Draft for Discussion
Refined Goals and Features of WRIT 1122 and 1133

First Year Committee
Jennifer Campbell, Doug Hesse, Matt Hill, Heather Martin, Casey Rountree, Rebekah Schultz-Colby

October 30, 2007

What follows is our revision of the goals and features of WRIT 1122 and 1133, followed by our syntheses of the questions we discussed in small groups last week.

By **goals**, we mean the knowledge, abilities, and skills we expect students to demonstrate upon completing each of these courses. Immediately below are the goals that should be included in syllabi, and following them are elaborations of those goals. Following them are "features" of the two courses. By **features**, we mean the characteristics and requirements, such as the amount of writing, general pedagogies used and so on.

Goals

WRIT 1122: Academic Writing

Students will

1. Demonstrate practical knowledge of the concept "rhetorical situation," through the abilities both to analyze and to write effectively in different kinds of situations.
2. Demonstrate proficiency with basic elements of rhetorical analysis (such as logos, ethos, and pathos) in a range of texts, and the application of that facility in their own writing.
3. Demonstrate the ability to produce writing that effectively provides evidence and reasoning for assertions, for audiences of educated readers.
4. Demonstrate the ability effectively to incorporate written sources into their own writing and to document those materials.
5. Demonstrate the ability to use feedback to revise their own writing and the ability to provide useful feedback to others.
6. Demonstrate the ability to edit and proofread their writing.

WRIT 1133: Writing and Research

In addition to continuing to master the goals of WRIT 1122, students will

1. Demonstrate practical knowledge of academic research traditions (for example, text-based/interpretive; measurement-based/empirical; and observational/qualitative) through effectively writing in at least two of those traditions.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of rhetorical/conventional differences among various academic disciplines or groups of disciplines. e
3. Demonstrate practical knowledge of rhetorical differences between writing for academic audiences and writing for popular audiences, through both analysis and performance.
4. Demonstrate proficiency in finding, evaluating, synthesizing, critiquing, and documenting published sources appropriate to given rhetorical situations.

Elaboration of the Goals for WRIT 1122: Notes to faculty

1. Demonstrate practical knowledge of the concept "rhetorical situation," through the abilities both to analyze and to write effectively in different kinds of situations. A rhetorical situation has a purpose, an intended readership, and a writer. Situations are embedded in contexts, which bring certain expectations by readers of textual conventions, what will count as effective rhetorical moves, genres. (For example, arguments about individual privacy rights in 2000 differed from those in 2002.) No single course can teach students to be effective in every possible rhetorical situation. However, a course can—and should—teach students the need to adjust for writing situations, and students should demonstrate their grasp of that concept, including by producing pieces of writing that would be successful in different ones.

2. Demonstrate proficiency with basic elements of rhetorical analysis (such as logos, ethos, and pathos) in a range of texts, and the application of that facility in their own writing. Teachers of WRIT 1133 should expect students to come to their classes 1) knowing the terms logos (including assertions, evidence, and logical arrangements), ethos (the type of persona the writer creates and projects for his or her reader), and pathos (strategies for eliciting emotional or affective responses) and 2) having some experience with rhetorical analysis. As a result, students completing 1122 should be able to discuss and write meaningful things about strategies that writers have employed in particular rhetorical situations (both what and why), even to point out the weaknesses, limitations, or critiques of their choices. Of course, there are many layers and complexities for each of those terms, centuries of rhetorical theory. The point is not to bury students (or teachers) with all the nuances and complexity, although some teachers may choose to include more than others. The point is to give them some theoretical knowledge (and associated techniques) and the opportunity to practice it.

3. Demonstrate the ability to produce writing that effectively provides evidence and reasoning for assertions, for audiences of educated readers. While 1122 broadly teaches rhetorical analysis, it privileges logical reasoning, for two reasons. Logical reasoning is privileged in academic writing (a practical reason), and civic society would be better served by discourses in which claims were supported with evidence and reasoning (an ethical and idealistic reason). As a result, a substantial amount of writing for the course should be for "educated" (even idealized) readers.

