<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics in Writing: Biomedical Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WRTG 3020, section 077, Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructor and Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor: Don Wilkerson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Phone: 303-492-3606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:Donald.Wilkerson@colorado.edu">Donald.Wilkerson@colorado.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office: Temp Building #1, Rm. 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Hours: T 3:30-5:00; W 12:30-2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU Writing Center Information: <a href="http://www.colorado.edu/PWR/writingcenter.html">http://www.colorado.edu/PWR/writingcenter.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Course Description

There are many possible approaches to a class entitled "Biomedical Ethics." A philosophy course would introduce you to the philosophical theories that are most relevant to the topic, and then have you apply those theories to an analysis of current issues in bioethics. You would very likely read John Stuart Mill on Utilitarianism and selections from Immanuel Kant on his duty based ethical theories. Next you would read current philosophers who work in either the Utilitarian tradition (for instance, Peter Singer) or the Kantian (John Rawls). No doubt you would consider other contemporary philosophical theories and apply all of the above to ethical questions about abortion, genetic engineering, euthanasia, and other enduring concerns.

In a sociology or anthropology course, you would consider how different cultures define “health,” “personal autonomy,” “the authority of healer,” and other relevant concepts. In addition, you would address how class, race and gender influence public health policy in our culture and others. You might also address the relevance of Western ethical and legal constructs to medical research done in non-Western cultures. (For instance, is it ethical to develop an AIDS medication by performing human tests on an African population that will not be able to afford the medication? Do Western ethical concepts like informed consent protect the rights of individual Africans or are they a ruse that allows a rich culture to exploit a poor one? Can we even speak of individual autonomy in cultures that value communal concerns over individual rights?)

There are still other approaches you might take in a biology course devoted to the subject, or a religious studies course with a special emphasis on bioethics. Each approach has its obvious merits, and each approach is worthy of a full semester’s attention. Unfortunately, each is also well beyond what we can do in a semester long writing course.

Most of our course time must be spent addressing matters of form, style, evidence, audience and the writing process. We will certainly address several relevant philosophical and cultural issues, but we will do so in order to create a framework that allows us to discuss the basic elements of an argument and common rhetorical strategies for persuading a skeptical, informed reader.

So instead of actually reading Mill and Kant, we will read about them and learn how their ideas have been synthesized into something called the “Four Principles of Bioethics.” Instead of doing an in depth study of ethical norms across cultures, we will focus on Western ethical and scientific norms and then consider how they apply to clinical and research questions both in our culture and abroad. In short, this course will present a general overview of basic theories and current debates in bioethics as a framework for developing your skills as analytical writers and thinkers.

### Papers and Course Objectives

You are required to write two graded papers in this course. In addition, you will have several un-graded writing assignments: two responses to ethics scenarios, a research prospectus, an annotated bibliography and a few brief worksheets and one-paragraph responses to study questions about the readings.

The first graded paper is patterned after the MCAT writing test. Through the MCAT paper you will learn how to write a clear sentence, a coherent paragraph and make effective transitions between paragraphs. You will also learn how to define terms, clarify unstated assumptions, present evidence in support of an assertion, and respond to counter arguments and objections. (This assignment also offers valuable test taking preparation to students planning to take the MCAT.) I will give you a set of prompts that will speak to a wide range of relevant issues: clinical ethics, research ethics, the impact of technology on patient care and medical ethics, ethical theory in general, the nature of innovation in medicine and research, the nature of law and citizenship, and the nature of leadership.

You will write two preliminary drafts and one final draft of the MCAT paper. Some students will critique your drafts in class; others will critique it in writing. You, in turn, will comment on your classmates’ work. Through the MCAT exercise, you will learn how to draft an argument and how to critique one. You will then apply these skills to your major term project and to your commentary on other students’ projects.

The second graded paper will be written in commonly used form that is widely adaptable to academic, professional and journalistic writing. The major project will help you develop a sense of audience and a sense of how to use writing as a means of defining your place in a professional or academic community. While there are a number of ways you can organize
your term project, most students in the past have either refuted an essay or essays on a relevant current issue; or analyzed a policy, policy proposal or professional code to show why it is unlikely to achieve its stated ends. You will write three preliminary drafts and one final draft of major term project. Your classmates will again critique each draft orally and in writing.

Early in the semester you will complete a number of un-graded assignments that are designed to help you brainstorm a topic for your second paper and do preliminary research for it. You will write a paper prospectus and consult with me about the topic. You will revise your paper topic based upon our consultation and then compile an annotated bibliography on the revised topic. While you will not receive a grade on these assignments, failure to do them, and do them well, will minimize your chances of getting a good grade on your second paper in this class.

