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- Institute for Eloquentia Perfecta
Though courses in composition, public speaking, and academic English have been part of USF's curriculum for decades, the department of Rhetoric and Language is a relatively new one, not yet ten years old. In that decade we have been busy. Among our accomplishments:

- developing a graduate program (Master's in Professional Communication) that is thriving in its fourth year;
- developing a minor;
- developing and piloting a Directed Self-Placement program for undergraduate admissions;
- undergoing substantial revision of the curriculum to integrate the three areas of our department, including changes that may impact USF's core curriculum;
- hiring several new full-time faculty;
- developing an English Placement Test to properly onboard international/multilingual students;
- participating significantly in the development of writing and speaking across the USF curriculum, including participation in the assessment of graduation competencies, offering/supporting core writing classes across many disciplines, providing written and oral communication support to multiple graduate programs, directing and staffing writing and speaking centers that directly support the work of hundreds of students each semester, and playing a significant role in creating Writing and Public Speaking core offerings in the new Honors and Engineering Programs;
- finally, our faculty have earned multiple college- and university-wide awards for teaching and service (see “Faculty” section and Appendix A).

The Department of Rhetoric and Language comprises three areas that correspond to discrete academic fields of study--composition, public speaking, and academic English for multilingual students. This particular combination is somewhat unique for an academic unit, but department faculty are energized by the many points of connection among these areas of study, and we have found that this structure provides USF students with the best possible learning opportunity in each area (it doesn't hurt that the faculty in these different areas all like each other!). On the undergraduate level, composition and public speaking are often lumped together as the "rhetoric" division of Rhetoric and Language, while Academic English for Multilingual Students (AEM) is a distinct program within the department (though it overlaps in many places with the rhetoric division). We will often explicitly refer to these areas as “Rhetoric” and “AEM.” This program review also explicitly includes the Speaking Center, a multi-faceted student support program that is housed within the public speaking area but which serves the whole department and much of the university. This self-study report also frequently references the M.A. in Professional Communication, a
graduate program that was developed by and is administered mostly by Rhetoric and Language faculty.

I. Mission and Learning Outcomes

The mission of the Department of Rhetoric and Language is to teach students to use communication effectively to engage with people, texts, and the discourses of academia and civic society.

This mission involves three components: first, to assure that students develop the skills in written and oral communication that will allow them to be successful in academic, civic, and professional contexts; second, to promote understanding of and proficiency in rhetoric and literacy; and third, to offer a variety of classes and co-curricular activities that promote excellence in writing and speaking and their corollaries: reading, listening, and responding.

Our focus on excellence in written and oral communication situates our mission centrally within the University's Jesuit Catholic tradition, of which *eloquentia perfecta* is a foundational element. The department houses nearly every class that meets two of USF's eleven Core areas--A1: Oral Communication and A2: Written Communication. Between those two Core areas and the AEM program, we have contact with almost every new and transfer student at USF, usually within their first or second semester at the university. The Rhetoric and Language Department provides a valuable service to the rest of the university, then: our program is forefront in providing students with a basic understanding of the norms and conventions of academic communication and research. Academic success is our prime goal, but we also expect students in our classes to learn how to read rhetorical situations, to develop the skills to grasp complex social and cultural discourses, and contribute to the ongoing conversations that constitute our civic lives. Through encouraging this kind of studied awareness, we contribute to the university's strategic priorities, assuring that our students have the analytical foundation for understanding Jesuit values, such as how they may serve as "men and women for others," how they may gain insight into the "fundamental questions of purpose and meaning in a global context" and how they may work to promote justice.

