<u>W-COURSE</u> CERTIFICATION REQUEST

Thank you for your interest in planning and offering a Writing-Intensive (W) course. Writing-Intensive courses help meet Simon Fraser University's commitment to the education of undergraduate students as defined by the new curriculum. This form is intended to:

- determine whether proposed or existing courses meet the W criteria;
- estimate the number of W seats available to students;
- assist faculty to think through the elements of a W course

FUNDING NOTE: *Courses approved for W certification will receive additional instructional assistance funds (extra TA support) at a rate of $75 per enrolled seat in the semester in which a W course is offered, disbursed to Faculties and then distributed to Programs. Course development funds are no longer available.*

This form is divided into TWO sections:

> **Section I** requests instructor, program and course information;
> **Section II** requests detailed course content information.

Please contact Susan Rhodes at slrhodes@sfu.ca or Local 3312 if you have any questions about completing this form. Completed forms can be sent either electronically to the email address above or through campus mail to Susan Rhodes, Curriculum Office, VP Academic.

Course Title: <u>Writing for Design, Media, and Informatics</u>

Course # (if known): <u>IAT309W</u>

Is the course (double-click the applicable box, select "checked" from the Default Value and click "OK"):

☒ a new course?

☐ a modification of an existing course to meet the W criteria?

☐ a course that has previously been piloted as a W course?

☐ an existing course that fulfills the W criteria for certification?

To be considered, this form must be approved by the Chair/Director of your program and by the Associate Dean of your Faculty. Please have them sign off as noted below, or send an email confirmation to slrhodes@sfu.ca

Chair/Director: _____   Date approved: _____

Associate Dean: _____   Date approved: _____

Section I

INSTRUCTOR/PROGRAM INFORMATION

Name of Instructor(s): Chantal Gibson

Department: SIAT

E-mail: chantal_gibson@sfu.ca　　　Telephone:　778-782-7503

If not the instructor named above, who will develop or revise the course? ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯

Familiarity with W courses
Has the instructor(s) previously taught a writing-intensive course?

Yes, I have taught 3 W courses at SFU: TECH100/101W, IAT209W, BUS360W

Has the instructor(s) attended any writing workshops?

Yes, I have attended WILO training in the past. My area of interest is writing & response scholarship. I am currently the W Coordinator for FAS.

If the course has multiple instructors, how will the department ensure there is a consistency of instructional approach and that the varying course content will routinely meet the W criteria?

Instructors will use the same readings, assignments, grading criteria, and rubrics to maintain consistency across all sections of the course. If more than two instructors are teaching the course, a course lead will be selected to support the consistent delivery of the material across all sections.

COURSE ENROLMENT AND OFFERING INFORMATION

If this is a new or modified course:
- when will it first be offered? ⎯⎯ Sept. 2009 ⎯⎯
- how often will it be offered? Fall & Spring ⎯⎯
- what is the expected enrolment per offering? Estimate 100 students

If this is an existing course:
- how often is it offered? ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯
- what is the current average enrolment per offering? ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯
- what is the expected enrolment increase, if relevant, with W designation?⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯

Section II

THE W CRITERIA

1. Students have opportunities to use writing as a way of learning the content of the course and are taught to write in the forms and for the purposes that are typical of disciplines and/or professions.

Writing is not used simply as a medium through which students can be evaluated on whether they have understood course material. Rather, students are given opportunities to use the process of writing as a way of exploring and critiquing complex concepts and coming to understand them. They are also given instruction and practice in writing in such disciplinary forms as lab reports, literary analyses, or policy briefs.

2. Examples of writing within the disciplines are used as a means of instruction about typical structures, modes of reasoning, styles of address, and the use of technical language and of evidence.

