

W-COURSE PROPOSAL AND REQUEST FOR FUNDS

Section I

A. COURSE TITLE AND NUMBER

Course Title: *Critical & Creative Thinking IAT 209-3*

Has the proposed course been approved by your program and the Chair/Director of your program? Yes X No _____

B. INSTRUCTOR/PROGRAM INFORMATION

Name of the persons proposing the course: *John Bowes, Chantal N. Gibson*

Department: School of Interactive Arts & Technology, Faculty of Applied Science

Position: *SIAT Director: Bowes, Senior Lecturer: Gibson*

E-mail address: chantal_gibson@sfu.ca

Telephone: 604-268-7500

Will you be responsible for teaching, revising and/or developing the course?
Yes X No _____

C. COURSE DESCRIPTION

This blended learning course helps the second year student understand and practice the processes that support critical and creative thinking as well as effective communication across several disciplines: academic and professional writing, online writing, written and oral communication, research, collaboration and teamwork. This course builds on the foundational learning strategies students are introduced to in first-year writing courses and aims to prepare them for the more rigorous practices needed for the upper level grades. It seeks to help students identify the strengths and limitations of their own thinking practices and to identify the thinking practices of other writers, professionals and theorists and the rhetorical strategies they use to persuade their audience.

Each week students attend a 2 hour workshop early in the week (Monday or Tuesday) where they discuss the course readings and the theoretical material that will support the weekly writing activity, which is executed online in a team conference later in the week (from Wednesday to Friday). The course is designed to give students the opportunity to do their “homework” online under the guidance of a TA and/or the course instructor. The course introduces students to theories of metacognition, thinking errors and strategies of manipulation, methods of testing and evaluating arguments, the components and construction of rhetoric for scientific and technical communication, art theory and

criticism and delivery via oral discourse, alongside theories of innovation and cultural change.

The course aims to help students understand writing as a complex, (multi)disciplinary practice and how critical thinking and rhetorical strategies inform their academic, professional and social experience. Throughout the course, students receive feedback from instructors, TAs and peers on their writing and how their own thinking processes inform their work.

List any prerequisites: *IAT100/101 Systems of Media Representation 1 & 2*

Is the course (please select one)

a course that has been taught before as a W course?

a modification of an existing course?

a new course?

Familiarity with W-courses

- If you will be teaching the course, have you previously taught a writing intensive course?
Yes, I am currently teaching a writing intensive course.
- Have you attended any writing workshops? (Please specify)
Yes, I (Chantal Gibson) have taken the series of three writing workshops in 03/04.
- Are you registered to attend any workshops on teaching of writing intensive courses?
No, however, those IAT instructors or TAs who have not taken the workshops will register in the next session.

Section II

D. INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES

(1) Summary of Instructional Methods

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 writing, online academic postings, rhetorical analysis, art critique, scientific/technical analysis, compare and contrast paper, persuasive/research proposal, annotated bibliography and oral presentation) 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 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, as each formal assignment will form the foundation for the next and will therefore lead the students through a progressive process (i.e. the website critique, the compare and contrast paper and the team oral presentation are assignments that take place over 2 to 4 weeks, where each week incorporates a drafting process that provides a foundation for the final assignment). Each week students will have the opportunity for peer review and team collaboration. At least 70% of the course grade will be based on written work for which students will receive feedback.

(2) Descriptions of Writing Assignments

Assignments

As recommended by the W-course guidelines, assignments will provide clear direction on purpose, form, topic, audience, text features, conventions, process, and evaluation criteria. With regard to the W-course assignment suggestions, the following will be integrated into course work: audience awareness, appropriate rhetorical structures, response to readings, exploratory writing about new concepts, summary statement about new discussion (online posting discussion summaries), draft ideas about a new topic (persuasive presentation process), research report, text analysis (academic articles/weekly readings), critique (art review and website critique), literature review, position writing (reflective writing, compare and contrast presentation, research/persuasive presentation), annotated bibliography (product of research presentation), personal narrative (reflective writing), commentary and profile.

Low-stakes Assignments

Some of the written assignments will be for few or no marks and will be given in the online conferences or in class as an integral part of the learning process. Low stakes assignments will include (1) individual reflection, political speech analysis, scientific article analysis, components of website critique, components of compare and contrast assignment, components of research presentation and (2) single-paragraph commentary on readings where students will be asked to identify a point of interest or contention from the readings with an explanation of why they find interest in or would argue the point they have identified. All low stakes assignments are mandatory, as they will permit students (as per the CWIL objectives) to experience writing “as a practice for thinking through content/concepts/reasoning...and will [allow] students opportunities to write during learning something rather than only, or mainly, after learning something, encourages risk-taking and critical thinking since it focuses on reasoning and concepts rather than on the technical aspects of writing.”