Our efforts to accomplish these goals are associated with our emphasis on rhetoric and literacy. Literacy itself relates to a basic ability to participate in the conversations that

---

1 The MAPC academic director is a rhetoric faculty member, and the board consists mainly of Rhetoric faculty who developed the MAPC curriculum as part of a department committee that was formed in response to recommendations in our previous program review. Since MAPC is a free-standing graduate program, it will undergo program review on its own timeline; however, its organizational structure and history are so tied to the work of Rhetoric faculty that we feel it necessary to include in certain aspects of this review.
make our world, including foremost the ability to operate competently within a linguistic community. But literacy also means to have the skills to "read" those world-making conversations in all their complexity. Rhetoric builds on this: at its core, it can be thought of as skillful argument and persuasion, as the power to determine what will be effective in a given situation. However, we see rhetoric also and simultaneously as an understanding of all the processes we use to make and interpret meanings socially. Promoting rhetoric means to assert the "world-making" and relational functions of communication, and it means to reflect on the ethics of communication (which also squarely situates our mission within the university’s mission). The USF mission and values call on us to understand the moral dimension of every significant human choice, and its strategic priorities call on us to always reflect, to "understand . . . the ethics of what is done." By promoting a rhetorical understanding of written and oral communication, we encourage analysis and reflection on how communication may articulate a humane and just world. It enables us to see how the "right reasoning" of eloquentia perfecta contributes to a humane and just world, and it enables us to critique the ways that communication based on self-interest and power over others can diminish a humane and just world.

In our courses, then, we teach excellence in speaking and writing through learning outcomes that emphasize rhetoric, argumentation, and literacy. We approach communication dialectically, exploring the connections between writing and speaking, between oracy and literacy, between writing and reading, speaking and listening. Beyond the classroom, we enact our mission through events and activities that promote these aspects of our mission, including in our showcase events--the department's selective journal of student writing, Writing for the Real World, and our annual celebration of student speaking, The Cotchett Speaker Showcase. Further, we enact it through support services and affiliated programs for excellence in literacy and rhetoric--The Conversation Partners program, the Debate Team, the Writing Center, the Speaking Center. Each of these voluntary programs offer students individualized opportunities for support and growth in languaging.

The mission statements and outcomes for these programs reflect our pedagogical goals and the alignment of writing, speaking, and literacy with Jesuit values and institutional goals and outcomes. Specific sections throughout this self-study will examine how the mission and outcomes are realized in the work of these programs, but we list all the missions and outcomes here to ground the rest of the study.

**Rhetoric Program Mission**

The mission of the Rhetoric Program in the Department of Rhetoric and Language is to teach all University of San Francisco students to communicate effectively and ethically in
academic, civic, and professional contexts. Through our classes, service, and co-curricular activities, we advance the Jesuit ideal of eloquentia perfecta--reason and eloquence in writing, speaking, and languaging--and guide our students as they learn to engage critically with the texts that influence their beliefs, values and actions.

**Rhetoric Program Learning Outcomes**

Upon successful completion of the rhetoric program, students will be able to:
1. Explain and apply rhetorical concepts, theories, and principles in the process of analyzing various texts and rhetorical situations.
2. Evaluate the ethics and effectiveness of their own and others’ communication in academic, civic, and professional situations.
3. Produce research-driven written, oral, and digital communication that demonstrates awareness, knowledge, and application of rhetorical concepts.
4. Articulate and interpret their own rhetorical choices and composing processes.

**Speaking Center Mission:**

The purpose of the USF Speaking Center is to provide an atmosphere that fosters critical thinking and peer mentoring, allowing students to confidently create and perform effective presentations. We fulfill this mission by identifying individual needs and addressing content, arrangement, situation, and delivery through the principles of effective oral communication.

**Speaking Center Learning Outcomes:**

1. Minimize communication apprehension / speaking anxiety and increase communication confidence.
2. Craft and present well organized, well-reasoned and appropriately supported oral presentations that are responsive to topic, purpose, audience, and occasion.
3. Deliver and create speeches using an audience-centered, extemporaneous delivery approach.
4. Help students evaluate the effectiveness of their own communication.
AEM Program Mission

AEM’s mission is to serve students for whom English is not the primary language primarily in developing their written and oral language proficiency and secondarily fostering dialogue that promotes awareness of expectations of the academy and a deeper understanding of the USF Mission.

