Introduction

(This part has been written in response to the CCCC suggestions.)

This proposal has been written in response to CUNY Mandate to phase out developmental and ESL courses below transfer level. In order to help the committee understand the terminology used, I offer the following characteristics of the so-called ‘accelerated learning approach (from now onwards AL):

* AL is a specific form of education aimed at achieving the desired learning outcomes in a shorter, compared to the conventional learning, period of time
* It is a complex methodological system advocating holistic approach to learning
* It utilizes all available pedagogical and psychological means to enhance learning
* It integrates a number of advanced and effective educational and psychological theories, teaching practices and instructional tools
* It appeals to the learner’s intellectual and emotional potential and counts on high intrinsic motivation
* It focuses on the adult learner’s needs, goals, life conditions and learning outcome applications
* It is a truly learner-centered and practical approach to learning

The field of Second Language Acquisition has always stressed the role of time in language acquisition. Native speaker children operate a vocabulary of 5,000-8,000 words by age 6. However, many of our CUNY and NYCCT foreign or second language learners come to ESOL classes with fewer than 3,000 words. Clearly, specific strategies are needed to both enhance learning and make acceleration of language learning possible. I write this preamble because educational institutions such as CUNY do not always take into account the difference between a native speaker/user of a language and a language learner. A native speaker in a developmental course technically needs to ‘educate’ his/her language, but has, as a language user, acquired the inner structure of that language. For them language use is automatic. On the other hand, for non-native speaker learners, the processes are very complex, need to be made automatic and are time-dependent. Accelerated learning, thus, needs to be planned carefully, and is likely to take some additional forms and structures if it is to be successful. Developmental learning in co-requisite form may differ in some aspects from ESL learning.
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**COURSE OUTLINE**

**EAP 101 CO (2 hr., 0 cr.) to run concurrently with ENG 1101**

**Prerequisites**

For incoming students: 51-55 on the CUNY Assessment Test in Writing; for continuing students: “S” in 021W without writing proficiency; “S” in 022R without reading proficiency.

**Course Description**

ENG 1101/EAP CO offers additional, well-coordinated, meaningful instruction for reading and writing required in English 1101 along with an emphasis on language enhancement. The co-requisite focuses on reading comprehension; critical thinking; the structured writing process; rhetorical awareness, writing in diverse genres, grammar, mechanic and cross-cultural rhetoric and communication; listening and spoken communicative competence.

**Grade Policy and Procedure**

English 1101 /EAP 101 CO will be assessed as one course. Students will need to earn an overall 70% in order to earn a Pass. This means, students need to reach 70% in ENG1101 and 70% in CO to pass. One instructor will teach ENG 1101 and CO in the fall 2020 pilot. This model will be re-evaluated for SP 2021.

**New York City College of Technology Policy on Academic Integrity**

Students and all others who work with information, ideas, texts, images, music, inventions, and other intellectual property owe their audience and sources accuracy and honesty in using, crediting, and citing sources. As a community of intellectual and professional workers, the College recognizes its responsibility for providing instruction in information literacy and academic integrity, offering models of good practice, and responding vigilantly and appropriately to infractions of academic integrity. Accordingly, academic dishonesty is prohibited in The City University of New York and at New York City College of Technology and is punishable by penalties, including failing grades, suspension, and expulsion. The complete text of the College policy on Academic Integrity may be found in the catalog.

**Required Texts / Library resources and bibliography**

***America Now: Short Readings from Recent Periodicals, 9th ed.;*** edited by Robert Atwan, Bedford/St/Martin’s: Boston/New York, 2011.

**Note:** The proposed textbook espouses a multicultural view of topics and it actively engages issues of diversity, from multiple perspectives. Students will examine, discuss, and write about pressing issues facing the integration of ethnic and racial diversity in all facets of working and public life in America today. Each of the topics below will have a comparative dimension of examining the way these topics are viewed in USA and how they are viewed from the outside in: from the rest of the World towards USA. So the novelty will be in brining a world’s view to the USA issues. This brings both national and international attention to diversity in all forms, particularly ethnic and racial.

