

FACULTY SENATE
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
Course Approval Form

*Chairman English
Sub. Comm.*

74-5/58

To: Sub. Com.



Department English
Title Expository Writing
Sponsor(s) Dr. Donohue & Dr. Wolfe No. of Credits 3

File # 74-25-58

Approved by the department Graduate ()
Not recommended by the department Undergraduate (X)

Information copies forwarded: Academic Dean; Chairman; Curriculum Committee

[Signature]
Signature: Department Chairman

ACADEMIC DEAN

Consultation on proposal has been held and I fully endorse implementation.

Comments:

[Signature]
Signature: Academic Dean

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Proposal received *9/15*
Open Hearing held *5/2*

Returned to the department for the following reason(s): *Sub. Comm. resolve discrepancy with Comm. Dept*

Approved by the Curriculum Committee *12/2/76*

Presented to Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate as information *2/11/76*

Notifications forwarded: Academic Dean; Department Chairman

[Signature]
Signature: Chairman, Curriculum Committee



State of New Jersey

GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE

GLASSBORO, NEW JERSEY 08028

DEAN OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

April 14, 1975

TO: Joseph Tishler, Chairperson, Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee

FROM: Alan B. Donovan **ABD**

Attached are sixty copies of the course "Expository Writing" sponsored by the English Department. I am endorsing the course with the following observations.

In the preparation of and consultation about this course, questions have been raised by the Communications Department. Indeed, I believe you and members of your committee may have received a memo from John Collins, Chairperson of the Communications Department dated March 3. This memo details the results of two departmental votes about the course as well as a list of specific objections. At my request, there have been meetings between both departments, as well as a written response by the English Department to the above mentioned memo.

In light of all this, my reasons for endorsement are as follows:

1. There has never been any question that members of the English Department possess the required credentials and skills to teach this course.
2. I must affirm the principle that divisional departments are charged with the responsibility of determining courses essential for the best educational program for their majors. Such determinations are, of course, subject to the process of consultation, as well as to my review and approval at the divisional level.
3. This course is intended to supplant, for qualified students, the writing competency requirement. There are in fact courses other than Communications 101 which may also satisfy this competency requirement, e.g., "Creative Writing" and "Journalism." As such, "Expository Writing" must be considered a general education requirement course, not a course required as part of the major sequence, even though it is designed for English majors. The same is true, of course, for a Communications major who takes "Journalism" to fulfill the writing competency requirement.
4. The teaching of writing certainly may be accomplished by more than one means and such different means should be established because of different goals in mind. I do not believe - given the methods of instruction and the stated effectiveness of this course - that it sufficiently overlaps or duplicates the methods or intent of any course now being taught so as to be disqualified for this reason.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions in this regard.

cc: Dr. Collins

Dr. Donohue



State of New Jersey

GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE
GLASSBORO, NEW JERSEY 08028

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

TO: Dr. Alan Donovan, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences

FROM: Dr. Charles T. Donohue and Dr. Edward L. Wolfe for the English Department

DATE: 4/11/75

SUBJECT: Response to "the basic objections" of the Communications Department to the course proposal for "Expository Writing" sponsored by the English Department

For both clarity and precision, our response is divided into three parts: (1) the provenance of the objection to "Expository Writing," (2) the criteria that we believe should govern the approval of new courses, and (3) answers to "the basic objections" to "Expository Writing."

1. Provenance. It would be surprising if not astonishing at almost any college to find opposition to a proposal by the English Department for a required course for English majors in expository writing. In this respect, however, Glassboro State College is unlike most colleges. The cause of the opposition to this proposal is historical: the administration's arbitrary separation of the Communications Department from the English Department in 1964 (?). Before this separation, the English Department developed, administered, and conducted all of the courses offered at the college in the English language, writing, and literature. At the time of the separation, the administration organized the Communications Department for the purpose of teaching Communications 101, Communications 102, and Advanced Writing--the main writing components of the General Education Program and the English Majors Program. The administration's stated rationale for the separation was that faculty who devote their efforts exclusively to teaching writing would be more effective and successful in this enterprise than would faculty who teach related courses in literature and the English language as well as writing. This is not the place for a detailed discussion of the separation or the rationale that supported it. Nonetheless, we believe it was an unfortunate and unwise decision, but the past cannot be remade.