In all, the purpose of this course is to teach you how to read and think critically and how to express your thoughts in a rhetorically compelling and convincing way. The specific goals of this course can be subdivided into the following categories:

Rhetorical Knowledge:
- Acquire a “tool kit” of rhetorical terms that will allow you to speak intelligently about the aims and strategies of your paper and the aims and strategies of the papers that you critique
- Learn how to calculate the expectations and relative expertise of your likely audience
- Learn how to emphasize the novelty of your ideas within a given field or the “public mind”
- Enhance your understanding of the specific formal elements of a conventional essay and how to adapt those elements to a specialized medical or academic audience on the one hand, or a general or policy maker audience on the other.
- Refine your skills in presenting scientific and technical principles and analyses in terms that a non-scientist can understand
- Understand how to weigh and employ common rhetorical appeals in both scientific and lay arguments
- Refine your skills in crafting an introduction that focuses the reader’s attention on the issue at hand and the purpose of your essay
- Understand the paragraph form as the basic unit of composition and verbal reasoning
- Refine your skills in crafting a conclusion that places your specific argument in a broader social or intellectual context
- Appreciate writing as tool for building consensus within an informed community

Critical Reading and Thinking:
- Recognize and evaluate a statement of fact, of arguable opinion, of taste and of dogma
- Understand the common types of evidence in an argument
- Understand how unstated assumptions can undermine the validity of an argument
- Refine your ability to state a defensible analytical or argumentative thesis
- Explore advanced means of defending and developing the thesis over the course of a 7-12 page essay
- Review how to summarize a counter-argument or objection fairly and sympathetically
- Learn how to analyze and refute an argument by addressing the validity of its claims, evidence, and unstated assumptions
- Understand how to evaluate the validity, relevance and credibility of academic and non-academic sources in both print and electronic formats

Social and Professional Context:
- Understand the general ethical responsibilities of physician or medical researcher
- Understand the general philosophical foundations of bioethics
- Understand how those philosophical foundations have been assimilated into a practical decision making rubric called “The Four Principles of Bioethics”
- Understand that healthcare professionals frequently have a professional obligation to enter into public debate about healthcare policy
- Understand that health care policy is always developed within a political context
- Understand how the conventions of political argument influence health care policy
- Understand the basic conventions of academic peer review and how they differ from the conventions of journalism and think tank advocacy

Writing Process:
- Learn how to brainstorm ideas for an essay by evaluating your personal interests and knowledge, and by consulting with your peers, professors and other relevant professionals
- Understand the importance of actively pursuing sources and arguments that are counter to your case
- Understand the recursive nature of revision
- Learn how to refine and focus your ideas through the practice of revision
Learn how to present purposeful, direct and tactful oral critiques of your peers’ writing

Writing Conventions:
• Refine your ability to write simple, clear, economical prose
• Learn how to quote, paraphrase and cite sources according to discipline-specific conventions

WORKSHOP FORMAT
This course is a writing workshop. Much of our class time will be spent analyzing and discussing your essays. Every third class period you will post a draft of your work on the CU-Learn website for this course (https://culearn.colorado.edu/webct/entryPageIns.dowebct). Your classmates will download a copy of the draft. Some will insert written commentary into your draft and repost the document on the website. Others will be prepared to offer an oral critique of your work in class. On some days the entire class will discuss your paper; on other days your paper will be discussed in a small group of 6-9 students. The workshop method is designed to:
• Teach you how to analyze and critique the work of others;
• Give you direct audience response so that you can develop a realistic sense of the diverse interests and expectations of your audience;
• Teach you that writing is never a solitary act, but an ongoing dialogue with your collaborators, critics and the wider culture;
• Provide you with a method for drafting and revising your essays in your other courses.

You are expected to write multiple drafts of each essay. Each draft should be presented as if it were a final draft. Each draft must be typed, double-spaced and turned in on time. Late drafts are not accepted. I will comment -- in writing and in class - on each draft. I will grade the final draft only.

DUE DATES (subject to change at my discretion)

• 8/28- Response to Clinical Ethics Scenario
• 9/9- Response to Savior Sibling Scenario
• 10/10- Research Prospectus for Paper #2
• 10/24- Paper #1- MCAT Response
• 10/31- Annotated Bibliography & Summary
• 12/16- Paper #2 – Term Project

Written Critiques of student writing throughout the semester. (Later in the semester, I will hand out workshop schedules with specific posting dates for the drafts of your papers and your written critiques.)

ASSIGNMENT VALUES

• 25% - 2-4 page response to an MCAT question
• 40% - 7-12 page policy analysis or refutation of an analytical or argumentative essay (term project)
• 25% - Daily oral and written critiques of student writing over the course of the semester
• 10% - Minor writing assignments, including ethics scenarios, prospectus, and annotated bibliography.

Additional Requirement - Regular participation in class discussion of texts and student writing. Lack of substantive class participation will result in a full letter grade penalty.