4. Demonstrate the ability effectively to incorporate written sources into their own writing and to document their use. The emphasis in 1122 is on **using** readings (summarizing, paraphrasing, critiquing, synthesizing) rather than on **finding** readings. How to introduce and punctuate quotations effectively is also important, as is following conventions for in-text citation and a bibliographic page. As a result, teachers may find it most productive to have students work with "given" readings—and with one or two source materials—rather than on extensive "found" readings. Students should understand the rhetorical uses of readings—to enhance ethos, to add support, to generate contrasting ideas, etc.—as well as the ethical.

5. Demonstrate the ability to use feedback to revise their own writing and the ability to provide useful feedback to others. As the features of 1122 and 1133 make clear, all elements of composing are important. This goal underscores the revision as a key skill to be developed/demonstrated in the course. Revisions are changes to a text that would change the summary (or propositional content) of that text. Because much writing occurs in collaborative contexts, it's also important for students to develop abilities to give productive help to others.

6. Demonstrate the ability to edit and proofread their writing. Texts that have errors in word choice, spelling, grammar, conventional usage, or punctuation significantly compromise the ethos of their writers and may even cloud meaning. Texts whose style, voice, or register is inappropriate to the rhetorical situation at hand also compromise ethos. Students unable consistently to produce generally well-edited or proofed texts have not accomplished this goal.

Elaboration of the Goals for WRIT 1133: Notes to faculty.

1. Demonstrate practical knowledge of academic research traditions (for example, text-based/interpretive; measurement-based/empirical; and observational/qualitative) through effectively writing in at least two of those traditions. Research is central to WRIT 1133, but research understood broadly. There is a close relationship between rhetoric and epistemology, the ways that knowledge is made in different traditions, including such matters as what counts as evidence and what form an argument must take. The University houses several research traditions. One is reading-based research, in which the writer assembles a set of written texts and, through complexly intertwined practices of interpretation, analysis, and synthesis, develops an argument. For most students, in most writing courses, this is what research means. It is the primary method of the humanities, and it is a component of most other disciplines. However, it is hardly the only research tradition that matters in the university. A related tradition is interpretive, in which the artifacts aren't print texts but, rather, art or music, images, architecture, and the whole gamut of popular culture artifacts. A third tradition is measurement-based research, in which the writer uses a systematic procedure to generate a quantitative representation of a phenomenon, then makes an argument based on that representation. The phenomena are physical in the natural sciences, and the measures come through instruments such as scales or rulers or dosimeters or spectrometers or so on. The phenomena are social or psychological in the social sciences, and the measures come through instruments such as surveys. Another research tradition is qualitative research, in which the writer uses systematic observational or first-hand inquiry strategies to generate descriptions of phenomena, then interpret those descriptions to support arguments. Methods include interview and direct observation.

2. Demonstrate an understanding of rhetorical/conventional differences among various academic disciplines or groups of disciplines. The emphasis of this goal is "understanding of differences" and not "mastery of specific disciplines." The latter, of course, would be impractical for WRIT 1133 and is properly the responsibility of individual departments and disciplines. The goal is not inoculation to perform well in the writing style of many disciplines but, rather, the ability to analyze and learn to emulate that disciplinary discourse, with the help of future teachers of it, in future courses. "Academic discourse" is hardly a unified entity, and students benefit from knowing that the concept of "rhetorical situations" learned in 1122 applies within the academy as well as without. Clearly this goal maps closely against goal one. That is, the adherence to certain epistemologies in certain disciplines often manifests itself in patterns of organization and development, citation practices (and the values underlying them), the ethos of writers, and so on. However, a research method isn't manifested only in disciplinary discourses. A lot of popular writing uses interview or observation, for example, or gathering and interpreting artifacts (think of essays on film genres). One can "demonstrate an understanding" both through analysis and through performance, and teachers will likely find both useful in teaching this goal. As with any of these goals, teachers may elect to have students emulate features of disciplinary disciplines, writing short papers or parts of papers or doing exercises with voice and style, rather than only doing fully-fledged papers.

