# Course Change Proposal

## Form A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Group (College): Arts and Letters</th>
<th>Academic Organization (Department): English</th>
<th>Date: 3/8/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Course Proposal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Department Chair:</strong> Sheree Meyer</td>
<td><strong>Submitted by:</strong> David Toise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ___ Change X ___ Deletion ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this course fulfill a requirement for single-subject or multiple subject credential students? Yes ___ No ___</td>
<td>For Catalog Copy: Yes X ___ No ___</td>
<td>Semester Effective: Fall X ___ Spring __, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCE (Extension): Yes ___ No ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This course replaces experimental course Subject Area (prefix) and Catalog Nbr (course number):

If changing an existing course, should new version be considered a repeat of the original version? If so, the same Course ID will be maintained. If not, a new Course ID will be assigned. Note: In PeopleSoft terminology, the Course ID is the unique system identifier, not the Catalog Nbr.

### Change from:

| Subject Area (prefix) & Catalog Nbr (course no.): Engl 200a | Title: Methods and Materials of Literary Research | Units: 3 |

### Change to:

| Subject Area (prefix) & Catalog Nbr (course no.): Engl 200a | Title: Methods and Materials of Literary Research | Units: |

### JUSTIFICATION:

Course has been revised to meet the requirements of a Graduate Writing Intensive course.

### NEW COURSE DESCRIPTION:

(Not to exceed 80 words, and language should conform to catalog copy. See http://www.csus.edu/ummanual/acad.htm - Guidelines for Catalog Course Description)

Required of all MA candidates in English under Plans A and C and Creative Writing Plan B, acquaints students with principal sources, techniques, critical approaches, and genres of literary research. Students should take this course as early as possible in their graduate careers. Students prepare an annotated bibliography and a paper explicitly engaging with critical approaches. As part of these projects, students practice writing, revision, and critical reflection involving peer and instructor feedback. Students must write a minimum of 5,000 words.

### Note:

| Prerequisite: Enforced at Registration: Yes ___ No ___ |
| Corequisite: Enforced at Registration: Yes ___ No ___ |
| Graded: Letter X ___ Credit/No Credit ___ |
| Instructor Approval Required? Yes ___ No ___ |

### Course Classification (e.g., lecture, lab, seminar, discussion):

discussion

### Title for CMS (not more than 30 characters):

### Cross Listed? Yes ___ No X ___

If yes, do they meet together and fulfill the same requirement, and what is the other course.

### How Many Times Can This Course be Taken for Credit? 1

### Can the course be taken for Credit more than once during the same term? Yes ___ No ___
FOR NEW COURSE PROPOSALS OR SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES ONLY:

Description of the Expected Learning Outcomes: Describe outcomes using the following format: “Students will be able to: 1), 2), etc.” See the example at http://www.csus.edu/acad/example.htm

By the end of the semester, students will:
1. Understand the major research and/or professional conventions, practices, and methods of inquiry in the discipline;
2. Understand the major formats, genres, and styles of writing used in the discipline;
3. Practice reading and writing within the discipline;
4. Practice reading and writing as a learning process that involves peer and instructor feedback, revision, critical reflection, and self-editing.

**Attach a list of the required/recommended course readings and activities [Note: it is understood that these are updated and modified as needed by the instructor(s).] This attachment should be forwarded only to your Dean's office, not Academic Affairs.

Assessment Strategies: A description of the assessment strategies (e.g., portfolios, examinations, performances, pre-and post-tests, conferences with students, student papers) which will be used by the instructor to determine the extent to which students have achieved the learning outcomes noted above:

1. Paper with draft and/or proposal and revision
2. Annotated bibliography with draft and/or proposal and revision
3. Informal student writing in the discipline

For whom is this course being developed?
Majors in the Dept X  Majors of other Depts X Minors in the Dept  General Education  Other X
Is this course required in a degree program (major, minor, graduate degree, certificate)? Yes  No X
If yes, identify program(s):

Does the proposed change or addition cause a significant increase in the use of College or University resources (lab room, computer facilities, faculty, etc.)? Yes  No X
If yes, attach a description of resources needed and verify that resources are available.

