEMS text box, so you might use part A of this response to provide some context for sample assignments to which you will refer readers in part C.
- B. **Provides specific assessment information.** As with part A, you might use part B to provide some context for grading standards, rubrics, grading contracts, or other assessment information to which you will refer readers in part C.
- C. **Specifies where reviewers can find additional information in the attachment(s).** You do *not* need to provide readers with every assignment that students will complete. Instead, please strive to provide representative samples that will help reviewers recognize the importance of various assignments. For example, if someone were to attach 19 files with all the assignments for a course in which 60% of the course grade is based on



students' completion of four major writing projects and 30% of the course grade is based on 15 weekly, low-stakes, writing-to-learn activities, the sheer numbers may lead reviewers to incorrectly conclude that the 15 writing-to-learn activities are more important than the four major writing projects. Reviewers would get a more accurate perception of the relative importance of coursework if the proposer attached just three sample assignments: two sample major writing projects and one sample writing-to-learn activity.

Learning Outcome 3: Knowledge of Composing Processes

Your CEMS description of Learning Outcome 3 is your opportunity to describe how the course helps students with all phases of the writing process, including invention, drafting, revision, and copyediting. Note that for the First Writing Course, the composing processes outcome emphasizes

- teaching students the difference between revising and editing,
- teaching students to give and use peer response appropriately, and
- encouraging students to revise their work.

For the Second Writing Course, this outcome emphasizes reflection and improvement.

Reviewers will be best equipped to review a course if the Knowledge of Composing Processes section of the CEMS proposal:

- A. Indicates how instructors teach revision and feedback.** An overview of the process required for a typical writing project may be sufficient, though some proposers also include references to other class activities that encourage revision.
- B. Explains the impact of revision on student grades.** If, for example, your institution uses a portfolio system and/or a grading contract system, you can explain how this method has a direct impact on student grades.
- C. Specifies where reviewers can find additional information in the attachment(s).** For example, the assignment sheet for a representative writing project may be useful to reviewers if it includes due dates for rough drafts, peer response, and so forth.

Learning Outcome 4: Knowledge of Conventions

The CEMS form for Learning Outcome 4 gives you an opportunity to explain how students are introduced to appropriate genre conventions in the First Writing Course or disciplinary conventions in the Second Writing Course. It also gives you an opportunity to explain how students are encouraged to adopt surface conventions appropriate to the rhetorical situation, and how they are taught to document their work.

Reviewers will be best equipped to review a course if the Knowledge of Conventions section of the CEMS proposal:

- A. Indicates how genre or disciplinary conventions, surface conventions, and documentation are taught.** Because responses to previous outcomes sometimes indicate



how genre or disciplinary conventions are taught, proposers sometimes wonder if they need to mention genre or disciplinary conventions, or whether they should focus on grammar, mechanics, and citation here. If this is the case with your proposal, we recommend that you refer reviewers to the previous responses before discussing surface convention. While there is no need to completely rehash information provided in earlier sections, omitting any reference to genre or disciplinary conventions here may suggest that grammar, mechanics, and citation are more central to your course than they are.

- B. Provides assessment information.** Students' ability to adopt appropriate conventions no doubt has an impact on the grades they receive on their writing projects, and you may have already provided information about grading standards for projects. If that is the case, simply remind reviewers where this information was provided. Of course, if there are other graded activities that are related to Knowledge of Conventions (e.g., an MLA documentation quiz), you might mention them here.
- C. Specifies where reviewers can find additional information in the attachment(s).**



English Composition Exemplars

Ohio Transfer 36 English Composition (First Writing) Learning Outcome Exemplars

Below are examples of responses to each of the four learning outcomes. These are not meant to act as a direct template for your course but rather to illustrate a range of formats and depth of response and elements of assessment and documentation that we hope to see to be able to assess if your course fits well into the Ohio Transfer 36.

LO1: Rhetorical Knowledge: Students will develop their understanding of rhetorical situations as they read and write in several genres.

By the end of their first writing course, students should

- Understand how genre conventions shape the texts they read and should shape the texts they compose.
- Understand the possibilities of electronic media/technologies for composing and publishing texts for a variety of audiences.
- Compose texts that
 - Have clear purpose.
 - Respond to the needs of intended audiences.
 - Assume an appropriate stance.
 - Adopt an appropriate voice, tone, style, and level of formality.
 - Use appropriate conventions of format and structure.
- Recognize common rhetorical strategies and appeals.
- As appropriate, attempt to employ rhetorical strategies and appeals in their own writing.

