

General Studies Request Form

Permanent numbered courses must be submitted to the workflow in [Kuali CM](#) before a General Studies request is submitted here. The General Studies Council will not review requests ahead of the new course being reviewed by the Senate.

More detailed information about requesting General Studies designations is found [here](#).

Proposal Contact Information

Submitter Name	Submitter Email	Submitter Phone Number
Mark Hannah	mark.hannah@asu.edu	(765) 543-3374

College/School	Department/School
The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLA)	Department of English (CENGLISH)

Submission Information

Select the type of submission:

New Request (This course or topic does not currently hold this designation)

Requested Effective Date

Spring 2023

ASU Request

Is this request for a permanent course or a topic?

Permanent Course

Subject	Course Number	Units/Credit Hours
ENG	391	3

Course Information

Course Title

Writing in Context

Course Description

How do we understand the ways in which people use written language to carry out work in professional, academic, social and/or personal contexts? How does our understanding of the ways writing is produced for an audience shift between and among these different contexts? More importantly, how do writers adapt their writing practices in order to facilitate audience understanding as well as cultivate an audience's capacity for action? Familiarize students with rhetorical practices that position them to read, assess and respond to the rhetorical demands of a wide range of writing contexts. Strengthens students' existing rhetorical skill sets and problem-setting capacities for producing and circulating work (widely defined across material, print and digital media) that responds to a range of problems in an applied manner. Assesses the rhetorical demands of writing contexts and in developing and producing tailored, audience-specific texts that forward work in complex, interdisciplinary environments.

Is this a crosslisted course?

No

Is this course offered by another academic unit?

No

General Studies

Requested Designation

L - Literacy and Critical Inquiry

L: Literacy and Critical Inquiry

Rationale and Objectives

Literacy is here defined broadly as communicative competence—that is, competence in written and oral discourse. Critical inquiry involves the gathering, interpretation, and evaluation of evidence. Any field of university study may require unique critical skills that have little to do with language in the usual sense (words), but the analysis of written and spoken evidence pervades university study and everyday life. Thus, the General Studies requirements assume that all undergraduates should develop the ability to reason critically and communicate using the medium of language.

The requirement in Literacy and Critical Inquiry presumes, first, that training in literacy and critical inquiry must be sustained beyond traditional First Year English in order to create a habitual skill in every student; and, second, that the skill levels become more advanced, as well as more secure, as the student learns challenging subject matter. Thus, two courses beyond First Year English are required in order for students to meet the Literacy and Critical Inquiry requirement. Most lower-level "L" courses are devoted primarily to the further development of critical skills in reading, writing, listening, speaking, or analysis of discourse. Upper-division "L" courses generally are courses in a particular discipline into which writing and critical thinking have been fully integrated as means of learning the content and, in most cases, demonstrating that it has been learned.

[Revised October 2020]

Please note:

1. ENG 101, 105, or 107 must be prerequisites to this course. ENG 102, 105, or 108 are acceptable as alternatives.
2. Honors Thesis courses ([493 omnibus](#)) meet "L" requirements.
3. The list of criteria that must be satisfied for designation as a Literacy and Critical Inquiry "L" course is presented below. It will help you determine whether the current version of your course meets all of these requirements. If you decide to apply, please attach a current syllabus, handouts, or other documentation that will provide sufficient information for the General Studies Council to make an informed decision regarding the status of your proposal.

To qualify for the "L" designation, the course design must place a major emphasis on completing critical discourse—as evidenced by the following criteria:

"L" Criterion 1

Per [policy](#), students must have completed ENG 101, 105, or 107 to take an L course. This means the course must have, at minimum, ENG 101, 105, or 107 (or ENG 102, 105, or 108) as a prerequisite.

Please confirm that the course has the appropriate prerequisites, or that a proposal to change the prerequisites has been submitted in Quali CM.

Yes

Identify the submitted documentation that provides evidence.

Course catalog description and Syllabus Header

Provide detailed evidence of how this course meets this criterion.

Prerequisite(s): ENG 102, 105, or 108 with C or better OR Visiting University Student

"L" Criterion 2

At least 50 percent of the grade in the course should depend upon writing assignments (see Criterion 3). Group projects are acceptable only if each student gathers, interprets, and evaluates evidence, and prepares a summary report. *In-class essay exams may not be used for the "L" designation.*

Describe the assignments that are considered in the computation of course grades--and indicate the proportion of the final grade that is determined by each assignment.

Rhetorical Situation Analysis - (17.5% of course grade) Students will complete a written rhetorical situational analysis assignment during the semester. The analysis will be based on an example of a contemporary public issue, and students will write a 4-5 page analysis of the rhetorical dimensions and constraints operating in the example.

Problem Setting Narrative – (17.5% of course grade – NOTE: The grade for this project is split 80/20. Specifically, 80% for the written component and 20% for the visual component) This project involves students visually mapping out and writing a 4-5 page written narrative that describes the various inputs and/or pathways that “feed” a problem of public concern.

Report – (20% of course grade) Students will perform secondary research and write a 10-15 page report that provides background information about an aspect(s) of a public problem mapped in the Problem-Setting Narrative.

