



M.A. in English Program

ENGL-5010-01: The Teaching of Writing

Spring 2015; Mondays & Wednesdays, 15:30-16:45

Anne McCabe, Ph.D.

Office Hours: Mondays 10:30-11:30; 12:30-2:00 p.m., Tuesday and Thursdays: 3:30-5:00 p.m., and by appointment

Office: San Ignacio Hall, 3rd floor **Office phone:** 91.554.5858 ext. 237

e-mail: mccabea@slu.edu

Goals and Outcomes: Reflective of its mission, Saint Louis University strives to engage its students in five interrelated dimensions contributing to the development of the whole person: 1) scholarship and knowledge, 2) intellectual inquiry and communication, 3) community building, 4) leadership and service, and 5) spirituality and values. The goals of the course are to present participants with an overview of approaches to composition instruction, provide theoretical background to and practice in a collaborative process approach to teaching writing, review materials and resources for teaching writing, and analyze methods of overall assessment and evaluation. Participants will come away with an awareness of the practical implications of these areas in terms of course design and classroom procedures, and to do so by considering both first and second language student writers, with a focus on the latter, demonstrating sensitivity to a range of learning styles and backgrounds.. Thus, participants will be prepared to lead a community of writers in achieving effective and ethical written texts, showing awareness of values placed on writing depending on context and situation,

By the end of the course, participants will have the ability to:

- ✓ articulate their philosophy of writing teaching: what writing is and how teachers can best ensure student success
- ✓ design a writing course taking into account local context (including learner background, learning styles, and course purposes)
- ✓ choose materials, create classroom interactions, and design lessons which allow for scaffolded practice in learning outcomes
- ✓ provide effective feedback on written texts, designed to lead learners to greater autonomy in the decision-making process of writing
- ✓ consider the above *vis-à-vis* theoretical perspectives on writing and writing teaching

Required Texts: None. All readings available on our SLU Blackboard site.

Course Description: Class sessions will involve seminars, workshops, presentations, and some brief lectures to provide background on each of the major units of themes listed below. Discussions will be based on readings from major journals and from edited collections on teaching writing.

Unit 1: What is composition? Theories of text: discussion of literacy, text, discourse, writing, genre, register, text types; analysis of texts for register, generic features, textuality, interpersonal positionings. Theories of composition: traditional rhetoric, current-traditional paradigm, process approach, critical pedagogy, genre-based approaches.

Unit 2: Teacher response: types of response (oral, written). Focuses of response (grammar, content). Types of teacher response: alternative methods. Peer response: organizing peer response in the writing class: issues and practicalities.

Unit 3: Materials and resources for teaching writing, including new technologies. Choosing readings; designing activities, responses and exercises; using computers; outside sources in the writing classroom.

Unit 4: Assessing/Evaluating writing. Basic considerations in assessment. Designing assessment tasks. Scoring rubrics and procedures. Timed vs. in-class vs. portfolio assessment. Organizing portfolio assessment.

Unit 5: Bringing it all together: Writing and identity.

Course Requirements:

After the first three main units, students will complete a related assignment, which may be a short paper, oral presentation, or mini-lesson. They will also design as a final project a detailed syllabus for a writing course of their choice (e.g. a freshman composition course, a secondary level writing course, or an English as a Second Language writing course), which they will submit along with a paper outlining the reasons for major decisions taken in designing the course, providing the rationale and context for the syllabus: with explanations as to the target learners, objectives, methods, materials, assessment procedures, and potential problems and possible solutions (while citing the relevant literature – note: students must include references to class readings; to achieve the maximum grade, further sources must be consulted).

