Instructor: Tobin von der Nuell  
Office: Temporary Building #1 (TB1), Room 02A

Telephone:  
Office: (303) 492-4396 (+ voice-mail)  
Home: (303) 772-5178  
Before you opt to E-mail me, call me. Call my office only during my office hours; all other times, call me at home—leave a message and I will return your call as quickly as I can. Please feel free to call me at home between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. My E-mail address is vondernu@colorado.edu. If you choose to E-mail, please consider the audience—your writing instructor—and proceed accordingly.

Office Hours:  
MW 12:51-2:30, and by appointment

Rationale:  
Below are the key criteria for an upper-division core writing course, as specified by the Colorado Commission of Higher Education, with explanations on how this course addresses them:

Extend Rhetorical Understanding. WRTG 3020 advances your rhetorical knowledge and awareness. This applies both to how you approach contemporary American short stories and how you write about them. In reading stories you not only analyze how they work as literature—through structure, use of language, symbol, character, plot and theme—but also how they are rhetorically designed to appeal to certain audiences. How does each author draw in or distance the audience from the main protagonist as he or she encounters conflict and, in succeeding or failing to overcome it, grow or change from the experience?

Your own critical writing on these stories will alert you to rhetorical choices you can make to communicate your ideas to your audience (various discourse communities)—how, for instance, you might develop your thesis by making appeals to pathos, ethos, logos, and how you can best support your claims with valid reasons, sound underlying assumptions (inferences), and convincing evidence.

Extend Experience in the Writing Process. This course offers an opportunity to improve writing through multiple drafts that respond to the perspectives of other readers. You will revise your work by considering the class’s and the instructor’s suggestions. This will confirm that writing is a collaborative enterprise. It is also a process that takes advantage of current technologies: exchanging work and consulting on writing via E-mail, as well as accessing research resources through the Internet. The class also utilizes audio and video materials, ranging from listening to authors read short stories on www.NewYorker.com or iTunes (and then writing short critiques on them) to receiving further instruction in the editing process from a video such as Richard Lanham’s “Revising Prose.”

Master Writing Conventions. By now you should have mastered the conventions of grammar and punctuation; this course enables you to hone those skills. On a more advanced level, you will reflect on how to use style, tone, and diction appropriate to your audience (discourse community) and gain practice in documenting your evidence correctly.
Demonstrate advanced comprehension of content within a specific discipline. To communicate your insights into the dramatic texts, you will learn specialized terms from the study of literature. As you frame questions and develop theses for analysis and argument, you may choose to extend beyond the discourse community of students of literature, developing your topic along interdisciplinary lines. For instance, if you are majoring in sociology or psychology, you will be encouraged to write on a topic arising from the stories that draws on the knowledge and terminology of that discipline but that can still communicate successfully to a non-expert audience.

Overview: Please understand this is neither a course in literary criticism, nor one solely in the study of the short story. The purpose of this course is to help you develop your ability to critically read; critically think; and write clear, interesting, persuasive, logically organized, and thesis-driven essays. The intent of the course, in fact, is to sharpen your skills of communicating, in writing, a thought from your head into the heads of others. We will accomplish these tasks by focusing on the three modes of academic rhetoric: description, analysis, and argument. Developing these skills is not easy. It takes practice, often in the form of several revisions. You will write at least one short assignment and two full essays of roughly 3-5 pages each. You will not be writing short stories for this class.

Texts: 1. Your papers, with copies for classmates as assigned. (Budget for copies.)

2. Course Packet/Miscellaneous handouts (Bring to Class Each Day) -- the course packet contains content materials, namely the short stories we will read this semester, as well as readings in rhetoric, in particular materials on literary terms for discussing stories and chapters which explain the shape of a story and its elements—character, plot and theme. The packet also contains several short critical essays on Updike’s “A&P.” It also provides critical writing strategies from both Rosenwasser and Stephen’s Writing Analytically (Asking “so what?” to derive a thesis) and Graff and Birkenstein’s They Say, I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing (Metacommentary, metadiscourse). Finally, it provides a number of exercises in grammar, punctuation, and editing.

3. How to Read Literature Like a Professor, Thomas C. Foster – though the title sounds incredibly pretentious, the book is anything but. It functions to demystify the rhetorical strategies authors use to construct a short story. The book provides not only intelligent methods for recognizing patterns, subtext, intertextuality, and allusions but also strategies to argue why recognizing such things helps to “de-code” character and thematic meanings within stories. This is an excellent and accessible rhetoric for critically reading and writing about short stories.