3. Demonstrate practical knowledge of rhetorical differences between writing for academic audiences and writing for popular audiences, through both analysis and performance. There are significant differences between writing for academic audiences and writing for popular audiences. The most obvious is a depth of knowledge or expertise between the two groups of readers. However, another important difference is that academic audiences are usually obliged to read texts to keep up with their professions, while popular audiences elect to read—or not read—texts on various subjects; this has implications for style and manner of presentation, perhaps even the design of the texts. Students in 1133 should recognize and understand the differences between writing to an audience of disciplinary experts reading for professional reasons and writing to an audience of nonexperts reading for civic or aesthetic reasons. One way to develop that knowledge experientially is to have students "translate" pieces written for one type of audience into pieces intended for the other.

4. Demonstrate proficiency in finding, evaluating, synthesizing, critiquing, and documenting published sources appropriate to given rhetorical situations. While multiple kinds of research are important in 1133, writing with reading is vital. The added emphasis in 1133 (over 1122) is on "finding." Students should learn to use academic databases and develop strategies for finding information for specific rhetorical needs. Research needs to be understood as a purposeful act, with sources sought and used to address specific writing needs rather than as a hollow formal act of gathering and dumping.

Features

Both WRIT 1122 and 1133

1. Focus on the production of student texts. The feature that most distinguishes writing courses from, say, other classes that may include written assignments is the former's sustained emphasis on student writing. The student's texts are the primary focus of the course, receiving as much respect as expert texts—and more time and attention. The focus can be seen in several practices, including explicit instruction on writing strategies and processes; sharing student writing with others in the course; peer workshops; writing center consultations; individual conferences with the professor, and so on. While students do engage readings, they do so primarily in order to improve their own writing and their critical/analytical facilities. Students will have an opportunity to write for different purposes and audiences, with the goal of developing tools they need to communicate effectively in various academic and civic contexts.

2. Include specific instruction in rhetorical and critical analysis. Rhetorical and critical analysis helps students become more astute readers, analysts, and critics of published texts, focusing on how and why writers achieve effects on readers. Students will learn how texts vary in both form and content according to their intended audiences, their purposes, and the contexts in which they were written. Students will learn to read a text closely, and write *about* the way it functions, and not just what it contains. They will also learn to evaluate claims, evidence, reasoning strategies, and ethical and emotional appeals as well as logical. WRIT 1122 focuses on basic strategies for rhetorical and critical analysis, primarily in popular and civic discourses. WRIT 1133 emphasizes how these skills function within the contexts of research and disciplinary traditions, including in relation to more popular writings about academic knowledge.

3. Include specific instruction and practice in using rhetorical strategies. The emphasis on using rhetorical strategies complements instruction in rhetorical and critical analysis. The shift in emphasis is from *analyzing* what others have done, with what effect, and why, to *using* those strategies in students' own writings. Writers face a host of decisions as they plan, organize, and compose texts. They must persuade audiences situated within a certain historical time and cultural place, limited by certain constraints: time, money, logistics, etc. Vital to navigating this maze of choices is understanding the particulars of the rhetorical situation. What does my audience know or believe, and what implications does that have for me as a writer? What evidence and reasoning will be most effective? What tone should I adopt, and how should I present myself? What organizational strategies are most effective in this given situation? How do I best deal with points of view different from my own?

4. Emphasize writing for well-educated audiences, generally for public/civic purposes (1122) and academic audiences (1133). In the finite time of a single course, it's clearly impossible to give students practice in all types of writing and writing situations they will encounter. For example, writing to people with high school educations and who may do fairly little reading, may invoke strategies significantly different from writing to college graduates subscribing to *Wired* or *Harpers*. Similarly, there are important differences between writing in professional/workplace situations, writing for personal development and pleasure, writing in specific academic disciplines, and writing on subject matters, issues, and ideas for a broader reading public. This latter falls under writing for civic purposes, that is, writing that seeks inform and influence thought and decision making in various public spheres.