Overview of Assignments:

Unit 1: Position Statement on Teaching Writing (6-7 pages)

Unit 2: Interview Report/Oral Presentation: Responding to Student Writing (2-3 pages)

Unit 3: Lesson Plan/Classroom Activity Plan and Discussion

Syllabus and Rationale/Defense (with assessment explanation)

Grading:

30% class participation, preparation and final reflection

40% course design and justification (with assessment explanation)

30% unit assignments

Grading Scale:

A	4.0	Very high intellectual initiative and achievement (work always goes beyond the given, shows informed risk-taking, adds new perspectives)
A-	3.7	High intellectual initiative and achievement (work consistently goes beyond the given, shows informed risk taking, adds fresh perspectives)
B+	3.3	Clearly above average, approaching high achievement (work goes beyond the given, shows some risks, adds something new)
B	3.0	Above average (work sometimes goes beyond the given, can show attempts at risk-taking and new perspectives)
B-	2.7	Slightly above average
C+	2.3	Approaching above average performance
C	2.0	Work is as required; average performance
C-	1.7	Slightly below average performance
D	1.0	Achievement of questionable acceptability
F	0.0	Failure
AF	0.0	Failure due to excessive absences or unauthorized withdrawal

Late Assignment Policy: The assignment schedule states when assignments are due. Late assignments will drop one full letter grade for each class day late.

Accommodation Statement:

In recognition that people learn in a variety of ways and that learning is influenced by multiple factors (e.g., prior experience, study skills, learning disability), resources to support student success are available on campus. Students who think they might benefit from these resources can find out more about:

- Course-level support (e.g., faculty member, departmental resources, etc.) by asking your course instructor.
- University-level support (e.g., tutoring/writing services, Disability Services) by visiting the Academic Dean's Office (San Ignacio Hall) or by going to http://spain.slu.edu/academics/learning_resources.html.

Students who believe that, due to a disability, they could benefit from academic accommodations are encouraged to contact Disability Services at +34 915 54 58 58, ext. 204, send an e-mail to counselingcenter-madrid@slu.edu, or to visit the Counseling Office (San Ignacio Hall). Confidentiality will be observed in all inquiries. Course instructors support student accommodation requests when an approved letter from Disability Services has been received and when students discuss these accommodations with the instructor after receipt of the approved letter.

Contact: Please check our SLU Global site regularly; announcements, assignments and additional information will often be handled via the site. All readings and their due dates are made available at our site.

Statement on Academic Integrity: Students should be familiar with the Saint Louis University Madrid Campus policy at: http://spain.slu.edu/academics/academic_advising/docs/Academic_integrity.pdf. In writing up research, it is important to be careful about citing all exact words, as well as ideas, taken from outside sources. Please do not hesitate to ask your instructor about the correct ways of handling and citing outside sources. Sanctions for violations of academic integrity include an F for the course, with the possibility of further disciplinary action taken by the university.

Outcomes Assessment: Saint Louis University - Madrid Campus is committed to excellent and innovative educational practices. In order to maintain quality academic offerings and to conform to relevant accreditation requirements, we regularly assess our teaching, services, and programs for evidence of student learning outcomes achievement. For this purpose we keep on file anonymized representative examples of student work from all courses and programs such as: assignments, papers, exams, portfolios, and results from student surveys, focus groups, and reflective exercises. *Thus, copies of your work for this course, including such as submitted papers may be kept on file for institutional research, assessment and accreditation purposes.* If you prefer that Saint Louis University-Madrid Campus does not keep your work on file, you will need to communicate your decision in writing to your professor.

Certificate in University Teaching Skills: As part of an agreement with the Reinert Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning, some of the work for this class may be used to satisfy requirements for the Certificate in University Teaching Skills program. If you are pursuing one of the Certificates, completion of this course will count as the equivalent of **two** of the required Effective Teaching Seminars.

To receive these accommodations, you must: 1) formally enroll in the program by the beginning of **this semester** by completing a **Statement of Intent** form found on the Program Requirements page of the Reinert Center website at <http://slu.edu/ctl> (credit will not be given retroactively); and 2) complete this course successfully. At the end of the semester, you may request that I inform the Reinert Center that you have completed the course, and your records will be marked accordingly.

Course Syllabus

Note: readings are subject to change

Introductory meeting

Jan 14: Introduction to the course; preparation of readings for Unit 1.