Indicate which department or programs will be affected by the proposed course (if any). none

The Department Chair’s signature below indicates that affected programs have been sent a copy of this proposal form.

Approvals: If proposed change, new course or deletion is approved, sign and date below. If not approved, forward without signing to the next reviewing authority, and attach an explanatory memorandum to the original copy.

Signatures: Date
Department Chair: 4/12/10
College Dean or Associate Dean: 4/22/10
CPSP (for school personnel courses ONLY)
Associate Vice President
and Dean for Academic Programs

Distribution: Academic Affairs (original), Department Chair and College Dean. Dean’s office to send original after approval to Academic Affairs, at mall zip 6016. An electronic copy must also be sent.

9/10/2008
Methods and Materials of Literary Research

Please note this syllabus is meant to be illustrative of a 200A section that meets the GWI requirements; it is not meant to be prescriptive.

[week 1]
Monday, September 8th
- Introductions
- Review syllabus

[week 2]
Monday, September 15th
- Jonathan Culler, Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction, chapters 1 (pp 1-17), 2 (pp 18-41), and 5 (pp 69-81).

[week 3]
Monday, September 22nd
- Culler, Literary Theory, chapter 6, pp 82-93.

[week 4]
Monday, September 29th
- "Feminist Criticism and Hamlet," Hamlet, pp 208-240.
- SACCT Post #1 due (everyone must post this first time).

[week 5]
Monday, October 6th

[week 6]
Monday, October 13th
- Catherine Belsey, Poststructuralism, chapter 4, 69-88.
- "Deconstruction and Hamlet," Hamlet, pp 283-331.
- SACCT Post or Response Due
[week 7]
Monday, October 20th
- “Psychoanalytic Criticism and Hamlet,” Hamlet, pp 241-282.
- SACCT Post or Response Due

[week 8]
Monday, October 27th
- Waugh, “Reconstructing Historicism,” pp 386-404
- SACCT Post or Response Due

[week 9]
Monday, November 3rd
- Waugh, “Postcolonialism” (pp 340-361) and “Race, Nation, and Ethnicity” (pp 362-385).
- Peter Erickson, “Can We Talk about Race in Hamlet?” (hand out)
- SACCT Post or Response Due
- Sign up for research presentations/roundtable discussion (11/17 through 11/24).

[week 10]
Monday, November 10th
- Myra Jehlen, “Gender” in Lentricchia and McLaughlin’s Critical Terms for Literary Study (pp 263-274).
- Francoise Meltzer’s “Unconscious” in Critical Terms for Literary Study (pp 147-162).
- Library visit and research discussion
- SACCT Post or Response Due
- 7 page paper due

[week 11]
Monday, November 17th
- Barbara Johnson’s “Writing” in Critical Terms for Literary Study (pp 39-49).
- Stephen Greenblatt’s “Culture” in Critical Terms for Literary Study (pp 225-232).
- Kwame Anthony Appiah’s “Race” in Critical Terms for Literary Study (pp 274-283).
- SACCT Post or Response Due
- Student presentations and round-table discussion on bibliographical research: this class, feminist theory/your field or psychoanalytic/your field bibliographies.
- Preliminary bibliography due for this week’s presenters
- Working from your Hamlet/Frankenstein paper, post the following document to our SACCT discussion board: start with your introductory paragraph (including your thesis), append to that any chunk (500-750 words) of the body of the paper.

[week 12]
Monday, November 24th
- Student presentations and round-table discussion on bibliographical research: this class, deconstructive OR new historicism/cultural criticism OR race/post-colonialism bibliographies.
- Preliminary bibliography due for this week’s presenters.
- SACCT Post Response Due

[week 13]
Monday, December 1st

[week 14]
Monday, December 8th
- Movie night (tba)
- Hand in revised Hamlet/Frankenstein paper.