5. Substantially use process pedagogies, including regular attention to invention, production, revision, editing, and design; responses to multiple drafts and works in progress; and so on. Good writing does not occur magically. Process pedagogies recognize that strong writing skills develop over time through practice. Rather than focus solely on the finished product (e.g. the final exam; the one-time graded paper; the longer research paper), process pedagogy guides students through various aspects of writing, from invention to drafting to revision. A key feature of process pedagogies is providing feedback to students during the process. These may include small group feedback sessions, teacher-student conferences, comments on drafts, and in-class workshops.

- **Invention** is the act of generating ideas and content or discovering new directions that writing might take. Invention strategies may include systematic inquiry heuristics, free-writing, journaling, preliminary research, outlining, questioning, along with classroom collaboration and discussion. Through invention, students discover both what they already know about their subject and what they need to know.
- **Drafting** is the fundamental process of getting words down on the page or screen in a productive order informed by purpose, audience, and context when producing any document.

- **Revision** involves considering the fit between a developing text and the rhetorical situation for which it's being produced. Revision attends to substantive issues, including overall structure, argument and logic, purpose, and uses of evidence. Based on their self analysis and feedback from instructors and peers, students doing revision work make additions, subtractions, transpositions, and substitutions to their texts, at levels ranging from sentence to paragraphs to ideas and sequences.
- **Design** means attending to the physical features of the text as it is delivered to its audience. At one level, design includes features such as typefaces, margins, and spacing. At another level, it includes the incorporation of visual elements (images, tables) and document layout. At still another level, it may include multimedia or digital texts, perhaps even including sound or video.
- **Editing** means attending to surface-level features of texts to make them conform to readers' expectations of style, grammar and usage, manuscript conventions, and so on. Editing involves both proofreading and focusing on textual features as small as words, phrases, and sentences to promote not only correctness but also precision and rhetorical effectiveness. See #8, below.

6. Include a reading component. Reading in WRIT 1122 and 1133 is important both for practice in rhetorical analysis and for providing content for students to write about, with, through, and against. Through active reading, students come into conversation with texts by others, analyzing received positions and arriving at their own. Students need to be able to summarize readings, interpret their meanings and implications, analyze their rhetorical strategies, relate them to other texts about the same subject matter, and explain their limitations or inadequacies. To practice these skills, students in WRIT 1122 and 1133 may read a text or set of related texts; discuss them (unpacking the meanings, debate the terms used, arriving at an interpretation); write in response; synthesize multiple readings; produce critiques or reviews; and use summary, paraphrase, or quotation to incorporate ideas into their own texts. Reading of student writing in the course is also important, using all the strategies one might use for published writing.

7. Teach basic techniques for incorporating and documenting sources. In WRIT 1122, students will begin to develop an awareness of, and comfort with using, sources in their writing. The course will focus primarily on **working with sources, rather than finding them**, and concentrate on dealing effectively with a limited number of sources, rather than an extensive list of them. This will include learning how to summarize accurately, paraphrase key ideas, and quote or cite specific ideas or information concisely, accurately, and in ways that blend source materials effectively with their own writing. Students will consider such questions as Why draw on sources? What types of sources will best support particular arguments or rhetorical situations? How do writers evaluate sources, attending to such things as the author's credentials and quality of reasoning and evidence, the timeliness of the research, its intended readership, and so on? Students will gain **basic experience** in documenting sources appropriately according to MLA and at least either APA or Chicago Manual of Style. The goal is not to have students master all conventions of all style manuals but to teach them how to use style manuals and to understand the vital importance of following conventions to document sources aptly. **Students in WRIT 1133 will emphasize, additionally, finding and evaluating sources.**