Note: Please have read BEFORE this session 'WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition' (available: <http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html>)

Unit 1

Jan 19, Jan 21, Jan 26: Main themes: What is composition? What is written text? Lecture and discussion on: literacy, text, discourse, writing, genre, register, text types Analysis of texts for register, generic features, textuality, interpersonal positionings.

Readings:

For Jan 19:

Ong, W. J. (1988). Literacy and orality in our times. In G. Tate & E. P. J. Corbett (Eds.), *The writing teacher's sourcebook* (pp. 37-46). Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1996). Literacy and linguistics: A functional perspective. In R. Hasan & G. Williams (Eds), *Literacy in Society*. London: Longman, 339-376.

Kress, G. (1993) Genre as social process. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.) *The Powers of Literacy: A Genre Approach to Teaching Writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 22-37.

Colomb, G. (1988) Disciplinary "secrets" and the apprentice writer: the lessons for critical thinking. *Resource Publication*, Series 1 No. 6.

For Jan 21-26:

Frankel, K. K. (2013). Revisiting the role of explicit genre instruction in the classroom. *Journal of Education*, 193(1), 17-30.

Linton, P., R. Madigan & S. Johnson (1994) Introducing students to disciplinary genres: the role of the general composition course. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, 1/2.

Wardle, E. (2009) "Mutt genres" and the goal of FYC: Can we help students write the genres of the university? *College Composition and Communication*: 60/4, pp. 765-789.

Suggested further reading

Gage, J.T. (1991) On "rhetoric" and "composition". In Lindemann, E. & G. Tate (Eds) *An Introduction to Composition Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 15-32.

Kalantzis, M. & B. Cope (1993) Histories of pedagogy, cultures of schooling. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.) *The Powers of Literacy: A Genre Approach to Teaching Writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 38-62. (Available: SLU English Department Office)

McCabe, A. (2009) Teaching writing outside the U.S.: A different composition. In Kolapo, F. (ed) *Immigrant Academics and Cultural Challenges in a Global Environment*, pp. 151-185. Youngstown, NY: Cambria Press.

Carter, M. (2007) Ways of Knowing, Doing, and Writing in the Disciplines." *College Composition and Communication* 58.3: 385-418.

Rose, M. (2006) *An Open Language: Selected Writing on Literacy, Learning, and Opportunity*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Shaughnessy, M.P. (1979) *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979. (Available: SLU Library)

Tuesday, January 27: Last Day to Drop a Class Without a Grade of W and/or Add a Class

Jan 28, Feb 2, Feb 4: Main themes: Theories of teaching composition: traditional rhetoric, current-traditional paradigm, process approach, critical pedagogy, genre-based approaches. Includes discussion of the role and place of grammar in the composition classroom.

Readings:

For Jan 28:

Stewart, D.C. (1985) Some history lessons for composition teachers. *Rhetoric Review*, 3/2, pp. 134-144.

Fulkerson, R. (1990) Composition theory in the eighties: axiological consensus and paradigmatic diversity. *College Composition and Communication*, 41/4, pp. 409-429.

For Feb 2:

Fulkerson, R. (2005). Composition at the turn of the twenty-first century. *College Composition and Communication*, 10 (3), 267-333.

Connors, R.J. (1981) The rise and fall of the modes of discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 32/4, pp. 444-455.

Goleman, J. (2004) An "immensely simplified task": form in modern composition-rhetoric. *College Composition and Communication*, 56/1, pp. 51-71.

For Feb 4:

Russell, D.R. (1997) Rethinking Genre in School and Society: An Activity Theory Analysis. *Written Communication* 14/4: 504-554.

Suggested further reading:

Berlin, J.A. (1982) Contemporary composition: the major pedagogical theories. *College English*, 44/: 765- 777. Available: <http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/~davis/crs/E398t/Jim%20Berlin--Contemporary%20Composition.pdf>

Connors, R.J. (1991) Writing the history of our discipline. In Lindemann, E. & G. Tate (Eds) *An Introduction to Composition Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 49-71.

Lunsford, A.A. (1991) The nature of composition studies. In Lindemann, E. & G. Tate (Eds) *An Introduction to Composition Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 3-14.