As part of the engagement with and instruction in writing, students read samples of typical forms of the writing in their discipline, not only for **what** *they say but* **how** *they say it and what that means for them as writers who need to produce such texts themselves. To this end, they may analyze various kinds of texts in the discipline, focusing on matters of structure, logic, style, and evidential support and learning to recognize how successful writers use strategies that will meet the expectations of their readers.*

3. Students receive appropriate feedback and response to their writing that is based on explicit criteria and is directed at improving the quality of their writing.

One of the fundamental means by which all writers improve their writing is through response intended to assist in improvement. Such response, however, is more likely to be understood and acted upon when students know what is expected of them. They need to be well informed about what will receive comment, how and by whom comment will be given, and what qualities and characteristics in their writing will be reflected in the grades received. The criteria on which writing an assignment is evaluated should be clearly expressed in writing when the assignment is given and should coincide with the analyses of the features and goals of academic and disciplinary discourse (as discussed in Criterion 2).

4. Revision is built into the process of writing for formal assignments, usually in terms of revisions of the same paper, or alternatively, in revisions accomplished through successive similar assignments.

W courses acknowledge that writing is a process. Writing instruction will typically include instruction, assistance, and practice in all stages of the process, from initial brainstorming or other idea-generating strategies through organization, drafting, revising, and submitting a completed paper. These techniques not only assist in making a final paper worth reading, they also mean that students rethink what they are saying about a topic and are more likely to get it straight in their minds and on the paper. If successive similar assignments are employed, the characteristics being marked in each assignment should be explicitly identified and show that there is a planned, cumulative effect on students' development as writers over the course of the semester. Through revision, students have opportunities to make use of the responses described in Criterion 3, thereby enhancing their evolving knowledge and skills. This criterion assumes a process that includes responding to drafts; it does not assume, in the interests of not increasing workloads, grading drafts nor giving further extensive feedback on revised work. It also assumes that response and marking will not be left entirely to TAs but that some will be done by, and/or carefully guided by, instructors.

5. At least half the course grade is based on written work for which students receive feedback (see Criterion 3).

The feedback received may be either before revising an assignment or on a succession of similar assignments (see Criterion 4). Writing on which no feedback is received by the student (including such things as essays in final exams) **is not** *included the calculation of this 50 percent. The grade for written work encompasses all aspects of the assignment; it does not distinguish effective expression from knowledge of content as evident in the written work.*

INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES
1. Please give a one-paragraph description of the content and overall format (lecture, seminar, tutorial etc.) of the course.

IAT309W prepares students for the demands of a hi-tech workforce that values collaboration among artists, engineers, designers, and project managers, professional writers who must be able to adapt their communications effectively to meet the needs of experts and lay audiences. This course helps students to develop critical thinking and writing strategies that can be adapted to a wide range of professional communication situations related to design, media arts and technology. Through the exploration of genre and style (reflective, critical, persuasive, technical, narrative and expository), students recognize written documents as applications of critical thinking and communication principles and learn to shift content, as well as authorial voice and tone, across modalities of writing. In weekly seminars and regular workshops, students learn to use low-stakes and high-stakes writing activities to identify the needs of an audience and to apply the appropriate writing strategies required to avoid audience resistance. Instructor feedback and peer review model revision strategies to help students develop their writing skills and enhance their professional image. Drawing from a number of disciplines (communications, design, composition and rhetoric, engineering, arts, journalism and business) the customized course material introduces students to samples of genre specific writing, as well as the theoretical material required to critically evaluate and model the work.

2. What writing will students do as a way of learning the content of the course?

Students will have opportunities to use writing as a way of learning the content of the course through low-stakes (few or no marks) and higher stakes (10 marks and up) writing assignments. Students will be taught to write in the forms and the purposes (reflective, persuasive/rhetorical, expository, critique, compare & contrast paper, and research writing) that are typical to the discipline and related areas. Students will practice appropriate styles of argumentation and evidence, modes of reasoning (critical inquiry, critical analysis and elements of rhetorical structure, including logic and persuasive language), styles of address and conventions, and audience awareness. Students will be given explicit criteria for each writing activity, including overview, process, guidance, expectations and grading.