Example 1:

A. Students compose four (4) major essay assignments (including a reflection), each demonstrating a clear purpose, audience, stance, tone, conventions, rhetorical strategies, etc.

Students read OER materials (including *Bad Ideas About Writing*) in order to think more critically and objectively about writing and literacy. Readings from *Bad Ideas About Writing* emphasize critical thinking and relate directly to rhetorical genres like academic writing or writing for college, which is among the first topics covered with the intent to demystify the genre of “academic writing.”



Students are also afforded an opportunity to compose texts electronically via a word processor and work collaboratively in virtual environments such as Google Docs.

B. Student learning is determined by whether students complete all drafts and revisions for major essay assignments, participate fully in all peer workshops, and submit all major essay assignments.

Learning is also assessed in terms of comprehension and discussion of assigned readings.

C. See the attachment with the filename “working syllabus,” which includes not only the course calendar with readings (pages 5-8), but also explanations for each essay assignment (pages 9-12) and a labor-based grading contract (pages 13-15).

LO2: Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing: Students will develop their critical thinking skills as they analyze model texts and secondary sources.

By the end of their first writing course, students should be able to

- **Use reading and writing for inquiry learning, thinking, and communicating.**
- **Locate and evaluate secondary research materials, including visual texts such as photographs, videos, or other materials.**
- **Analyze relationship among writer, text, and audience in linguistically diverse texts.**
- **Use various critical thinking strategies to analyze texts.**
- **Develop a clear line of reasoning and recognize how incorporating ideas and evidence from sources can strengthen their work.**

Example 1:

A. Students read texts about writing and the writing process, critically thinking about their own positionality and purposes as writers.

Students complete reader responses that analyze assigned readings.

Students think critically about writing concepts and myths about writing when reading and responding to chapters in *Bad Ideas About Writing*.

Students incorporate common secondary sources via class readings. They also use electronic resources like Google Scholar and the university library research databases to locate and incorporate secondary sources beyond those used as common class readings.



B. Student learning is determined by whether students participate fully in all peer workshops, providing critical, thoughtful feedback and implementing feedback they receive in meaningful ways that results in better (e.g., more detailed, clearer, focused) revised essays.

Learning is also assessed with regard to whether students are able to locate, incorporate, and cite reliable sources relevant to their essays.

C. The attached syllabus (filename “working syllabus”) includes peer workshop information (pages 3-4), as well as specific readings about peer review (i.e., Peer Review and Collaborating with Others, referenced on page 5 of the calendar). Additional readings help with discussions and learning related to secondary research materials (e.g., Plagiarism and Academic Integrity).

LO3: Knowledge of Composing Processes: Students will work individually and collaboratively to hone their revising and editing skills.

By the end of their first writing course, students should be able to

- **Recognize that writing is a flexible, recursive process that typically involves a series of activities, including generating ideas, and text, drafting, revising, and editing.**
- **Use electronic environments to support writing tasks such as drafting, reviewing, revising, editing, and exploring texts.**
- **Discover and reconsider ideas through drafting, reviewing, and revising.**
- **Recognize the difference between revising and editing and understand why both processes are critical.**
- **Understand that writing is often collaborative and social. To demonstrate that understanding, students should be able to**
 - **Work with others to improve their own and others’ texts.**
 - **Balance the advantages of relying on others with taking responsibility for their own work.**
- **Apply this understanding and recognition to make global and local revisions.**

Example 1:

A. One of the main ways we address composing processes is through peer review workshops. Students complete four peer review workshops (one per major essay assignment), including asynchronous peer review (e.g., marginal comments via Word), synchronous peer review (e.g., in-person discussions of asynchronous feedback), and electronic peer review (e.g., Google Docs).

The result of these peer review workshops is the kind of learning and application common to peer review: drafting, collaboration, recursive writing, editing, and revision.



B. Student learning is assessed via a labor-based grading rubric that accounts for whether students participate fully in all peer workshops, providing critical, thoughtful feedback and implementing feedback they receive in meaningful ways that results in better (e.g., more detailed, clearer, focused) revised essays.

C. The attached syllabus (filename “working syllabus”) includes an example of a labor-based grading rubric, complete with points associated with each step in the peer review process (pages 13-15). As the rubric demonstrates, students must thoroughly and thoughtfully complete all drafts and revisions to earn full credit.

LO4: Knowledge of Conventions: Students will study genre conventions and apply appropriate conventions of their own work.