TEXTS
Course readings will be available through the CU-Learn website. (I will also sometimes email readings, hand out packets or refer you to relevant web sites.) Under the Course Content link on the left-hand menu, you will find several folders with a diverse range of readings—essays on rhetoric; background readings on science, ethics and public policy; model student essays; readings on style, mechanics and proper citation form; and other relevant topics. You can also find hyperlinks to a variety of useful guides and resources at: http://www.colorado.edu/PWR/links.html The schedule below contains the specific readings for the course. Don’t panic if some of the readings seem long. You may have four readings on a given day, but many of the essays will be as short as 2-5 pages.

PROVISIONAL SCHEDULE (Subject to Change at My Discretion)
The readings below can be found on the CU Learn website for this course unless otherwise noted in the schedule. Each day’s schedule is subdivided into Reading, Discussion, Writing and Written Peer Review assignments. The assignments below are designed to give you a general outline of the assignments and rationale for each assignment based on the goals of the course. You should expect some small changes to individual assignments and the sequence of assignments. I will send out emails on a weekly basis that will remind you of the assignments and inform you of any changes to the schedule or the content of the assignments. Typically, the emails will also contain a more detailed set of discussion questions than the ones you find below.

WEEK 1: TUESDAY
Course Introduction

Discussion: Course Syllabus and Objectives

THURSDAY
The Principles of Bioethics and Clinical Decision Making

Readings:
Social and Professional Context:
1.) AMA Ethics Scenario - “Terminating a Patient-Physician Relationship.”
2.) “Rights, Duties, Responsibilities” – Markkula Center for Applied Ethics
3.) “The Four Principles of Bioethics” at the University of Washington Medical School Web Site on Bioethics:
**WEEK 2: TUESDAY**

**Reading:**
- *The Healing Ethos and Ethos in Argument*

  **Rhetorical Knowledge:**
  1.) *Silva Rhetoricae*, an online encyclopedia of classical rhetoric at [http://humanities.byu.edu/rhetoric/silva.htm](http://humanities.byu.edu/rhetoric/silva.htm)
  
  Read the links entitled “What is Rhetoric?” “Persuasive Appeals,” “Logos,” “Pathos” and “Ethos”

  **Social and Professional Context:**
  2.) Ethics Scenario: “The Acupuncture Alternative” – Markkula Center
  3.) Ethics Scenario: “Withholding Information at a Patient’s Request” – Beauchamp and Childress (from *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*)
  4.) “The Healing Ethos” from *Practical Medical Ethics* (Oxford Univ Press) – Campbell, Gilbert and Jones
  5.) “Chinese Bioethics” – Bowman and Hui (Canadian Medical Association Journal)

  **Discussion:**
  1.) I will send out a detailed list of questions about the Healing Ethos and its relationship to both medical ethics and the concept of *ethos*.
  2.) Be prepared to discuss both ethics scenarios in light of the readings. Focus on both the most ethical course of action and how the physician should balance rhetorical appeals when he or she discusses options with the patient.
  3.) Food for thought: At what point does persuasion become coercion in a physician-patient relationship?

**No Writing Assignment**

**THURSDAY**

**Reading:**
- *Ethical Abuses in Research and The Belmont Report*

  **Social and Professional Context:**
  1.) Ethics Scenario: “Informed Consent” from *Ethical Issues in International Health Research* at [http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/bioethics/](http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/bioethics/)
  2.) “Evolution of Protection of Human Participants in Research”
  3.) “The Foundations of Bioethics” – Karen Gervais
  4.) “The Belmont Report” (with my annotations)
  5.) Excerpt from the Code of Federal Regulations 45CFR46, the so called, “Common Rule”

  **Discussion:**
  1.) What is the difference between a rule and a principle?
  2.) Be prepared to discuss the scenario in light of the various readings. Make your case regarding what you think is the best, most ethical course of action.

**No Writing Assignment**

**WEEK 3: TUESDAY**

**Reading:**
- *Philosophical Foundations for the Principles of Bioethics: Kant and Utilitarianism*

  **Social and Professional Context:**
  1.) Ethics Scenario: “The Nash Case: Are Savior Siblings Ethical?” -- Robert F Card (with minor changes by me)
  2.) Introduction to *Biomedical Ethics* – Mappes & DeGrazia
  3.) Videos Lectures on Kant and Utilitarianism at:
  - [http://ethics.sandiego.edu/video/Theory/Kant/Kant_rm.html](http://ethics.sandiego.edu/video/Theory/Kant/Kant_rm.html)
  - [http://ethics.sandiego.edu/theories/Utilitarianism/](http://ethics.sandiego.edu/theories/Utilitarianism/)

  **Writing:** Write three separate responses to the following questions (3-4 pages total)
  1.) How would a Utilitarian respond to the Nash Scenario?
  2.) How would a Kantian respond to the Nash Scenario?
  3.) What is your opinion about the ethicality of savior siblings and why?

  **Discussion:** I will send out a detailed list of reading/discussion questions for the Mappes reading. We will discuss those and your written responses to the scenario.