Students will receive appropriate response to their writing from instructors, TAs and peers, with revision built into the process for the formal assignments. Feedback from Low-stakes writing activities is designed to support and scaffold Higher-stakes assignments. For example, the short expository writing activities (3%) and compare and contrast paper (10%) are designed as components of the research case-study project (40%). As well, the reflective analysis (10%) is designed to support the reflective Process Analysis component of the research case-study project (15%). Students are encouraged to view the course holistically and to explore *how* and *why* critical thinking processes and written communication strategies can be applied across different writing modalities. In-class workshops will provide students the opportunity for peer review. At least 50% of the course grade will be based on written work for which students will receive feedback.

An Assignment and Grading Overview has been provided below:

IAT309W Assignment & Grading Overview

Component	Value	Due
Expository Writing: Short pieces that explain, summarize, describe or define a key concept from the weekly readings.	15% (5 x 3%)	**In class**: **Week 2** **Week 3** **Week 4** **Week 5** **Week 6**
Reflective Writing Analysis: **Part 1:** Guided by questions, students interrogate a piece of their own writing. **(In-class week 3)** **Part 2**: Students write a short reflection: "How are your critical thinking and writing processes evidenced in the work?" **(Due week 4)**	10%	**Week 4**
Persuasive Writing /Writing a Critique: **Part 1:** Students analyze a persuasive work, identifying the rhetorical strategies used to build an argument. **(In-class week 5)** **Pat 2:** Students compose a critique of the work and argue for or against the effectiveness of the strategies identified in the analysis. **(Due Week 6)**	10%	**Week 6**
Compare & Contrast Paper **Part 1:** Students will explore the similarities & differences between genres (selected narrative, technical, expository works from SIAT) using a visual/concept map to show the relationships between ideas. **(In-class week 7)** **Part 2:** Students will compose a compare & contrast paper to articulate their findings in Part 1. **(Due week 8)**	10%	**Week 8**
Revision Portfolio	15%	**Week 11:** Revised submission of: 1. In-class summaries (5) 2. Reflective Writing Analysis 3. Persuasive Writing Critique 4. Compare & Contrast Paper Plus 5. Vocabulary Builder: Defining term wit context of a sentence. 6. Sentence Builder: Crafting concise sen 7. Asking Critical Questions: News Articl 8. Exit Reflection: Review of process and development

		Week 14:
Case Study Project: Research Paper & Process Analysis	40%	Planning and Initial Research (5%) Research Paper (20%) Process Analysis (15%)

3. Please list and explain the type(s) of formal written assignments and instructional methods you propose for this course by responding to the following items:

- How is the form(s) of the writing used in the course typical of the discipline or profession? How does writing contribute to learning the course concepts and ways of reasoning?

The short expository writing activities (3%) take the form of short *clear and concise* paragraphs. Professional designers, of all kinds, must be able to communicate ideas (explain, summarize, describe or define) to themselves, colleagues, executives, and clients with clarity and confidence. These activities help students learn and evaluate their understanding of course concepts, as well as practice writing for a professional audience.

The reflective paper process (10%) takes the form of process analysis. Students are asked to respond to a list of critical questions and to compose a final response based on their answers. Professional designers, of all kinds, must be able to recognize their work as applications of their own critical thinking and communication processes. These activities help students learn and evaluate their thinking and writing processes and to practice writing for a professional audience.

- What methods will you use to instruct the students on how to write for the assignments and the course?

  - Classroom instruction: The purpose of the writing activities, the processes for composing/revising them, and the grading criteria are discussed in class. Writing is discussed as a professional practice, but it is also used as the vehicle for communication, to explore and demonstrate critical thinking and promote discussion I the classroom.