Course Material (A Warning): The course will deal in contemporary short stories from such sources as the Best American Short Stories series, The New Yorker, Harper’s Magazine, and The Atlantic. The stories often contain a realistic portrayal of the world around us, and since stories are created through conflict, some of them will contain graphic yet
honest insight into a variety of sometimes uncomfortable subject matter, including substance abuse; emotional, physical, sexual abuse; depression; violence; death; sexuality; infidelity; family dysfunction; and the like.

There is the chance that this material might not sit well with everyone intending to take the course. On the matter, my position fits well with Tobias Wolff’s, and his introduction to *The Vintage Book of Contemporary American Stories*. In it, he writes:

> As it happens, many of the stories in this book confront difficult material: violence, sickness, alcoholism, sexual exploitation, marital breakup. Well, so do we. I have never been able to understand the complaint that a story is “depressing” because of its subject matter. What depresses me are stories that don’t seem to know these things go on, or hide them in resolute chiperness; “witty” stories that flog you with transcendence. Please. We’re grown-ups now, we get to stay in the kitchen when the other grown-ups talk.

> Far from being depressed, my own reaction to stories like these is exhilaration, both at the honesty and the art. The art gives shape to what the honesty discovers, and allows us to face what in truth we were already afraid of anyway. It lets us know we aren’t alone.

> These are serious stories, but hardly grave.

I would hope no one would drop the course because of the material, but that is a decision you will each have to make.

**Rhyme and Reason of Assignments:**

For the course you will write three papers: Short Assignment, Paper 2, and Paper 3. Each builds into the next and each successive paper is more demanding than the last; I take a very hands-on approach for the Short Assignment and a very hands-off approach for Paper 3. The final exam in the course is Paper 3. Though all three papers will help to establish your course grade, I will look more closely at, and weigh more heavily, the work you do for Paper 3 to decide your final grade. In other words, the course encourages you to grow as a writer, testing your abilities but allowing you room to make and learn from mistakes early on without significant penalty.

Paper 1—Short Assignment: I control this paper and limit the choices you have. Your job with this first assignment entails critically reading, as you work through the design of a short story for you to understand its basic shape (the “plot line,” if you will). From there, you will delve into how to ask questions of the short story that require you not to rewrite it (descriptive plot summary), but to frame an argument. You will also derive inferences (analysis) in your efforts to use textual evidence to effectively support your arguable claims, your theses. The audience for the short assignment will be me, and only me; I want you to actively shape your entire rhetorical approach to that audience in order to establish a credible ethos. You must strategize about voice, types of evidence and examples, consider what this audience may already know or not know about your topic and what attitudes this audience may already have that might impede or facilitate his response. You each will have two peer review workshops for Part One, two closed paragraphs on two of three stories.
Part two, a more complete essay shaped from one of the closed paragraphs, you will write on your own and submit for a grade.

Paper 2: You will have much more freedom with this first full paper. You will pick one of four stories to write about, and you will frame your own argument (your own issue and thesis). You will begin to consider more completely counter arguments, counter objections and how you will defend effectively against them. Your audience will be the entire class: a group of literary stars well read in the subject matter but who likely has differing opinions regarding your issue/thesis and its defense, and who bring various other discourse communities to the table. I will play a less controlling role for Paper 2 than I was with the Short Assignment Paper, but I certainly will help you to shape your paper with issue ideas, wordings for your thesis, reasons why/evidence to help you defend your position, counter evidence for you to consider, and/or conclusion ideas. You each will have two peer review workshops, one regarding the shape of your argument, and the other as a full rough draft of the argument.

Paper 3: Your final exam, if you will. Again, you will choose one of four stories to write about, and you will derive your own issue and thesis. You will have to defend against counter claims and you will have to shape well your paper. Your audience will be the editor of a literary magazine of your choosing, a professional and academic audience who understands fluently the shape of a literary argument but who may or may not know well the story you will be writing about. As this paper will stand as your final, I will not offer issue ideas, thesis statements, or evidence to support your claims. I will, however, offer counter claims that you must defend against; that is, my job will entail working to have you question what is and is not working well in the shape/intent of the paper. Like Paper 2, you will have two peer reviewed workshops for this assignment.

