CROSS-CULTURAL WRITING FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS
Sustainable Cultures

CLASS POLICIES

WRTG 3020/3030/3040 sections 800 & 801
Fall 2013 University Club 10
Section 800 9:30-10:45
Section 801 11:00-12:15
Instructor: Dr. Andrea Feldman
Office: Temporary Building #1, Room 204
Phone: (303) 492-6011
E-mail: feldman@spot.colorado.edu
Office Hours: T,R 8:15-9:15 AM and by appointment

Required Texts:
http://writershelp.bedfordstmartins.com/ebooks/helphandbook.php (purchase access code at www.writershelp.com, online textbook)

Online readings: These collections of readings address issues of multiculturalism and sustainability in the context of education and offer guidelines on ethnographic fieldwork. (See specific assignments in the weekly syllabus below).

Resources for writing conventions:
The Purdue University OWL (on-line writing lab):
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/
The Colorado State University Writing Center: http://writing.colostate.edu
The Oregon State Resource Center:
http://cwl.oregonstate.edu/Webresourcespage.html
Silva Rhetoricae http://humanities.byu.edu/rhetoric/Silva.htm

These resources will help extend your mastery of academic essay writing conventions.

In addition to the required texts, the course will draw on texts from rhetoric and discourse studies:
These additional readings will be assigned in the form of handouts:
Lanham, Richard. Revising Prose. (rhetorical approaches to grammar and style)
Norgaard, Rolf. Ideas in Action. (rhetoric and argument text)
Essays on rhetoric and multiculturalism by Chief Seattle and June Jordan.
Objectives:

Cross-cultural writing is a section of WRTG 3020, 3030, and 3040 that is intended for non-native speakers of English who wish to enroll in an upper-division writing course. The course is taught as a rigorous writing workshop using advanced readings and materials, emphasizing critical thinking, analysis, and argumentative writing. Course readings focus on cross-cultural communication in the arts, business, and scientific fields. Future work in these fields will require you to write and speak clearly to an inter-disciplinary audience; accordingly, coursework will include a formal oral presentation. Assignments will be tailored to meet the needs and interests of individual students. The final project for this course is to create a document related to the student’s field that can stand on its own in the real world.

The need for a cross-cultural writing course becomes more apparent as the United States becomes ever more interdependent with our worldwide neighbors. One of the aims of this course is to center multi-lingual experience by exposing you to multiple literacies and asking you to include your own voice in this global conversation. We will explore the power of literacies and unveil the literacies of power. Specific goals include:

- developing proficiency with the tools of technology
- building relationships with others to pose and solve problems collaboratively and cross-culturally
- designing and sharing information for global communities to meet a variety of purposes
- managing, analyzing, and synthesizing multiple streams of simultaneous information
- creating, critiquing, and evaluating multi-media texts
- attending to the ethical responsibilities required by these complex environments

Students need to join this "global village" by thinking critically about the roles of writing and language in forging a multicultural society. Because language and writing are necessarily culturally bound, diverse aspects of culture are often neglected in traditional writing courses. This course offers a chance to examine and debate concerns which are all too often undervalued or ignored. Language--often a tool to disenfranchise--can thereby become a tool to meld.

Why is this class a “Core Course”?

This 3000-level writing and rhetoric seminar satisfies upper-division core requirements in various CU-Boulder schools and colleges because it extends rhetorical
knowledge and writing skills in ways that draw on theoretical perspectives and address specialized disciplinary communities.

More broadly, this upper-division seminar is part of the statewide “Guaranteed Transfer” pathway of courses. In the context of statewide courses, this course meets the goals of an Advanced Writing Course (GT-CO3):

**Rhetorical Knowledge.** The course takes a rhetorical perspective on the process of inquiry and research. Key rhetorical texts that will guide our discussions include Rolf Norgaard’s *Composing Knowledge* (Bedford/StMartin’s), a rhetoric/reader that focuses on the role of writing and rhetoric in inquiry, and on the conventions that frame academic conversations. Because that text discusses academic discourse conventions and their application and adjustment to other discursive spheres, the book fosters metacognitive awareness and skills about writing and rhetoric. Discussions of academic research are also informed by the well-regarded *Craft of Research*, by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory Colomb, and Joseph Williams (U of Chicago Press). We will also draw on the substantive materials on two nationally recognized rhetoric and composition websites: The Purdue University OWL (on-line writing lab), and the Colorado State University Writing Center and Oregon State University websites. For elucidation of rhetorical concepts and specific terms, we’ll work with the nationally recognized website *Silva Rhetoricae*.