Since its organization, the Communications Department has grown and assumed many other functions and responsibilities outside the area of writing. At the present time, about one third of the faculty teaching Communications 101, Communications 102, and Advanced Writing also teach courses in language, communications, and media. Irrespective of the merits of the original rationale for separating the writing courses from the English Department, it is clear that the Communications Department no longer supports that rationale in practice. Apparently, the Communications Department believes that writing can be taught effectively and successfully by faculty who also teach in related areas. We, of course, fully agree with this position and believe the original rationale for removing most of the writing courses from the English Department should not now be used to evaluate the merits of the proposal for "Expository Writing."

2. Criteria for Course Approval. We believe that decisions regarding the approval of new courses should be made on the basis of three criteria: (a) the educational need or, at least, desirability for the course; (b) the professional competence of the sponsoring department to administer the course, the professional competence of the faculty to teach the course, as well as the adequacy of the staff and college facilities to support the course; and (c) the demonstrated correlation of the course to the goals of our Divisional General Education Models and/or the goals of a major program. If a course proposal can meet these three criteria, it is reasonable to conclude that it should be approved, and we believe the proposal for "Expository Writing" very clearly meets these criteria.

(a) The need for an intensive course in expository writing for English majors becomes increasingly more apparent every semester. Exposition, as we explain in the course proposal, is the form of discourse that is used to explain anything to anyone. It is not only the most common form of discourse, but the most important form for college students and educated adults generally. We employ exposition when we write college examinations and term papers. We also employ exposition when we write essays, business reports, professional articles, advertising brochures, course proposals, and rebuttals to objections to course proposals. But proficient expository writing is quite different from writing stories and poems, informal papers and journals, diaries and letters, descriptions and newspaper items. The proficient expository writer may present a picture which is partly a narrative of events, partly a description of a scene, and partly a personal expression of opinion, but the emphasis in exposition is upon query, logic and fact, upon the investigation of situations, the exhibition of motives, the analysis of character, and the examination of consequences. The proficient expository writer, like all writers, strives to construct a coherent picture, one that makes sense. But he must also make certain that his picture stands in clear and accurate relationship to evidence, that it is true. Moreover, he must learn to grapple with and to manipulate abstractions like "honesty" and "trust," or "educational need," "competence," and "correlation" in ways that are not droll, capricious, or idiosyncratic. Proficient expository writing, in consequence, is as demanding as it is useful. But proficiency can seldom be acquired or mastered without rigorous formal training.

Traditionally, such formal training in expository writing has been the province of the English department, and, traditionally, proficiency in expository writing has been a skill attributed to and expected of English majors. With reference to a small minority of our students, this traditional proficiency is still alive and well, but for a variety of reasons--perhaps the decline in writing instruction and practice in secondary schools, perhaps television, perhaps indolence--the writing skills and general verbal powers of college students throughout the nation have declined sharply in recent years. Students, including those with an expressed desire to major in English, often enter college with little training in writing and no training in the rhetoric of exposition. Yet, in a society in which few English majors will be able to gain employment as teachers, proficiency in expository writing may be the most valuable skill such majors can acquire in college. As we explain in the course proposal, the English Department "will come to depend more and more on students who are looking for the broad cultural background and verbal training traditionally associated with the college student who has majored in English. 'Expository Writing' will unquestionably help us to provide this training." The course is not merely a desirable addition to the college curriculum: it is a necessary course for the education and training of competent English majors.

(b) The professional competence of the English faculty to administer and to teach "Expository Writing" is just as clear as the need for the course itself. Every

member of the department has taught expository writing as part of the department's undergraduate and graduate seminars here at Glassboro. In addition, all but two members of the department have taught expository writing as part of Communications 101, Communications 102, and Advanced Writing here at Glassboro. Furthermore, six members of the department have had extensive experience teaching writing in high school, and all members of the department have taught expository writing in other colleges and universities, including Columbia University, Cornell University, Duke University, Harvard University, Rutgers University, the University of Iowa, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of West Virginia. On the basis of training, experience, and expressed interest, the English faculty provides an enormous base of competence for the teaching of "Expository Writing."