[Finals week]
Monday, December 15th
- Final draft, annotate bibliography due, with 5-7 page introductory essay.
Grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACCT Posts, 3@3 points each</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACCT Responses, 3@3 points each</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankenstein/ Hamlet paper, draft 1 (7 pages)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Research Presentation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Annotated Bibliography</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line-by-Line Assignment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankenstein/ Hamlet Paper draft 2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotated Bib w/Intro essay</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance and participation</td>
<td>7 points*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More than two absences and you lose 7 points for participation. More than 4 absences and you risk failing the course.

Catalog course description:
Required of all MA candidates in English under Plans A and C and Creative Writing Plan B, acquaints students with principal sources, techniques, critical approaches, and genres of literary research. Students should take this course as early as possible in their graduate careers. Students prepare an annotated bibliography and a paper explicitly engaging with critical approaches. As part of these projects, students practice writing, revision, and critical reflection involving peer and instructor feedback. Students must to a minimum of 5,000 words of writing.

General learning goals:
By the end of the semester, students will
1. Understand the major research and/or professional conventions, practices, and methods of inquiry in the discipline;
2. Understand the major formats, genres, and styles of writing used in the discipline;
3. Practice reading and writing within the discipline;
4. Practice reading and writing as a learning process that involves peer and instructor feedback, revision, critical reflection, and self-editing.

Required Texts:

Assignments:
1) SACCT Post: 3 points possible for each post. For the seven theoretical approaches we cover during weeks 1-11 (feminist theory, psychoanalytic theory, deconstruction, the new historicism, cultural studies, race/ethnicity, and post-coloniality), you will have to write three posts in which you examine and discuss the theories and texts we've read. These posts are due before class. The postings must be at least 600 words to
receive credit. Postings should quote the texts and engage with the readings critically and analytically (rather than through summary). Try to be as specific as possible: name the reading you are discussing and use quotation as often as possible. Your grade will be based on the extent to which you link specific quotations from the text to larger, more significant, intellectual issues raised by the readings. All posts must be done by week 11. You can only do one post per week.

Your post might:

- address passages from the reading that provoked a strong reaction from you: excitement, disagreement, approval, etc. Offer reasons, evidence, and support for your responses! Remember not to personalize your responses too much and to use appropriate language, as you would in our class. Avoid: “Derrida disgusts me because...”. Use your emotional response as a jumping off point for ideas: “I am uncomfortable with the idea that language has no meaning.”

- note a pattern within an author’s writing or among more than one authors. Ex., “Isn’t it interesting how the term ‘the Other’ seems to work differently in several different contexts.”

- make a connection between readings, class discussion, and your experiences. “Gates’s discussion of signifyin(g) reminds me of something my kids did the other day...” “Gates seems to be linked to Derrida because...”

- examine a moment of confusion. Here it’s not really helpful to just write: “I didn’t understand a word she wrote” but to focus on a specific passage or idea that seemed confusing. Use quotations to zero-in on where and why you get confused.

- expand on an idea raised in class and tie it back to the readings. Remember to refer back to the class date and conversation specifically, so that others will know what you’re talking about.

2) SACCT Responses: 3 points possible for each post. You must also post 3 responses, each a response to one of your classmates’ posts. These responses are due no more than a week after the original post and also must be at least 600 words to receive credit. Try not to simply praise your colleagues (or simply castigate them): your grade will be based on the specificity with which you can articulate how your classmate’s post helps you to see the theories/ideas of the class differently or where and why you might have moments of difference. All responses must be done by week 12; you can only do one response per week.

Your response might:

- address a passage from the original post that provoked a strong reaction from you: excitement, disagreement, approval, etc. Offer reasons, evidence, and support for your responses! Remember not to personalize your responses too much and to use appropriate language, as you would in our class. Avoid “My classmate doesn’t understand Derrida because...”; try instead, “I differ with her reading of Derrida because...”