By the end of their first writing course, students should be able to

- **Recognize the genre conventions for structure, paragraphing, tone, and mechanics employed in various rhetorical contexts.**
- **Use syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling appropriate to particular rhetorical situations.**
- **Select and employ appropriate conventions for structure, paragraphing, mechanics, format, and design.**
- **Acknowledge the work of others and use a standard documentation format as needed.**

Example 1:

- A. Students participate in peer workshops in order to compare and assess development, structure, paragraphing, mechanics, etc. Students also learn APA citation style, which is used more widely than MLA.
- B. Students are assessed according to whether their “final” essays (they have a chance to revise after submitting a “final” revision) that have been peer reviewed and revised lack errors and include appropriate citations, when necessary.
- C. While less overtly mentioned, conventions apply to the labor-based grading rubric and to the kinds of feedback instructors provide (pages 13-15 of “working syllabus” attachment). In general, students do not “lose points” for errors or formatting mistakes, but those issues are pointed out during peer review workshops and instructor feedback so that students have multiple opportunities to revise and correct any errors.



Ohio Transfer 36 English Composition (Second Writing) Learning Outcome Exemplars

Below are examples of responses to each of the four learning outcomes. These are not meant to act as direct template for your course but rather to illustrate a range of formats and depth of response and elements of assessment and documentation that we hope to see to be able to assess if your course fits well into the Ohio Transfer 36.

LO1: Rhetorical Knowledge: Students will develop their understanding of rhetorical situation as they read academic texts and practice tailoring their work for specific audiences.

The second writing course reinforces the rhetorical principles that students address in the first writing course. In addition, by the end of the second writing course, students should be able to

- **Read academic texts and understand how disciplinary conventions shape the texts they read.**
- **Compose texts that respond to the needs of appropriate audiences, using suitable discourse conventions to shape those texts.**
- **Use academic conventions of format and structure when appropriate.**

Example 1:

(A) The second writing course emphasizes academic writing. Students in this second course expand their rhetorical knowledge by reading scholarly articles written for a variety of peer-reviewed journals and by composing texts that require them to address various aims and audiences. In most sections of the course, students prepare three major writing projects during the semester (typically 1000-1500 words each) and then compile an end-of-semester portfolio of at least 5000 words.

The attached working syllabus illustrates a typical range of writing assignments: a rhetorical analysis (general public as target audience), a report on the results of a survey (student selects target audience), and a forum analysis (other members of student's major as target audience). Students also complete frequent informal writing assignments both in and out of class. The attached working syllabus, for example, is for a class in which students compose a weekly reading reflection, four research logs, and frequent in-class writing.

(B) In all sections of the course, the formal writing must constitute the major portion of each student's grade, but other assignments typically have a significant impact as well. The working syllabus is for a section of the class where formal writing (three major essays and the end-of-semester portfolio) constitute 60% of the course grade, research logs constitute 24% of the course grade, and reflections and in-class work constitute the remaining 16% of the course grade.



(C) For specific reading assignments in a typical section, see the calendar in the working syllabus, pages 15-20 of the attachment. For more information about formal writing, see the “Unit projects” section (pages 10-11) and the “Showcase portfolio” section (page 14) of the working syllabus. For more information on research logs, see page 11. For more information on in-class work, see pages 11-12. For complete breakdown of the semester grade, see page 9.

LO2: Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing: Students will further develop their critical thinking skills as they analyze and synthesize academic texts.

The second writing course reinforces the critical reading and thinking skills students develop in the first writing course. In addition, by the end of the second writing course, students should be able to

- **Find and evaluate appropriate material from electronic and other sources.**
- **Locate, evaluate, organize, and use primary and secondary research material. Secondary research material should be collected from various sources, including journal articles and other scholarly texts found in library databases, other official databases (e.g., federal government databases), and informal electronic networks and internet sources.**
- **Analyze and critique sources in their writing.**
- **Juxtapose and integrate ideas and arguments from sources.**
- **Use strategies- such as interpretation, synthesis, response, critique, and design/redesign- to compose texts that integrate their original ideas with those from academic sources and other documents.**

Example 1:

(A) The common reading in the course should give students an opportunity to learn what is considered “good writing” in a variety of academic disciplines and to reflect on why the expectations vary. Common class readings typically include at least eight articles from peer-reviewed journals in various academic fields. The attached working syllabus, for example, includes reading assignments from a journal of literary criticism, two rhetoric journals, two sociology journals, a bioethics journal, a library science journal, and a psychology journal.