For all three papers, you are encouraged to further your knowledge of the stories by doing on-line research. Though most of the stories are too contemporary to have much written about them, you ought to discover what, if anything, others are arguing about the pieces. Research, of course, is a good method to discover counter evidence, through the various readings of any one story. Furthermore, most (if not all) stories make references or allude to other subject matter (historical events, real people, written works, movies, songs, so on). As such, these works become part of the data we must learn to read and analyze well, and you are encouraged to explore, via research, how such material might bring new meanings to the stories themselves.

Writing Concepts to take away from the Course:

1. Good writers will think not so much about themselves (what they like) as they will about their audience (discourse community) and their intentions for writing to that audience.
2. The act of writing is an act of dialogue, and the writer must anticipate and deal with readers’ questions and objections.
3. The writer should structure as a reader thinks, generally working from a point instead of towards one. (There are a few exceptions, such as a lab report.)
4. Written communication by its very definition assumes that readers are not psychic, and cannot understand something unless that something is actually there in the text.

5. It is a strength of an essay, and not a weakness, for the writer to help readers understand and follow a clear line of thought, through clear transitions and clearly-set-out supporting points.

6. In stating a point early and clearly, the writer is not “giving away too much.”

7. The desire to “create suspense” is a lousy excuse for a structureless or underdeveloped essay.

8. Few readers will continue to read what they already know or could learn from an earlier primary source; readers read essays because they want to learn something new, something original—what the writer “thinks,” and why.

9. Writing is a process, one of continually re-questioning, reshaping, and revising; all writing is improvable, and therefore revision is a means to success, not a mark of failure: a sign of strength and not of weakness.

10. Grammar, spelling, and punctuation matter: whether done correctly or not, they tell readers much about the writer’s credibility.

11. No matter how general, nebulous or abstract the subject matter, specificity and concrete details are at the heart of all good writing.

12. There is a big difference between an essay that seems impressive because it is incomprehensible, and one that is impressive because it has clarity, purpose, and development, and therefore leads to thinking on the part of the reader.

13. Although good writers attune themselves to their audience, all writers have a personal voice and it is something to be encouraged, not denied or exorcised (by writing like a textbook or aping the styles of others).

14. The world is comprised of an infinite number of data sets waiting to be made sense of beyond their descriptive makeup.

15. Outside of your undergraduate requirements, few people will care about “what you know”—facts; many people, however, will care greatly about what you can do with what you know—analyze, argue, problem-solve. Throughout life, whether in an academic, professional, or civic setting, you will be required to demonstrate it in writing.

**Course Format:**

This course will be taught as a peer review workshop. This means that much of our class time will be spent in the reflective process of analyzing and discussing your essays. The goal of the workshop approach is threefold: to teach you how to analyze and critique the work of others; to give you the kind of criticism you need to improve your essays; and, ultimately, to model for you the type of critical analysis you should subject your writing to after you leave this class. Students are expected to come to class prepared to join in class discussions (without being called on) and to offer helpful analyses that demonstrate insightful, close readings of their peers’ papers.

**Paper Formats/Formalities:**

We will establish a schedule for peer reviewing your papers. Unless otherwise instructed, you must submit copies of all drafts so that each class member receives a copy. All papers are due the class period before their scheduled review dates. If your paper is not distributed to the class at that time, it will not be reviewed until your turn comes up again in the next rotation. Any exception to this rule shall be made at my discretion.
All work prepared outside of class is to be typed with 1.5 spacing in Times New Roman 12-point font. To minimize paper use, print on both sides of the paper and do not include a cover/title page. **Please number your drafts so we can distinguish between various versions. To my copy, please attach the copy of the previous draft with my comments.**

**Workshops:**

*Rules of the Game:*

1. Arrive on time to class, especially on the days that you are handing out a draft. I want to spend no more than five minutes setting up for the next session’s peer review workshop. Please keep in mind that the unfortunate can and will happen—lost and broken discs, printer problems, long lines for printer use, so on. Do not gamble: print your copies the night before, if you must.

2. Do not skip peer review workshops; no paper has ever improved by missed workshops.

3. Although I will not intentionally down grade you for a missed workshop, I will not accept a “final draft” of a paper that I have seen few, if any, drafts.

4. If you distribute a draft but fail to attend the day of the peer review workshop, your paper will go to the bottom of the pile. If time permits, we will workshop the paper in your absence; however, I tend to want to give more time to the authors who attend class.

5. Office hours are a supplement to, not a replacement of, peer review workshops; **DO NOT** expect me to give you a private workshop because you missed class.