Policy Proposal – (20% of course grade - NOTE: The grade for this project is split 75/25. Specifically, 75% for the written component and 25% for the multimodal component) Students will write a 10-15 page policy proposal for a public or private agency that describes a proposed solution for addressing the public problem they identified in the Problem-Setting Narrative and Report. Students also will produce a multimodal component (e.g. a short podcast or a short video) to support their proposal.

Identify the submitted documentation that provides evidence.

Syllabus (See Course Projects and Course grading sections for descriptions and course grade computation process)

How does this course meet the spirit of this criterion?

This course emphasizes the production of written arguments that are responsive to the specific rhetorical demands of a rhetorical situation. Students learn how to define a problem solving context, i.e. a rhetorical situation, for readers through effective framing of public issues. In each course project, students write informal and formal texts that address the problem they define.

Provide detailed evidence of how this course meets this criterion (i.e. where in the syllabus).

Rather than respond to predetermined rhetorical situations wherein a problem already exists students will name, define, and frame a public problem that both states the specific problem and also situates that problem within larger political, economic, environmental, social, etc. realms. The Rhetorical Situation

Analysis and Problem Setting Narrative assignments are unique projects that help students learn how to define and describe writing contexts. Students then write traditional genres, e.g. Reports and Policy Proposals, that address the problem that is named, defined, and framed in the first 2 course projects. See Course Projects descriptions.

"L" Criterion 3

The writing assignments should involve gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence. They should reflect critical inquiry, extending beyond opinion and/or reflection.

Describe the way(s) in which this criterion is addressed in the course design.

Students will complete 4 substantial projects that incorporate the gathering, interpreting, and evaluating of evidence, as described below.

Rhetorical Situation Analysis - Students will gather information about a public issue by conducting secondary research using ASU library databases and Google Scholar and locating 6-10 articles. To help students think through this information, they will write 3 discussion board (DB) posts during the first 3 weeks of the project. After collecting their research and when completing their DB posts, students will analyze the information and identify key themes about their public issue. When analyzing they will evaluate their sources' relevance for describing the salience of this issue in contemporary society and later develop a bibliography of sources to include as part of the final project submission.

Problem Setting Narrative – Students will explain how they gathered their research information (4-5 new sources to be added to the bibliography from the Rhetorical Situation Analysis project) and evaluate its relevance to documenting and describing the different dimensions of the public issue that they represented in the visual map. To help students think through this research information, they will write 2 discussion board (DB) posts during the first 2 weeks of the project and discuss what the sources generally indicate as well as how they specifically relate to the public issue the students are addressing.

Report – Students will use ASU library databases and Google Scholar to identify 6-10 sources that are relevant to their report focus and further contextualize the prior research they completed in the Rhetorical Situation Analysis and Problem Setting Narrative projects. To help students evaluate the sources and assess their relevance, students will write annotations (1/2 to 1 page in length) for each source. To receive feedback on these annotations, students will submit 2 of them as DB posts for peer review and then later develop a bibliography of sources to include as part of the final project submission. Also, students will write a draft outline for the report that shows where the sources will be used in the report, and the draft outline also will be submitted as a DB post for peer review.

Policy Proposal – Students will conduct secondary research and identify 4-5 new sources that further contextualize the prior research they completed in the Rhetorical Situation Analysis, Problem Setting Narrative, and Report projects. Students will annotate these sources and add them to the bibliography of sources located and analyzed in the Report project.

Identify the submitted documentation that provides evidence.

Syllabus (See Course Description and Course Outcomes)

How does this course meet the spirit of this criterion?

This course requires students to conduct secondary research in all course projects which involves gathering information from print and electronic sources, interpreting and evaluating that information, and then applying the information in their written work.

Provide detailed evidence of how this course meets this criterion (i.e. where in the syllabus).

Students conduct significant secondary research in the Rhetorical Situation Analysis and Problem Setting Narrative projects and locate 6-10 and 4-5 sources, respectively. These 2 projects together require students

to locate, interpret, and apply 10-15 sources in 8-10 pages of written text (4-5 pages for each project). The written text that students produce serves as the baseline or jumping off point for the Report and Policy Proposal assignments in which students will locate, interpret, and apply 10-15 sources (6-10 for Report and 4-5 for Policy Proposal) in 20-30 pages of written text (10-15 pages for each project). Approaching the task of writing in this manner prompts students to see that all writing is relational and not performed in one-off, contained contexts.

To complete their research, students will perform keyword searches on ASU library databases and Google Scholar and also write research annotations of their collected sources in the Report and Policy Proposal projects to help support their interpretation and evaluation of their secondary sources. Overall, the course emphasizes the centrality of research in all writing activities. See Course Projects descriptions and Course Schedule.

"L" Criterion 4

The syllabus should include a minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity. Substantial writing assignments entail sustained in-depth engagement with the material. Examples include research papers, reports, articles, essays, or speeches that reflect critical inquiry and evaluation. Assignments such as brief reaction papers, opinion pieces, reflections, discussion posts, and impromptu presentations are not considered substantial writing/speaking assignments.

