WELCOME TO HONORS WRTG 3030
“WRITING ON SCIENCE AND SOCIETY”

WRTG 3030, Sections 520R and 888R
Spring Semester 2015
Dr. Rolf Norgaard

MW 3:00-4:15 p.m.
SMTH S200C

Course Office Hours and Contact Information:

T R 9:30-11:00 a.m. and by appointment
Environmental Design Building (ENVD), lower level, enter at NW corner, Room 1B64

Mailbox in ENVD, lobby area
Office phone / voice mail: 303-492-3605
E-mail: rolf.norgaard@colorado.edu (M-F)

Brief Course Description

Welcome! This Honors version of WRTG 3030 “Writing on Science and Society” is a rhetorically informed introduction to science writing that hones communication skills as we examine the relationships among science, engineering, and society, and the manner in which scientific and technical information moves across different rhetorical contexts and becomes relevant to a variety of audiences. The course is intended for upper-division students in Engineering and for students in Arts and Sciences majoring in the sciences. Taught as a writing seminar emphasizing critical thinking, revision, and oral presentation skills, the course focuses on helping students draw on their technical expertise while engaging audiences beyond their own disciplines. The course draws on broad rhetorical principles for cogent writing and speaking, and applies them to the demands of communicating in the fields of science and engineering and in the work environments of organizations.

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 and discourse 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 science writing and technical communication. Key rhetorical texts that will guide our discussions include articles on the rhetoric of science (e.g. Jeanne Fahnestock’s “Accommodating Science: The Rhetorical Life of Scientific Fact”) and on effective scientific and technical prose (e.g. Gopen and Swan, “The Science of Scientific Writing”). For guidelines on writing in professional genres, we will refer to the substantive materials on three nationally recognized websites: The Purdue University OWL (on-line writing lab), the Colorado State University Writing Center, and the Colorado State University WAC Clearinghouse.

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 and to the scientific method. You will also have opportunities to integrate various
technologies (e.g. Desire to Learn, PowerPoint) into assignments and major projects, and to develop advanced information literacy skills pertinent to your research area.

Conventions. The documents you will write for this course will call upon the key genres of technical and professional communication, culminating in a major project. 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. All of the assignments in the course are geared to real-world audiences—including members of your discipline or profession, potential employers, and the audience for your semester-long project. 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.

Course Overview and Objectives

As in any writing endeavor, effective technical and professional writing grows out of sound, incisive critical thinking. For the professional, such thinking must be grounded in field-specific expertise, but also in an understanding of not only the immediate rhetorical situation as it is driven by the work environment, but also the professional and societal contexts that shape the field. As writers analyze issues within this interplay of contexts, they learn to exercise their abilities and responsibilities as individuals within the profession, and more broadly as citizens within a community.

This course is based on a number of “first principles” that help to define and orient our work together. Ours is a course that:

- Uses broadly relevant issues in science and engineering as an occasion for learning about and applying rhetorical principles and strategies.
- Applies your own disciplinary expertise to issues that extend beyond your own immediate area of specialization, such as issues in ethics, law, public policy, and professional education.
- Familiarizes you with various writing genres and issues in technical and professional communication.
- Attends to critical-thinking skills and rhetorical principles that transfer from one writing task to the next, and from discipline to discipline.
- Encourages a sustained focus on revision to hone the analytic and argumentative edge that many forms of technical and professional communication require.
- Focuses on multiple dimensions of communication: written and oral, formal and interpersonal.
- Enables you to work collaboratively on communication issues (peer response, collaborative editing, team projects).
- Respects and challenges students by seeing you as an intellectual resource and part of the course design—in terms of your own writing and speaking, your disciplinary interests, and your role as readers and writers.

The course opens with a series of shorter assignments that highlight (1) the objectives of the course, (2) rhetorical issues and strategies pertinent to your own professional career documents, and (3) ongoing discussions about science and engineering issues in the public press. The final half of the course is devoted to a longer individualized project, suited to your particular interests and disciplinary expertise. This project will employ one of several technical and professional writing genres (e.g. report, proposal, substantive correspondence, as appropriate to the audience). The development of this project also includes a formal oral presentation. Other oral communication skills will be called upon throughout the semester.