**THURSDAY**

**Reading:**
- *The Concept of Justice in Bioethics and the Right (or not) to Healthcare*

  **Social and Professional Context:**
  2.) Pay special attention to the first 7 pages wherein she focuses on ethical theory. The last 9 pages focus more on Canadian law.
  3.) “Warning: Bioethics May Be Hazardous to Your Health” by Ronald Bailey at:
  4.) “The Ethics of Excess” by Dick Lamm
  5.) “The Cost of Care: Two Troublesome Cases in Health Care Ethics” by Christopher Armstrong and Robin Whitlock

  **Discussion:**
  1.) In your view and based on the readings, do you think that healthcare is a right?
  2.) Is the debate over universal healthcare best addressed as a matter of right or a matter of practical economic effect?
  3.) I will send out a set of questions that direct your attention to various points in the Friesen essay. She does a very nice job of summarizing both the Libertarian and Egalitarian view of the right to healthcare and offers an interesting refutation of the Libertarian view.
  4.) I will also send out a couple of questions about the Bailey
### WEEK 4: TUESDAY

#### The Writing Process: How to Brainstorm Topics for Your Term Projects

**Readings:**
- 1.) “Assignment Sheet for Your Major Projects”
- 2.) “Bioterrorism and Science: The Censorship of Scientific Journals Will Do More Harm than Good” – Ryan Nielsen
- 3.) Model Prospectus Worksheet for “Bioterrorism and Science”
- 4.) Model Prospectus and intro for “Unapproved and Unregulated: Dissolving Body Fat in America” — Ashley Moore
- 5.) Model Prospectus and intro for “The Gene Patenting Controversy” – Suzanna Fiala
- 6.) “Why Adult Stem Cells Are Not Sufficient” – Adam Mitchell (The Mitchell essay includes annotations that explain the essay’s form and strategies in terms that we discussed during our two last classes.)
- 7.) Intro and background to “Elective C-Sections: Do Woman Have A Right to Demand a Procedure?” – Jordan Schneider

**Discussion:**
1.) Come in with questions about the Assignment Sheet and the various brainstorming recommendations within it.
2.) Note the differences between the various papers and the prospectuses for them.
3.) Note how Schneider couches her case in terms of the four principles of bioethics.

**Writing:**
There is no writing assignment for today. Your prospectus worksheet will be due during week seven (see below).

### THURSDAY

#### Facts, Inferences, Intentionality

**Readings:**
- 1.) “Speech Acts” – Kent Bach (from the Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy [http://online.sfsu.edu/~kbach/spchacts.html](http://online.sfsu.edu/~kbach/spchacts.html))
- 2.) Brief selections from “The Building Blocks of Social Reality” – John Searle (from The Construction of Social Reality)
- 3.) “Facts, Opinions, Value Judgments and Writing as a Collaborative Act” -- Donald Wilkerson
- 4.) *Silva Rhetoricae*, “enthymeme”
- 5.) “Facts and Opinions Discussion Assignment” – Wilkerson

**Discussion:**
Be prepared to discuss the 18 statements in the Facts and Opinions discussion Assignment in light of the above readings. Tell me whether the phrasing of the statement makes it a *brute fact*, an *institutional fact*, a *defensible inference*, an *indefensible assertion*, or a *statement of dogma*. Revise the indefensible assertions so that they are defensible.

**Writing:**
I will send out an email that assigns one statement to each student. Write a one-paragraph analysis of it according to the questions contained in #5 above. You will also lead class discussion of the statement.

Be sure to incorporate what you learn from this assignment in your response to the prospectus worksheet. Be sure that your provisional thesis and reasons in the worksheet are stated as defensible inferences that prepare you to analyze a text, ethics code, event, etc.

Drop by office hours if you want to discuss paper ideas.

### WEEK 5: TUESDAY

#### Model Student MCAT Responses

**Readings:**
- 1.) Model Student MCAT Responses
- 2.) Topics for Your First Paper

**Discussion:**
8.) Rack the sample responses from best to worst and be prepared to defend your ranking. Identify specific elements of each paper that are either praiseworthy or problematic. I will note your comments on the board, and by the end of the class, you will have defined the elements of an “A” quality response. I will also call your attention to common problems and mistakes in the sample responses.

9.) Be prepared to identify your four favorite prompts in the “Topics for Your First Paper” reading. I will assign one of your four favorites as the topic of your first paper. I will also assign you to a posting/workshop group. I will distribute a posting schedule on Wed that assigns you to a group, assigns 6 principal readers to each author and includes a detailed set of questions about logic, form and style that will allow the readers to focus their analysis of each paper.

### THURSDAY

#### How Academic and Think Tank Scholarship Influences Public Policy

**Readings:**
- 1.) The intro section of “Trans Fats: How Two Think Tank Advocates Misrepresent the Relevant Science – Jim Margolis
- 2.) The intro section of “The ABCs of AIDS” by Taryn Tindall

**Writing:**
I will send out a detailed set of questions on think tanks, their political influence, how they differ from academic presses and journals, and their often problematic influence on science policy.