**Topics (from the textbook, supplemental readings, and online resources)**

1. Paths to Success and Personal Happiness

2. Cross-cultural Norms and Values

3. The “Ethnics” and Ethics of Food

4. Migration, Immigration, and Identity

5. Schooling, Public and Private Spaces: the Racial and Ethnic Divide

6. Gender Roles, Marriage and Family across the world

7. Safety and Security in Public and Private Spaces

8. Social (in) Action and Civics

9. Technology, Jobs and Shifting Working Space

10. Social Networks, Digital Platforms, and Prejudice

11. Environmentalism and Science versus the Other: Saving the Planet

12. Global Initiatives and Partnerships

14. Sciences, genetics and the future of humanity

15. The Discourse of Change: The Role of Language in Ethnic and Racial Discourse

**EAP 101 CO Learning Outcomes/Assessment (Table 1)**

NOTE: These are outcomes specifically designed for Second language learners and will be focused on in the CO.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Learning Objectives/Outcomes** | **How Objective Will be Assessed** |
| 1.Expand linguistic repertoire of grammatical and lexical means, including expanding sophisticated vocabulary, higher level idiomatic structures, more complex sentence types, variety of subordinating clause use, transitionals, and paragraph cohesive devices. | Written assignments, quizzes, oral presentations, teach-others activities, and specially targeted assignments for individual language and learning needs. |
| 1. 2. Develop an understanding of varied linguistic, cultural, and cross-cultural tools that are used to build textual meaning. Interpreting textual meaning using ethnic and racial lens to understand prejudice and to engage in appreciation of true diversity of gender, race and ethnicity.
 | Frequent and varied reading assignments with guided reading sheets, comprehension assessment, and writing assignments that focuses on cross-linguistic and cross-cultural analysis.  |
| 3. Develop competency in using varied online resources, social media, and technology. | Projects (group or individual) that would demonstrate successful navigation of online resources, web and social media: gathering information, evaluating online sources and using computer programs to draft projects that include embedded links, graphs, charts, video and audio clips and website links. |
| 1. 4. Evaluate one’s own writing progress by engaging in self- and peer-evaluation of writing at various drafting stages (metacognitive skills)
 | Participate in group discussions of self and peer evaluation sheets; collaborative activities that allow for self and teacher assessment of genre knowledge, standard writing conventions, writing processes and final published products such as ‘whole class booklet’ (part of Portfolio) |
| 5.Develop skills that will enable students to become an independent learner, writer, reader and thinker, sensitive to issues of social, ethnic and racial justice.  | Students will engage in activities that will foster independent thinking, ability to work on one’s own; develop skills to sustain individual work on projects, independent search for information; critical independent evaluation of learning sources and class work. Assessment will include formal and informal checklists, learning guides, reflection on own learning strategies, and assessing progress more formally by completing a self-evaluation of achievement report (at certain points during the semester). |

**Class Schedule for ENG 1101 with EAP 101 CO**

EAP 101 CO follows the syllabus and overall LO requirements for ENG 1101. However, the specific learning outcomes, outlined in Table 1 above, are meant to help enhance the learning of multilingual, international and ESOL students, and support the teaching in ENG 1101. The teaching and learning in EAP 101 CO will closely follow work done in ENG 1101 class, reinforce elements of it, help students understand it, and provide opportunities for additional practice and support with language and linguistic needs.

Table 2 is just an example of weekly activities, shared with Developmental CO to emphasize that EAP 101 CO is only different in its focus on language acquisition.