**Your Obligations:**

1. A bit of common sense: the workshop will not function if the players do not engage themselves deeply into it; cursory, half-hearted work will help no one.

2. You must come to class prepared; I will not allow you to review papers during the workshops. Guilty parties will be asked to leave, marked absent for the day, and required to justify in writing why they were ill-prepared (1-2 page letter). **Bottom line: DON’T COME TO CLASS ILL-PREPARED**—it’s a slap in the face to me and every student who comes prepared each time with quality and insightful comments for your drafts.

3. You will prepare **ALL** papers assigned to you to be peer reviewed. You will spend greater time on the papers for which you are a primary reviewer, but you will prepare them all with written comments. Your goal will be to offer at least one useful content comment for each paper. Note: Occasionally, I will randomly collect all of the copies of one student author’s peer reviewed draft to see the quality of your comments; if the work is cursory, careless, or missing, I will pull privately aside those responsible, to discover the reason for it.

4. You will print your name at the bottom of each draft you return to an author.

**Grading:**

Semester grades will be based on performance in the following areas; approximate percentage breakdown will be as follows:

- 85% -- Graded essays (and short writing assignments, quizzes)
- 15% -- Quality and consistency of oral critiques and general participation

Grading in the PWR is rigorous. You are certainly not predestined to receive a C, but neither are you guaranteed a B- or better for “improvement” or “effort” or for merely completing assignments. Good papers require, at a minimum, effort, and papers that
are diligently revised usually improve; but each paper is graded on its final quality. While grading of written work can never be as objective as that of a SCANTRON, remember that I am on your side. My goal is to help those that are serious about wanting to improve your writing, your thinking on paper. I can do that only through honest feedback. I encourage you to focus not on a grade, but on what you can learn about improving your writing. I do not grade on a curve; I grade you individually against the following criteria and scale.

Criteria for evaluating papers include clarity, logic, substance, originality, mechanical correctness, and stylistic grace. Preliminary drafts will not be graded.

All papers will be graded by letter:

A=Excellent; outstanding
B=Good; superior
C=Average
D=Below average, but passing
F=Not passing

- A paper needn’t be perfect to warrant an ‘A.’ In fact, there’s probably no such thing as a perfect argument/analysis or perfect paper. However, some papers are beautifully written and force the reader to change his mind, to reconsider his position on an issue, or accept a new insight as sound. Those papers will receive an ‘A.’ (Excellent in content, form and style; unusually substantive and original; imaginative; resourceful in supporting evidence; logically sound; persuasive; stylistically clear and free from mechanical errors.)
- A ‘B’ paper will be superior work. The essay needs to be quite persuasive, but if it contains problems with grammar, mechanics, and sentence-structure, it doesn’t merit an ‘A.’ A B-paper may be an A-paper in need of some polishing, or it may lack a key component. (Good with no major flaws; interesting, sharply focused, solidly supported, marked by above average thought and expression; smooth and clear style, and clearly directed at a particular audience; generally clean in grammar.)
- I consider a ‘C’ to be a commendable grade. ‘C’ means average; it does not mean “poor.” You will get a ‘C’ if your paper has numerous problems with grammar, mechanics, and sentence structure. A C-paper needs to have a clear structure, though, and it needs to take a clear position and offer some support. (Reasonably competent; formally complete, focused, developed, and balanced; lacking in originality or significance of effective development of ideas, or marred by distracting errors in grammar; may contain a mixture of strengths and weaknesses. In this class, “descriptive” papers will earn a ‘C.’)
- A ‘D’ paper contains even more mechanical problems and makes little attempt to deal with the issue and thesis at hand. (Substantially incomplete in content, form or proof; disorganized, illogical, confusing, unfocused; marked by pervasive errors or burdened with irrelevancies that impair readability.)
- An ‘F’ paper contains so many errors that it can’t be understood. A paper will receive an F if it does not fulfill the assignment guidelines or deadlines.
(Incoherent or disastrously flawed; unfocused and formless, devoid of proof or rendered unreadable by elementary errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, or mechanics; or plagiarized* in whole or in part; NEVER TURNED IN, OR LATE.)

- I often tell students that papers are graded by the Lapsang Souchang method. After reading an A-paper, I say, “That paper deserves a glass of fine Lapsang.” After reading a B-paper, I nod my head approvingly, but do not feel that celebration is called for. While reading a C-paper, I wonder if I need a glass of Lapsang in order to get through the paper. While reading a D-paper, I go for the Souchang by the time I’ve completed the first paragraph. An F-paper can be read only after one has some really strong Souchang; otherwise, the reader develops nervous tics.