- examine a moment of enlightenment or confusion you had in response to another post. What did connection did this post help you to see? Why are these connections valuable/meaningful to you? How did the post help you to see something new about the reading or theories? What specifically did it suggest that you hadn’t seen before and why was this helpful to you? What confused you about the post? Here it’s not really helpful to just write: “I didn’t understand a word she wrote” but to focus on a specific passage or idea that seemed confusing. Use quotations to zero-in on where and why you get confused.

3) 7 page paper due: Draft 1, 15 points. Choose two essays from different critical perspectives on either Frankenstein or Hamlet. This essay will be due, first on November 10th, and then, after my response and the response of your colleagues, will need to be revised and turned in on the last day of class. (For the response of your colleagues, see the ‘line-by-line’ assignment week 13). Write a unified essay, with a clearly articulated thesis, that addresses the following questions:
1) What do you see as important about bringing the two essays together? Might one approach be more compelling than the other (at least in the case of this text)? Taken together might they offer a third, and more powerful, approach to the text?
2) What evidence from Frankenstein or Hamlet would you cite to support your answer to that first question?
3) Why might your understanding of the two essays be an important one in terms of the text and/or in terms of literary studies more generally?

4) Student presentations of bibliographical research and round-table discussions: weeks 11 and 12. 5 points. 10 minutes for each presentation. Students will give a brief presentation outlining their research project, their findings thus far, and some of their tentative conclusions. You must have a hand out that goes along with your presentation. Your presentation should elicit questions and constructive criticism from your peers during the discussion that follows; part of your grade will come from the amount of audience interest your presentation generates.

- In your research presentation and in your accompanying hand out, you should briefly describe your theoretical approach, briefly describe your field, and (using quotation from a couple of critical sources that might go on your annotated bibliography) discuss: 1) whether you think this connection (between field and theory) is an easy or difficult fit, explaining why or why not and 2) has this connection been well developed or not, speculating on some possible reasons why. (For example, you might claim that feminist theory and Victorian texts are an easy fit because there was a comparatively large number of women writers in the nineteenth century.)
- Your research presentation is the first step in your final project, an annotated bibliography of approximately twenty entries and a 5-7 page introductory essay. An annotated bibliography is a document produced for other researchers to give them an overview of what sort of research has been done in a particular field. Scholars often use an annotated bibliography as a jumping off point for their own research. Your job is to produce an annotated bibliography that examines what work has been done within a particular literary field (e.g., British modernism) from a particular theoretical perspective (e.g., psychoanalysis). The main question your bibliography should address is: based on your knowledge of other theoretical approaches, what are the advantages/disadvantages (intellectually, politically, and/or literarily) of this approach and how do those advantages/disadvantages reveal themselves in the specific work critics have done in this field. Your essay should make use of and cite entries on your annotated bibliography. Each entry in your bibliography should have an annotation of 100-200 words: what is this argument of this book/text? How does it fit into the larger picture of your bibliography and connect to other works on your list? You should also have a 5-7 page introductory essay: a unified essay, with a clearly articulated thesis, that addresses the advantages and disadvantages of this connection, citing the materials collected in the annotated bibliography.

During the roundtables

Volunteer moderators are responsible for introducing each speaker and keeping speakers to their 10 minute limit. Questions take place after all the presenters have gone; the moderators should open the floor to questions but also think of some questions of their own to get conversation going or restarted if it slows. Similarly, if one paper is getting all the questions, the moderator might follow redirect questions to another participant. Generally, moderators are responsible for helping to keep the conversation going and make sure everyone is included in the conversation.