Table 2: Sample Weekly Activities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  Reading |  Writing |
| Week 1 | Introduction I Introduction to the course, textbook, syllabus, portfolio expectation, and reading software; discussion of relationship between reading & writing; reading/writing diagnostics |
| Week 2 | Vocabulary Development: Context clues, morphological clues, use of dictionary | AnnotationUse of vocabulary: sentence-writing, parts of speech, sentence structure |
| Week 3 | Identifying main ideas vs. supporting details; Paraphrasing; Vocabulary development | Annotation; Summary; Discussion of rhetorical modes (narration, comparison/contrast, persuasion); Grammar Instruction |
| Week 4 | Comprehension Main ideas vs. supporting details; Making logical inferences; Paraphrasing | Rhetorical modes continued; Understanding components of an essay (intro, body, conclusion); FormattingPre-writing strategies; Organizing ideasI Intro to  |
| Week 5 |  Essay 1 (Narration) Drafting Workshop | Essay 1 (Narration) Drafting Workshop |
| Week 6 |  Writing as s Writing as a structured process: proofreading, revising, and editing | Essay 1 workshop (revision practices and peer review). Grammatical instruction |
| Week 7 | Analytical Strategies: Identifying patterns of organization; Analyzing relationships between ideas; Recognizing rhetorical modes | Transitions/ Grammar instructionDiscussion of Essay 2 (Comparison/Contrast) |
| Week 8 | Analytical Strategies: Critical Reading: evaluate argument and specific claims in a text and examine their reasoning/ supporting evidenceD | Use of transitions in Argumentation: thesis statements; topic sentences; claims |
| Week 9 | Critical reading: Analyze multiple texts addressing similar themes or topics; evaluate/ compare the authors’ points of view and approaches. |  Development: Body paragraphs; use of evidence to support ideas; sourceintegration, including quotation  |
| Week 10 | Identify quotations that demonstrate similar/different viewpoints/approaches;Essay 2 Drafting Workshop | Development: Body paragraphs; use of evidence to support ideas; sourceintegration, including quotations; Essay 2 Drafting Workshop |
| Week 11 | Essay 2 workshop (revision practices and peer review). Grammatical instruction |
| Week 12 | Identify author’s tone, style, purpose, and point of view in texts from various content areas. | Discussion of Essay 3. Elements of research: source location and evaluation; Documentation.Grammatical instruction |
| Week 13 | Elements of research: appropriate citation. Essay 3 Drafting Workshop. |
| Week 14 | Essay 3 workshop (revision practices and peer review) |
| Week 15 | Reflections on final research project. Course conclusion. Class portfolio due. |

**Anticipated Course Enrollment**

We anticipate up to 40 students.

**Reason for this anticipated enrollment:**

This is a pilot so the planned section to pilot is only one.

## Course Design and Structure

The 2-hour co-requisite will be taught by the same professor teaching the associated ENG 1101 (English Composition I) section.

In order to maximize student-centered individual instruction, we ask to restrict the English 1101 to 20 and associated co-requisite class size to 20 same students (in the available California models, ESL CO is capped at 10 for best results).

## Pedagogical Strategies and Instructional Design

The course will focus on providing the relevant language and linguistic education that would help meet the reading and writing demands of English 1101 Composition 1, a course which all City Tech students take. Currently there are one full-time and 2 part-time faculty members who would be qualified to teach this course, pending appropriate professional development. Instructors teaching the co-requisite sections will offer support and instruction in reading and writing, delivered through lectures, group work, use of technology and digital platforms, high-impact practices, student peer and self editing exercises, and self-regulated learning methodology. There will be no online, or partially online course sections offered.

**Supports**

We believe that embedded reading and writing tutors would augment classroom instruction. CO should follow ENG 1101 regular class. Tutoring should be available after each CO class meeting.

## Pilot Timeline

## (including: After-Pilot Steps to Review, Revise and Redraft the Proposal)

In Fall 2020, we plan to pilot up to two co-requisite sections. In Spring 2021, based on the data obtained from the Fall 2020 section, we will revise or confirm the pilot, or make other appropriate decisions. Upon close examination of the fall 2020 pilot, we will draft a proposal for the permanent course, or additional new co-requisites drawn from credit courses, whichever is better suited to ESOL students’ success, with the offering structure revised as needed. Besides the learning outcome assessment, we will examine passing rates in the ENG 1101CO; solicit faculty feedback, and student self-assessment of the course success and outcomes. In addition, we will confer with CUNY ESL DC and other expert bodies to determine the best path forward.

Justification for the Proposal for Post-Pilot Evaluation

Historically, upper-level ESOL (and developmental) reading and writing courses have served as gateways to English 1101, which, in turn, serves as a pre-requisite for many courses at the college. ESOL courses have also historically been offering the necessary educational help for both language and general knowledge acquisition prior to taking ENG 1101 and other courses, bridging the gaps between foreign high school education and USA college requirements, or filling the gap between (inadequate) obtained high school education in USA and college requirements of recent immigrant students of multilingual backgrounds. It is important to note that ENG 1101 standards will not be lowered for students enrolled in the 1101-CO; the level of instruction and exit requirements will be identical to mainstream ENG 1101. Implementing this integrated reading and writing co-requisite is likely to provide intensified meaningful language input and instruction, and increase retention and graduation rates, thus allowing students to move forward with their collegiate aspirations more successfully.