Nystrand, M., Greene, S. and Wiemelt, M. (1993) Where did composition come from? *Written Communication*, 41/4, pp. 267-333.

Schuster, C.I. (1991) Theory and practice. In Lindemann, E. & G. Tate (Eds) *An Introduction to Composition Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 33-48.

Williams, J.D. (2003) *Preparing to Teach Writing: Research, Theory, and Practice*. (Chapters 1-2). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (Available: SLU library).

Feb 9: Unit assignment #1 due (position paper on teaching writing): Peer Review

Unit 2:

Feb 11, 16: Main themes: Response and revision. Teacher response: characteristics, limitations and process.

Readings:

In-class:

Miller, S. (2005) Tutor taxonomy. *Pedagogy* 5/1, 102-104. Publisher: Duke University Press.

Arbur, R. (1977) The student-teacher conference. *College Composition and Communication*, 28/4, pp. 338-342.

Memering, W.D. (1973) Talking to students: group conferences. *College Composition and Communication*, 24/ 3, pp. 306-307.

For Feb 16:

- Smith, S. (1997) The genre of the end comment: conventions in teacher responses to student writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 48/2, pp. 249-268.
- Straub, R. (1996) The concept of control in teacher response: defining the varieties of 'directive' and 'facilitative' commentary. *CCC* 47.2, 223-251.
- Goldstein, L. M. (2004) Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, 63-80.

Suggested further reading:

- Horvath, B.K. (1988) The components of written response: a practical synthesis of current views. In G. Tate and E.P.J. Corbett (eds) *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*. New York: Oxford University Press, 268-264. (Includes annotated bibliography on written response).
- Lees, E.O. (1988) Evaluating student writing. In G. Tate and E.P.J. Corbett (eds) *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*. New York: Oxford University Press, 263-267. (Available: English Department Office).
- Losey, K. (1997) Between you and me: plotting the contours of the writing conference. In C. Kirklighter, C. Vincent, & J.M. Moxley (eds) *Voices & Visions: Refiguring Ethnography in Composition*. Portsmouth, NH : Boynton/Cook. (Available: SLU library)
- Murray, D. (1988) The listening eye: reflections on the writing conference. In G. Tate and E.P.J. Corbett (eds) *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*. New York: Oxford University Press, 232-237. (Available: English Department Office).

Feb 18, 25, Mar 2: Main themes: Response and revision. Peer response: characteristics, limitations and process.

Readings:

For Feb 18:

Duane R., V. Panton, L. Yena, S.K. Miller, E.Waggoner (2002) *Strategies for Teaching First-Year Composition*. Chapter 8: "Orchestrating Peer Response Activities". Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Holt, M. (1992). The value of written peer criticism. *College Composition and Communication* 43/3, pp. 384-392.

For Feb 25:

DiPardo, A. & Freedman, S.W. (1988) Peer response groups in the writing classroom: theoretic foundations and new directions. *Review of Educational Research*, 58/ 2, pp. 119-149.

For Mar 2:

Caulk, N. (1994) Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28/1, pp. 181-188.

Ferris, D. (2003) Responding to writing. In Kroll, B. *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 119-140). Cambridge University Press.

Rollinson, P. (2004) Experiences and perceptions in an ESL academic writing peer response group. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, 12, 79-108.

Suggested further reading:

Bishop, W. (1993) *The Subject is Writing: Essays by Teachers and Students*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook. (Available: SLU library)

Williams, J.D. (2003) *Preparing to Teach Writing: Research, Theory, and Practice*. (Chap. 4). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (Available: SLU Library)

Mar 4: In-class workshop

Mar 11: Unit 2 Oral Assignment Due

Unit 3:

Mar 9, 11, 16: Main themes: Written materials & resources: choosing readings, sequencing writing activities. Classroom dynamics.

Readings:

For Mar 9:

Fitts, K. (2005) Ideology, life practices, and pop culture: so why is this called writing class? *The Journal of General Education*, 54,2.