  - Modeling: Strong examples of student writing will be selected and shown to the class. Students will be asked to look at the strengths of the selected works and to consider "trying them on" or modeling the practices in their own assignment (portfolio) revisions.   Examples of weak writing are *based* on student work but are not actual samples of student work. They are constructed by the course designer/instructor to look familiar to and representative of student work—without the possibility of alienating any students.

  - Guest speakers: Professional writers in SIAT and industry will be invited in Week 9 to discuss writing as a professional practiced and to prepare students for their final case study project.

- Annotated Samples: Samples assignments with feedback are used to promote critical thinking and improve writing. The following is an example of a compare and contrast activity from my first year W course, using student samples and instructor feedback/analysis.

Compare and Contrast:

Example of Weak Argument that shows little Critical Thinking:

For teamwork it is important to be a good listener. We learned this in the Tech100 class in week 3. Listening is very important if people want to work together. Team members must have good listening skills if they want to succeed in university. If teammates don't listen to each other, there could be a misunderstanding and a conflict could occur. I think I am a good listener because I always look at teammates when they are talking to me. Sometimes I nod my head to show them I am listening and that I understand their message. Artifact 1 shows my listening skills. I repeat back what the person said so they know that I read their message and understand it. This is why my teammates get along and we are in the norming stage.

Example of a Stronger Argument that demonstrates Critical Thinking:

After reviewing my Tech100 online and face to face activities, I learned that I have developed good listening skills. According to MacLennan (2003), "[c]ommunication is not simply an exchange of ideas or information, but an interaction between people." This means that the speaker's message can only be received effectively if the listener is paying attention and engaged in the communication process. I've learned that just because I am not speaking does not mean I am not communicating. For example, when I was in a team meeting last week, I showed Jared and Sonia, our team leaders, that I was listening to them by using various non-verbal listening cues. I used regulators such as maintaining eye contact and nodding my head in agreement, to show I was paying attention and to encourage them to keep speaking. I also used two emblems, a thumbs-up and an OK sign, to show I enthusiastically agreed with their ideas. I believe I also demonstrate strong listening skills when I am communicating with my team online. Artifact 1 is a posting by Sonia stating her suggestions for our team guidelines. I thought her ideas were really good, so, in Artifact 2, I repeated the key points I agreed with before I elaborated on her ideas and added my own. By taking the time to repeat what she said, I was able to show Sonia that I "listened" carefully to her message. As a result, Sonia acknowledged me for paying attention to her and suggested we combine our ideas for the final team guidelines (Artifact 3). By listening to Sonia, I believe I showed respect for her (one of our team guidelines), which made her want to work with me to complete the final guidelines.

- How does each assignment relate to the previous one and build on it or lead to the next?

The short expository writing activities (3%) asks students to explain, summarize, describe or define course concepts and ideas *clearly and concisely*. Students will complete the same kinds of writing tasks within the contexts of the reflective paper, the critique, the compare & contrast paper and the final case study project.

The reflective paper process (10%) asks students to *explore and critically evaluate* a piece of their own writing and to *explain* the effectiveness of their thinking and writing processes. This assignment is designed to support the final research case study project, especially the Process Analysis component (15%).

The critique paper process (10%) asks students to *analyze* a persuasive work (identify the rhetorical strategies used to build an argument) and to compose a critique of the work, arguing for or against the effectiveness of the strategies identified in the analysis. The following critique paper processes are transferable to the final research case study project (40%):

- identifying and deconstructing the strategies at play in a persuasive/rhetorical work (appeals to ethos, pathos, logos)
- forming a opinion/conclusion based on the logical evaluation of one's own critical thinking process
- composing a critique with the awareness of using persuasive/rhetorical strategies
- constructing a measured, controlled, credible (1st person) voice that critiques the work (not the writer)

The compare & contrast paper process (10%) asks students to *explore* the similarities & differences between genres (selected narrative, technical, expository works from SIAT) *using a visual/concept map* to show the relationships between ideas and to compose a *compare & contrast* paper to articulate their findings/conclusions. This assignment is designed to support the final research case study project (40%).