NOTES

1. The list below are some of the resources used in preparation of the proposal as well as the main position statements by the TESOL International (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) most notable and influential organization of the kind; and CATESOL (California TESOL as a TESOL International Affiliate).

2. There seems to be almost no guidance for ESL acceleration. In my search I found only one Power Point. See attached.

**Resources Consulted or Cited**

ESOL is not Developmental or Remedial:

<http://www.tesol.org/about-tesol/press-room/position-statements/higher-education-position-statements>

<http://www.tesol.org/docs/pdf/13489.pdf?sfvrsn=0>

CCCC (Council for College Composition and Communication): Position Statement on Second Language Writing, Teaching and Policy in Higher Education

<http://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/secondlangwriting>

On Accelerated ESL – response to the “Acceleration Law Implementation, the so-called AB-705)

<https://www.catesol.org/single-post/2017/05/01/CATESOL-Position-Statement-AB-705>

CompletecollegeaAmerica.org (CUNY follows this philosophy also CUNY Start, see PPs from CUNY included on this website)

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED392039.pdf>

http://www.ppic.org/wp-content/uploads/remedial-education-reforms-at-californias-community-colleges-august-2018.pdf

<https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/accelerated-learning-what>

**References**

**(NOTE: Most data on accelerated learning reports seems to have combined results for native and non-native writers. For the purposes of this proposal, the same data was used to support efficacy of accelerated learning for all students. As new segregated data becomes available, it will be integrated into the proposal.)**

Bailey, T., & Cho, S. W. (2010). Issue Brief: Developmental Education in Community Colleges. *Community College Research Center, Columbia University*.

Scott-Clayton, J. E. (2018). The Looming Student Loan Crisis Is Worse Than We Thought. *Evidence Speaks Reports,* Vol. 2, #34. Brookings.

**Sample Materials: See Appendix**

**(NB: Sample teaching materials and learning aids for the proposed co-requisite are specially designed to support students with weaker reading and writing skills)**

**Appendix A**

 **ENG1101-EAP 101CO Instructional Cycle**

|  |
| --- |
| **Pre-Reading Set-Up**In-class activity or discussion to build “schema” or activate students’ background knowledge on the topic/ questions. Teacher provides guidance (what to pay attention for, key terms that might be unfamiliar to students, portions they may hind challenging). Students read assigned texts at home. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Post Reading Activities**In-Class activities for students to process, clarify, and engage with ideas/info from readings – e.g. small-group & whole-class discussions, in-class writing, debates, games. Metacognitive conversation woven throughout to increase students’ awareness of strategies for approaching academic reading, reasoning, and writing. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Open Book Quiz**Students move from informal and largely oral discussion to explaining key ideas/info from reading in their own writing. Provides incentive and accountability for completing and reviewing readings. Good quiz questions require students to demonstrate they understand key parts of text (poorly written questions allow students to locate and copy or simply provide opinion) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Essay**Students move from explaining discrete portions of the reading to integrating, synthesizing, building arguments. Good prompts require higher order thinking with key ideas/info from assigned texts, students must articulate & support their own perspective (poor prompts allow students to bypass the text, over-rely on personal comments, and/or string together chunks of summary with no analysis) |

Adapted from California Accelerated Project, developed by Katie Hern

**Appendix B**

 **ENG1101-EAP 101 CO Integrated Reading and Writing**

 **Assignments**

 **Sample Assignments and Activities**

**#1: Summary, Analysis, and Response Essay**

This is a text-based writing assignment. In this assignment, students are asked to read an article and to write an essay that includes a summary that represents the main message and key points, an analysis that examines the textual elements, and a response that engages the author’s ideas.

Starting with the reading process, students apply reading strategies to understand and examine the text in preparation for writing. This writing assignment requires different cognitive processes while students write for various purposes – to summarize, to analyze, and to respond. Specific strategies and guidelines are used to scaffold reading and writing tasks and to guide students through the discursive process in each part of the assignment.