AEM Program Learning Outcomes

Students who have applied themselves rigorously in their AEM studies (at the test-score level expected of students who were not required to take any additional AEM courses) will be able to:

A. Communicate successfully in writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes.
B. Intelligibly communicate orally for a variety of academic and personal purposes.
C. Understand the rationale and demonstrate means for using reliable sources of information.
D. Demonstrate and articulate typical expectations of a liberal arts education in US universities.
E. Articulate knowledge of the USF Mission
II. History

This fall marks the 10th anniversary of the Department of Rhetoric and Language, which was formed from three distinct programs housed at the time within the Department of Communication. The Composition and ESL (now-AEM) programs had spent less than a decade in that department, in what was an odd juxtaposition of all the programs that focused in some way on human communication. (The earlier histories of the programs--including ESL’s particularly tumultuous one--can be found in Appendix F) In 2009, there was a sense of stability for each program as part of the Communication department, even if faculty felt that there was an uneasy fit between these programs and the Communication Studies program, which existed in a shared institutional space but without close interaction or integration of faculty or programs. Communication Studies had a major and minor, making it more of the controlling force in the department as degree-granting programs carry more institutional cache at USF. Further, although the Composition program offered 20-30 sections of Written and Oral Communication (then RC 130-131; now RHET 130-131) that met both composition and public speaking cores, but there was little interaction between these faculty and Communication Studies’ core of public speaking faculty, who were composed almost entirely of adjuncts. The Public Speaking program at the time, despite constituting a Core area, was largely confined to multiple sections of one public speaking course (COMS 103; with RCOM 130 discrete) rather than serving as an actual program, unlike Composition and ESL, both of which had their own sequences of courses, robust curricular development, and dedicated full-time faculty. Further, even though Composition had a few Communication PhDs who were experienced and qualified to teach many Communication Studies courses, there was no overlap in teaching in these programs. On the other hand, The ESL and Composition programs worked together significantly in that period, as they had a degree of intellectual overlap since the ESL course sequence blended into Composition’s developmental writing program.

In 2009, the Communication major underwent program review, and one of the administration’s responses was to remove ESL and Composition from the Department to form a new program. However, the Provost also removed the public speaking course and management of Core A1 from Communication Studies, coupling it with Composition to form an expanded Rhetoric program that would manage all of Core A (some 15 adjunct faculty would be moved from Communication Studies to the new program; no full-time faculty--including the several rhetoricians in Communication Studies--would join the new unit). The new program was granted department status, choosing the name "Rhetoric and Language" to represent the core elements that resonated with its three units. Faculty in the new department by-and-large saw these developments as positive, although there were concerns that this new unit would be seen strictly as a service department and that the ratio
of full-time to part-time faculty, already skewed in the Composition program, was further thrown off by the transfer of 15 new adjuncts and 70 additional sections each year. In the next three or so years, four new full-time term (not tenure-track) faculty were hired (Hunt, Gabor, Ewert, Leung).

The recent history of the department is perhaps best characterized by its response to various questions and suggestions raised in its initial program review, which took place in Spring, 2013 (with an action plan meeting December, 2013). The reviewers' suggestions for improving the department revolved around action items for both faculty and administration. What follows is a summary of the reviewers’ suggestions and actions taken in response over the past six years. It is important to note that aspects of many of the suggestions were not viable because they would violate the USFFA CBAs or alter university policies formed in response to the CBA.

1. “a program of reduced course loads for which full-time faculty can apply so that those chosen can offer a series of faculty development workshops on the above issues instead of teaching their third class”

   **Response:** no action taken. In recent years, the university has made an effort to reduce the amount of NTA offered to faculty, so expansion of NTA to this type of development was never on the table.

2. “a competitive college-wide system of semester-long career development leaves that one can apply for with a research proposal every six years.

   **Response:** the most recent CBA (2017) includes a limited program of term sabbaticals --fourteen one semester sabbaticals are available to over 90 term faculty over a seven- year period. Two Rhetoric and Language faculty (Brian Dempster and Michelle Lavigne) have been awarded sabbaticals since the program’s inception in Fall, 2017.