2.) I will also send out a set of questions that direct your attention to how Margolis, Tyndall and other students have used today’s reading to brainstorm ideas for their major projects.

3.) Feel free to relate times when you have seen group think at work in the university or other venues.

**Writing:**
Group One will post a first draft of their MCAT on CU Learn
### WEEK 6: TUESDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Critical Reading and Thinking:</th>
<th>Thoroughly read the student essays for workshop discussion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td>Everyone in class should be prepared to discuss all 6 essays in terms of the reader’s questions I emailed last week. While the principal readers will lead the discussion, EVERYONE in the class should be prepared to say something brilliant, immediately about each essay. Pay special attention to the author’s preliminary clarification of terms and assumptions and the degree of detail in the author’s core illustration of the prompt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Peer Review:</td>
<td>Select principal readers should insert comments into the author’s word doc and repost the document on CU-Learn by the beginning of class. Refer to the Workshop Groups and Readers sheet I emailed you for specific directions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td>Group Two will post a first draft of their MCAT paper on CU-Learn by 4:00 pm on Wednesday.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THURSDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading:</th>
<th>Critical Reading and Thinking:</th>
<th>Thoroughly read the student essays for workshop discussion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Knowledge:</td>
<td>tba on paragraph construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td>Everyone in class should be prepared to discuss all 6 essays in terms of the reader’s questions I emailed last week. I am not kidding about the “brilliant, immediately” rule. We only have 12 minutes to cover each paper. Make comments about paragraph coherence, as well as the author’s preliminary clarification of terms and assumptions and the degree of detail in the author’s core illustration of the prompt. Be on the ball; move fast.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Peer Review:</td>
<td>Select principal readers should insert comments into the author’s word doc and repost the document on CU-Learn by the beginning of class. Refer to the Workshop Groups and Readers sheet I emailed you for specific directions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td>Group Three will post a first draft of their MCAT paper on CU-Learn by Midnight Friday.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WEEK 7: TUESDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading:</th>
<th>Critical Reading and Thinking:</th>
<th>Thoroughly read the student essays for workshop discussion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Knowledge:</td>
<td>Silva Rhetoricae, the links on “metabasis,” “anthypophora,” “rhetorical questions.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.)</td>
<td>“A Very Short History of Bad Writing” – Joseph Williams (from Style: Toward Clarity and Grace)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.)</td>
<td>“The CU Writing Center and Writing as a Collaborative Act” – Wilkerson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td>Come in with questions about the readings and be prepared to discuss and defend your revisions in the worksheet bundled with the “Editing for Brevity and Clarity” reading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Peer Review:</td>
<td>Select principal readers should insert comments into the author’s word doc and repost the document on CU-Learn by the beginning of class. Refer to the Workshop Groups and Readers sheet I emailed you for specific directions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THURSDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading:</th>
<th>Writing Conventions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.)</td>
<td>“Editing for Brevity and Clarity” -Wilkerson (my expanded take on Richard Lanham’s “paramedic method” for revising prose.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.)</td>
<td>“A Very Short History of Bad Writing” – Joseph Williams (from Style: Toward Clarity and Grace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.)</td>
<td>The CU Writing Center and Writing as a Collaborative Act – Wilkerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td>Come in with questions about the readings and be prepared to discuss and defend your revisions in the worksheet bundled with the “Editing for Brevity and Clarity” reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written:</td>
<td>1.) Complete the worksheet at the end of “Editing for Brevity and Clarity.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.)</td>
<td>I will hand out a sign up sheet for one- on-one conferences in my office about your prospectus worksheet. I will be available most of the day tomorrow and at various times next week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.)</td>
<td>Make an appointment by the end of the week with a Writing Center consultant to review the last draft of you MCAT paper. You can make an appointment two weeks in advance at <a href="http://www.colorado.edu/PWR/writingcenter.html">http://www.colorado.edu/PWR/writingcenter.html</a> Your paper is due in two weeks and two days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FRIDAY (Electronic Submission)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading:</th>
<th>Prospectus Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td>Conference Prospectus Conference. Begin today and continue through next week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td>Post your completed Prospectus Worksheet on CU-Learn a half hour before your appointment with me. If you plan to meet with me next week, be sure that your prospectus worksheet is posted by midnight today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WEEK 8: TUESDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading:</th>
<th>Compiling an Annotated Bibliography and Judging the Credibility of Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### THURSDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading:</th>
<th>Anticipating and Answering Objections (Workshop: Group One, Full Draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Reading:

### Writing Conventions and Critical Reading and Thinking:

2. Cornell web site on evaluating sources: [http://www.library.cornell.edu/olinuris/ref/research/tutorial.html](http://www.library.cornell.edu/olinuris/ref/research/tutorial.html)
3. Model Annotated Bibliography on the topic of Group Think – Wilkerson and various web resources
4. “How to Write a Summary” – Wilkerson

### Discussion:

1. Come in with questions about the readings. I will highlight basic aspects of the annotation form and the most important links on the Cornell sites.
2. Is academic peer review subject to groupthink? Why or why not?
3. Clarification of new workshop groups and the use of small group workshops.