Assignment 1: Metacognition—Thinking about Thinking
Conference Assignment: Individual reflective analysis, 5 marks, due week 1

After reading the Week 1 course material, students are asked to explore their own thinking processes, and identify some of the major influences that affect their decision making. Students are provided a self reflection chart and asked to answer, critically, questions that encourage reflective practice (see sample below). Students are required to inform their answers with information (key terms, theory, new ideas) from the course readings and the class discussion wherever possible. When the chart has been filled out, students are asked to post it to their team conference for peer review and feedback. Students are then asked to review their answers and the comments from teammates and submit a 2 paragraph summary of their findings for evaluation and feedback. Students will be assessed by an instructor or TA on how well they integrate ideas from the Week 1 material within their analyses of their own thinking processes.

The introductory low stakes assignment is designed to ensure that everyone in the class starts the term with some familiarity with the expectations for the course. The assignment allows students to (1) reflect on their own thinking practices (2) articulate their ideas in narrative form (3) develop a revised piece of writing from a draft (4) familiarize themselves with their teammates and appropriate forms of peer critique (5) practice integrating course material into their own thinking and writing practice. The assignment allows instructors to (1) measure students' understanding of the course readings (2) evaluate the writing levels of students in the first week of classes (3) set the tone for student evaluation for the term (4) measure the comfort of students in an online writing environment.

Draft Assignment Sample:

Self Reflection Chart Thinking About My Thinking
NAME: <input type="text"/>
What cultural beliefs do I subscribe to?
What spiritual beliefs do I hold? How might they affect the way I think? Are there options I will never consider or explore? Are there subjects I will never engage?

Do I believe in ultimate free will, or am I a strict determinist? What thinking effects does this belief produce?

Do I believe thinking is something that you can improve at, or do I believe that my thinking ability is pretty much set in stone? How much control do I have over my thinking potential?

What opinions or beliefs have been instilled in me due to my upbringing or personal experience?

What is more important to me - feeling happy, avoiding conflict/stress, being right, being perceived as right, or getting along with other people? How might these priorities affect my thinking process?

How much faith do I put in my own memory? How might this level of confidence in my own memory affect the way I think and listen?

How stubborn am I? How easy is it for me to hear an opinion I don't agree with?

What determines how good of a thinker someone is - his/her genetics, his/her upbringing, his/her commitment to thinking as a skill, or something else? What effects might this belief have on my own thinking?

Who or what do I define as a credible source? How rigorous am I in making sure what I subscribe to is actually true? For that matter, how do I define truth? How do these beliefs/actions affect my thinking process and outcomes?

Self Reflection Summary

What have you learned? What are the major factors, beliefs, behaviors, etc, that affect you personally when it comes to your own thinking process? Write a short summary outlining what you have discovered and submit it through the online assignment link.

Assignment 2: Thinking Errors and Strategies of Manipulation
Speech Analysis: Short answer, 5 marks, due in week 2

This week students examine some of the most common thinking mistakes we make as untrained and undisciplined thinkers and explore some of the tactics used by third parties to manipulate our thinking process. For this weekly activity, students analyze a contemporary speech that has current relevance in the media (e.g.: the first presidential debate between President George Bush and Senator John Kerry). Students are asked to peruse the transcript or the video footage of the speech in an attempt to identify poor thinking habits and tactics of manipulation.

Students are provided with a template to complete the week’s writing exercise (see sample below) and asked to use the document to record and identify 10-12 examples of fallacious thinking. Specifically, students are asked to (1) provide context (at what point in the speech does the example of fallacious reasoning occur?) (2) reference the fallacious excerpt (quote the comment or clearly paraphrase the point) (3) identify exactly what is fallacious about the excerpt, using new terminology learned in the readings (e.g.: “mine is better” thinking , face-saving, resistance to change, harmful conformity) and then (4) summarize their observations into a 2 paragraph evaluation to be submitted for evaluation and feedback. Students will be assessed by an instructor or TA on how well they integrate ideas from the Week 2 material within their analyses.

This low stakes assignment is designed to get students thinking critically about current events, media representation, and the role fallacious reasoning can play in the strategies public speakers use to influence their audiences. The assignment allows students to (1) connect theory and practice by using terms from the readings to identify some thinking strategies of current influential speakers (2) reflect on their own thinking practices (3) develop a revised piece of writing (evaluation) from a draft (list of examples) (4) develop their own conclusions in the 2 paragraph evaluation based on their own critical thinking practices. The assignment allows instructors to (1) measure students’ understanding of the course readings (2) provide feedback on student writing to support the first higher stakes assignment in week 4.

Draft Sample Assignment:

Week 2 Fallacious Thinking: Identification Exercise			
Name: <input type="text"/>			
Context: at what point in the debate...	Reference to Fallacious Statement	What kind of Fallacious Thinking is it?	Explain.

Assignment 3: High Level Thinking, Full Spectrum Critical Analysis Pt. 1
Team Conference: 1st draft of website critique, 0 marks, due in week 4

This week students examine some formal techniques and fundamental principles designed to assist their journey to become higher-level thinkers. The readings introduce students to 12 key principals for higher-level thinking, techniques for gathering information and processing ideas. These techniques, used in combination with a sincere effort to avoid the poor thinking habits mentioned in Week 2, aim to help students improve their creative and critical thinking abilities. For this assignment, students must choose a website that might be considered provocative in nature or perhaps uses propaganda-like techniques, and conduct a full spectrum critical analysis of both the site itself, and the ideas presented within it. The students primary critical tools will be Edward De Bono's Six Thinking Hats (one of the techniques mentioned above) and the materials introduced in the first three weeks of this course.