3. “Rectify the severe imbalances of full-time to part-time faculty and consider converting term faculty lines into tenure-track lines”

   **Response:** the Provost has provided funds to several Arts and Sciences departments, including Rhetoric and Language, to offer one-year, non-renewable term positions to part-time faculty during years when university enrollment exceeded expectations. Hiring and reinstatement has not been confirmed on these positions until after June pre-registration. The imbalance mentioned above remains, and has been exacerbated due to numerous Rhetoric faculty teaching and administering outside the department. A continuing-term faculty member in Rhetoric was not renewed this year, but the search was canceled due to university budget cuts that have hit Arts and Sciences particularly hard, further exacerbating the imbalance.
The following summary gives an overview of faculty teaching trends from 2015 to 2019 (see appendix B and C for full details). The standard public speaking courses (Rhet 103 and 104) and the standard composition courses (Rhetoric 110 and 120) and the most popular writing in the disciplines (WID) classes (Rhetoric 203, Rhetoric 206, and Rhetoric 310) are overwhelmingly taught by part-time faculty. On the other hand, the themed first-year seminar classes (and transfer-year classes) are taught by a higher percentage of full-time faculty. The most balanced are the two composition classes at either end of our placement scale: Rhetoric 110N and Rhetoric 130/131. In these classes, for our incoming students with the lowest and the highest SAT scores, respectively, full-time and part-time faculty teaching assignments are closer to equal. The pie charts below show the breakdown for the last five years (2015-2019).
RHET 195

- # of full-time: 16
- # of part-time: 17

RHET 295

- # of full-time: 19
- # of part-time: 11
4. “Facilitate greater curricular coherence through, for example, paid workshops, course releases, and development leaves”

Response: The department has prioritized curricular coherence by providing a number of different kinds of professional development opportunities, some focused on deep thinking about curricular issues, some as more hands-on workshops. The College of Arts & Sciences has funded some of these so that we could attract increased involvement from adjunct faculty, who are not required to attend such events. But course releases and developmental leaves have not been offered. Still, even without funding, most of our
adjuncts are highly engaged and interested in such opportunities, so we tend to get good turnout. Some of the opportunities include:

- Many faculty take advantage of CTE (Center for Teaching Excellence) retreats and colloquia. Six Rhetoric faculty have participated in retreats that engaged faculty in collaborative syllabus development.
- Several department faculty attended a two week-long Digital Media and Composition Workshop at the Ohio State University, leading to expansion of curricular practices around teaching with technology.
- Numerous workshops focused on curriculum, grading, syllabi, etc, sponsored by department, usually aimed at all faculty, though frequently these emphasized topics like teaching speaking in the writing class or scaffolding writing assignments for public speaking instructors.

5. “Expand the curricular interconnections among the three areas”
   **Response:** Though this particular suggestion is succinctly stated, it was actually one of the most discussed and significant elements of the review. The curriculum section in this document details the curricular changes and the process through which they were envisioned and worked out. But to summarize: we’ve undergone extensive work to develop the curriculum with an emphasis on integration. Composition classes now have a public speaking element; public speaking classes have a formal written assignment. Faculty have received professional development support for the work of planning, scaffolding, and evaluating these new assignments. AEM faculty have provided workshops to help faculty in non-AEM classes to better integrate and work with multilingual students. We’ve sought out overlaps between oral proficiency and public speaking. We’ve engaged in significant curricular development that is currently not fully realized only because its scope would result in changes to the Core that must be decided by the entire faculty of the university.

   At an intellectual level, these interconnections have undergone significant informal and formal discussion at various department-sponsored events (see list below). Of particular note is the intellectual work accomplished through twice-yearly department retreats and through a number of workshops and speakers provided through a Jesuit Foundation curriculum grant obtained in AY 2015-2016 (Department faculty obtained a second grant this year, which will further support curriculum development in 2019-2020).