- Will students get feedback or response of some kind to their assignments and if so, when and how? How do you plan to make your criteria explicit?

Students will receive written instructor/TA/and or Peer feedback (within 1-2 weeks) on the following assignments:
- The short expository writing activities
- The reflective paper
- The critique paper
- The compare and contrast paper
- Planning and Research Notes

Grading Criteria and Marking Rubrics will be used to make assessment and evaluation criteria explicit for all individual assignments and peer activities. The following is a draft version of a peer review workshop activity using the assignment Grading Criteria and Formatting Guidelines to support constructive feedback:

Draft Sample Peer Review Activity: Student Feedback Session

Instructions: In class this week, you will be paired with a revision partner. You will exchange first drafts and conduct helpful critiques of one another's work.

As an peer reviewer, you will be asked to examine your partner's choice of topic, the thoroughness of the analysis, and the overall quality of the work from the word (local level) to the concept (global level). Be constructive and proactive in your review of your partner's work keeping in mind the thinking and writing strategies introduced so far in the course. **Note: you must give feedback to your partner. Participation in this activity is necessary to receive full marks for the major assignment due at the end of the week.**

When presenting your ideas to your partner, do your best to be very clear and thorough. Make sure your partner has a clear sense of exactly what aspects of the work you are critiquing: argument, counter argument, evidence, documentation, referencing, grammar, etc. Use the assignment grading criteria as a guide. Remember to Listen to what your editing partner has to say, to ask questions to clarify any confusion, and to use the critique session outcomes to strengthen your paper in the remainder of the week.

Name of Writer: **Name of Peer Reviewer:**

IAT309w Critique Draft 1 Workshop

Step 1: Based on the title of the paper, what do you think the paper is about?

Step 2: Read the first draft of your colleague's critique. Highlight with a marker or use an asterisk (*) to identify areas that jump-out-at-you. Don't make a judgment (good or bad/right or wrong) just keep reading.

Step 3: Now read the draft again. Underline the THESIS. Based on the thesis, what do you think the paper is about? Does the THESIS link logically to the Title?

Step 4: Locate and underline the Major Claims or Arguments in the body paragraphs. Do the claims link logically to the THESIS? Does the work feel focused?

Step 5: Answer the following questions. Provide comments wherever necessary.

Formatting Criteria Does the paper contain	yes/no	Feedback/Revision Comments
a title page with student name, ID, course name, section and date?		
4 full pages of text, double spaced (not including title or reference pages)?		
12pt font, Times New Roman?		
1 inch margins on all sides?		
page numbers on each page?		
indented paragraphs (no spaces between paragraphs)		
a minimum of 5 sources in the reference page (do not include dictionaries & encyclopedias in the 5).		
APA in text citations (Last name/or article name, year)		
References in APA: alphabetical order: Last name, first initial.(date)…		
Content **Does the intro…**	**yes/no**	**Feedback/Revision Comments**
provide relevant background information about the artist (background, training, culture)? clearly describe the art work (the genre, style, or media)? state the purpose or message or cultural significance of the work?		
Do the body paragraphs take the subject apart by describing the component issues, ideas, background information, and important subsections in the work?		

Does the paper include the opinions and ideas of other artists, critics or experts? Are the full names of the critics or experts included in the text? Are the titles of the experts included (Dr. or Chief critic)? Are quotes or summaries integrated into the writer's ideas?		
Does the conclusion offer an evaluation of the work? Does it discuss the work's strengths, merits or weaknesses in communicating its message?		
Style, Tone, Voice		
Overall does the work appear or sound professional? Why or why not? (Do you notice any inconsistent uses of pronouns "I" or "you")?		
Grammar, Mechanics		
Are there areas where the writing sounds odd or inconsistent? Areas where sentences need to be revised? Areas where grammar needs to be proofread?		
General Impressions		
What do you like best about the work? What are its strengths? What areas need to be revised for next draft due next week?		