(c) The close correlation of "Expository Writing" to the goals of our Divisional General Education Models and to the goals of the English-major program is, we believe, clear and direct. The relation of the course to the English-major program has already been discussed (item 2 a), but the relation of the course to our Divisional General Education Models is no less apparent. "Expository Writing" is proposed as a one-semester writing course for English majors and designed to satisfy the writing competence requirement of our Divisional General Education Models. The present requirement reads "Competence Studies," "Fundamentals of Writing." The definition of "Writing Competence" and the explanation of the courses that satisfy the competence requirement are admittedly rather vague. Nonetheless, because exposition is the most important form of discourse for college students and for adults in general, an intensive course in the rhetoric of exposition should certainly be interpreted as satisfying the "Writing Competence" requirement as well as Communications 101, or the present alternative courses, Creative Writing and Journalistic Writing.

3. Answers to "the basic objections" to "Expository Writing." The Communications Department's first "objection" to "Expository Writing" falls into three parts: (a) that requiring "Expository Writing" "in place of the present Competency Course . . . would be adding a course to the English major . . . by drawing a course from the General Education design," (b) that this replacement of one course for another "would set a dangerous precedent for other curricula," and (c) that this decision "could also adversely affect the aim and intent of the heterogeneity of General Education courses." It is necessary to consider each of these points separately.

(a) We again wish to make clear that the present General Education requirement reads "Writing Competence." "Expository Writing" is specifically designed to fulfill this requirement by providing intensive training and practice in expository writing, which is the most useful and most important form of writing for college students. We see "Expository Writing" as merely substituting, for English majors, another and more useful course in place of the three courses presently available to them (Communications 101, Creative Writing, and Journalistic Writing) for the satisfaction of the requirement in "Writing Competence."

(b) Because "Expository Writing" manifestly fulfills the three criteria that should govern the approval of new courses [(1) the educational need for the course, (2) the professional competence of the sponsoring department to administer and teach the course, as well as the adequacy of the staff and college facilities to support the course, and (3) the demonstrated correlation of the course to goals of General Education and the English major], we can not see how its approval can be construed to be "a dangerous precedent for other curricula."

(c) Whether or not heterogeneity is necessarily an advantage in General Education courses is, indeed, a moot question. Nevertheless, an examination of the recommended courses for General Education indicates that heterogeneity is not an expressed

objective in the selection of the courses recommended. Moreover, the revised, three-track Competence Requirement in mathematics clearly works against heterogeneity. Finally, "Expository Writing" will be open to non-English majors on a space available basis. It is English Department's intention to offer one or two sections of the course each semester.

The Communications Department's second "objection" is that our students' needs for "more intensive experiences" in writing "should be" met by courses "in addition to, rather than in place of, the current one-semester requirement." This objection is particularly thoughtful and useful because it speaks directly to our students' needs for what we prefer to call more intensive training and practice in writing. We emphatically agree that this training and practice, at least for some students, not only should be, but must be, in addition to "the current one-semester requirement," or any one-semester requirement. Indeed, our conviction that a clearly defined series of required writing courses for English majors is necessary constitutes the very basis of our request for the approval of "Expository Writing."

The English Department has already unanimously approved a sequence of required writing courses for English majors that will provide intensive training and practice in writing each academic year. We thought it best, however, to request the approval of our two new courses one at a time. The sequence of courses approved by the department is as follows:

- A. English 101, unless waived by examination, will be required of all English majors during their freshman year. Other students will be admitted on a space available basis (recommended class size, 20 students).

English 101, Expository Writing

This course is designed for the student who has a sensitivity toward language and some verbal facility, but who needs practice and guidance in the mechanics of writing and particularly in the rhetoric of exposition. The course concentrates on the study of the devices, techniques, and evaluative standards of expository prose. Literary models of exposition and the student's own writings are read, analyzed, evaluated, and discussed. Each student writes a minimum of eight expository essays during the semester.