Draft Sample Assignment:

This week, you should explore the Net to find a suitable website that provides enough material for your critical assessment.

Once you have found a suitable candidate, you should begin your assessment by following the steps provided below:

1. Conduct an A.G.O. on your chosen site. What are the aims, goals and objectives of the site? Identify its central themes, perspectives, and point-of-view.
2. Begin to take apart and objectively examine the presentation methods and ideas discussed in your chosen website using the Six Thinking Hats system together with the perspective-broadening tools introduced in the unit.

1. White Hat

- What items are being presented as facts?
- What items are being presented as opinions?
- Are opinions or beliefs attempting to be passed off as facts?

2. Red Hat

- Does the site elicit any emotional response from you?
- How do you think other people might respond emotionally to this site? Do an O.P.V. to help you generate ideas.
- Do the ideas put forth on the site elicit an emotional response from you? Is it a different emotion from the one generated by the site itself - its look-and-feel, its layout, its imagery, etc?
- What connotative uses of language, or semantics, are being used in an attempt to generate emotional responses?
- Is there language present that might evoke emotional responses from readers other than you?

3. Yellow Hat

- What does the site do well?
- What is positive about the site's construction?
- What is positive about the ideas it presents?
- What might other people find positive about this site? Do an O.P.V. to help you generate ideas.
- What principles of skilled thinking are evident in the argument?

4. Black Hat

- What facts are not supported or are supported with questionable means?
- Is there any evidence that poor thinking habits or tactics of manipulation are being employed?
- Are there any weak analogies? False dilemmas? Appeals to ignorance?

5. Green Hat

- Can you think of alternatives to the idea's being presented in the site?
- Do you have any suggestions about the site's look and feel? How might it convey its message better?
- What would be the consequences of adopting the ideas presented in the site?

3. Post the URL of your chosen website together with your preliminary observations and analyses to a thread of your own (label the thread with your full name) on the conference board before **Sunday... @ 23:00.**

4. In class next week, you will present and review your initial essay analysis with an editing partner. After this review session, you will have the following week to refine your essay before handing it in on Sunday ... @ 23:00.

Instructions for Essay Analysis draft due next week in class

1. Begin with a title and clear introduction that

- a. Describes the website and its intended audience.
- b. Presents a clear thesis that articulates what the site is attempting to “do”. (Ex: This site uses various strategies to persuade viewers to buy guns.)

2. Guide your reader through the site and clearly outline the strategies you discuss (make connection to course readings).

3. Support your claims with examples from the site.

4. End with a conclusion that encapsulates your argument.

5. Cite borrowed sources in APA style.

6. Proofread analysis for correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

This low stakes conference discussion will be reviewed by an instructor or TA: evaluative comments will be given on the critical analysis but a grade will not be awarded. This assignment permits students to use writing as a way of learning course content: (1) students read an academic article (DeBono’s 6-Hat approach to thinking) and reflect on the material as it relates to their own learning process (2) apply DeBono’s method of critical thinking to breakdown/deconstruct the website into its components to begin to (objectively) explore how it tries to persuade an audience (3) gain understanding of using a critical thinking technique for the purpose of producing ideas (anticipates the question “How do I start this essay?”) and (4) apply concepts and ideas from Weeks 1, 2, and 3 of the course to reinforce the relevance of the scaffolded learning experience. The assignment allows instructors to (1) measure student understanding of the course readings and the instructions for this major assignment (2) provide feedback on student writing to support the first higher stakes assignment in week 4.

***Assignment 4: Testing & Evaluating Arguments Full Spectrum Critical Analysis
Website Critique: 20 marks, due in week 4***

This week students will look more closely at the practice of using critical thinking techniques to test ideas and evaluate their arguments. The readings address informal and formal methods of testing ideas and introduce the concept and implications of semantics. In class, students continue to refine their Week 3 analyses taking into account the concepts and points of clarification discussed in the week 4 readings, as well as the input students receive from their editing partner during the F2F session in week 4 (see below).

In the class session, the instructor will guide students through a revision session that highlights the key points of the week 4 readings. Student volunteers will be asked to present their websites to the class and to discuss where they are at in the critique process. Student audience members will be asked to provide feedback to the volunteers to support their writing process. In pairs, students will work on their draft critiques to explore informal and formal methods used to test ideas and they will practice evaluating arguments. Students will be directed to the assignment instructions and paper criteria (below), which will also serve as the guide or a revision checklist.

Draft Sample Assignment: Editing Partner Review Session (Student View)

In class this week, you will be paired with an editing partner - someone with whom you will exchange initial website analyses for the purposes of conducting helpful critiques of one another's work.