Audience (i.e. the other five people in the room): You should think of questions that might get at similarities and differences between the panelists approaches, individual ideas you'd like to know more about, similarities and differences with your own project and approach, research suggestions, comments and questions based on your own knowledge of theory and the text on with which they are involved. Remember they are partly graded on the amount of interests their presentation evoke, so give them a hand and ask a question.
5) Preliminary bibliographies, 5 points.
In addition to your presentation, preliminary bibliographies are due on the day of your round-table (either week 11 or 12, depending on your topic). Your preliminary bibliography should have:

- An Introduction of about 500 words that suggests the advantages/disadvantages (literarily, intellectually, politically, etc.) of combining your theoretical field (e.g., psychoanalysis) with your literary field (e.g., British Modernism).
- 10 annotated entries, at least 4 not available through the Internet. Each entry in your bibliography should have an annotation of 100-200 words: what is this argument of this book/text? How does it fit into the larger picture of your bibliography and connect to other works on your list?

6) Line-by-Line Assignment, 5 points for your written response to 5 peers:
Posting, due class meeting of week 11. Working from your Hamlet/Frankenstein paper, post the following document to our SACCT discussion board: start with your introductory paragraph (including your thesis), append to that any chunk (500-750 words) of the body of the paper.

You will be assigned 5 class-mates whose posts you must read with care and respond to in writing as described below, using Claire Kehrwald Cooks' Writing Line by Line. You must read the posts of all other classmates (but you do not have to respond in writing to more than the five assigned to you.)

Responding to writing:

1) You're not evaluating (grading) the writing sample; your only goal is to “move the writing to the next level.” Your question is not “what is wrong?” but “how to improve?”.

2) You should read each piece. You should respond in a written paragraph form to five of them; I'll give each student a list of 5 peers to whose paper excerptcs you must respond. Your job is to respond in general to the writing (where it works best) but also to find at least two specific instances of writing where changing wording and punctuation could improve the clarity of the argument/point.

- In particular, you're looking for places where language tends to obscure rather than create meaning (yes, take off your deconstructionist hat for the moment).

- How might moments of obscure writing suggest a part of the argument here that could be worked out more fully?

In particular, Claire Kehrwald Cook's first chapter should be useful here. You may want to suggest a couple of rewording possibilities for each instance; most importantly, you want to be able to describe what some of the writing issues are here and how they might represents moment where the argument needs to be worked out more fully. Feel free to refer to Cook's discussion. For the five essays to which you're assigned to respond, this response should be typed up. Be prepared to discuss your responses in class, as well.

In class, I'll have all the posts printed up for us to refer to, and we'll workshop several of the writing samples together, with the specific respondents to that essay leading the way but with the whole class participating.

7) Revision of Frankenstein/Hamlet essay. 20 points. Due week 14. Revision of essay based on instructor and peer response. Write a unified essay, with a clearly articulated thesis, that addresses the following questions:

1) What do you see as important about bringing the two essays together? Might one approach be more compelling than the other (at least in the case of this text)? Taken together might they offer a third, and more powerful, approach to the text?

2) What evidence from Frankenstein or Hamlet would you cite to support your answer to that first question?
3) Why might your understanding of the two essays be an important one in terms of the text and/or in terms of literary studies more generally? The final paper will be graded on the analytical power and originality of its argument, the specificity with which the author links his or her argument to specific examples and texts, the author's ability to integrate and build on other critical and scholarly voices, and the clarity and style with which the author renders his or her argument.

8) Annotated bibliography. 25 points. Due finals week.
Annotated bibliography of approximately twenty entries and a 5-7 page introductory essay. An annotated bibliography is a document produced for other researchers to give them an overview of what sort of research has been done in a particular field. Scholars often use an annotated bibliography as a jumping off point for their own research. Your job is to produce an annotated bibliography that examines what work has been done within a particular literary field (e.g., British modernism) from a particular theoretical perspective (e.g., psychoanalysis).

- The main question your bibliography should address is: based on your knowledge of other theoretical approaches, what are the advantages/disadvantages (intellectually, politically, and/or literarily) of this approach and how do those advantages/disadvantages reveal themselves in the specific work critics have done in this field. Your essay should make use of and cite entries on your annotated bibliography.