**#2: Pre-reading Guides**

These reading guides are designed to develop or activate a schema of background knowledge to facilitate critical reading and thinking through writing, visual mapping, and discussion. Some of the items/questions allow students to preview the reading, while others develop students’ vocabulary and awareness of certain concepts found in the texts.

**#3: Reading Quiz**

The objective of the post-reading quiz is twofold. First, it gauges students’ mastery of the meaning and essential elements of a given text. As an assessment that involves reading and writing, it also requires students to read like a writer as they examine the purpose, tone, and organization of the text. They can then learn more about writing.

**#4: Synthesis Argument Essay**

A synthesis essay is a discussion that incorporates multiple sources of information. To synthesize the ideas from different sources, students have to identify similar or conflicting arguments and ideas among the authors. The application of synthesis in an argument relies on critical and valid reasoning, and supporting evidence from various sources, forms, and contexts. As they present their points of view, students also evaluate their claims the way they examine arguments and ideas from other sources to inform and advance their discussion. The use of multiple sources in different genres and modes, including multimedia, websites, and other texts, allow students to develop multimodal literacies that are essential to 21st century learning.

**Note**:

The texts used in the assignments are examples. They may or may not become actual assignments in the ENG1101 co-requisite course. They are selected to demonstrate that a range of text-based assignments, which are fundamental to the integrated reading and writing approach, can be generated with the same group of texts. The following sample assignments are of varying lengths and address different outcomes.

**#1: Summary, Analysis, and Response Essay**

**Objective:**

In this assignment, you are asked to read an article on college education. You should use active reading techniques before and during reading to help you understand the text and identify the main points and purpose of the article. After reading, you have to write a summary that represents the main idea or thesis and supporting points, to write an analysis that examines the textual elements, and to respond to the article thoughtfully.

**Readings:** (Choose one of the following)

* “Are College Lectures Unfair?” by Annie Murphy Paul
* “Does College Education Still Prepare People for Jobs?” by [Tomas Chamorro-Premuzic](https://hbr.org/search?term=tomas%2520chamorro-premuzic) and [Becky Frankiewicz](https://hbr.org/search?term=becky%2520frankiewicz)
* “Technology and the College Generation,” by Courtney Rubin

**Requirements**:

Part 1:

Your **summary** should be around 100 words. To prepare for the summary writing, you should fill out a template with the thesis and the major supporting ideas. Use the following strategies in your summary:

* Introduce the article in the beginning of your summary. Include the author’s name, the date of publication, and the publication title within the first few sentences.
* Focus on the author’s arguments by accurately stating the article’s thesis and major supporting ideas in your own words.
* Avoid giving examples and evidence that are too specific, to maintain the focus of the overall argument of the article. Feel free to generalize about types of evidence, kinds of examples, and rhetorical strategies used by the authors to support their argument;
* Use an objective tone and a mix of paraphrased and quoted source material.
* Do not include your opinion.

Part 2

Your **analysis** should be at least 300 words (about one page). You should use an objective tone when you analyze the text. Focus on some of the following topics:

* The context in which this article is written
* The purpose of the article (what is it? Is it clear?)
* The intended audience of the article
* The organizational patterns of the text
* The techniques used to achieve the purpose
* The tone(s) of the text (you may include quotations as illustrations)
* The thesis of the article (is it well supported?)

Part 3:

Your **response** should be around 200 words. Give your personal response/reaction to the text. In this part, you should write in first person by using the pronoun “I.” Consider the following questions:

* What ideas do you find interesting/powerful?
* Do you agree or disagree with some of the ideas presented/ Why or Why not?
* How does the author support his/her argument?
* Do you find the author’s argument convincing?
* How do you personally relate to some of author’s ideas?