As an editor, you will be asked to review your partner's choice of website, his or her thoroughness of the critical analyses, and the overall quality of critical review. Be critically constructive and proactive in your review of your partner's work keeping in mind the thinking lessons introduced during the past four weeks. **You must give feedback as participation in this activity is necessary to receive full marks for the major assignment due at the end of the week.**

If you are presenting your idea to your editing partner, do your best to be very clear and thorough. Make sure your partner has a clear sense of exactly what site you are critiquing, what its objectives are, what audience it speaks to, what devices it uses to convey its messages, and what your critical assessment has concluded. Listen to what your editing partner has to say, ask questions to clarify any confusions, and use the critique session outcomes to strengthen your essay in the remainder of the week.

(Draft) Evaluation and Grading Criteria for IAT 209 Website Analysis

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.

This in-class revision exercise gives students the opportunity to (1) receive and implement instructor and peer feedback (2) develop a final paper from a draft (3) identify strengths and areas for improvement in a peer paper (4) apply the critical thinking skills addressed in Weeks 1 to 4 through writing and peer critique.

Assignment 5: Rhetoric Components & Construction
Team Conference: 0 marks, due in week 5

This week students are introduced to the elements of rhetoric, as they continue to explore their role as “the critic.” Students are asked to think about themselves as creators of writing, and to explore the methods and strategies they use to earn audience credibility. Then students consider their role in reviewing, critiquing, and assessing credibility in the works of other writers (colleagues, theorists, etc.). This session aims to help students understand that good critical writing comes from an awareness of how argument is constructed and how proofs are drawn in both written and spoken form.

This week’s readings ask students to explore the question “what is an issue?” Topics include invention, reasoning, arrangement, style, finding good subjects, the hallmarks of good questions, inventing ethos and providing proofs. For this week’s online assignment, students are asked to complete a rhetorical analysis of an article that attempts to be scientific. Student teams are asked to deconstruct the article, to identify the rhetorical strategies employed by the writer.

DRAFT: Critiquing a 'Scientific' Paper - Team Conference Activity

Read the following scientific article, by Captain Joyce Riley:

[Gulf War Syndrome Biological Warfare Conducted on U.S. Military Members, and Corporate Bio-Genocide Levied on the Planetary Population](#)

In this assignment you will deconstruct Riley's rhetorical situation. You **MUST** make at two (2) substantial postings to your team conference: these postings must show critical attention to the reading.

Week 5 Online Activity:

1. Form your own teams of five or six people.
2. All team members **MUST** read the article before entering the conference discussion.
3. Individually, contribute at least two substantial critical postings of the article to your team conference thread. Consider the following: **What is the purpose of the paper and how does it do its job?** Here are some other questions to consider. (You may want to consider dividing the questions among your team members to prevent too much overlap).

- What is the rhetorical situation?
- What is the purpose of the article?
- What is the author's relationship with the subject/issue?
- What is the author's relationship with the audience?
- What is the audience's relationship with the issue?
- How does author construct an ethos (character)? Or invent credibility?
- Does the work make use of pathetic appeals?
- What appeals to logic are made?

4. Next week, your team will do a Compare and Contrast between this article and another one which will be assigned to you at that time.

This low-stakes conference discussion will be monitored by an instructor or TA to keep students on track, but students will be responsible for facilitating their own discussion and providing feedback in preparation for the first major team assignment. This low-stakes activity (1) teaches students that the critic does more than just describe situations or people, that he or she analyzes issues for the core problems and evaluates the potential solutions or alternatives according to specific criteria (2) provides a basic framework to help students deconstruct other writer's/speaker's work as well as their own (3) allows students to practice the process of critique.

Assignment 6: Rhetoric for Scientific and Technical Communication
Team Conference: 0 marks, due in week 6

This week students examine rhetorical strategies related to scientific and technical communication. This segment will focus on two prime issues: (1) The basic structure of key scientific and technical documents (primarily research reports) and (2) the key issues and needs in communicating about science to lay or non-expert people. The course material acknowledges that within these two broad categories, there are many variations in written products. Students are informed that this course touches on the broad, general issues that are important to most branches of science and technology, leaving specifics to the many style guides and reporting demands of specialized disciplines and their major journals.

This week, students will build on the knowledge gained in the Week 5 exercise, by comparing the Week 5 article to another article that claims to be scientific. Using information from the readings, students will compare the structure, voice, tone, language and arguments in both papers and discuss which of the two articles is more scientific (more persuasive) based on the common elements of scientific writing outlined in the readings.

Draft Sample Assignment:

Compare and Contrast - Team Conference

Read Chapter One of *Are We Hardwired: The Role of Genes in Human Behavior* - a book by Michael Grunstein and William R. Clark: [Chapter One: Mirror, Mirror...](#)

While reading this chapter, notice the presence or absence of the qualities of scientific writing mentioned in the unit this week.

After reading *Mirror, Mirror...*, you and your team are being asked to hold a Compare and Contrast session on your team conference where you will discuss the quality of scientific writing in this week's readings as compared to that of last week's - *Gulf War Syndrome Biological Warfare Conducted on U.S. Military Members, and Corporate Bio-Genocide Levied on the Planetary Population*. Look at how both work's attempt to convey scientific information to a lay audience. Which one is more persuasive and why?