- Each entry in your bibliography should have an annotation of 100-200 words: what is this argument of this book/text? How does it fit into the larger picture of your bibliography and connect to other works on your list?

- You should also have a 5-7 page introductory essay: a unified essay, with a clearly articulated thesis, that addresses the advantages and disadvantages of this connection, citing the materials collected in the annotated bibliography.
Appendix 2

Graduate Writing Intensive (GWI) Course Approval Request Form

To be completed by Faculty member responsible for teaching the course:

Course Name/Number ___English 200a_____
Course Title ___Methods and Material of Literary Study___
Instructor's Name ___David Toise____
Campus phone ___278-6404__________________________
Email ______dwtoise@csus.edu_____________________

The purpose of the GWI course is (a) to immerse graduate students in the discourse of their academic or professional discipline and (b) to prepare graduate students to participate effectively in that discourse. All GWI courses must meet the guidelines listed below.

Please complete the second column of the chart on the reverse of this form to explain how each guideline is met, then submit this form with the Form A Course Change Proposal along with a copy of your Course Syllabus and each writing assignment. Additional information may be attached or requested as needed.

General learning goals: By the end of the semester, students will
1. understand the major research and/or professional conventions, practices, and methods of inquiry of the discipline;
2. understand the major formats, genres, and styles of writing used in the discipline;
3. practice reading and writing within the discipline;
4. practice reading and writing as a learning process that involves peer and instructor feedback, revision, critical reflection, and self-editing.

Guidelines:
1. The course learning goals must include the four general learning goals listed above.
2. Students must write a minimum of 5000 words or 20 double-spaced pages of discourse. At least one assignment must be a minimum of 5 pages or 1250 words.
3. Writing assignments must be spread out over the entire semester.
4. At least 60% of the course grade will come from instructors’ assessment of student writing.
5. Assessment of student writing should focus primarily on critical thinking, synthesis, and organization.
6. The course must consist of a minimum of 3 upper division units or a minimum of 2 graduate level units and must be designed primarily to meet the needs of graduate students.
7. Each section should have no more than 30 students.
8. The course should include a range of assignments, both informal and formal, in the types of genres typical in the discipline: for example, a research paper, proposal, critical response, annotated bibliography, abstract, case study, laboratory report, etc.
9. Formal assignments should include multiple drafts with revision based on feedback from peers and the instructor.
10. Formal assignments should include multiple drafts with revision based on feedback from peers and the instructor.

GWAR/Glade/Spring 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>How requirement is met</th>
<th>GE approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course consists of a minimum of 3 upper division units or 2 graduate units</td>
<td>Listed in Course Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes the four required learning goals</td>
<td>Listed on Course Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each section caps at 30 students</td>
<td>Listed in CMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immerse students in the discourse of the discipline: genres, literacies,</td>
<td>Listed in Course Syllabus and Catalog Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stylistic conventions, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students write a minimum of 5000 words of discourse</td>
<td>Listed in Catalog Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one assignment of 1250 words</td>
<td>See Syllabus, assignments 7 and 8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing spread out over entire semester</td>
<td>See Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 60% of course grade from instructor’s evaluation of writing</td>
<td>See Syllabus (“Grades”).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of writing focuses primarily on critical thinking, synthesis,</td>
<td>See Syllabus, assignments 7 and 8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes a range of informal writing assignments in disciplinary genres</td>
<td>See Catalog Descriptions; Course Syllabus assignments 1, 2,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes a range of formal writing assignments in disciplinary genres</td>
<td>See Catalog Description; Course Syllabus, assignments 7 and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal assignments include multiple drafts with revision based on feedback</td>
<td>See Catalog Description; Course Syllabus, assignments 4 and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from peers</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal assignments include multiple drafts with revision based on feedback</td>
<td>See Catalog Description; Course Syllabus, assignments 3 and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from instructor</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GWAR/Glade/Spring 2010