- Grading writing assignments is always a tricky business. It’s not like math tests. In the latter, everyone agrees that 2+2=4 (in base 10, at any rate), but in the former, not everyone agrees about what constitutes good writing. If everyone agreed, we wouldn’t have so many excellent manuscripts being rejected by one publisher after another before finally being accepted. I make every attempt to grade fairly, and in the end I will stand by my judgments. On the other hand, discussion about your grade(s) can be a fruitful process as it forces both of us to think carefully about how we are evaluating written work. Grades reflect evaluation, and evaluation is central to the writing process. One of the goals of the course is to enable you to evaluate your own writing accurately and honestly. Hopefully we can use the grading process to help us achieve this goal.

*Plagiarism: Papers that fail to provide full documentation of information taken from outside sources, unless that material is considered common knowledge, will receive an ‘F.’ All students of the University of Colorado at Boulder are responsible for knowing and adhering to the academic integrity policy of this institution. Violations of this policy may include: cheating, plagiarism, aid of academic dishonesty, fabrication, lying, bribery, and threatening behavior. All incidents of academic misconduct shall be reported to the Honor Code Council (honor@colorado.edu; 303-725-2273). Students who are found to be in violation of the academic integrity policy will be subject to both academic sanctions from the faculty member and non-academic sanctions (including but not limited to university probation, suspension, or expulsion). Other information on the Honor Code can be found at http://www.colorado.edu/policies/honor.html.

Spring 2009 (Tentative) Syllabus:

Week 1

1/12—Introductions; Homework (HW): Buy Books; Read HT LIT Intro-p. 14; Read John Updike’s “A&P” x 2; Read intro section of course packet.

1/14—Discuss “Form and the Essay” and questions about the course policies; HW: Read “A&P” one more time; Read HT LIT Chapter 3 and pp. 28-73; Read again intro section of course packet (for vocabulary and concepts); Read paragraphs of Wuthering Heights and Othello.

1/16—Reading Quiz and apply “Form and the Essay” to WH and O; HW: Re-read what you must and HT LIT pp. 74-116.
Week 2
1/19—Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday, No classes.

Week 3
1/26—Set up “A&P” workshop (review course policies for workshop rules); thesis do’s and don’ts; HW: Read Descriptive Traps sheet; Prepare workshop sheets; Read HT LIT pp. 162-225.
1/28—Workshop (WS) “A&P” Group 1; Set up Group 2; HW: Read HT LIT pp. 226-244.
1/30—WS “A&P” Group 2; HW: Read Michael Cunningham’s “White Angel” (WA) and Susan Perabo’s “Some Say the World” (SStW) x2.

Week 4
2/2—Discuss “WA” and “SStW”; HW: “WA” and “SStW” paragraph assignments; Read HT LIT pp. 245-281.
2/4—Set up WS for “WA” group and consider “WA” worksheets; Finish “SStW” discussion; Discuss HT LIT; HW: Prep “WA” group.
2/6—WS “WA” group; HW: “WA” part 2 thesis statement.

Week 5
2/9—“SStW” Class Assignment; set up “SStW” group; HW: Prep “SStW” group.
2/11—WS “SStW” group; set up “WA” part 2; HW: Prep papers for next class.
2/13—WS “WA” part 2; Short Assignment sheet—Assertions (Closed vs. Intro paragraphs); Read four stories for Paper 2: TBA: 1. ________________; 2. ____________________; 3. ______________________; 4. ________________________.

Week 6
2/16—Assertions, part 2; Discuss stories 1 and 2.
2/18—Discuss stories 3 and 4.
2/20—Set up workshop for Paper 2 (P1); Discuss stories, if needed; GSP quiz; HW: Prep Group 1 (G1).

Week 7
2/23—WS: G1 (intro paragraph +); Handout (HO): G2; DUE: 11:00 Class Short Assignment, Part 2.
2/25—WS: G2; HO: G3.
2/27—WS: G3; No Handout; DUE: 12:00 Class Short Assignment, Part 2.