Instructions

1. Review the unit materials and your comments on last week's readings on your team conference.
2. Review the unit materials from this week.
3. Read *Mirror, Mirror...*
4. Post to your team conference at least **two substantial postings** that attempt to critically compare and contrast the readings from the last two weeks on the basis of what you have learned about scientific writing, construction of ethos and overall quality and components of strong arguments.

To assist you in making your comparative critical analyses, you may want to consider these issues:

- Which reading was more persuasive?
- Which reading looked and felt more scientific?
- How well rounded were the arguments in each reading?
- Compare the language used in each reading. Was one more technical than the other?
- How logical and well supported are the arguments?

The low stakes conference discussion will be monitored by an instructor or TA to ensure that students are on track, but students will be responsible for facilitating their own discussion and providing feedback in preparation for the first major team assignment. This low-stakes activity (1) teaches students that the effectiveness and persuasiveness of academic (e.g. scientific) and professional writing is often determined by how well it adheres to certain disciplinary criteria and in relation to works of other writers working within the discipline and (2) that the compare and contrast method of analysis is a useful way for critical thinkers to critique ideas and arguments.

Assignment 7: Rhetoric for Art Theory and Criticism
Team Conference: 10 marks, due in week 7

This week students examine rhetorical strategies related to art theory and art criticism. Students will learn how art is written about, the reasons for art criticism, and how to analyze a critique or review. This segment will focus on two prime issues: (1) The basic structure of an art critique and (2) the key issues and needs in communicating about art to lay or non-expert people. Students are informed that this course touches on the broad, general issues that are important to most branches of art criticism, leaving specifics to style guides and reporting demands of specialized disciplines and their major journals.

Students will explore deconstruction as an analytic process and complex mode of analysis that essentially endorses a perspective that all art—meaning any cultural product—has a cultural context in which it exists. Assuming the role of the art historian, students examine the context in which an object is produced or written about previously. As the art critic, students assign an object (and the artist) a cultural value that translates into a successful or unsuccessful attempt by the art piece with reference to the art world at large.

This week, students will use the knowledge gained in the course and in the Week 7 readings and class session to compose a short art critique. Sample art critiques from different genres (film, sculpture, architecture) will be provided along with detailed assignment criteria to guide students through the critique writing process. The critiques will be assessed and evaluated by an instructor or TA. The feedback provided will support the Week 9 team presentation process.

Draft Sample Assignment:

Individual Art Critique

This week you will compose a 2-page art critique using the critical thinking skills and rhetorical writing skills you have learned so far in this course. You will post your Individual Art critique to your Team Conference by Sunday, Feb... @ 11pm. This week's assignment is directly related to your **Week 9 Team Presentation**, and therefore participation in the conference is mandatory. Those students who do not participate in the conference, which will be monitored by the course TA, will NOT receive a grade for the Week 9 Team Presentation.

Keep in mind that next week, **Week 8**, your team will choose two of the critiqued art pieces from members of your team to explore for your team's Compare and Contrast presentation in Week 9. Ensure that all members of your team avoid working on the same topic as other teammates, so that your team has a variety of topics to choose from.

Choosing your subject:

For your critique you will write about a work of art that you feel has some culture significance. You don't have to like the work, but you must argue how the work succeeds/fails in its objectives. You may write about any non-film artwork of your own choosing - a sculpture, an architectural piece, a play, a digital/new media work - anything except a movie.

Writing your critique:

1. In your team conference create a personal thread appropriately labeled with your name. Your thread will be your workspace for this writing process.
2. Post a short summary: Here you will begin with an introductory statement informing your reader what the work is about. What kind of work is it? Describe it. Does it have a genre or style? Give general information about the artist/director/architect and other relevant information.
3. Post your 2-3 paragraph analysis to the conference: Take the subject apart by describing the component issues, ideas, background information, and important subsections in the work. "Important" is a relative term here, and you must decide what is important by considering the subject itself and the readers' needs.

Ensure that you:

- State your general impression of the work—positive or negative—but remember to justify your reaction with examples and supporting evidence.
 - Explain social-historical context of the work (what era it was made or set in), and how this might explain the work's content and style.
4. Post a 1 paragraph evaluation: Here you must bring to bear your judgment about the work, the subject, and any background readings or information you have. In making judgments, you are evaluating the merits of the ideas under discussion.

Next week, as a team, you will review these individual critiques and choose two of them to create a team Compare and Contrast Oral Presentation.

This low-stakes activity (1) teaches students that the effectiveness and persuasiveness of academic (e.g. art criticism) and professional writing is often determined by how well it adheres to certain disciplinary criteria and in relation to works of other writers working within the discipline (2) allows students to compare and contrast the conventions of art writing and scientific writing and (3) allows students to create a draft that will support the Week 9 Team Compare and Contrast Presentation.

Week 8: Rhetoric Delivery via Oral Discourse
Class Session: Prep for week 9 team assignment

This week students will focus on strategies for delivering oral discourse. The course material examines the differences between oral and written communication and looks at ways speakers can develop sound oral presentation skills for classroom presentations, personal interviews, staff meetings or formal presentations to large audiences. Students are expected to apply the oral speaking strategies and compare and contrast techniques learned this week to the team presentations in Week 9.