**Overall Strategies**:

* Use pre-reading techniques to facilitate understanding of the article, including accessing background knowledge in the subject area, establishing your own purpose for reading the material.
* Make sure you understand unfamiliar vocabulary and concepts by using context clues or a dictionary.
* Annotate the text to help you understand important ideas
* Read the article carefully and identify the main idea and important points.
* Pay attention to the author’s purpose and tone.
* Begin your essay with the summary of the article and then lead into the analysis with an effective transition.
* In the analysis, your points should be supported by examples from the text.
* Link your analysis to your response with an effective transition.
* Though your response is subjective, it should reflect a deep level of textual engagement and the thinking of an informed reader and/or critic.
* Revise your draft to achieve accuracy, coherence, and effectiveness.
* Avoid spelling and grammar mistakes.

**Paper Length**: 600-700 words (typed double-spaced)

(Learning outcomes: ENG1101 #1, #2, #3, $4; ENG1101-CO #1, #2, #3, #4, #6)

**#2.1 Pre-reading Guide**

Before you read “Are College Lectures Fair?” by Annie Murphy Paul, briefly respond to the following questions:

1. Just by looking at the title, what do you think the author is going to discuss?
2. Can you think of instances when you felt that some lectures in high school or college took a specific cultural form that favored some people while discriminating against others?
3. Between lectures and active learning activities such as in-class learning exercises and projects, which do you prefer? Why?
4. Briefly describe the best classroom experience you have had in high school or college.

(Learning Outcomes: ENG1101 #3. #4; ENG1101-CO #2, #5, #7)

**#2.2 Pre-reading Guide**

Before you read “Do Higher Education Still Prepare Students for Jobs?” by [Tomas Chamorro-Premuzic](https://hbr.org/search?term=tomas%2520chamorro-premuzic) and [Becky Frankiewicz](https://hbr.org/search?term=becky%2520frankiewicz). Complete the mind map below:

**Skills that prepare you for the job market**

Rate the importance of these skills in a scale of 1 to 10 (1 as the least important and 10 the most important) by putting the number next to each skill (follow up with discussion in groups or pairs).

(Learning outcomes: ENG1101 #3. #4; ENG110-CO #2, #4)

**#3 Reading Quiz**

Answer the following questions about Courtney Rubin’s “Technology and the College Generation.” Make sure that you read the text carefully while answering the questions.

1. What is the main idea of this article?
2. Based on the article, how do students and faculty perceive using emails in college?
3. In the last paragraph, what exactly is the “surprising obstacle?” How does it relate to what the author has previously discussed in the article?
4. In the article, what does Mr. Jones mean by saying “E-mail is a sinkhole where knowledge goes to die”? Do you agree with his statement? Why?

(Leaning Outcomes: ENG1101 #2, #3; ENG110-CO #1 #2, #4, #6)

**#4 Synthesis Argument Essay**

A synthesis is a written discussion that draws on two or more perspectives. As you present your point of view, you also incorporate ideas and arguments from other sources to inform and advance your discussion. These sources are not limited to written texts. You can use websites and multimedia texts.

For this assignment, watch Angela Lee Duckworth’s talk “Grit: The Power of Passion and Perseverance” and read Mike Rose’s “Why Teaching Kids to Have ‘Grit’ Isn’t Always Such a Good Thing.” Take notes as you watch Duckworth’s talk and read Rose’s argument. In the essay, discuss the purpose and key message of each piece and examine the validity of its reasoning. How do the authors support their arguments? Do you agree or disagree with their views? Why? Choose at one other source from the library database or valid academic or informational sites to illustrate your argument and evaluate the claims of both authors. Make sure that your argument demonstrates valid reasoning and your key ideas are supported with evidence and examples found in the texts and/or your own experience. Selectively quote and paraphrase from each source to support your points. Proofread and revise your draft for accuracy, coherence, and effectiveness. MLA documentation format should be used and a works cited page should be included.

**Sources:**

“Grit: The Power of Passion and Perseverance,” by Angela Lee Duckworth

<https://www.ted.com/talks/angela_lee_duckworth_grit_the_power_of_passion_and_perseverance>

 “Why Teaching Kids to Have ‘Grit’ Isn’t Always Such a Good Thing,” by Mike Rose

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2015/05/14/why-teaching-kids-to-have-grit-isnt-always-a-good-thing/?utm_term=.a78f0c111bfd>

**Paper length**: around 700 words (typed double-spaced)

(Leaning Outcomes: ENG1101 #1, #2, #3, #4, #5; ENG110-CO #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6)