**Writing Process.** The course offers an opportunity to understand writing from the audience or reader perspective by focusing on the peer review of work in progress. Through this approach, you’ll discover how revision is central to writing as a tool for civic analysis and engagement. You will also have opportunities to integrate various technologies (e.g. PowerPoint, on-line course website) into your writing projects, and to develop advanced information literacy skills pertinent to your papers.

**Conventions.** The documents you will write for this course will call upon key genres for academic analysis and professional communication. In the process you will learn about genre conventions appropriate to your field and/or to your audience, about how to draw on specialized vocabularies in ways that still make your work accessible to secondary audiences, and about the role of textual features and document design as persuasive tools.

**Effective application.** Many of the assignments in the course are geared to real-world audiences—including members of your discipline or profession. In the process, you will become familiar with writing in a disciplinary or specialized rhetorical situation, even as you make your work accessible to secondary audiences in other related fields.

*Innovative uses of technology and active student learning:* The course includes interactive workshops and analysis of visual rhetorics, including podcasts, video clips, cartoons, and other visual media. The classroom allows students to form both large and small groups to workshop their papers using the laptop carts and screen projector to instantly critique and evaluate each others’ papers.
In addition, the technology allows us to analyze the visual rhetoric components of the course. In both large and small group settings, we will critique video streams, isolate individual frames for analysis, and integrate text within the visual media.

A large portion of the course centers on writing workshops and peer critiques of others' papers. Using laptop carts in small interactive groups, students will highlight areas of concern in their own and others' papers, make necessary changes, instantaneously correct errors, access online databases and search engines, and rework areas of concern in their papers. Students can also reach the course website and other course materials made available by the library.

**Writing Process and the Workshop Format:**
The course offers an opportunity to understand writing from the audience or reader perspective by focusing on the peer review of work in progress. Through this approach, you will discover how revision is central to the writing process. Your own writing will be the principal text; we will all work together as a team to improve each paper. We will adopt the attitude that any paper can be improved, and give constructive criticism to everyone. Your job will be to provide oral and written commentary on other students' papers when assigned to do so.

**Method:**
1. Attendance and promptness are mandatory. More than three absences will lower your final grade. More than six will result in an F for the course.
2. Papers must be typed, double-spaced. You are responsible for bringing in the specified number of copies when the paper is due. I will not read handwritten papers. Spelling and grammatical errors are not acceptable; see the recommended texts above if you have this problem. Word-processing is helpful for revision.
3. Assignments: see attached syllabus for dates.
   We will attempt to work on each paper once a week. Please note that your paper is due to be distributed in advance of the discussion on your paper. In addition, you will be required to give oral and written commentary on another student's paper once a week. Oral and written participation constitute 30% of your final grade (see below). It is a good idea to revise your paper nightly even though you will only hand it in on the due date. Late papers will not be accepted. I will not accept final papers that have not been reviewed at least five times in class. "First draft" final versions are unacceptable and will not receive a grade.
4. Plagiarism: Plagiarism is a crime and will result in an F for the course, as well as possible disciplinary action by the university. Always be sure to give credit for words or ideas from another source and do not hand in work which is not your own.
5. I encourage students with disabilities, including non-visible disabilities such as chronic diseases, learning disabilities, head injury and attention deficit/hyperactive disorder, psychiatric disabilities, to discuss with me, after class or during my office hours, appropriate accommodations. 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 (303-492-8671, Willard 322, www.colorado.edu/disabilityservices).