Note: Students will not have a conference activity this week so they can prepare for the week 9 presentations. The Week 7 critiques will be turned over quickly this week to ensure students can apply instructor feedback to their presentations.

Assignment 8: Team Oral Presentations
Oral Presentation: 15 marks presentation, 5 marks peer participation assessment

For Week 9 student teams must prepare a 15 minute team oral presentation - complete with visual aids and a well planned presentation script - that critically compares and contrasts two pieces of artwork that were discussed by individuals in week 7.

This medium-stakes activity (1) allows students to practice the compare and contrast exercise introduced in Week 6 (2) allows students to practice art criticism in an oral presentation (3) allows students to practice rhetorical strategies for oral delivery in a non-threatening situation for relatively low marks and (4) allows students to practice integrating oral, visual and textual forms of delivery to create a persuasive presentation.

Draft Sample: Team Presentation Instructions

1. Each team member will revisit the Week 7 conference and review the critiques (summaries, analyses and evaluations) posted by your teammates. As a team, decide on the two critiques you would like to work on for your presentation.
2. As a team work together to construct a compare and contrast analysis. As you explore similarities and differences between your subjects, keep the following questions in mind:
 - **The Artists:** are the artists/creators similar and/or different? Look at the artists/creators background: age, gender, cultural/social background, education, methods, techniques, etc.
 - **The Subjects:** are the works similar and/or different? What are they made from? When were they created? Why were they created? Where are they located? What is the social/political/cultural context for the work? Who is the audience?
 - **The Critics:** are the printed/published discussions about the works similar or different? How were the works received by critics (journals, newspapers, magazines) and the public?
3. Decide how you will divide the work load equitably and maximize the skill set within your team. Here is a list of tasks you should consider:
 - **Research:** your presentation must show evidence of research from credible sources.
 - **Organization:** due to the nature of the work, compare and contrast analyses require clear organization of ideas and logical structure of arguments.
 - **Writing:** though you are not handing in a written assignment, all written aspects of the presentation (ex: power point slides with text) must be edited and proofread for clarity.
 - **Visual aides:** you are expected to provide visual support during your presentation; therefore you need to decide which visual aides (power point slides, photographs, video, etc.) will be most effective. Notify your instructor in your week 4 in-class session so arrangements can be made for technical support.
4. During your teams Week 9 scheduled Team Presentation time deliver your **15 minute** oral presentation. All team members must have a speaking role.

Note: If all team members have followed the Week 7 assignment instructions and handed in a 2 page art critique, your team should have MOST of the foundational research and information needed for the Week 9 compare and contrast presentations.

Assignment 9: Innovation and Change

Week 10-13 Team Case Study: 30 marks project, 10 marks peer assessment

This high-stakes assignment will be developed over the last four weeks of the course. During this time, the course material focuses on theories of change and innovation, specifically looking at how creative and critical thinking informs the decisions made by inventors, researchers, companies, other change agents that alter the technological, political and social landscape. For the final team assignment, students assume the role as change agent.

For the end of term case study, student teams are expected to produce a concise visual/textual presentation (e.g. website or Flash presentation) that does five things:

1. Identifies a failed technology.
2. Critically articulates, using the ideas presented throughout the entire course, why the technology failed.
3. Proposes a plan that if executed, would have made the technology a success.
4. Satisfies each of the three conditions above in a critical, well-communicated and persuasive manner.
5. Uses the skills of all members of the team equally.

The purpose of the case study is to provide students with a weighty assignment that encourages them to integrate many of the key ideas, theoretical perspectives, creative and critical thinking exercises and the textual, oral and visual delivery skills learned throughout the course.

This assignment will be developed and presented in four distinct stages.

1. Individual Research Proposal
2. Team Case Study Outline
3. Mini Oral Presentation
4. Final Project

Detailed assignment descriptions and feedback/assessment strategies below:

Draft Sample Assignment

Week 10: Identify a Failed Technology Individual Research Topic Proposal: 0 marks

Each team member will individually research a topic of interest. Each student must do the following:

1. Identify a failed technology you feel might be a good idea to base the final project on. It can be anything - a product, a tool, a service, a piece of software or a hardware unit. Provide a short description of the technology, and if possible a link to an online reference of the technology.
2. In 3-4 sentences identify why you think the technology failed. Provide references to back-up your claims.
3. In 3-4 sentences identify what you think could have been done to have made the technology a success.
4. Post this information to your team conference.

Your research proposal may be used by your team in Week 11 to choose a failed technology to focus on for the Final Team Project.

Remember...

In order to receive full marks for the Final Project in Week 13, you must participate in, and complete the weekly activities.

This low stakes writing activity will be evaluated by an instructor or a TA, but not graded. The proposal feedback from the marker is meant to inform the final decision making process but not determine it. Teams are free to choose their own topic. The assignment ensures that ALL team members take part in the proposal writing process. As well, this is the final individual writing assignment for the term. This short assignment provides markers the opportunity to provide feedback on each student's writing and to note any key improvements or areas for concern.