For Mar 11:

Perry, P. H. (1996) Beyond naming writing: Freirian conscientization in the college composition classroom. *Faculty Symposium: Virginia Commonwealth University. October*. Available at http://www.has.vcu.edu/eng/symp/per_txt.htm.

Friday, March 13: Last Day to Drop a Class and Receive a Grade of W

For Mar 16:

Rankin, E. (1990) From simple to complex: ideas of order in assignment sequences. *JAC*, 10/1. Available: http://www.jacweb.org/Archived_volumes/Text_articles/V10_II_Rankin.htm

Suggested further reading:

Sullivan, F.J. (1995) Critical theory and systemic linguistics: textualizing the contact zone. *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory* 15, 411-434.

Vila, H.J. (2000) *Life-Affirming Acts: Education as Transformation in the Writing Classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers. . (Available: SLU Library)

Mar 18, 23, 25: Main themes: Technology and teaching writing: working in the computer lab; on-line resources available for teachers and students of writing.

Readings:

In class:

SLU Freshman Writing Program (http://libguides.slu.edu/freshman_writing;
<http://www.slu.edu/english-department/writing-program>)

Reinert Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning (<https://www.slu.edu/cttl>)

The Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL) (<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/>)

Chickering, Arthur and Stephen C. Ehrmann (1996), Implementing the seven principles: technology as lever, *AAHE Bulletin*, October, pp. 3-6.

For Mar 23:

Parker, J. (2011) Academic and digital literacies and writing in the disciplines: a common agenda? *Journal of Academic Writing*, 1(1) pp. 1-11.

For Mar 25:

Duffelmeyer, B. B. (2000) Critical computer literacy: Computers in first-year composition as topic and entertainment. *Computers and Composition*, 17 (3), 289-307.

Further Reading:

Kroll, B. (Ed.). (2003). Exploring technology. *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (285-310). Cambridge University Press.

March 30-April 5 Semana Santa

Apr 6: Unit 3 assignment due (oral presentation on materials to use in a specified course)

Unit 4

Apr 8, 13, 15, 20: Main themes: Assessment and evaluation of writing. Analysis of different schemes and systems.

Readings:

In class:

Associates.CCCC Executive Committee. (2006). Writing assessment: a position statement. Retrieved from www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/writingassessment.

For Apr 13:

Williams, J. D. (2003). *Preparing to teach writing: research, theory, and practice*, Chapter 10 Assessing and evaluating writing (pp. 131-150). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Yancey, K. B. (1999) Looking back as we look forward: historicizing writing assessment. *College Composition and Communication*, 50/3, *A Usable Past: CCC at 50: Part 1*, pp. 483-503.

For Apr 15:

Gere, A.R. (1980) Written composition: toward a theory of evaluation. *College English*, 42/1, pp. 44-48+53-58.

For Apr 20:

Estrem, H. (2004). The portfolio's shifting self: possibilities for assessing student learning. *Pedagogy* 4 (1), 125-127.

Unit 5

April 27, 29, May 4: Main themes: bringing it all together; writing and identity

Readings:

For Apr 27:

Duff, P. A. (2007) Problematizing academic discourse socialisation. In *Learning Discourses and the Discourses of Learning*, edited by Marriott, H., Moore, T., & Spence-Brown, R. Melbourne: Monash University ePress. pp. 1.1–1.18. Available: <http://books.publishing.monash.edu/apps/bookworm/view/Learning+Discourses+and+the+Discourses+of+Learning/134/xhtml/chapter01.html>

For Apr 29:

Oliva, A. & Milian, M. (2013) First year students' construction of an academic identity in English as a foreign language. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria*. REDU. Número monográfico dedicado a Academic Writing. Vol.11 (1) Enero-Abril. pp. 59-77. Available: <http://www.red-u.net/>

For May 6:

Elbow, P. (1995) Being a writer vs. being an academic: A conflict in goals. *College Composition and Communication*, 46 (1): 72-83.

May 6: Presentation of final syllabus

Wednesday, May 13th: Final syllabus and justification paper due; presentation of final syllabus