

## Criteria for Evaluating RHE 309K Proposals

The RHE 309K proposal should include:

1. A title consisting of no more than 30 characters and spaces.
  - This title should be appealing to undergraduates who might see it among a list of titles in the Course Schedule.
  - Abbreviations are acceptable -- “Rhet” for “Rhetoric,” for example -- as long as the title remains readable.
2. A one-paragraph explanation of the course, *clearly and concisely* describing its content.
3. An outline of the curricular goals and their relation to the general goals for RHE 309K as detailed in the course Instructor Guide: [http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/398t/course\\_guides/309k/course\\_requirements](http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/398t/course_guides/309k/course_requirements)
4. Enumeration and description of the major units in the course, including explanations of the following:
  - The unit’s progression.
  - How the principal blocs within the class relate to one another.
  - How each unit relates to the overall curricular goals.
5. The course reading list, including required textbooks and handbooks, along with a justification for how this content will promote the course goals. For example, carefully selected and varied readings allow *representation* and *rhetorical analysis* of multiple perspectives and support the development of units that reflect the course’s rhetorical goals.

The DRW places two restrictions on course content:

- First, RHE 309K must first and foremost be a course in rhetoric;
  - Second, RHE 309K must require a rhetoric textbook and a handbook that are approved by the department. A list of approved rhetoric textbooks and handbooks is available here: [http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/398t/course\\_guides/309k/course\\_requirements](http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/398t/course_guides/309k/course_requirements). If an instructor wishes to use a textbook and/or handbook that does not appear on this list, s/he must request permission, in writing, from the Associate Chair.
6. A description of the major assignments (including multimodal compositions) that students will complete in the course. These assignments and their progression should reflect:
    - All Writing Flag requirements, as designated by the School of Undergraduate Studies, and detailed online at <http://www.utexas.edu/ugs/core/flags/guidelines/writing>. Among these requirements is revision based on meaningful feedback from the instructor and the students’ peers. The course calendar can demonstrate how peer-review and instructor feedback will be paced/managed during the semester.
    - An attention to the writing process, such as a sequencing of short and long writing assignments to encourage students to do some pre-writing before they tackle a major

- project.
- An effort to teach argumentation by having students analyze and compose according to some rhetorical principles.

7. An explanation of how research will be incorporated into the particular units and the major writing assignments. For example, assignment descriptions can detail research requirements/expectations.

8. A breakdown of how the students' work will be assessed, including--if appropriate--individual assignments with percentages equaling a 100% final grade. This method of assessment should advance the course goals. NB: According to DRW policy, no more than 10% can be allotted to participation, and this judgment must be based on some quantifiable evidence (e.g., counting completed homework assignments).