### Writing:

1. You have an annotated bibliography with 7-10 entries due in approximately two weeks, on Friday of week 10.
2. Group One should post revised full drafts of the MCAT paper by 4:00 pm Wednesday.

---

## WEEK 9: TUESDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choosing the Right Word (Workshop: Group Two, Full Draft)</th>
<th>Revising Your Final Draft (Workshop: Group Three, Full Draft)</th>
<th>MCAT Paper Due Friday at Midnight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading:</strong> <strong>Critical Reading and Thinking:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Read two essays for full class discussion and two for small group discussion thoroughly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Conventions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “Wordy and Obscure Phrases in Lay and Scientific Prose” – Wilkerson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Discussion:** We will do a combination of full class and small group workshop. The entire class will discuss two papers. The other four will be discussed in small groups of 9, two papers in each group.

**Written Peer Review:** All six principal readers should post comments on CU-Learn by the beginning of class.

**Writing:** Group Three should post revised full drafts of the MCAT paper by 4:00 on Wednesday.

---

## WEEK 10: TUESDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Arguments: Those Who Would Heavily Regulate or Prohibit Human Bioengineering; or, how professional writers cover the themes and employ the strategies we used in the MCAT paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading:</strong> <strong>Social and Professional Context &amp; Rhetorical Knowledge:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. “Ideological 'Matrix' Regarding the Regulation of Bio-technology” – Wilkerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “Luddite” – Encyclopedia Britannica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Excerpts from the Vatican Statement on Biotechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “How to Regulate Science” – Francis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading:** **Social and Professional Context & Rhetorical Knowledge:**

1. “Ethics and Ideology” – Gregory Stock, from Redesigning Humans
2. “Are Humans Obsolete” – Langdon Winner (Winner responds to Stock)
3. “We are Plenty Good Enough” – Interview with Bill McKibben

**Writing:** Please Post an annotated bibliography of 7-10 entries by midnight.

**Reading:** I will send out a new posting schedule with new principal readers. The schedule will contain a specific set of questions for...
Fukuyama, from *Our Posthuman Future* (pay close attention to his refutation of James Watson on pp. 7-8 and his response to objections re: international regulation on pp. 8-11)

5.) “What’s Wrong with Enhancement” -- Michael J. Sandel

6.) “Biotech Century” -- Jeremy Rifkin

**Discussion:**

1.) I will send out an email that assigns 4-5 student-critics to each essay. You will lead class discussion on the essay.

2.) With which of the four essays do you most agree?

3.) Did any of their arguments change your initial views about bioengineering?

4.) Do any of the essays, apart from the Vatican statement, contain faith-based claims? Do such claims enhance or undermine the argument?

---

**WEEK 11: TUESDAY**

**The Essay Form**

Rhetorical Knowledge:

1.) “Form and the Essay” – Paul Murphy

2.) “Analyzing Arguments” -- Wilkerson

3.) “The Nursing Crisis in the Developing World”- Chaguturu and Vallabhaneni (with my annotations re: formal and structural components)

4.) “One and Two Part Arguments from Foreign Affairs” (intros with my annotations)

5.) Model Student Essay: “Parental Notification Laws: Who are We Protecting?” Leah Wilson (with my annotations)

6.) “Parental Notification Laws” in first draft format with annotations.

7.) Listen to my voice commentary on CU Learn that explains why “Learning to Kill, Learning to Heal” is a “C+” essay.

8.) Annotated paragraphs of “The Economics of Medical Malpractice” that illustrate a “B” quality developmental section.

**Discussion:**

1.) We will discuss the basic form you will use in your essays and the Wilson and Chaguturu essays as a model of that form.

2.) Be sure to listen to my comments on “Learning to Kill, Learning to Heal” and read my comments on “Medical Malpractice.” They are intended to illustrate my grading standards for the second paper. The various model student essays we have read throughout the class illustrate the components of an “A” paper.

**Writing:** Group One will post an introductory section on CU-Learn by 4:00 pm Wednesday.

---

**WEEK 12: TUESDAY**

**THURSDAY**

**Writing Introductions**

(Workshop: Group One, Intro)

Rhetorical Knowledge:

1.) *Silva Rhetoricae*, the links on “arrangement,” “epanodos,” “anticategoria,” “metastasis,” “procatalepsis,” “diasyrmus,” “paromologia,” “elenchus,” “erotema.”

**Discussion:**

1.) I will send out an email that assigns 4 student-critics to each essay. You will lead class discussion on the essay.

2.) I will send out a more detailed set of questions that call your attention to the various authors’ use of the tropes of refutation that I asked you to look up in *Silva Rhetoricae*.

3.) Note, too, how the authors use the paragraph form to carry on a critical dialogue with their opponents—a summary paragraph followed by a response or refutation in a separate paragraph.

