

GT-CO1, 2 & 3 Sequence and Content – April 15, 2016 Fac2Fac

The Issues:

1. WHERE, in the sequence, specific content gets taught (citing references is commonly used as an example).
2. When a student starts with GT-CO2 and then transfers to an institution that does not offer GT-CO3, that creates a problem.

The Goal:

Faculty at April 15 F2F conference provides GE Council prioritized recommendations for resolving the above issues.

The Faculty Feedback:

1. The community colleges offer CO3. As for schools that do not teach citing references in a CO1 class, I frankly, as a long time English instructor do not understand that oversight in a college composition course, especially since high schools now see it as part of the Common Core. So not teaching citations in CO1 seems like a disservice to students. Lindsay.Lewan@arapahoe.edu
2. I think it would help the transfer process if colleges and universities could assume that some kind of extended research project happens in GT-CO2. While CU Denver currently doesn't offer any GT-CO3 courses, I imagine that will change in the near future since it is becoming easier for students to test out of our GT-CO1 course. It is our belief that a two-course required sequence--whether it is CO1 and CO2 or CO2 and CO3--is essential for all our graduates. Michelle.Comstock@ucdenver.edu
3. The content goals in #3 Develop, Deepen and Extend Composing Conventions includes citation listed as documentation under each category. The content goals in #4 Uses Sources and Evidence expands on accurate citation by looking at evidence selected and used appropriately. Therefore, I argue that citation is included consistently throughout the content necessary for CO1-3. This may be a language issue as most English instructors I've encountered throughout this process tend to be quite inflexible about terminology. Furthermore, citation is referenced directly in the competency for written communication, which all three courses require. Courtney Fullmer [\[mailto:cfullmer@western.edu\]](mailto:cfullmer@western.edu)
4. GT-CO3 appears to be a much smaller problem, as many institutions do not offer it. This could be solved by discussion among those institutions only? The justification at the beginning of the content states specifically that "The CO3 course allows for teaching writing in the context of a specific discipline." Which I believe is the central element instructors should keep in mind while debating this sub topic. Courtney Fullmer [\[mailto:cfullmer@western.edu\]](mailto:cfullmer@western.edu)
5. Most schools do not have a CO3, and it is, the way our committee envisioned it, just a deepening of the knowledge from CO2. As I recall, and I do not have the stuff in front of me, CO2 was distinguished from CO 1 by the research component (I agree with whoever wrote that citations should be taught in both—and CO1 IF it is taught properly—that is, as MORE than a way to cite but rather a way to think about how we handle materials. In my view—either CO1 and CO2 or CO1 and CO3 could fulfill the two-course sequence—however, I have not seen any syllabi for CO3 classes. I am going on what we decided as a group last Fall. CO1 (or some equivalent) is a non-negotiable from my perspective. Jeraldine.Kraver@unco.edu
6. Incoming freshmen complete a CO2/CO3 writing sequence at UCB. We have no CO1 classes. Students do not get credit for CO1. Students who transfer into UCB with either CO1 or CO2, but not both, fulfill our CO2 equivalent lower-division writing requirement and students who transfer in with both a CO1 and a CO2 course fulfill both the CO2 equivalent lower-division writing requirement and the CO3 equivalent upper-division writing requirement. Patrick.Tally@colorado.edu
7. Regarding the research component and how the course content is articulated from CO1 to 2 to 3, it goes something like this: CO1 deals with close and critical reading of outside sources that are provided to students. They learn to read those sources rhetorically so that they have a skill set moving forward in their evaluation of sources and the importance of the representation of multiple perspectives and stakeholder positions to any reasonable, researched topic. They learn that there is an ethos around academic writing/argument which

suggests that is importantly tied to evidence-based reasoning, In CO1, they use the reading skills developed early in the course to demonstrate that they can write summaries of sources accurately and fairly, responding to them using textual and experience-based evidence. They then synthesize multiple sources around a research question that lies somewhat afield of what any one of the provided sources addresses directly. They learn fundamentals of source acknowledge and attribution and the focus is on academic writing. CO2 moves at a faster pace than CO1, as students move quickly from rhetorical analysis of sources they're asked to read and into synthesis. They are expected to acknowledge/cite sources very early and learn about differing ways of doing so based on audience and purpose. They engage in extended independent research project utilizing library databases and field-based research, culminating in a source-based argument with complete bibliography. To get there, they write a stakeholder analysis, a formal proposal, an annotated bibliography, an audience analysis, and a full research paper. They subsequently transform their academic researched argument and reformulate it for a non-academic audience. In CO3 in the English Department (because yes, CO3 is also taught as Business 300 and Journalism and Technical Communication 300 and Liberal Arts 300) students have a suite of choices. They can take CO301A, B, C, D which align with disciplinary affiliations and for which students research/write both for their disciplinary area and for lay audiences that need to understand the knowledge of those disciplinary areas. Their research is done in ways that align with disciplinary conventions and databases that are discipline-specific. In CO300, Writing Arguments, students study the many genres of argument and trace theoretical underpinnings of rhetoric and argumentation. They produce research-based arguments for varied audiences and purposes, including but not limited to academic audiences. They use many more sources than in CO150 and are expected to use specialized databases and field research approaches that fit their research topics. In CO302 students undertake the study of writing and research at an advanced level similar to CO300 but in a digital context, exploring a range of genres, conventions, and digital tools for composing complex texts in online environments. Here too independent research is expected to be completed using specialized research tools, databases and field experiences.

Regarding the sequence of CO 2+3 at CSU, here's what I've learned from talking to various people in the comp program and elsewhere at CSU:

As an R1, we believe we meet the needs of our student population when we offer a two course sequence that's pitched at a bit higher, more rigorous level. It is widely felt on our campus that our students need writing during the later years of their college work, and as students approach their capstone courses in many departments, we find that they are well served by having a course between the first-year composition but prior to the capstone. As a writing program, we feel strongly that an upper-division course better serves our students as they move into the heart of their major curricula and provides significant writing experience during the second half of students' college experience.

At the time of the articulation of the two-course agreement, I'm told there was also concern about the balance between upper and lower division credits. Far too many students ended up nearing graduation and not having enough upper-division credits. Expanding requirements at the lower division was seen to exacerbate this problem given the lower-division breadth requirements. I'm not sure if this would still be a problem but apparently it contributed to the efforts with a CO2 + 3 sequence.

A possible solution to the conundrum of transfer of CO3: What about a kind of PLA-in-reverse, wherein our two course sequence of CO2 and 3 would transfer in as CO1 and 2 to a community college? Thinking about this metaphorically, if a student has taken a 300-level French course, shouldn't she also be considered to have effectively completed a 100-level French course? Sue.Doe@ColoState.EDU

A Proposal for April 15 Fac2Fac:

Institutions:

- This conversation will not get very far without CSU Ft Collins and UC Boulder's participation.

- It would also be helpful to have 'pair' institutions (Aims-UNC, CCD-Metro, CCD-UCD, PCC-UCCS) also represented.

Data to Bring to F2F

- Does your institution allow incoming freshmen an option for CO1/CO2 vs CO2/CO3?
- If Yes, what are the factors that determine placing students in CO1 versus CO2? (Please bring cut scores for any placement exams.) For students starting in CO2, are they exempt from CO1? Is credit awarded for CO1? Should it be?
- If No, is your institution considering adding a CO2/CO3 option for undergraduate students?