RECOMMENDATION FOR ADMISSION TO THE COURSE: No student, unless a declared English major, should be admitted to this course without the approval of the Chairman of the English Department.

- B. English 201, unless waived by examination, will be required of all English majors during their sophomore year. Other students will be admitted on a space available basis (recommended class size, 20 students).

English 201, Expository Writing and Research

This course builds upon Expository Writing, emphasizing more sophisticated literary models of exposition and requiring longer student essays. Emphasis shifts, however, from exposition in general, to the demands, techniques, and evaluative standards of research in the humanities. In addition to writing several brief expository essays, the student investigates, analyzes, and interprets a research project in the humanities and presents his findings in a relatively long expository essay with scholarly support.

RECOMMENDATION FOR ADMISSION TO THE COURSE: No student should be admitted to this course who has not successfully completed English 101 without the approval of the Chairman of the English Department.

- C. English 390 is now required of all English majors in their junior year. Other students are admitted on a space available basis (recommended class size, 12 students) with the approval of the Chairman of the English Department.

English 390, English Seminar I

This course builds upon Expository Writing and Research. Each section of the course deals with a particular period, author, or movement in English or American literature or language, and is designed to develop further the students' abilities to write, logically and cogently.

- D. English 391 is now only strongly recommended for English majors in their senior year. Other students are admitted on a space available basis (recommended class size, 12 students) with the approval of the Chairman of the English Department.

English 391, English Seminar II

This course builds upon English Seminar I. Each section of the course enables a small group of students to investigate intensively an area of literature or language under a professor competent in the field. Many different subjects are offered each year, but all seminars emphasize individual guidance, class discussion, and the preparation and presentation of a substantial research paper.

Our proposal for "Expository Writing" is the initial course in a sequence of writing courses. It is, in consequence, a vital part of the sequence because it is designed to provide the foundation for "Expository Writing and Research" and for all of the other courses in the sequence. It is our starting-point for training and practice in writing beyond the current one-semester requirement.

The Communications Department's third "objection" makes two points: (a) "Advanced Writing is offered by the Communications Department each semester" for any department "anxious to have their majors receive more intensive training in writing," and (b) "Advanced Writing was formerly required of all English majors." We will speak to these points in reverse order.

It is true that Advanced Writing was formerly required of all English majors, but because of the criticism expressed by some members of the English Department regarding our majors' writing skills and because of the English faculty's belief that our majors' writing skills might best be improved if they were given training and practice in expository writing about literature, Seminar I was substituted as a writing requirement in place of Advanced Writing. At the time of the substitution, almost all of our majors were preparing to teach English and it was believed that writing exclusively about language and literature would not merely provide training and practice in expository writing, but would also reinforce their knowledge of the subjects they would teach, language and literature, as well as writing.

Unfortunately but understandably, English Seminar I, like Advanced Writing, is based on the assumption that students will enter the course with certain verbal powers and skills that are often not taught or, at least, not learned in Communications 101. This is not in any way meant as a criticism of the Communications Department or of the individual members of that department. Rather it is meant as a frank acknowledgement of what might be called the Principle of Curricular Entropy: in an atmosphere of academic freedom, the uniformity or similarity of course content, course emphasis, and course objectives is in inverse proportion to the number of sections of the course offered. When the Communications Department is forced to offer sixty or eighty sections of Communications 101, many of which must be staffed by adjunct faculty, it is impossible for the department to

guarantee uniformity or even similarity of course content, emphasis, or objectives.

This is particularly true when the content of a course is as broadly defined as the content of Communications 101. For example, the syllabus for Communications 101 offers the following directions for writing assignments: "weekly writing will be required, such as formal papers, informal papers, journal-keeping and paragraph exercises." It is clear that enormous latitude is delegated to the individual instructor who decides what writing assignments his students will engage in. It is altogether possible that a student can successfully complete Communications 101 without having any systematic training or practice in formal, expository analysis and synthesis--in definition, classification and division, use of examples, comparison and contrast, causal analysis, and process analysis. Formal training in expository analysis and synthesis is, however, the very heart of our proposal for "Expository Writing." Such training will provide the foundation necessary for "Expository Writing and Research," and for Seminar I. And because we intend to offer only one or two sections of the course each term, we shall encounter no problems with Curricular Entropy.