**Writing:**

1.) One-paragraph to one-page response to this question: Of all the essays we’ve read on the subject, which do you find the most convincing? Did the essay or essays change your initial view or reinforce it?

---

**Writing:** Group Two will post an introductory section on CU-Learn by midnight Friday.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adapting Swales CARS Model to General Essays (Workshop: Group Two, Intro)</th>
<th>How to Write a Background Section (Workshop: Group Three, Intro)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Reading:**  
  Rhetorical Knowledge (Review Reading):  
  1.) Read “Swales CARS model from ‘Research Articles in English.’” (Two page excerpt)  
  Critical Reading and Thinking:  
  2.) Thoroughly read the student essays for workshop discussion and analyze them according to the reader’s questions I emailed to you.  
  **Discussion:**  
  1.) Make recommendations to the authors of a general essay about how they might incorporate the various moves of the CARS model into their intros.  
  2.) Full Class discussion of the student intros (brilliant, and immediate).  
  **Written Peer Review:** Select principal readers should insert comments into the author’s word doc and repost the document on CU-Learn by the beginning of class. Refer to the Workshop Groups and Readers sheet I emailed you for specific directions.  
  **Writing:** Group Three will post an introductory section on CU-Learn by 4:00 Wednesday. | **Reading:**  
  Rhetorical Knowledge:  
  1.) “How to Write a Background Section in a General Essay” -- Wilkerson  
  Critical Reading and Thinking: Thoroughly read the student essays for workshop discussion and analyze them according to the reader’s questions I emailed to you.  
  **Discussion:** Full class discussion of the intros (brilliant, etc.).  
  **Written Peer Review:** Select principal readers should insert comments into the author’s word doc and repost the document on CU-Learn by the beginning of class. Refer to the Workshop Groups and Readers sheet I emailed you for specific directions. |

**WEEK 13: TUESDAY**

- **Paraphrase and Citation:** (Make an Appointment at the Writing Center ASAP; No workshop today)

**Reading Writing Conventions and Rhetorical Knowledge:**  
1.) Sections 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 of “The Harvard Guide for Writing with Sources” – Gordon Harvey  
2.) “Quoting and Paraphrasing,” Univ of Wisconsin, Madison. Pay close attention to “Successful and Unsuccessful Paraphrases.”  
3.) Paraphrase Exercise

**Writing Center Reminder:** Make an appointment now to meet with a consult during the last two weeks of the semester: [http://www.colorado.edu/PWR/writingcenter.html](http://www.colorado.edu/PWR/writingcenter.html). They get booked-up fast, so don’t hesitate.

**Writing:**  
1.) Complete the paraphrase exercise (entire class).  
2.) By 4:00 Wednesday, Group One should post a revised intro, background section and two developmental sections  
3.) Be sure to cite sources in the text and use discipline-specific attribution phrases to introduce quotes and paraphrases. You do not need a polished works cited page for this draft, but please put together a basic works cited sheet with author, title, publication or URL.

**THURSDAY**

- **How to Write a Developmental Section** (Workshop: Group One, Second Draft)

**Reading:**  
**Critical Reading and Thinking:**  
1.) Read two essays for full class discussion and two for small group discussion thoroughly.  
**Rhetorical Knowledge:**  
2.) “How to Write a Developmental Section” -- Wilkerson

**Discussion:** We will do a combination of full class and small group workshop. The entire class will discuss two papers. The other four will be discussed in small groups of 9, two papers in each group.

**Written Peer Review:** All six principal readers should post comments on CU-Learn by the beginning of class.

**Writing:**  
1.) By midnight on Friday, Group Two should post a revised intro, background section and two developmental sections.  
2.) Be sure to cite sources in the text and use discipline-specific attribution phrases to introduce quotes and paraphrases. You do not need a polish works cited page for this draft, but please put together a basic works cited sheet with author title and publisher or URL.

**THANKSGIVING BREAK: 11/24-11/28 NO CLASSES**

**WEEK 14: TUESDAY**

- **Developmental Sections (cont.)** (Workshop: Group Two, Second Draft)

**Reading:**  
**Critical Reading and Thinking:**  
1.) Read two essays for full class discussion and two for small group discussion thoroughly.  
**Rhetorical Knowledge (Optional reading for those writing research proposals):**  
2.) “Writing Research Proposals” – Anne Penrose and

**THURSDAY**

- **The Evolving Thesis and Strategies for Revision** (Workshop: Group Three, Second Draft)

**Reading:**  
**Critical Reading and Thinking:**  
1.) Read two essays for full class discussion and two for small group discussion thoroughly.  
**Rhetorical Knowledge:**  
2.) Selections from “Making a Thesis Evolve” – David Rosenwasser and Jill Stephen
3.) NASA Grant Proposal: “3-D Cloud Morphology and the Retrieval of Optical Depth” – Philip Gabriel

Discussion: We will do a combination of full class and small group workshop. The entire class will discuss two papers. The other four will be discussed in small groups of 9, two papers in each group.