6. Grading: (25 pages minimum of graded writing)
20% Short assignments 2-3 pp. (includes assigned written comments on papers)
10% Class participation (includes turning in drafts when due)
70% Papers
In addition to short assignments, you will write three formal papers in this class.
   1st paper: analysis (5-10 pp.)
   2nd paper: argument (5-10 pp.)
   3rd paper: analysis or argument (7-10 pp.)
The three formal papers will be weighted in the following manner.
The better of the required papers will be worth 30% of your final grade. The next best paper will be worth 25% and the remaining paper worth 15%. Make three copies of each full-length paper and submit two: one for yourself, one for me, and one for the additional instructor who may be grading your paper in addition to me.

The standards for the papers are as follows:

The Program for Writing and Rhetoric assigns grades based on the evidence provided by the final version of the essay that you submitted. The classroom workshop in which your drafts are discussed encourages you to improve your work, and provides you with the tools to do so, but grades on the final papers are not assigned based on effort, progress, or time spent on the task. Pluses and minuses attached to grades reflect shades of difference, as do split grades (e.g. A-/B+).

A  A paper that is excellent in content, form, and style: original, substantive, insightful, persuasive, well-organized, and written in a clear, graceful, error-free style. Although not necessarily “perfect,” an “A” paper rewards its reader with genuine insight, gracefully expressed. Such a paper is an ambitious project that engages interesting, complex ideas in a perceptive manner. It offers a nuanced, specific claim that responds to a genuine question at issue, and it follows a compelling line of reasoning. It engages and responds to questions and counterarguments in a thoughtful manner, and explores well-chosen evidence in a detailed and revealing way. The paper does not repeat, but rather enhances, what writer and reader already know. Offering a context for its ideas, the essay could be read and appreciated by
someone outside of the class. The style is clear, precise, and graceful, and the author’s voice engaging.

B  A clearly written, well-developed, interesting paper that shows above average thought and writing craft. The essay reaches high, and meets many, though not all, of its aims. The thinking and writing are generally very solid, but the paper may have some unresolved problems in argument and style, some thin patches in content, or some tangents that don’t fit in. Despite these problems, the paper does not have major flaws that compromise the general effectiveness of the case it presents or the overall readability of its prose.  OR  A paper that is far less ambitious than an “A” paper, but reaches all of its aims. This is an essay that may be well organized and cleanly, even elegantly written, but whose reasoning and argument may nonetheless be somewhat routine or self-evident.

C  A paper that represents a mixture of strengths and weaknesses. The paper may be somewhat readable, organized at the surface level, and have a claim, but it will have real unresolved problems in one or more key areas: conception, quality of the claim, line of reasoning, use of evidence, and language, style, or grammar. The paper may fulfill the basic requirements of the assignment, but, finally, say little of genuine importance or significance.  OR  A competently written essay that is largely descriptive.  OR  An essay that offers scant intellectual content and little more than personal opinion, even when well written.

D  A paper that is seriously underdeveloped or seriously deficient in content, form, style, or mechanics. It may be disorganized, illogical, confusing, unfocused, or contain pervasive errors that impair readability. A paper that does not come close to meeting the basic expectations of the assignment.

F  A paper that is incoherent, disastrously flawed, unacceptably late, plagiarized, or non-existent.
WRTG 3020/3030/3040  
Course Syllabus  
Instructor: Andrea Feldman

Syllabus: This syllabus is tentative. Any changes will be announced in advance. If you are absent on the date your paper is due, be sure to have someone bring it to class. Attendance on the day your paper is discussed is crucial.

Note the following abbreviations:
- para=paragraph
- WS=workshop
- REV=revision. Distribute copies to classmates.
- COM=commentary. You are responsible for initiating the discussion on a given paper. You may be required to submit written commentary.
- SA=short assignment to be typed and handed in to me. (1 copy only)

**Unit 1: Contrastive Rhetoric**

**Week 1**

T 8/27  
Introduction  
Discussion of upcoming assignments and directions for SA#1.  
Introduction to forming analysis and sustainability concepts (threshold concepts of the course).