The Communications Department's fourth "objection" makes four interrelated points, three of which have already been partially discussed. The first point is that "the principles of rhetoric and exposition are emphasized" in Communications 101 and Advanced Writing. The wording of this objection is instructive, "the principles of rhetoric and exposition are emphasized." Now, inasmuch as rhetoric merely means the art of writing well and Communications 101 is a writing course, it is not surprising that writing well is emphasized. However, there is no indication from the syllabus for Communications 101 and particularly what we take to be the core of the syllabus, the directions for writing assignments, that exposition is indeed emphasized. Directions that call for the writing of "formal papers, informal papers, journal-keeping and paragraph exercises" are useful writing guides for a general course offered to a large, undifferentiated group of students, many of whom have no interest in writing, have very limited verbal skills, and possess no verbal fluency. But such directions do not provide the basis for systematic instruction and practice in formal expository analysis and synthesis. In consequence, even discounting the Principle of Curricular Entropy, we cannot agree (point two) that the differences between "Expository Writing" and Communications 101 are "primarily in approach rather than in content, nor (point three) that "Expository Writing would clearly duplicate courses now available." We designed our proposal specifically to deal with deficiencies our students do in fact have after successfully, and often meritoriously, completing Communications 101.

The fourth point of the fourth "objection" seems somewhat inconsistent, but, on the basis of the mission of Communications 101, valid. After arguing that "Expository Writing would clearly duplicate courses now available," the point is made that "to limit the course to just emphasis on rhetoric and exposition is inconsistent with research." Let us again point out that "Expository Writing" emphasizes the rhetoric of exposition and not "rhetoric and exposition." In any case, if the course would, in fact, duplicate courses now available, then these courses must also be "inconsistent with research." But we feel sure that the Communications Department did not intend this conclusion, and herein lies the inconsistency. You cannot logically object to a course as a duplication and at the same time object to it as an aberration. We have repeatedly attempted to explain that "Expository Writing" would not duplicate courses now available; we will willingly admit that its content and objectives are inconsistent with some current research. We willingly admit that it would be unwise to require "Expository Writing" of a large undifferentiated group of students with no interest in writing, few verbal skills, and little fluency. For such students, informal papers, journal keeping, paragraph exercises, letter writing,

tape recordings, and a whole host of other devices have proved useful. But "Expository Writing," as explained in the course description, is specifically designed for "the student who has a sensitivity toward language and some verbal facility." It is designed for the student who already has a desire to write effectively and who already is fluent. It is designed for English majors and other students who are sufficiently motivated to apply for admission.

The Communications Department's fifth and final "objection" is a curious administrative objection that cannot be answered on purely rational, pedagogical, or disciplinary grounds. Yet it may, unfortunately, be the most telling objection of all. After presenting four objections based on the content, the objectives, and the curricular correlatives of the course, the Communications Department implicitly negates, disregards, or repudiates these objections, and, in effect, says the course is worthy and can be offered so long as it is called Fundamentals of Communications 101 and is listed under the Communications Department as a Communications course. It is difficult to respond to the objection, but we will try.

First of all, to paraphrase Iago, "Courses should be what they seem;/Or those that be not, would they might seem none!" The course description of "Expository Writing," which would also be the catalogue description, has already been quoted. It bears little or no resemblance to the following catalogue description of Communications 101:

"The aim is to develop communications skills. Emphasis is placed on the individual's role both as a sender and as a receiver of ideas. Therefore, the course includes frequent assignments in reading, writing, speaking and consideration of research technique (sic)."

The absence of any close resemblance between the two course descriptions is altogether proper, for the courses, we believe, are really quite different. It also seems altogether proper that a student who has successfully completed "Expository Writing" should be given credit for his efforts by having the course "Expository Writing" recorded on his transcript. Otherwise we face a situation a little like a student who has taken a course in Organic Chemistry being credited with a course in General Science. We may know that the student has had practice and training in organic chemistry, but will his potential employers know this?

