

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
Kathleen Lamp	kslamp@asu.edu	(480) 965-3796

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?

Topic	Course Number	Units/Credit Hours
Subject		
ENG	472	3

Topic Information

Topic Title

Rhetorical Leadership

Topic Description

In this course, students will learn about the importance of rhetorical leadership. Specifically, students will analyze and discuss iconic moments when leaders employed rhetoric (speeches, public letters, multimedia presentations, etc.) to effect change in times of historical, social, environmental, and technological crisis. In doing so, students will not only gain a better sense of the relationship between rhetoric and leadership but also develop and demonstrate strategies for navigating crises in current and/or future leadership positions.

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.

Catalog description/syllabus

Provide detailed evidence of how this course meets this criterion.

Prerequisite(s): ENG 101, 105, or 107 with C or better; ENG 200 with C or better; one ENG 200- or 300-level literature course with C or better OR ENG 101, 105, or 107 with C or better; minimum 45 hours 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.

The assignments "Tropes in Crisis Response," "Identifying Artifacts of Rhetorical Leadership," "Comparative Speech Analysis" and "Rhetorical Leadership" are all writing assignments and make up 450 of the 600 points (75%) of the total grade (See Syllabus "major assignments" and "assignments").

Identify the submitted documentation that provides evidence.

Syllabus (see "major assignments" and "assignments")

How does this course meet the spirit of this criterion?

75% of the assignments in the class are writing assignments

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

The assignments "Tropes in Crisis Response," "Identifying Artifacts of Rhetorical Leadership," "Comparative Speech Analysis" and "Rhetorical Leadership" are all writing assignments and make up 450 of the 600 points (75%) of the total grade (See Syllabus "major assignments" and "assignments").

"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.

The "Tropes in Crisis Response" assignment asks students to gather three rhetorical artifacts related to crisis and identify common rhetorical tropes leaders use to respond to that crisis. Similarly, "Identifying Artifacts of Rhetorical Leadership" asks students to identify a rhetorical artifact, place it in context and used class concepts to analyze it. The "Comparative Speech Analysis" ask students to first do a reading on "feminine rhetorics" and identify rhetorical concepts in two speeches. Finally, the "Final Assignment" asks students to gather three rhetorical artifacts, and evaluate how these artifacts align with previously established characteristics of rhetorical leadership (See Syllabus "assignment").

Identify the submitted documentation that provides evidence.

Syllabus (see "assignments")

How does this course meet the spirit of this criterion?

This class first asks students to analyze the features of "rhetorical leadership" by gather examples of leadership, interpreting these examples to define the characteristics of rhetorical leadership, and then finally using those characteristics, students are asked evaluate rhetorical leadership in a crisis of their choosing.

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

The “Tropes in Crisis Response” assignment asks students to gather three rhetorical artifacts related to crisis and identify common rhetorical tropes leaders use to respond to that crisis. Similarly, “Identifying Artifacts of Rhetorical Leadership” asks students to identify a rhetorical artifact, place it in context and used class concepts to analyze it. The “Comparative Speech Analysis” ask students to first do a reading on “feminine rhetorics” and identify rhetorical concepts in two speeches. Finally, the “Final Assignment” asks students to gather three rhetorical artifacts, and evaluate how these artifacts align with previously established characteristics of rhetorical leadership (See Syllabus “assignment”).

"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.

The “Tropes in Crisis Response” assignment asks students to gather three rhetorical artifacts related to crisis and identify common rhetorical tropes leaders use to respond to that crisis. Similarly, “Identifying Artifacts of Rhetorical Leadership” asks students to identify a rhetorical artifact, place it in context and used class concepts to analyze it. The “Comparative Speech Analysis” ask students to first do a reading on “feminine rhetorics” and identify rhetorical concepts in two speeches. Finally, the “Final Assignment” asks students to gather three rhetorical artifacts, and evaluate how these artifacts align with previously established characteristics of rhetorical leadership (See Syllabus “assignment”).

Identify the submitted documentation that provides evidence.

Syllabus (see “assignments”)

How does this course meet the spirit of this criterion?

The class requires four essays that reflect critical inquiry and evaluation. The first three build critical inquiry skills and the fourth utilizes these skills in a process of rhetorical evaluations.

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

The “Tropes in Crisis Response” assignment asks students to gather three rhetorical artifacts related to crisis and identify common rhetorical tropes leaders use to respond to that crisis. Similarly, “Identifying Artifacts of Rhetorical Leadership” asks students to identify a rhetorical artifact, place it in context and used class concepts to analyze it. The “Comparative Speech Analysis” ask students to first do a reading on “feminine rhetorics” and identify rhetorical concepts in two speeches. Finally, the “Final Assignment” asks students to gather three rhetorical artifacts, and evaluate how these artifacts align with previously established characteristics of rhetorical leadership (See Syllabus “assignment”).

"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.

Grading turn around is never more than a week (see “feedback”). Discussion posts often give students a chance to informally try out their ideas and get feedback from peers and the instructors prior to formal

writing assignments. Feedback on the “Identifying Rhetorical Leadership” offers substantial feedback in terms of topic selection and approach for the “Final Assignment” (see assignments). Assignments are generally spaced to allow for feedback (see “reading schedule”)

Identify the submitted documentation that provides evidence.

Syllabus (see “assignments” and “reading list/timeline”)

How does this course meet the spirit of this criterion?

The writing assignments are structured so that students get timely feedback— generally within 3 days but never more than a week— that they can use to improve on future assignments which are generally well spaced.

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

Grading turn around is never more than a week (see “feedback”). Discussion posts often give students a chance to informally try out their ideas and get feedback from peers and the instructors prior to formal writing assignments. Feedback on the “Identifying Rhetorical Leadership” offers substantial feedback in terms of topic selection and approach for the “Final Assignment” (see assignments). Assignments are generally spaced to allow for feedback (see “reading schedule”)

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

[ENG 472 Rhetorical Leadership Syllabus.pdf](#)

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

No Response

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

No Response