(Draft) Evaluation and Grading Criteria for IAT309W Paper

Grading	Criteria
A	Your paper presents a cogent, well-articulated argument and demonstrates mastery of the elements of effective writing. Your paper clearly identifies and analyzes important features of your argument. Your arguments and counter-arguments are well developed and well supported by credible evidence and proper APA referencing. Ideas are cogently developed, organized logically, and connected by clear transitions. Your paper demonstrates control of language, including diction and syntactic variety. Your paper demonstrates facility with the conventions of standard written English, and may have occasional flaws.
B	Your paper presents a competent outline of your argument and demonstrates adequate control of the elements of effective writing. Your paper identifies and analyzes important features of the argument and analyzes them in a generally thoughtful way. Your arguments and counter-arguments are satisfactorily supported, and generally follow APA referencing conventions. Your paper supports the main points of the argument and demonstrates sufficient control of language to convey ideas with reasonable clarity. Your paper generally follows the conventions of standard written English but may have flaws.
C	Your paper demonstrates some competence in its analysis of the argument and its control of the elements of writing, but is plainly flawed. A typical paper in this category exhibits one or more of the following characteristics: does not identify or analyze most of the important features of the argument, although some analysis of the argument is present; doesn't fully address counter-arguments; mainly analyzes tangential or irrelevant matters that have little credible support, or reasons poorly; is limited in the logical development and organization of ideas; offers support of little relevance and value for the issue at hand; does not convey meaning clearly; contains occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics, doesn't adequately follow APA referencing guidelines.
D	Your paper demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing skills. A typical paper in this category exhibits one or more of the following characteristics: does not present an argument based on logical analysis, but may instead present the writer's own views on the subject; does not develop arguments or counter-arguments, or is disorganized and illogical; provides little, if any, relevant, credible or reasonable support; has serious and frequent problems in the use of language and in sentence structure; contains numerous errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics that interferes with meaning, does not follow APA referencing guidelines.
F	Your paper demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing skills. A typical paper in this category exhibits more than one of the following characteristics: provides little evidence of the ability to understand and analyze the argument; provides little evidence of the ability to develop an organized response; has severe and persistent errors in language and sentence structure; contains a pervasive pattern of errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics that results in incoherence; does not follow APA referencing guidelines.

- If students do not revise a complete paper after getting instructive feedback on a draft, please explain how the successive writing assignments or the essay component of a mid-term exam would accommodate the criterion for revision?

Students will revise all of the following assignments and papers and include them in a final revision portfolio:
- The (5) short expository writing activities
- The reflective paper
- The critique paper
- The compare and contrast paper

4. Is at least half the course grade based on the written work/assignments?

Yes.

DISTANCE EDUCATION OFFERINGS
If this course is also offered by Distance Education, please respond to the following questions: N/A

- How do the pedagogy and evaluation methods for the DE section of the course differ, if at all, from the on-campus sections of the course?
- Is the course supervisor the same as the instructor of the on-campus offering?
- What involvement does the course supervisor have in providing instruction on writing?

MARKING AND RESPONDING
Who will read and respond to student writing?   Instructor_____ TA/TM_____   ___Peers   __X All

If TAs/TMs or Peers will be responsible for marking, please explain what you will do to ensure that:

- TAs/TMs and/or Peers are trained to respond to specific writing assignments
- Marking and grading are consistent
- Marking and grading are monitored by the instructor

The evaluation criteria, marking rubrics, and grading expectations are provided for students, instructors and teaching assistants. For example, students are provided a detailed marking rubric for each paper they write. Students are required to use them as worksheets and/or checklists throughout the drafting process to note their strengths and areas for improvement. Students are also given peer feedback sheets that provide students with critical questions to ask themselves when giving feedback to their colleagues.