8. Teach students editing and proofreading strategies in order to produce texts that meet the grammar, usage, and delivery expectations of their readers. Students should learn that careful attention to editing and proofreading strengthens their ability to be taken seriously by their readers. At the same time, students learn that the absence of sentence-level errors does not necessarily mean that the writing is effective. Students should learn strategies for editing and proofreading in the context of their own writing, rather than through generalized grammar exercises. Based on need, instructors may devote small amounts of class time to particular issues in style, or to grammar, punctuation, and usage errors. **Editing** is understood as having both an emphasis on **style** (e.g., word choice, diction, emphasis, transition, gracefulness) and on **managing errors in grammar, punctuation, and usage.**

- *Editing for style*: As time allows, concepts about editing as stylistic craft are introduced, with reference to course readings for positive models. Though students may not be ready for more sophisticated stylistic editing, they will benefit from introductory instruction on word choice, sentence structure, and other stylistic elements that can be used to enhance meaning.
- *Editing as error management*: Students learn to make distinctions within a continuum of concerns—between higher order and lower order writing errors. They learn to identify their own patterns of error and develop a variety of strategies for addressing and correcting these patterns. Students develop long-term skills for self-diagnosis of error and successful use of available resources, including use of a handbook and familiarity with the Writing Center. As students become proficient in self-diagnosis, explicit emphasis is placed on high-order errors, such as sentence-boundary confusion, that block readers from understanding the text.

Proofreading is a last step to ensure that the text is as free as possible from errors or unintentional elements. Students learn strategies for catching typographical errors, inconsistencies in spelling, and other purely surface-level mistakes that irritate readers and affect the author's ethos. Because research indicates the limited efficacy of marking all errors in a piece of writing as a means of teaching mechanical proficiency, instructor marking and evaluation of editing and proofreading errors is constructive and instructive, rather than punitive. Student writing is not expected to be error-free by the end of WRIT 1122, but by the end of the course, students should be able to distinguish different categories of error, be able to identify their individual error patterns, should have developed strategies for addressing these, and should be aware of the some of the resources available to them for strengthening their writing at the levels of style, grammar, usage, and punctuation.

9. Require students to produce from 6000 to 8000 revised and polished words (20-25 pages), in at least four texts. Just as musicians and athletes learn by practicing—by "doing" rather than by "studying about"—so do writers develop by writing. Students can generally expect many writing assignments, some of them single-drafted, even informal exercises, others more formal papers multiply drafted and revised. As a four-credit courses, WRIT will have students complete 8 to 12 hours of out-of-class work each week, the bulk of it in their own writing. Students will generally write several thousand words, in as few as four to as many as twenty individual writing assignments. Of that total volume produced, students will complete a least four "finished and polished" pieces, together totaling 6000-8000 words. By "finished and polished," we mean writing that is thoroughly revised and carefully edited, usually based on responses from the instructor (and peers), and represents the student's best work in given rhetorical situations.

10. Accomplish the course goals through a well-conceived sequence of activities and assignments. A commitment to the *process* of writing, which is at the heart of our pedagogies, informs the design of both courses: each section provides a careful sequence of reading and writing assignments designed to build student skills and abilities. Sequences of writing activities, for example, will equip students with the rhetorical skills to use in future or longer assignments. The cumulative sequence of assignments means that students continually draw upon what they have learned already in order to push themselves even further. Our goal is not only to provide students with a repertoire of writing tactics but to teach them how to combine those tactics into coherent, purposeful, and context-specific strategies.

11. Require a brief final portfolio. At the end of WRIT 1122, students will turn in a portfolio containing three pieces of writing that demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use rhetorical strategies. Two of the pieces should be papers written during the course. The third piece (which might count toward the "revised and polished" course total, if suitable) should be a compelling analysis of the other two, persuasively explaining how they demonstrate the writer's facility with rhetorical strategies. At the end of WRIT 1133, students will turn in a portfolio containing four pieces of writing. Two should be written during the course, and one should come from another course the student has taken at DU. The fourth piece (which might count toward the "revised and polished" course total, if suitable) should be a compelling analysis of the other three, persuasively explaining how they demonstrate the writer's ability to write researched papers for different expectations or situations.