Readings for R 8/29:  
Student essays. Read the three student essays published in Occasions:  
(1) Dodge, “A New Green GM”  
https://learn.colorado.edu/d2l/le/content/48131/viewContent/1163527/View

(2) Holland, “Biomimicry”  
https://learn.colorado.edu/d2l/le/content/48131/viewContent/1163528/View

(3) Bowlin, “Computer Engineering Major” pages 40-58  
http://www.colorado.edu/PWR/Documents/Occasions%20Online_2010.pdf  
(These essays are posted under READINGS in the course content on D2L)

R 8/29 Discussion: sample student papers listed above (also posted on D2L).

Readings for Tuesday, 9/3: “Letter from the Birmingham Jail” and “What is Science?”  
(see below for links).

**Week 2**

T 9/3  
Reading/discussion:  
Readings for 9/3:
Martin Luther King, Jr. “Letter from the Birmingham Jail” (online reading—
George Orwell, "What is Science?" Composing Knowledge, p. 298-303.

SA #1 (due Tues. 9/10 in class hard copy): Based on Orwell’s definition of sustainable science, discuss whether or not your major field is a sustainable science. (Briefly summarize the definition of sustainable science and discuss why your major does or does not fit into that definition).

R 9/5 Introduction to forming analysis: Rhetorical situation and problem formation. Application of readings to planning Paper 1. Distinguishing description, analysis, argument. Readings for Tuesday, 9/10:

Carson, Silent Spring www.uky.edu/Classes/NRC/381/carson_spring.pdf
Mark McCaffrey, Climate Literacy brochure: http://downloads.globalchange.gov/Literacy/Climate%20Literacy%20Booklet%20Hi-Res.pdf

Week 4
SA#2 (due Tues. 9/17): Discuss the argument (briefly summarize) one of the three assigned articles by Carson, Tierney, or McCaffrey, and evaluate its effectiveness.

R 9/12 Continue readings/discussion of Paper 1 topics.

T 9/17 All students turn in and distribute three prospective research topic ideas on sustainable energy. WS
R 9/19 Peer review strategies and partner assignments.

Week 5
T 9/24 Submit for WS introductions to Paper 1, Sustainable energy CU Dialogue Program
Read: Handout on analysis
SA #3 (due T 10/1 in class) Explain the difference between analysis and description (i.e., summary). Give examples to illustrate the difference.

R 9/26 Discussion of analysis, Pragmatics of Citations, and Tips on Titles WS/COM body paragraphs

Week 6
T 10/1  Project work day: work on body paragraphs
R 10/3  Project work day: work on drafts

Week 7

R 10/10  Complete in-class exercise from "Revising Prose" (handout).

**Unit 2: Visual rhetoric**

Week 8
T 10/15  **Paper 1 due in class**  
Readings for 10/17:  
bell hooks, “Teaching New Worlds” p. 172, Composing Knowledge  
June Jordan, “Nobody Mean More to Me than You” (handout)  
“Environmental Statement,” Chief Seattle (online reading)

SA #4 (due R 10/24) summarize one of the assigned articles.

Week 9
T 10/22  Discussion of Readings. All students turn in introduction to 2nd paper, and submit to class gmail account.
R 10/24  WS and blogging

Week 10
T 10/29  WS/REV/COM second paras: focus on rhetorical analysis
R 10/31  Project work day, conferencing

Week 11
T 11/5  WS/REV/COM full drafts: focus on argument
R 11/7  **Paper 2 due in class**

**Week 12**

**Unit 3: Civic Rhetoric**

T 11/12  Discussion/Introduction to readings  
Tips on Oral Presentations; How to handle powerpoint and poster Presentations. How to write a proposal letter.  
Proposal for promoting sustainability: Discussion to launch paper 3: sustainability issue incorporating different regions of the world, where each region presents what they need/will achieve with regard to reducing their carbon footprint, or improving sustainability.

**Week 13**

T 11/19  All Students bring in proposal letter for paper 3, and distribute copies to their groups.
R 11/21  WS/COM

**Week 14**

NO CLASS – THANKSGIVING / FALL BREAK

**Week 15**

T 12/3  WS/COM enclosure—community credibility/statement of purpose
R 12/5  Oral presentations

**Week 16**

T 12/10  Oral presentations
R 12/12  Oral presentations and closing remarks

FINAL PAPER DUE ON Fri. 12/13 BY 5:00 PM IN MY MAILBOX AT TB 1.