To ensure consistency across all sections of the course, all instructors and TAs will use the same grading criteria.   As well, TAs are required to take W training before classes begin AND to attend regular marking meetings with the course instructor.

TIPS FOR COMPLETING THE W-COURSE CERTIFICATION FORM

COURSE CONTENT AND INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES

The following guidelines and samples are meant to help orient you to best practices in writing up your course as a potential W-course. Each W-course needs to meet all five W-criteria. In order to assess how directly your course fulfills these criteria, the Writing Support Group requests that you consider each criterion when answering the questions relating to **instructional methods** and **writing assignment descriptions**. The "Tips for Clear W-Assignments" and the list of sample types of writing-based assignments that follow are included as guides and prompts (rather than templates) to help in creating assignments that meet the W-criteria.

*Please note this is **sample** language, used here to indicate the level of specificity needed. Adapt your descriptions to fit your course details. **Field- and Lab-based courses will obviously differ significantly from this sample. In your description, please address whether and how writing will be used, not only in the classroom but also in other learning sites**.*

> The course will be taught in a lecture/tutorial format with the bulk of the writing instruction given in the tutorials, although some modification of the lectures will be required so that the writing component receives discussion in lectures. The students will be required to write in a variety of modes: proposals, outlines, essays and revisions. Comments, written and oral, will be made on <u>all</u> papers and the revisions. Students will have two 30-minute one-on-one meetings with their tutorial leaders. We expect that some of the most important teaching will be done in these one-on-one consultations. The first will focus on the first assignment and prepare it for revision; the second will be to prepare a detailed outline for the second assignment.

Proposal and outline for first assignment	10%
First assignment	15%
Revision of first assignment	10%
Proposal and outline for second assignment	10%
Second assignment	20%
Final exam	30%
Tutorial participation	5%

No matter what format you use to present your assignments, it helps students work to your expectations if you are explicit about the following seven aspects of each assignment:

<div align="center">

TIPS FOR CLEAR W-ASSIGNMENTS

</div>

Purpose: Why this particular assignment? How does it serve the overall objectives of the course? (e.g., to practice a critical thinking skill such as critique of evidence; synthesize multiple sources; highlight how argument is signaled in primary literature; etc.)

Form: What is the form of the writing? (e.g., lab report; letter to the editor; abstract; literature review; etc.)

Topic: Is the topic assigned, or is it student choice? Is it a general question ("Discuss significance of…") or does it have a particular focus ("Compare x and y")?

Audience: Who is the intended reader for the assignment? You? A professional in the field? The general public?

Text Features: What specific textual features, and their ordering and interrelationships, are you seeking? (For example, proportions or sections or particular sequencing between parts of the assignment, use of tables and captions, relationship of equations to prose.)

Conventions: (language style) First- or third-person? Citation styles? Formality of language? (Standard English, academic, scientific style) etc.

Process: What are the deadlines for different stages of producing this assignment? Will there be models of successful assignment or explanations of criteria given out ahead of time? Can students expect feedback/revision cycles? By peers, TAs, instructors? When? What are consequences of late assignments?

Evaluation Criteria: What criteria will be used? Will certain parts be weighted differently from others? Possible criteria include: following assignment particulars, content, reasoning, logic, structure, quality of evidence, complexity of argument/depth of thinking, "risk," and grammar.

Assignment Suggestions: Here are some examples of the kinds of writing-based pedagogical techniques that might be used in designing a W-course.

- Response to readings
- "1-minute" paper
- Exploratory writing about new concept
- "Quick-writes"
- Summary statement of discussion
- Draft ideas about topic
- "5-minute" free writing on a chosen topic
- Lab report
- Grant application
- Research proposal
- Essay
- Text analysis

- Critique
- Literature review
- Letter to the editor
- Policy statement
- Position paper
- Memorandum
- Annotated bibliography
- Field notes
- Personal narrative
- Commentary
- Profile