The course is taught as an interactive seminar where your own writing and speaking activities and your own disciplinary expertise serve as essential course materials. You will write on communication issues germane to your own field, and on ethical and public policy issues that touch your future professional lives. Although there is no formal prerequisite, the course presumes that you already have some facility in writing. The course deals with issues of style, grammar, and organization, not in isolation, but in the context of larger rhetorical and argumentative concerns. Instruction will focus on rhetorically informed strategies relevant to communication needs in engineering and scientific fields. The course will also help you improve your oral-presentation skills and your ability to work collaboratively on communication tasks.
Texts and Materials

Working as a writer in college—and as a professional in the workplace—means working together. Writing is a social and collaborative act. The course is taught as an interactive seminar where your own writing and speaking activities and your own disciplinary expertise and design sensibilities serve as essential course materials. To that end, the principal text in the course will be your own writing, and the principal activity will be sharing our work with each other and encouraging each other as we look forward to that next draft and design review. This kind of collaborative discussion of work-in-progress is typical of writing done in organizations. Please post/download drafts on D2L 24 hours prior to classroom discussion. Drafts are required, but not graded. Please date all drafts. Your participation grade in the course (not to mention the quality of your work) will take a nosedive if you don’t submit and circulate your work on time. If you miss classroom discussion of your work because you do not turn in drafts in advance of class, the quality of your work will almost certainly suffer. I will not accept projects that have not been reviewed on a regular basis over the course of the assignment. "First draft" final versions are unacceptable and will receive an F. Late documents will not be accepted (except under extraordinary circumstances).

Required Texts

Readings and course materials (chiefly articles on the rhetoric of science) will be available as pdfs on D2L or as handouts distributed in class.


We will refer on an ongoing basis to technical and professional writing materials on three nationally recognized rhetoric and composition websites:

- The Purdue University OWL (on-line writing lab); see especially the tab on technical and professional writing: http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/
- The Colorado State University Writing Center, which offers an array of “writing resources” and “teaching resources” pertinent to this course: http://writing.colostate.edu/
- The Colorado State University “WAC Clearinghouse,” which supports scholarly exchange about communication across the curriculum: http://wac.colostate.edu/

Attendance and Participation

As writers, we rely on each other as fellow writers and as readers. For this reason, regular attendance and active participation throughout the semester are crucial to this seminar/writing workshop. Students who are absent will be expected to ask classmates for the information and assignments they missed. Students who miss more than three classes can expect their final grade to be lowered by one fraction of a letter (i.e. A to A-) for each absence after the third. Even when excused, more than six absences can result in an IW, IF, or F for the course. Please note this attendance policy. You have, in essence, three “freebies.” Horde them and use them wisely: anticipate that you may feel under the weather one day, or that you may fall madly in love, or that you may need to recover from falling out of love. Class starts at the announced time; tardiness is not acceptable (two late arrivals count as one absence).

Course Delivery and Review of Assignments

Ours is a collaborative classroom. A regular and required assignment is that you circulate, retrieve, and read documents to be discussed 24 hours in advance of the class, via Desire to Learn (D2L). You must come to class ready to comment on the work of your colleagues and to share in their inquiry. Student led design reviews and comments on drafts submitted by classmates will be a regular feature of the workshop. These presentations should be prepared in advance of class and should be well organized, cogent, and to the point. In our “workshops” (as
elsewhere in life), the Golden Rule applies well. Do unto other writers as you would have them do unto you. Writers want and need more than empty praise. They want an attentive and discerning audience, one that is ready to help improve the writing and thinking.

Various project documents will require considerable thought and attention. Frequent revisions will be necessary. You will be expected to work on these documents throughout the semester, even on days when your draft may not come up for discussion. You cannot pass this course without successfully completing all shorter projects and the final major project. Be sure to date and save all drafts, and to save your work (including various drafts) on computer files. Be sure to have drafts electronically accessible. Save a hard copy of every assignment for your files.

Information Literacy and Technology

This class will draw on multiple technologies, among them Desire to Learn, websites, PowerPoint, email, and digital library databases. We will use e-mail communication for messages from me, for general discussion, and at times for the circulation of drafts. Please check your university e-mail account (colorado.edu) several times each week as well as on those days when drafts may be circulated. If you use a non-university e-mail account (e.g. hotmail.com, msn.com), be sure to link it to the university e-mail account. Access to on-line library materials requires that you be identified as a university user (colorado.edu). See the University Libraries website for information on setting proxy servers. It is your responsibility to become familiar with sending and receiving attachments using commonly available software (e.g. Microsoft Word), and for pasting text into the body of an e-mail. For assistance on technical computing matters, contact 735-HELP or 5-4357 for the Information Technology Help-Line.