6. “Bring faculty together physically for enhanced collaboration”
   **Response:** our suggestion #4 response provides details on some of the enhanced collaborative work as relates to curriculum coherence, but our efforts to bringing faculty together for collaboration have included myriad events:
- Triads
- Pedagogy meetings
- New Curriculum Committee
- Composition Faculty Workshops
- Public Speaking Faculty Workshops
- Spring 2019 Workshops (speaking/writing combo)
- AEM “all hands” meetings
- All department workshops (on Assignment Sheets, on Non-Racist Approaches to Grading)
- Jesuit grant speakers
- Department retreats on topics: transfer of rhetorical knowledge; writing new department mission/outcomes; intersectionality
- The Integrating Multilingual Students committee developed four faculty development workshops that were offered in the department and to university-wide faculty
- Adjunct Rhetoric conference provides part-time faculty with the opportunity to present panels, mostly but not exclusively pedagogy-oriented, to audiences comprising other adjuncts, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty from other local schools

7. “Streamline the core curriculum, including re-numbering ESL courses to correspond with proficiency levels”

Response: Curricular changes are in the works that would result in streamlining some aspects of how Core A is delivered. As part of a multi-year effort, the College of Arts and Sciences, which is tasked with managing the core curriculum of the university, has been systematically reviewing USF’s six core areas. (Specific results of Core A assessment are reported below) Conversations are in progress about changes that will be discussed among faculty and all constituents and an overhaul would be engineered based on the report and recommendations of the university-wide Core Advisory Committee. We acknowledge that we still haven’t made some very hard decisions that would be required to actually streamline our curriculum. For example, the fate of our WID courses, as well as Rhetoric 130/131, and Rhetoric 195 must be worked out. However, our recent efforts to move to Directed Self-Placement (DSP) will help us make some of these crucial decisions (See section on Directed Self-Placement below for more details).

8. “Develop major(s) and minors, with the concurrent creation of appropriate upper-level courses”

Response: Dean Camperi made it clear in our action plan meeting that another major was not welcome in USF’s already-crowded field. Our MMM committee developed a plan for a Rhetoric minor which was initially approved at the Associate Dean level; however, the minor was put on delay until a turf clarification could be made with Communication Studies. Meanwhile, when it became clear that our own programmatic curricular changes
would result in significant modifications to course offerings that were connected to the minor, that program was pulled back until the new curriculum was established. Unfortunately, many of those curricular changes to the Core are on hold because they are so substantial that they require a broader university effort to change the core curriculum. Currently, we are devising a new upper-division Core class that will be a cornerstone of the minor, and we will re-introduce the minor once this class has been piloted and approved.

9. Dedicate more resources to the Writing Center and the Speaking Center.

Response: along with the Learning Center, these Centers were moved to the library to form a new learning commons, in a celebrated event that had been in the works for several years. The university has shuffled and re-shuffled space over the past 15 years or so, in the course of going through renovations of several of its biggest classroom buildings, with the goal of situating related offices and services in close proximity. The new learning commons would provide a shared space for several important student academic support services, all in a location--Gleeson Library--that provides perhaps the most significant academic support service of all.

While this move has partially resolved the space issue for the Speaking Center, the set-up is not ideal (the Center has to reserve rooms for the tutors to work with students, rather than having a dedicated space where a lectern, computer, etc can be kept). Meanwhile, support for Speaking Center direction has crested; the program had been directed by a part-time faculty member, Jacquelyn Horton, who built the center from a part-time tutoring program into a well-known and multifaceted locus of support. Horton was rewarded for her efforts, first with a special two-year teaching+service contract, and then with a series of one-year full-time contracts. But she accepted a permanent, full-time job this year, which the university was unwilling to match. This is a grave loss to the department and the university, and one the College would have liked to prevent but for severe austerity measures being imposed by the Provost’s office. Meanwhile, the budget for both Centers was reduced last year, with the Speaking Center having to limit its client contact by more than 50% in Spring 2019. The department remains committed to these resources, and we directed our sole one-year “replacement” line (down from five, as recently as three years ago) to an interim speaking center director, Patrick McDonnell (a long-term part-time faculty member in our program who has been in a full-time replacement line for the past three years).