Week 8
3/2—Thesis sheets; Richard Lanham’s Paramedic Method.
3/4—HO: G1A (last round of workshop); Grammar, Spelling, Punctuation Quiz.
3/6—WS: G1A; HO: G1B.
Week 9

3/9—WS: G1B; HO: G2A.
3/11—WS: G2A; HO: G2B.
3/13—WS: G2B; HO: G3A.

Week 10

3/16—WS: G3A; HO: G3B.
3/18—WS: G3B.
3/20—Paper 2 paragraph examples and Grading Sheet; HW: Read four stories for Paper 3: TBA: 1. _______________________________; 2. _______________________________; 3. _______________________________; 4. _______________________________.

Week 11

Spring Break, No Classes

Week 12

3/30—Discuss Stories 1 and 2.
4/1—Discuss Stories 3 and 4.
4/3—Set up Workshop: HO: G1 (intro paragraph+); GSP Packet; Conferences; DUE: 12:00 Class, Paper 2.

Week 13

4/6—WS: G1; HO: G2.
4/8—WS: G2; HO: G3; DUE: 11:00 Class, Paper 2.
4/10—WS: G3; No Handout.

Week 14

4/13—HO: G1A (last round); GSP Packet Continued.
4/15—WS: G1A; HO: G1B.
4/17—WS: G1B; HO: G2A.

Week 15

4/20—WS: G2A; HO: G2B.
4/22—WS: G2B; HO: G3A.
4/24—WS: G3A; No Handout; HW: Last weekend to write Paper 3.

Week 16

4/27—HO: G3B; FCQ’s; Conferences at my office.
4/29—WS: G3B (last day of regular class).
5/1—DUE: Paper 3 (turn into me at my office between 8-10:30 a.m.).

Attendance, Etc:

Because this course is structured as a writing workshop, it is imperative that you consistently attend class (always arriving on time with a positive attitude) to make the class worthwhile for yourself and others. Each absence after your third will lower your final grade by a third (B+ to B, for example). I DO NOT distinguish between unexcused and excused absences—if you are here, you’re here; if not, not. (Note: If
you will be absent due to religious observance, I ask that you let me know about it beforehand; there is, of course, no penalty for exercising a right to religious observance as long as I know about it prior to the absence.) Recognize that this class begins sharply on the hour; excessive tardies will add up to absences. Being absent does not entitle you to be non-active in the next session’s workshop; therefore, it is YOUR RESPONSIBILITY to approach me, at least a few minutes before class starts, to gather papers and a general sense of what we did in your absence.

Class Participation. If you expect to learn from the course, you must attend class and participate in the critiquing of student work. You will need to prepare for class and take part in class discussions consistently. Be prepared to talk!

Classroom Etiquette. Before class begins please turn off and store away all electronic devices. If I catch you—no matter how discretely—texting, phoning, checking messages, listening to music or surfing on-line during class, I will ask you to leave and mark you absent for the day. Please do not put me in the position of having to embarrass us both because of your highly rude habits.

University Policies: Disability Statement. If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit to me a letter from Disability Services in a timely manner so that your needs may be addressed. Disability Services determines accommodations based on documented disabilities. Contact: 303-492-8671, Willard 322, and http://www.colorado.EDU/disabilityservices.

Classroom Behavior. Students and faculty each have responsibility for maintaining an appropriate learning environment. Students who fail to adhere to such behavioral standards may be subject to discipline. Faculty have the professional responsibility to treat all students with understanding, dignity, and respect, to guide classroom discussion and to set reasonable limits on the manner in which they and their students express opinions. Professional courtesy and sensitivity are especially important with respect to individuals and topics dealing with differences in race, culture, religion, politics, sexual orientation, gender, gender variance, and nationalities. (http://www.colorado.edu/policies/classbehavior.html.)

Discrimination/Harassment. The University of Colorado at Boulder policy on Discrimination and Harassment, the University of Colorado policy on Sexual Harassment and the University of Colorado policy on Amorous Relationships apply to all students, staff, and faculty. Any student, staff or faculty member who believes s/he has been the subject of discrimination or harassment based upon race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status should contact the Office of Discrimination and Harassment (ODH) at 303-492-2127 or the Office of Judicial Affairs at 303-492-5550. Information about the ODH, the above referenced policies and the campus resources available to assist individuals regarding discrimination or harassment can be obtained at http://www.colorado.edu/odh.
My signature here below indicates that I have read, understood, and accepted for the duration of the semester the above Course Policies and Tentative Syllabus for WRTG 3020, Best American Short Stories.

Name____________________________________________      Date_____________________________