Special Notes and University Policy Statements

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 Hall, room 322, www.colorado.edu/disabilityservices. If you have a temporary medical condition or injury, see guidelines at http://www.colorado.edu/disabilityservices/go.cgi?select=temporary.html

If you speak English as a second language, you should contact me before the third class meeting so that I can better assist you in the course, advise you about special ESL courses, and/or refer you (if needed or desired) to appropriate services on campus.

Campus policy regarding religious observances requires that faculty make every effort to deal reasonably and fairly with all students who, because of religious obligations, have conflicts with scheduled exams, assignments, or required attendance. I am happy to accommodate such students. Contact me well in advance of any conflict. http://www.colorado.edu/policies/fac_relig.html

Plagiarism will not be tolerated; the paper will receive an automatic F, and your case reported, consistent with the procedures of the new Student Honor Code. We’ll discuss a good deal more about learning from and using the words of others during the course. This writing seminar provides an opportunity to understand issues of intellectual property and the appropriate use and citation of sources. 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). See http://www.colorado.edu/policies/honor.html and http://www.colorado.edu/academics/honorcode/
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

A writing class offers a special opportunity to discuss work in progress in a supportive yet critically demanding “workshop” environment. As you develop drafts and other materials for this course, you should bear in mind that you are “going public” with your work. This act carries with it an obligation for civil discussion and for understanding the concerns of your audience and their interests in your point of view. Students and faculty each have responsibility for maintaining an appropriate learning environment. Students who fail to adhere to behavioral standards may be subject to discipline. Faculty have the professional responsibility to treat students with understanding, dignity and respect, to guide classroom discussion, and to set reasonable limits on the manner in which students express opinions. Professional courtesy and sensitivity are especially important with respect to differences of race, culture, religion, politics, sexual orientation, gender, and nationalities. See policies at http://www.colorado.edu/policies/classbehavior.html and http://www.colorado.edu/studentaffairs/judicialaffairs/code.html#student_code.

Overview of Assignments and Readings

Workload: (graded work of approximately 30-35 pp., with substantive feedback on another 30pp. of drafts)

Summary/Response. A 250 word summary and a 2 pp. response (total of 3 pp.) to one of the following readings:
  George Orwell, “What is Science?”
  Jared Diamond, “Soft Sciences are Harder than Hard Sciences”
  Lewis Thomas, “Alchemy”

Resume/Cover Letter. In response to a particular job opportunity or announcement, develop or revise a one page resume that speaks to the job hiring criteria, and a one page (single-spaced) cover letter. (total of 3 pp. double-spaced equivalent)

Editorial Cartoon Project. Given background readings on sustainability, select an editorial cartoon on sustainability, and describe, analyze, and advance an argument about that cartoon. (4-5 pp.)
  Shellenberger and Nordhaus, “The Death of Environmentalism”
  Nordhaus, “Second Life”

Major Project: Proposal. A 400-600 word proposal that identifies the research issues and approach for your major course project. (2-3 pp.)

Rhetorical Life of Scientific Fact. Given Fahnestock’s classic article on how science is accommodated in various rhetorical contexts, analyze an instance of rhetorical accommodation. (5-7 pp.)
  Jeanne Fahnestock, “Accommodating Science: The Rhetorical Life of Scientific Fact”

Oral Presentation. A 7-10 minute oral presentation on the subject of the final project, designed to address a particular audience.

Final Project. A substantive inquiry into an issue or topic of the student’s choice. The project will go through multiples stages of revision, and will reflect the conventions of an appropriate science, technical communication, or professional writing genre. (about 12-15 pp.) Revision will be informed by the following readings:
  George Gopen and Judith Swan, “The Science of Scientific Writing”
  Various readings germane to the student’s own project.
Calculation of Grades

Your final grade will be determined as follows (assignments worth less than 10% may be graded on check/check plus/check minus basis):

- 7% Summary/response (3 pp.)
- 8% Resume and Cover Letter (2-3 pp.)
- 15% Editorial Cartoon Assignment (4-5 pp.)
- 5% Project Proposal (2 pp.)
- 15% Paper on rhetorical life of scientific fact (5-7 pp.)
- 10% Oral presentation on final project
- 25% Final project (12-15 pp.)
- 15% Rhetorical process/revision effort, timely submission of drafts, class participation, quality of discussion and referee comments in class, etc.

FOUNDATIONAL CONCEPTS

Academic inquiry has at its core a set of four key concepts. These concepts are not meant to suggest prescriptive forms of writing. The concepts operate as a dynamic web of relationships, and can be deployed rhetorically in a variety of ways.