In addition, all of the major writing projects in the second writing class must be researched and documented. Students must conduct primary research for some projects, and they must conduct secondary research for all projects.

Instructors design a variety of activities to ensure that students select academic sources (peer-reviewed journal articles) and cite only those that are most appropriate. In the working



syllabus, for example, students complete a research log in each unit. Each research log requires students to find and critique at least six potential sources, even though students might use only three of those sources in their formal essays.

- (B) In-class activities and reflections are typically assessed informally. Students who are engaged and complete the work typically receive full credit. Research logs are typically graded using a rubric. The quality of student research is also reflected in the grades on major writing projects.
- (C) A sample low-stakes writing activity, which requires students to read and reflect before class and then engage in a series of in-class activities, is on page 29 of the attachment. A sample research log assignment is on page 27 of the attachment, and the rubric for one research log is on page 36. The sample assignment for a major project (pages 24-27) illustrates how students use both primary and secondary research in one assignment. The “Research and documentation” sections of the “Grading Standards for Final Drafts of Major Writing Projects” (pages 30-35) illustrate how research and documentation affect the grades students receive on their major writing projects.

LO3: Knowledge of Composing Processes: Student will continue to hone their revision strategies and reflect critically on their writing practices.

The second writing course should reinforce the fact that writing is a flexible and recursive process. Because students often write more scholarly texts in the second course than they did in the first, practice in generating ideas and text, drafting, revising, and editing are even more important in the second class. By the end of the second writing course, students should be able to

- **Select and apply appropriate writing processes to match the context.**
- **Revise for a variety of technologies and modalities.**
- **Use composition and revision as a means to discover and reconsider ideas.**
- **Reflect on the development of their revision strategies and consider how those strategies influence their work.**
- **Produce successive drafts of increasing quality.**

Example 1:

- (A) Reflection and revision are key to student success in the second writing course; therefore, peer response and conferences with the instructor are critical. Students are typically required to complete rough drafts of their work at least two weeks before the final draft is due. In addition, in each section of the second writing course, students must compile an end-of-semester portfolio. Students are encouraged to further revise their earlier work when they compile this portfolio, and the last unit of the class is typically devoted to revision activities.



- (B) Revision has a significant impact on student grades. In the working syllabus, for example, students' unit projects are considered incomplete if they do not include rough drafts and peer response with the final drafts of their projects. Furthermore, there is a "grade forgiveness" policy: When a student earns a higher grade on the end-of-semester portfolio than on the individual unit projects, the original project grades may be replaced with the portfolio grade.
- (C) Specific details about the role of reflection and revision are on the working syllabus in the attachment. For example, page 10 outlines the requirements for submitting drafts and receiving peer response, and page 11 elaborates on the grade forgiveness policy.

LO4: Knowledge of Conventions: Students will study academic conventions and apply appropriate conventions to their own work.

The second writing course reinforces and reinforce and expand the knowledge of conventions students developed in the first writing course. In addition, by the end of the second writing course, students should be able to

- **Understand why conventions vary.**
- **Recognize the genre conventions employed by various academic disciplines.**
- **Employ appropriate textual conventions for incorporating ideas from sources (e.g., introducing and incorporating quotations; quoting' paraphrasing, and summarizing).**

Example 1:

- (A) Students in the second writing course become familiar with conventions of academic writing when they critically read peer-reviewed articles from a variety of fields. Textbook readings, class discussion, and other in-class activities help guide students' critical reading and ensure that they understand some of the disciplinary differences that shaped the examples of academic writing.

Students write essays in both MLA and APA format. Typically, the first major essay students write must be in MLA format; the second must be in APA format; students decide what the most method to use for the third essay, and they typically write a reflection in which they explain their choice.

- (B) Following appropriate disciplinary conventions has an impact on the grades that students receive on their major writing projects. For example, the "Grading Standards for Final Drafts of Major Writing Projects" notes that sources must be "cited in the prescribed format" (31). The grading standards also note the importance of observing other surface conventions, and students typically have an opportunity to review proofreading strategies and then copyedit their work in class on the day they submit a major writing project.



(C) Although students are encouraged to focus on content, development, and organization before worrying about style and mechanics, there is a “Style and mechanics” section for each grade level in the “Grading Standards for Final Drafts” (pages 30, 31, 32, 33, and 35). Furthermore, as the sample rubric for a research log illustrates (page 36), research logs are penalized if students do not follow the appropriate citation format.