Written Peer Review: All six principal readers should post comments on CU-Learn by the beginning of class.

Writing: 1.) By 4:00 on Wednesday, Group Two should post a revised intro, background section and two developmental sections.
2.) Be sure to cite sources in the text and use discipline-specific attribution phrases to introduce quotes and paraphrases. You do not need a polish works cited page for this draft, but please put together a basic works cited sheet with author title and publisher or URL.

WEEK 15: TUESDAY

How to Write a Conclusion (Workshop: Group One and Two, Full Draft)

Reading:
Critical Reading and Thinking:
1.) Read two essays for full class discussion and two for small group discussion thoroughly.

Rhetorical Knowledge:
2.) “How to Write a Conclusion” –Wilkerson

Discussion: We will discuss the papers of Group One and Two in small group workshops.

Written Peer Review: All six principal readers should post comments on CU-Learn by the beginning of class.

Writing: Group Three should post a revised full draft of by 4:00 on Wednesday. Include a rough draft of your works cited page.

THURSDAY

Final Comments and FCQs (Workshop: Group Three Full Draft)

Reading:
Critical Reading and Thinking:
1.) Read two essays for full class discussion and two for small group discussion thoroughly.

Discussion:
1.) We will discuss Groups Three’s papers in small group workshop.
2.) I will allow 15 minutes at the end of class for final comments and FCQs.

Written Peer Review: All six principal readers should post comments on CU-Learn by the beginning of class.

Finals Week: TUESDAY

Major Projects are Due in my Office and on CU Learn on Tuesday 12/16, between 4:00 and 5:00. (There is no final exam.)

GRADING

Grading in WRTG courses is rigorous; however, you are not predestined to receive a C or worse, nor is it impossible to get an A. To receive an A, your papers must defend a modestly novel thesis with relevant evidence, in response to likely objections and counter arguments. Your papers must be logically and formally coherent and conform to the conventions of grammar, diction and citation. Your best means of getting a good grade is to revise your essays according to the recommendations that your classmates and I give you during the workshops. That said, you are not guaranteed an A just because you follow our advice. Your relative success or failure is a function of your ability as a writer and thinker and the amount of effort you put into your work.

Please note: This is not a course in basic grammar and syntax. I assume that you have a working understanding of English grammar and usage. If you don’t, you will struggle in this course. If such is the case, I will do my best to direct you to people and resources that can help you.

PLAGIARISM

Do not plagiarize. Plagiarism is the use of someone else’s words or ideas without crediting them as the source. I will report all incidents of academic misconduct to the Honor Code Council. Students who are found to be in violation of the academic integrity policy will be subject to both academic and non-academic sanctions (including but not limited to university probation, suspension, or expulsion). In order to discourage plagiarism, I will not allow you to change the topic of your major project unless there is time to do two workshops and extensive revisions of the new topic.

ATTENDANCE POLICY
Because this course is a writing workshop, your class participation is essential to every student’s success in the course. Thus, it is imperative that you attend class. I allow three absences -- excused or unexcused. At the fourth absence, I will grade you down one full letter grade, and one full letter grade for each absence thereafter. I don't make a distinction between excused and unexcused absences. (Feel free to tell me why you missed class--minor illnesses, heavy traffic, failure to set your alarm clock, etc.--but do not assume that I am excusing your absence just because you offered an explanation.) It is your responsibility to make sure that such things don’t happen more than three times over the course of the semester. I only make exceptions to the three-absence rule in the case of an extraordinary situation -- i.e. death in the family, prolonged illness, injury, etc. In those instances, I require a written verification of your excuse in order for you to qualify for the exception. Typically, absences due to major religious holidays are also exceptions to the policy. Please inform me of such early in the semester. (Be advised that weekly 420 observances of the Church of Cannabis Almighty will not be accommodated.)

I will take attendance at the beginning of the class. If you are late, you will be marked absent. It is your responsibility to remind me—at the end of the class period—to strike your absence from the record. If you wait until the next class period, I will not strike your absence from the record and it will count against your three-absence allowance.

THE CU WRITING CENTER

I strongly encourage you to discuss your paper projects for this class and other classes with the consultants at the CU Writing Center. The consultants can also help you with writing projects that are not a part of your conventional course work—personal statements for graduate school applications, independent grant proposals, resumes, cover letters, etc. One of the aims of this course is to give you a vocabulary of rhetorical terms that will allow you to express your intentions to a Writing Center consultant. You can find out more about the services offered by the Writing Center and schedule an appointment with a consultant at: http://www.colorado.edu/PWR/writingcenter.html.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

If you have specific disabilities and require accommodations, please let me know by the end of the second class so that your learning needs may be appropriately met. Disability Services determines accommodations based on documented disabilities. Contact: 303-492-8671, Willard 322, and http://www.Colorado.EDU/disabilityservices.