Provide relatively detailed descriptions of two or more substantial writing or speaking tasks that are included in the course requirements.

Report - Students will perform secondary research and write a 10-15 page report that provides background information about an aspect(s) of a public problem mapped in the Problem-Setting Narrative. During the project, which spans 4 weeks, students will use ASU library databases and Google Scholar to identify 6-10 sources that are relevant to their report focus and further contextualize the prior research they completed in the Rhetorical Situation Analysis and Problem Setting Narrative projects. To help students evaluate the sources and assess their relevance, students will write annotations (1/2 to 1 page in length) for each source. To receive feedback on these annotations, students will submit 2 of them as DB posts for peer review and then later develop a bibliography of sources to include as part of the final project submission. Also, students will write a draft outline for the report that shows where the sources will be used in the report, and the draft outline also will be submitted as a DB post for peer review. When writing the report, students will imagine that the report will be submitted to their work supervisor who is in charge of writing a grant proposal to secure funding to support outreach efforts. 100% of the project is geared towards writing, and the grade students receive for this project will make up 20% of their final course grade.

Policy Proposal - Students will write a 10-15 page policy proposal for a public or private agency that describes a proposed solution for addressing the public problem they identified in the Problem-Setting Narrative and Report. During the project, which spans 4 weeks, students will conduct secondary research and identify 4-5 new sources that further contextualize the prior research they completed in the Rhetorical Situation Analysis, Problem Setting Narrative, and Report projects. Students will annotate these sources and add them to the bibliography of sources located and analyzed in the Report project. As part of this project, students also will produce a multimodal component (e.g. a short podcast or a short video) to support their proposal. When completing this component, students will imagine that the component will be delivered during the formal presentation of the proposal to the director(s) of the public or private agency. Overall, the writing students complete for this project will account for 75% of their work load and the multimodal component accounts for the remaining 25%. The grade students receive on this project will make up 20% of their final course grade.

Identify the submitted documentation that provides evidence.

Syllabus (See Course Projects – Rhetorical Situation Analysis, Report, and Policy Proposal)

How does this course meet the spirit of this criterion?

The course requires students to complete 2 written projects (Report and Policy Proposal) that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity. The Report and Policy Proposal projects are substantial in terms of the length of the projects (4 weeks to completion and 10-15 pages of written text for each) and also in the scope of the analysis and application of the research findings from both the 10-15 sources initially gathered, analyzed, and applied in the Rhetorical Situation Analysis and Problem Setting Narrative projects and the additional 10-15 sources that are gathered, analyzed, and applied in the Report and Policy Proposal projects.

Provide detailed evidence of how this course meets this criterion (i.e. where in the syllabus).

As demonstrated in the course descriptions, the course projects require students to perform a lot of secondary research and related analysis of sources in order to develop a deep understanding of the public problem they are setting for an audience to address. Students apply these research findings in their design and writing of the Reports and Policy Proposals that are each 10-15 pages in length. In the writing of the Reports and Policy proposals, students learn the conventions of these genres, which are the kinds of documents that students traditionally will be asked to produce in organizational and civic workplace contexts. See Course Projects descriptions.

"L" Criterion 5

These substantial writing or speaking assignments should be arranged so that the students will get timely feedback from the instructor on each assignment in time to help them do better on subsequent assignments. *Intervention at earlier stages in the writing process is especially welcomed.*

Describe the sequence of course assignments--and the nature of the feedback the current (or most recent) course instructor provides to help students do better on subsequent assignments.

Course projects are sequenced to build off one another, i.e. the skills developed in the first project (Rhetorical Situation Analysis) carry to the second project (Problem Setting Narrative) and the skills developed in the second project along with the first project skills will carry to the third project (Report) and so on. The students' focus on one issue throughout the semester heightens the sequencing and enables students to perform in-depth, nuanced analysis of one issue over time. Additionally, the writing students complete in early projects carries to the later projects and serves as the baseline or jumping off point from which new written text will be produced. Ultimately, sequencing the course in this way prompts students to see that all writing is relational and not performed in one-off, contained contexts. Written instructor feedback is offered to students within 1-2 class periods after the project deadline.

Identify the submitted documentation that provides evidence.

Syllabus (See Course Grading)

How does this course meet the spirit of this criterion?

Schedule is designed to provide instructors 1-2 class periods, after a project due date, to complete assessment and grading. Written feedback is provided to students in each project. Sentence/paragraph level as well as summary feedback are provided to students.

Provide detailed evidence of how this course meets this criterion (i.e. where in the syllabus).

As demonstrated in Course Schedule, course projects are organized in 3-4 week increments and feedback for each project is provided on or before the midway point of the following assignment. Students are encouraged to revise their projects based on the feedback and receive a higher grade. See Course Grading and Revision Policy.

Attach a sample syllabus for this course or topic, including the list of any required readings.

[ENG 391 - L Syllabus.pdf](#)

Attach the table of contents from any required textbook(s).

[ENG 391 TOC.pdf](#)

Attach any other materials that would be relevant or helpful in the review of this request.

No Response