Occasion / Problem / Question at issue
- Reflects and/or helps shapes rhetorical context
- Establishes ongoing relevance (exigence, the so-what question)
- Advantages of speaking directly to the issue
- The conversational model: occasions prompt a reply—the claim

Pitfalls:
- “The Funnel” (plot summary, gratuitous background info, broad generalizations)
- “The Misfire” (the gratuitous interest-getter opening; the misdirected but engaging story)

Claim / Thesis / Point
- Topic vs. claim (predication, claim establishes relationships among ideas)
- Arguable claim (potential refutability, risk; argument as dialogue)
- Claim as hypothesis during the revision process (arguable claims invite tests)
- Looks back to and answers the occasion, looks forward to and requires support and development
- Claims as generative tools (engines, not a “point” but vector)
- Social/ethical dimension, claims not just an abstract proposition (not just “claim that,” but “claim on”)

Pitfalls:
- The self-evident claim
- The statement of personal taste (“it’s just my opinion”)
- Troubleshooting the thesis (go-nowhere claims, underpowered claims, multiple or rival claims, cryptic claims)

Reasons / Support / Evidence / Line of Reasoning
- Reasons as answers to questions
- Reasons and audience: understanding what counts as evidence for an audience
- Earning a conclusion or claim
- Reasons as tools or opportunities for eliciting belief
- A trajectory of thought: line of reasoning
Pitfalls:
• Disconnect between claim and reasons (loose topical association)
• Examples, not reasons
• “Three reasons” (5 para essay)
• Discrete, unconnected “things I have to say” (no line of reasoning)
• Questionable assumptions

Skeptical Questions / Counterarguments
• Addressing counterarguments can carry positive persuasive force
• Skeptical questions and ethos (credibility, character)
• Counterarguments as tools for invention and revision
• The conversational model (good argument has all the virtues of good conversation)

Pitfalls:
• No reference to counterarguments
• The dismissive reference
• The late reference
• Missed opportunities for refining one’s own thinking and writing

GRADING POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

This class holds your writing to high standards. Because the grading is rigorous, we also want to be sure that it is fair, and that you have a rich set of opportunities to learn and excel in this course.

Working Drafts

Working drafts are not graded—all the more reason that you should welcome constructive comments for improving your paper. You can take advantage of workshop discussions by submitting thoughtful, substantive revisions on a regular basis, by keeping an open mind during discussions, and by asking for clarification from your instructor or classmates on any suggestions that remain confusing. You are always welcome to ask your instructor for additional help outside of class, or to visit the Writing Center of the Program for Writing and Rhetoric for additional consultations.

Improvement

We’re here to help you improve your writing. Although the course does not grade on improvement as such (we base grades on the evidence of the essay submitted, not on effort or time spent), we do weight your better papers more heavily when determining the final course grade. We want to give you a grade that reflects what you’ve learned in the course.

The Grading Process

The syllabus and schedule for your section of the course will specify when final drafts are due. As you revise your paper in preparation for its submission, your instructor will prod, coach, guide, advise, exhort, and encourage. Once you turn in your final draft, your instructor will judge the paper against the same standards that motivated the instructor’s comments during its preparation.

To ensure fairness and provide you with additional feedback, your papers also may be graded by another instructor in the Program for Writing and Rhetoric. Although the instructors will consult with each other about grades, your own instructor is responsible for determining your grade.
Appeals

Should you feel that the grade you have received is unfair, you are always welcome to submit an unmarked original copy of your paper to your instructor, with the request that it be graded by yet another reader. The grade for your paper may be adjusted in light of the comments given by the additional reader.

The Program for Writing and Rhetoric has an ombudsperson to help you resolve any concerns or conflicts you may have. Please contact the main office for more information.

Grading Guidelines

The Program 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 3030 Honors  
Tentative Syllabus

Post drafts to D2L 24 hours before classroom discussion/workshop

Unit One: Science, Engineering, and Society

Week One

Rhetorical Focus: Defining Terms

M 1/12  Course introduction: learning objectives. Questionnaire. Getting to know each other. Overview of course assignments and projects and their relation to your professional future. Introduce readings and summary/response assignment. Introduce resume and cover letter assignment.


Readings for this week:
Randy Harris, “Introduction” to *Landmark Essays on Rhetoric of Science*
George Orwell, “What is Science?” (definitional questions)
Jared Diamond, “Soft Sciences are Harder than Hard Sciences” (disciplinary questions)
Lewis Thomas, “Alchemy” (historical questions)

Week Two

Rhetorical Focus: Rhetorics of summary and analysis

M 1/19  NO CLASS – Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday. Post drafts of summary/response on D2L by 1/20 a.m.