It seems to us that if this course is a worthy addition to the curriculum as an alternative course for English majors for the satisfaction of "Competence Studies," "Fundamentals of Writing" (and we think it is a worthy addition), and if it is a course formulated, proposed, and taught in the manner indicated in the course proposal by the English faculty, for English majors, then candor, administrative probity, and disciplinary integrity all demand that the course be called "Expository Writing," and listed as an English course.



State of New Jersey
GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE
GLASSBORO, NEW JERSEY 08028

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

February 18, 1975

Dr. John Collins
Chairman, Communications Department
Glassboro State College

Dear John,

The enclosed course proposal for "Expository Writing" is an amended version of the original. I believe I have made all the changes that you and Mary Anne suggested during our discussion last week.

Again, I appreciate the attention your department has given to our proposal and, especially, the helpful criticism you and Mary Anne have offered.

Sincerely,


Terry Donohue
Chairman

P.S. The section of the proposal dealing with consultations will of course be completed before the proposal begins its way through curriculum committee process.

GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE
GLASSBORO, NEW JERSEY

COURSE PROPOSAL

I. Title of the Course: Expository Writing

Department: English

Sponsors: Dr. Charles T. Donohue and Dr. Edward L. Wolfe

II. Essence

1. Undergraduate course
2. Semester hours credit: 3 s.h.
3. Course level: Freshman
4. Prerequisites: No course is required as a prerequisite for Expository Writing, but the course is designed for English majors. Therefore, no student, unless a declared English major, should be admitted to this course without the approval of the Chairman of the English Department.
5. Curricular pattern: This is a one semester writing course designed to satisfy the Writing Competence requirement of General Education for English majors and other students who successfully complete the course.
6. Implementation: Beginning with the Fall Semester of 1975, one or two sections of the course will be offered each fall semester, as needed.

III. Other Details

1. Present staff is fully adequate for the implementation of the course.
2. Present library facilities are fully adequate for the course.
3. There are no special space needs.
4. Uniqueness of the course: Expository Writing may be distinguished from existing courses (e.g., Communications 101) on the basis of its students, its dominant emphasis upon the traditional rhetorical techniques of expository composition, and the exclusivity of its objectives--a mastery of the techniques and evaluative standards of expository analysis. The course is designed for the student who has a sensitivity toward language, some verbal facility, and a desire to write effectively, but who needs practice and guidance. Although some time is devoted to review and reinforcement in the areas of usage and the mechanics of writing, the dominant emphasis of the course is, again, the rhetoric of exposition. Now, rhetoric is simply the art of writing well and exposition is merely the form of discourse used to explain anything to anyone. But herein lies much of the difference between William F. Buckley Jr. and John Hunt,

between Edward M. Kennedy and Joshua Bilberry. Exposition is not only the most common form of discourse (the others being argument, persuasion, description, and narration), but certainly the most important form of discourse for college students and intelligent, responsible citizens. The course, therefore, is devoted to an intensive study of the devices, techniques, and evaluative standards of expository prose. Literary models of exposition and the students' own writings are read, analyzed, discussed, and evaluated. Each student writes a minimum of eight expository essays of about five hundred words during the semester. The objectives of the course are, through an emphasis upon traditional rhetoric, to guide the student to master the techniques and evaluative standards of expository analysis (the basic rhetorical and logical principles that underlie good expository writing), and to learn to write good expository prose.