Draft Sample Assignment

Week 11: Draft Team Outline , 0 marks

This week, you and your team are expected to choose a failed technology on which to base the Final Team Project and begin your team research efforts by creating a summary to be posted to the conference at the end of the week.

Instructions

In preparation for your mini-presentation next week, and to get you started on the Final Project, we suggest that you follow these instructions.

1. First, as a team, select the problem: it can be almost anything tried in the developed or developing world -- products, tools, services, software, or hardware. Use the individual summaries you prepared last week to decide as a team which subject is most interesting to all members.
2. The technology should be one that essentially failed with its intended clientele or target audience. As a team, clearly analyze why the product failed. Ideally, the materials we discussed in the last 3 units will help your team to analyze the failure of the innovation or new product; your team should use this material to *deconstruct*; or explain what went wrong. Your team is expected to use the concepts, ideas, and terminology presented in this course to clearly show your team's understanding of the material presented so far over the term.
3. Next, consider what could be done to make the product or innovation a success. Perhaps a change in the targeted audience or group; perhaps, too, it may involve some re-engineering of the product to produce enhanced usability, better cost/performance, lower cost, higher style, better user feedback, durability, and so on.
4. Finally, at the end of the week (on Sunday), your team will submit an organized outline - in the form of a Final Post to the team conference - that demonstrates the following:
 - o A clear outline of the problem
 - o The reasoning behind the products failure
 - o Your team's ideas about a solution that could be, or have been, used to remedy the problem

This conference posting, and more importantly the final submission, should demonstrate critical thinking skills and show your team's understanding of the course material. It should also demonstrate your team's research skills - all sources should be cited in-text and in a reference list. The instructor will be looking for strong written communication skills - everything should be clearly organized, well-written (headings, subheadings, etc.) and proof-read.

During this collaborative process, it is up to each team to decide how to distribute the workload among team members. **Each team member must have a clear role.** Remember, 10% of your grade for this project will be decided by a Peer Evaluation.

NOTE: You and your team are not expected to do *everything* during the conference; that is, your instructors are aware that only so much research can be done on a new topic, when a team is trying to get organized and process new information. Your conference post this week and your mini-presentation in-class in Week 12 should simply show that your team has done the preliminary research on the subject and has thoughtfully considered all aspects of the assignment mentioned above.

This low stakes writing activity will be evaluated by an instructor or a TA, but not graded. The feedback from the marker is meant to support teams as they head into the final two weeks of the course. Instructors and TAs will clearly state the strengths of the assignment as well as areas for improvement. Feedback will also guide and prompt students to demonstrate their critical thinking skills and offer suggestions on how to effectively integrate key course ideas.

Weeks 12: Mini Presentation, 0 marks

In Week 12 student teams will be asked to give a brief 5 minute presentation that outlines each team's chosen project and where the team is at in the research process. After each presentation, there will be a short Q&A session for the class to ask questions and offer feedback/suggestions to the team. The purpose of this in-class session is for teams to share information and compare and contrast approaches to the final project so that all teams may have a better understanding of this major assignment.

Week 13: Hand in Final Case Study

High Stakes: 30 marks for the project, 10 marks peer assessment

This final project is worth 40% of your semester grade - 10% for Peer Evaluation and 30% for the overall quality of the Final Project. It is due at the end of Week 13 - Sunday April ... @ 11pm. The project will need to be available online, and should be handed in on CD, on or before the deadline.

For more detailed information on the Final Project consult the [Week 13 Assignment description](#).

What are the expectations for the Final Team Project?

1. As a team of researchers, your job is to show your knowledge of the technology, so your team should make sure to articulate the following to your audience:
 - What the technology is. Communicate relevant information to your audience. (Who made it? What is it made of? When and where it was made?)
 - The purpose of the technology. (Why was it made? or What problem was it addressing or trying to solve? Who is the target audience?)
2. As a team of researchers, your job is to clearly explain why the technology failed. Here are some questions to consider, though this is NOT an exhaustive list:
 - At what point in the adoption process did it fail? Did it reach its intended audience?
 - Was the product timely and well researched?
 - What were the factors that contributed to the failure? Was it a design problem? Marketing problem? Management problem?
 - Did the target audience know how to use it? Did it have sufficient tech support?
 - Are there cultural/social issues to consider?
 - What influence did media play, if any?

NOTE: The key here is to apply what you have learned in the readings to your own work. You should use the appropriate terms, language and key terms whenever possible in your presentation as you are making a case for your credibility as a team of researchers.

3. Also, as a team of researchers, your job is to offer suggestions for improvement or alternatives based on your knowledge and research. Based on your findings, can the technology be fixed or modified? Or, do you suggest something new? What new concepts have to be implemented or what changes have to take place for your suggestions to work effectively? *Make sure to provide critical support for your ideas.