Synthesis of #1:

Prepared by Rebekah Shultz Colby

> What should be the relationship between "analysis" and "production" in WRIT 1122 and 1133? I realize this is an invidious binary, but I'm distinguishing between assignments that are "about" other texts, mainly as interpretations or elucidations of the rhetorical strategies they employ, and assignments that require students to practice/employ rhetorical strategies to achieve some rhetorical goal. (The contrast might be, "Analyze the rhetorical strategies used in a newspaper editorial about Halloween" vs. "Write a newspaper editorial about Halloween.")

There was a lot of discussion about why we would need to focus on production in 1122. There seemed to be agreement that we needed to practice analysis because it helped students become more aware of what and how they were writing when they engaged in production. There was a general consensus that the overarching, unwritten goal of 1122 was to help students become rhetorically savvy writers so that they could write a range of texts – a range that we couldn't accurately predict once they left our class. However, there was much more disagreement in the degree of importance in actually producing these rhetorically savvy texts. To persuade the skeptical part of our group, I brought up that production in a way is a type of analysis. Engaging in production is important because during the writing process, students become more aware of issues like audience and have to confront the messiness of writing – that there may not be one sure-fire technique in reaching their audience. While I and other members of our group eventually persuaded the more skeptical members of our group to concede that perhaps production had some value, these skeptics still argued that this type of rhetorical awareness could be achieved by just writing analysis and, in fact, rhetorical analysis was its own type of production. At this point, I sort of gave up. At least we had reached somewhat of a consensus that both analysis and production were important in 1122. It was also argued that another over-arching goal of 1122 was to help students become more aware of the choices they make as writers, which is closely related to the other over-arching goal of rhetorical savviness.

Even though we reached a consensus of sorts, I'm still not sure everyone in the group understood the value of production. Production is purely about rhetoric – making something happen, creating action, in the public sphere. (I did bring this up, but it was shot down since academia could be perceived as the public sphere.) Production is also about making rhetorical choices to a real audience with a real purpose in mind. Because of this, it is not just an exercise in imitation. There are genre conventions, but students should also become critical users of these conventions, not blind imitators, so that they know when to break the rules to effectively reach their audience. While I'm not sure I always do the best job of helping my students become critical users – writers who make rhetorical decisions based on their own needs to achieve their purpose and persuade their audience, not blind slaves to imitating conventions – I still think this should be the ultimate goal that I need to continue to strive for as a teacher.

Yes, analysis and production can become an invidious binary. There are times when reaching an academic audience seems to be a civic duty. Analysis and production should have a reciprocal relationship because they both help students become more aware of their choices in writing. There are many types of academic writing, each with their own discourse conventions, and students should become rhetorically savvy writers of these texts as well. However, I still think there is a value in defining civic discourse as discourse done in a public domain, outside of the university. And I think there is value in students actively engaging as rhetors in these types of civic discourses.

Perhaps the definition of production became so reductive because the term "production" itself sounds reductive. As the end result of some other process, production, or rather product, already sounds like it is in service to something else – in this case, analysis. In composition, "product" is always the demon term we are taught to avoid at all costs while engaging in process pedagogy. Because of its associations with the factory and labor, production sounds mechanical – so mechanical it could get reduced to simple imitation or "just following the rules." I'm not sure our disagreement was a simple matter of semantics though or not. But perhaps changing the term wouldn't hurt our argument either.

Synthesis of #2:

Prepared by Heather Martin

> One distinction between 1122 and 1133 is that the former foregrounds using sources (thus focusing on such things as summary, paraphrase, critique and the rhetoric of attribution), while the latter puts additional emphasis on finding and evaluating sources, including using library and other databases. Is this distinction useful, or should we make a change?