5. Scope of the course:

I. Usage (review, reinforcement, and where necessary continued instruction and practice)

A. Words and meaning

1. Denotation and connotation
2. Dictionaries and reference works

B. Grammar

1. Form-Class Identification: Parts of Speech
2. Phrases
3. Clauses
4. Sentences
5. Non-sentences
6. Agreement
 - a. Subject and predicate
 - b. Person
 - c. Tense
 - d. Voice
 - e. Pronoun reference

7. Modifiers

C. Punctuation

1. End stops
 - a. Period
 - b. Question mark
 - c. Exclamation point

2. Pauses
 - a. Comma
 - b. Semi-colon
 - c. Colon
 - d. Dash
 - e. Parenthesis

3. Quotation marks

4. Apostrophes

D. Mechanics

1. Hyphens

2. Numbers

3. Capitals

4. Abbreviations

5. Italics

E. Preparing a manuscript

1. Paper

2. Heading

3. Spacing

4. Use of quotations

5. Proof reading

II. Rhetoric

A. Thinking--From analysis to synthesis

1. Memory and invention

2. Identification of subject, occasion, and purpose

3. Analysis of subject and selection of a theme

4. Formulation and arrangement

- a. Beginning

- b. Middle

- c. End

5. Style

- a. Clarity

- b. Vividness
 - c. Interest
- B. Strategies for thinking and writing
- 1. Definition
 - a. Formal definition
 - b. Informal definition
 - c. Interrelated terms
 - d. Connotation
 - 2. Classification and division
 - a. Consistency
 - b. Exclusivity
 - c. Completeness
 - 3. Example
 - a. Immediacy
 - b. Vividness
 - c. Cogency
 - 4. Comparison and contrast
 - a. Logical comparison and contrast
 - b. Rhetorical comparison and contrast
 - 5. Cause and effect
 - 6. Process Analysis
 - a. Historical process
 - b. Scientific and natural process
 - c. Logical process
- C. Tactics for thinking and writing
- 1. Sentences to paragraph
 - 2. Amplification
 - a. Details and particulars
 - b. Ordering details

3. Unity
 4. Coherence
 5. Emphasis
- D. Stylistic designs for writing
1. Style
 - a. Formal and informal
 - b. Objective and subjective
 - c. Committed and uncommitted
 - d. Technical and colloquial
 - e. Abstract and personal
 2. Tone
 - a. Admiring
 - b. Hostile
 - c. Familiar
 - d. Condescending
 - e. Etc.
 3. Idiomatic usage, triviality, cliches
- E. Stylistic devices for writing
1. Sentence rhetoric
 - a. Periodic sentences
 - b. Loose sentences
 - c. Balanced sentences
 - d. Parallel structure
 2. Figurative language
 - a. Simile
 - b. Metaphor
 - c. Synecdote and metonymy
 - d. Sound imagery

3. Emphasis
 - a. Position
 - b. Coordination and subordination
 - c. Repetition
4. Clarity
5. Conciseness

F. Logic for thinking and writing

1. Deduction
2. Induction
3. Analogy
4. Logical fallacies
 - a. Begging the question
 - b. Faulty causation
 - c. Argument at the man
 - d. Ignoring the question
 - e. It doesn't follow
 - f. Two valued argument
 - g. Appeal to illegitimate authority

G. Texts: All students are required to have a good college-level dictionary, such as the Webster's Collegiate, a good handbook, such as Perrin's Writer's Guide and Index to English and a good rhetoric text, such as Connolly and Levin's A Rhetoric Case Book.

IV. Rationale for the course: Our English majors need, as early in their undergraduate study as possible, intensive training and practice in the logic and formal rhetoric of exposition. They need, moreover, more training and practice, not merely along with or in addition to the work we now do in our literature and language courses, but directly and centrally as a subject that is, in itself, endlessly fascinating and fundamental to our discipline. Moreover, we presently face two problems that have only recently become acute. For whatever reasons--intellectual indolence, the decline of writing instruction in secondary schools, or television--the writing skills and general verbal powers of college students throughout the

country have deteriorated sharply (see attached articles). At the same time, employment opportunities for college graduates have diminished rapidly. As fewer and fewer of our students find employment as high school teachers of English, fewer and fewer students will enroll as English Education majors. We will come to depend more and more on students who are looking for the broad cultural background and verbal training traditionally associated with the college student who has majored in English. Expository Writing will unquestionably help us to provide this training.

V. Consultations

1. This course was unanimously approved by the English Department Curriculum Committee on November 26, 1974.
2. This course was unanimously approved by the English Department on December 5, 1974.