W 1/21  Workshop summary/response drafts (responding to Orwell, Diamond, or Thomas)

Unit Two: Communicating Personal Expertise

Week Three

Rhetorical focus: Revision strategies and peer review

M 1/26  Workshop summary/response drafts. Discuss readings on sustainability (Schellenberger and Nordhaus)

W 1/28  Workshop resume and cover letter assignment. Introduce editorial cartoon assignment. Form editing groups.

Readings for this week:
Schellenberger and Nordhaus, “The Death of Environmentalism”
Nordhaus, “Second Life”
Week Four

*Rhetorical focus: Cultural tropes in science*

M 2/2  Workshop resume and cover letter assignment. Discuss ideas for major project. **Due: final version of summary/response.**

W 2/4  Writing Group A: Workshop drafts of editorial cartoon assignment on sustainability.

---

**Unit Three: Science and the Public Imagination**

Week Five

*Rhetorical focus: Framing arguments*

M 2/9  Writing Group B: Workshop drafts of editorial cartoon assignment on sustainability.

W 2/11 Discuss two articles on science and sociocognitive frameworks

Readings for this week:
- Amy Koerber, “From Folklore to Fact: The Rhetorical History of Breastfeeding and Immunology”
- Emily Martin, “The Egg and the Sperm: How Science Has Constructed a Romance Based on Stereotypical Male-Female Roles”

Week Six

*Rhetorical focus: Creating a research space*

M 2/16  Writing Group A: Review project proposals. Discuss genre and audience.

W 2/18  Writing Group B: Review project proposals. Discuss genre and audience.

---

**Unit Four: The Rhetorical Life of Scientific Fact—How Science Moves across Contexts**

Week Seven

*Rhetorical focus: Shifting forums for conversations on science*

M 2/23  Discuss article by Fahnestock (“Accommodating Science”) and ideas for applying it.

W 2/25  Information Literacy Seminar

Reading for this week:
- Jeanne Fahnestock, “Accommodating Science: The Rhetorical Life of Scientific Fact”
Week Eight

Rhetorical focus: Stasis—the kinds of questions we ask

M 3/2 Writing Group A: Workshop drafts on rhetorical life of science
W 3/4 Writing Group B: Workshop drafts on rhetorical life of science

Week Nine

Rhetorical focus: The shifting contexts of science

M 3/9 Workshop remaining drafts as needed. Discuss updates on projects. Discuss style in scientific writing (Gopen and Swan article)
W 3/11 Discuss two readings in rhetoric of science (Miller on Kairos, Fahnestock on Bering Crossover Controversy)

Reading for this week:
  George Gopen and Judith Swan, “The Science of Scientific Writing”
  Carolyn Miller, “Kairos in the Rhetoric of Science”
  Jeanne Fahnestock, “The Bering Crossover Controversy”

Unit Five: Genres for Communicating Science—Student Field Projects

Week Ten

Rhetorical focus: Framing questions at issue

M 3/16 Writing Group A: Workshop exploratory drafts and annotated bibliographies
W 3/18 Writing Group B: Workshop exploratory drafts and annotated bibliographies. Discuss style in scientific writing (Gopen and Swan article)

Week Eleven – SPRING BREAK

Week Twelve

Rhetorical focus: Stylistic resources for invention

M 3/30 Science showcase: bring in an interesting clip of science in social media/video
W 4/1  Writing Group A: Workshop rough full draft of project

Week Thirteen

*Rhetorical focus: Evaluating lines of reasoning*

M 4/6  Writing Group B: Workshop rough full draft of project.
W 4/8  Writing Group A: Oral presentations

Week Fourteen

*Rhetorical focus: Effective oral presentations*

M 4/13  Writing Group A/B: Oral presentations
W 4/15  Writing Group B: Oral presentations

Week Fifteen

*Rhetorical focus: Revision strategies for a major writing project*

M 4/20  Writing Group A: Workshop revised full drafts
W 4/22  Writing Group A/B: Workshop revised full drafts. FCQs.

Week Sixteen

*Rhetorical focus: Strategies you can implement beyond this course*

M 4/27  Writing Group B: Workshop revised full drafts. Final class, concluding remarks.
W 4/29  No class. Project work day.

**Final project due:** No later than M 5/4 at noon. Please submit as a hardcopy in my box in PWR main office (Environmental Design Building).