Responses to this question were split. Some argued that it is imperative that we maintain this distinction between the courses, while others called for it to be completely dissolved.

Folks who hoped to maintain the distinction argued that students need to take the necessary time with new types of sources material, time to learn quotation integration and to understand the differences between summary and paraphrase, etc, *before* learning to find and evaluate sources. These respondents felt that students who have knowledge of proper integration of sources and source material are better prepared to approach research methods. A benefit to maintaining the distinction is that students approach the research tasks in WRIT 1133 with confidence and enthusiasm, and with a sense of newness. This cuts back on the student tendency to dismiss 1133 lessons, saying that they already learned how to conduct research in 1122.

One person cited limitations on grading and response time as a reason to hold off on research until the spring quarter. The feeling was that instructors may not have the time necessary to properly evaluate and respond to student use of sources. When the instructor has provided all, or most, of the source material, he or she is better able to attend carefully to the ways the sources are used. Another person felt that it was to do a disservice to our students to send them out to find sources without the proper instruction in how to *use* what they find.

Faculty members who suggested a change referred to the present goals of the course and argued that research supports all of those goals. This person argued further that research allows students to engage more fully with the topic as they are offered more choice in the material they write about.
Another respondent noted that it can never hurt out students to have additional practice in finding, using, and integrating source material. One person noted that it's far too late in the spring quarter to introduce students to library research.

Our middle ground was to think of the approach to research in 1122 as providing "exposure" more than intensive instruction. Respondents felt universally that individual instructors should be able to decide for themselves how to approach the topic in 1122. In the end, the consensus was that the present elaboration, indicating that 1122 "will focus *primarily* on working with sources, rather than finding them," was sufficient in its present iteration.

Synthesis of #3:

Prepared by Jennifer Campbell

> Currently, WRIT 1133 has students practice at least two of three research traditions broadly understood as "textual, quantitative, and qualitative." It also has the goal of familiarizing students with different discursive traditions in the academy—the rhetorics of different disciplines or groups of disciplines. While I'm thinking there's some considerable overlap between them, they are represented as two different goals. Does this make sense? Should we drop the goal of familiarity with disciplinary conventions? Should the goal be "analytical awareness of" or "practice in"—or both?

Most folks seem to be comfortable with the idea of integrating research traditions and the disciplinary practice of research methods, and several emphasized that we should privilege the research traditions, especially in terms of examining the affordances and constraints of different methodologies and asking students to really think about why they would use different methods investigate specific topics. There was concern about any attempt at coverage of disciplinary discourses, with most suggesting that we should use interdisciplinary examples to illustrate research traditions/methods rather than dividing essays by field.

The responses consistently emphasized the need to include analysis AND practice, and analysis as an integral part of practice. One group "discussed the distinction between analyzing the rhetorical conventions of a document and analyzing the affordances and

constraints of a particular research method (what it allows us to see and what it ignores)." Again, this would foreground method and epistemology rather than specific disciplinary discourses. The issue of "integration" popped up several times.

On a related note, there was some discussion of framing the research projects differently—for example, promoting the integration of quantitative or qualitative research without insisting on a formal research report format. Also, there was the suggestion of lower-stakes "practice" in research methods prior to a larger research project in which students determine the best methods, audience, and genre for their specific topic.

Also, as we all know, a number of folks have noted that we need to refine how this goal is worded and translated into assessment.

Several groups discussed "the support we would need to teach students to produce texts in the various research traditions, including workshops and useful textbook chapters." There was a recognition that some of us will need to expand our understanding of various research methods, that we can facilitate this through workshops and sharing syllabi and assignment, and that we must make these resources available to adjuncts.
That pretty well covers it. ☺

Synthesis of #5:

Prepared by Matt Hill

> How do we best conceive of the relationship between "academic discourse" and "civic discourse?" Despite the title of 1122, I've generally wanted to think of it as a course that introduces "rhetorical thinking," and I tend to think that various public and civic discourses provide an easier means for doing so. (I also think those discourses are more engaging for students.) But I could be wrong.