The final form of the project should be a stand-alone visual presentation such as a website or a flash movie. Approach the final project as though you will hand off the finished multimedia presentation to the executive staff of the company responsible for the technology's invention. The final product should be interesting to watch and listen to. It should present clear and logical arguments and evaluations of the technology in question. It should raise interesting points, use academic references, and capitalize on the principles of innovation science discussed in the last few units to make interesting arguments. In a well communicated, persuasive and constructively critical manner, the presentation should attempt to make the hypothetical inventors, marketers, and/or investors in the failed technology see why their technology went wrong, and what could be (or, have been) done to turn the technology into a success.

When the project is completed, please put the project online and post a link to it on your team's conference by **Sunday, Apr... @ 11pm**. Additionally, you should submit a hard-copy of the presentation, on CD, to your instructor soon after the deadline.

The Final Team Project is worth 40% of your semester grade - 10% for the Peer Assessment and 30% for the overall quality of the final product. Please consult the [Evaluation Section](#) for further detail in this regard.

Peer Assessment Form

Please fill out the Peer Assessment form, available on the [Evaluation](#) page, and submit it through the submission tool on **Sunday, Apr... before 11pm**.

E. MARKING AND RESPONDING

Who will read and respond to or use student writing?

Instructor _____ TA _____ Peers _____ All

If TAs or Peers will be responsible for marking, how will you ensure that they grade and mark as you would (including providing appropriate feedback to students)?

The evaluation criteria, marking rubrics, and grading expectations are clearly 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 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.

Note: To ensure consistency across all sections of the course, all instructors and TAs will use the same grading criteria.

F. INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANCE

Which of the following new forms of instructional assistance will you need?

- TAs trained in teaching and evaluating writing? Yes
- Assistance in training your students to respond to feedback? Yes
- Other? Please describe

Three additional teaching assistants will be necessary to meet the requirements of a writing intensive learning class.

G. ASSESSMENT

Please explain how the effectiveness of the proposed W-course will be assessed.

- Comparison of writing in early assignments with those near the end of the term
By maintaining some consistency in the writing requirements/criteria, and by comparing writing assignments submitted across the term, the effectiveness of writing intensive instruction will be measurable.
- Comparison of initial draft of paper writing assignments with final drafts
Comparing the first drafts of writing assignments with final drafts, and determining how well students incorporate peer, TA and instructor feedback, will provide a measurable assessment of the writing intensive instruction.
- Comparison of writing with course results in previous years
One instructor and one TA will have taught the course pre-CWIL, and as such, will allow for the comparison of instructor skills and TA skills post-CWIL and the effectiveness of writing intensive learning will be measurable.
- Comparison of low-stakes assignments throughout the course
By comparing early online conference writing with end of term online conference writing, the effectiveness of writing intensive learning will be measurable.
- Comparison and continuity with teaching assistance
One of the TAs will have been a teaching assistant pre-CWIL and will continue with course post-CWIL, providing a measurement of the effectiveness of writing intensive learning.

H. FUNDING REQUESTS

Course Name and Number: IAT 209

Semester(s) funds requested for: 06-1/ 07-1/ 08-1

One-time only development funds requested:

We have asked one of our TAs to participate in the development of this course. He is familiar with the online and in-class structure of this course and offers another perspective—the valuable student perspective—on the course development. We'd like to request some money to pay for time attending writing seminars and working on course material. Perhaps \$500.

Requested (proposal)	Approved By UCITF	Requested by Assoc Dean	Funded	Details
\$500.00				
\$500.00				Total Development Funds

Instructional support funds requested (per term):

Calculations:

- Divide the total number of students (100) by the standard number of students per tutorial section (24) to find the number of tutorials normally offered: 4
- Divide the number of tutorials (4) by the number of tutorials per fulltime TA (1) to find the number of TAs normally assigned: .25
- Multiply the number of TAs normally assigned (.25) by up to 1.5 to find the projected number of TAs: 3.75
- Find the incremental cost by multiplying the number of extra additional TAs (projected – normal) by the average TA cost: $2 \times \$4969 = \$9,938$

Requested (proposal)	Approved By UCITF	Requested by Assoc Dean	Funded	Details
100				Number of students
24				Number of students per tutorial
1				Number of TAs normally assigned to this course
3				Number of TAs projected (multiply by up to 1.5)
2				Subtotal – Incremental TAs
\$9,938				Subtotal – Incremental TA cost
\$99.38				Subtotal – Incremental TA funding per student
				Additional instructional support
\$9,938				Total Incremental Instructional Funds
\$99.38				Total Incremental Instructional Funds per Student

Please provide a sample TUG for the proposed course:

- attached.

Please check the semesters during which you plan to offer the course and note your expected enrolments for each:

Fall 2004 enrolment: _____
Spring 2005 enrolment: _____
Summer 2005 enrolment _____

Fall 2005 enrolment: _____
Spring 2006 enrolment: 100
Summer 2006 enrolment _____

Fall 2006 enrolment: _____
Spring 2007 enrolment: 100
Summer 2007 enrolment _____

Fall 2007 enrolment: _____
Spring 2008 enrolment: 100
Summer 2008 enrolment _____

Thank you for considering this proposal.