The overall ideas from the groups is not too surprising. In both courses, the goal should be on the appropriate approach to writing that particular situations demand. So, each course should be rhetorically-grounded and should allow for an approach to writing that allows for public writing and academic writing to co-exist in the same class, even in the same assignments. As long as we are teaching students to engage with writing for an audience and with a purpose, then the civic can be part of the research tradition and vice versa.

The chunk which Heather sent to the list about #5 is particularly interesting: *It's difficult even to begin to wrap your head around the relationship between academic and civic discourse, because there's no third category that would include them both, i.e., you have to decide in favor of one or the other in advance of working through of their relationship. At present, the 1122-33 sequence is decided in favor of the academic over the civic (and, not incidentally, in favor of analysis over production), so the latter is inevitably subordinated to the latter: academic discourse becomes the master code. Which is, predictably, what the academy on the whole prefers. One could as easily, however, reverse the poles, though this would require seriously rethinking both 22 and 33 and the relationship between them, not to mention the place of the program and purpose of the program with respect to the University.*

Further concerns that were brought up included the notion that separating into "civic" writing versus "academic" writing might further widen the disciplinary divide between research traditions. Additionally, some concerns were raised that by focusing on one type of discourse over the other in each course, we could create an unwelcome split that might not encourage students to see their communicative needs through a rhetorical lens. In other words, this discursive split might seem more like a modes-based course.

Synthesis of #6:

Prepared by Casey Rountree

> If we are going to focus on rhetorical analysis and strategies, how sufficient are logos, ethos, and pathos? For example, we could well focus on stasis theory, on kairos, on any number of logical emphases (such as Toulmin analysis) or ethos/pathos conceptions (such as Burkean identification or consubstantiation).

The general consensus regarding how much/little we should include in our description of 1122's goal regarding rhetorical analysis was that we shouldn't burden that item with an extended list of all the possible "basic elements" instructors might utilize when teaching rhetorical analysis skills. Although the question that prompted our discussion implied instructors may feel constrained by the statement only listing logos, ethos, and pathos in particular, people did not indicate that they felt they were being asked to limit their teaching to just those three terms.

However, group members did express the idea that there would be a potential benefit to our department relying on a common vocabulary, to a certain degree, when we teach so that students moving into a 1133 section with a different instructor would be familiar with certain basic terms on the first day of class. But, we didn't believe we should restrict instructors' choices when it comes to the amount of time spent using those terms or their employment of other rhetorical terms and analytical methods. We also did not come to a consensus on what terms should be addressed specifically in all sections.

A few people suggested we might want to spend some of our big group time tackling that question of what terms we should be consistent in using, and even how each of us defines and teaches those concepts in class. That would possibly create greater consistency across sections and help each of us teach the concepts addressed in this program goal effectively.

It was also suggested that we might want address this issue by forming an ad hoc committee (the "Curriculum Committee"?) that could help create program-wide definitions of key elements and present teaching strategies to the big group.

A group member also suggested that the goal—which now says students will be able to "demonstrate facility with basic elements of rhetorical analysis"—might be improved by adding something relating to <u>production</u>, which is not specifically addressed in it now. (This relates to issues raised in question one.)

Finally, one person suggested it might be detrimental to load our course goals statements, which in part are directed towards an external audience, with terms that are likely to be unfamiliar to people outside our academic field. The concern was including jargon such as "logos, ethos, and pathos," not to mention "Toulmin analysis" or "Burkean identification" might actually hinder our efforts to communicate our departmental goals to a larger audience. However, many of the group did not see this as a problem and think it may actually help us express the level of rigor/sophistication we are striving towards to the general public. Nevertheless, we agreed considering our audience for these course goals was a good issue to remember as we move forward.