The departmental response to the suggestions above has, of course, not been piecemeal, so it’s worth discussing the dynamics of the past few years. In the months after our action plan meeting in December 2013, we formed a New Curriculum Committee; among its first accomplishments was reviewing alternate options for delivery of a core curriculum in writing, which was approved by Department Faculty in May 2014. In the time since, this committee has worked tirelessly to produce more proposals and pilot syllabi, as
well as assess the new curricular ideas. The committee included several full-time and part-time faculty representing all three areas of the department and so has been characterized by inclusivity and thoroughness. The other significant and highly efficient committee (formed with the production of the self-study in 2013) is one we’ve colloquially referred to as our MMM committee (Masters-minor-major). This committee led the charge in imagining and producing the proposal for our Masters in Professional Communication program, which has now been offering courses since Fall 2016. The MMM committee investigated MA programs nationwide to figure the niche market that would unite Rhetoric and Language faculty strengths with potential student demand. We submitted a proposal for a program in Professional Communication and Rhetoric in 2014, which was modified by the Dean’s office into Professional Communication, along with the requirement that the program have a significant online/hybrid component. Our proposal was “combined” with a proposal for an online writing program that administration had contracted.

Although Rhetoric and Language was asked to take a vote on housing the program, the fact that the new MAPC was approved as a combination of the two proposals has meant that the MAPC would exist as a freestanding program. Currently, the Academic Director is a Rhetoric and Language faculty member, the board consists of three Rhetoric and Language faculty and two other members, the majority of courses in the program were developed by and are taught by Rhetoric and Language faculty, yet the department does not receive the benefits one would expect of creating and housing a Master’s program. For example, we hoped that the increased revenue and need for faculty would result in the hiring of full time faculty who would bridge the two programs, and we thought that having an academic MA program would create the need for tenure track positions. But the program’s only hire has been a faculty member who doesn’t have roots in Rhetoric and was not qualified to teach any of our undergraduate classes. Subsequently, this new MAPC faculty member was hired away from USF after two years in the program. (Rhetoric and Language faculty have speculated on the isolation this junior hire may have felt, as the only dedicated faculty members in the program, teaching her entire load at the university’s downtown campus). Further, though a handful of rhetoric faculty benefit from the opportunity to teach their expertise at the graduate level, the effect on the department has been to pull faculty away from undergraduate teaching with no compensatory hires provided.
III. Curriculum

The programs that now make up the department’s curriculum have historically been shaped by specific needs of the university—for example, the Core A2 Written Communication learning outcomes pre-date the department and the old Rhetoric and Composition Program. However, since the department was established, faculty have engaged in a period of curriculum review and development in response to several different motivating factors: changes in the academic fields that inform the various programs, adoption of new educational technology, evolving demands of USF students and programs, and the reorganization of our own programs into a new department. Still, Core A1 Oral Communication and Core A2 Written Communication are touchstones for curricular development in the Rhetoric program, just as the University’s need to recruit, integrate, and retain multilingual/multinational students shapes AEM’s curricular development.

Although we’ve engaged in significant efforts in recent years to integrate the three areas of the department (and those efforts are detailed later in this section), it’s easier to separately unpack their curricula—including learning outcomes, goals, and courses. This section covers the Rhetoric program first (including Public Speaking, the Speaking Center, and Composition), then AEM, and then provides a general discussion of curricular management and change.

A. Rhetoric Program Curriculum

“Rhetoric Program” is more of a colloquial descriptor, referring to the writing and public speaking courses in the department that are not managed under the specialized AEM program. All courses in the catalog that are listed with the RHET prefix are technically part of the program, though RHET 106 and 106N and the four two-unit workshops for international students are only nominally Rhetoric courses and are actually run by AEM. Virtually every Rhetoric course either meets Core A1 Oral Communication or Core A2 Written Communication or is prerequisite to Core A2. In Rhetoric, there is currently no program in the sense of a major, minor, certificate or other formal institutional designation, although the two areas of the Rhetoric Program—composition, public speaking—have their own directors, who are involved in scheduling and managing a somewhat discrete set of faculty. Though the Composition and Public Speaking areas are discussed separately, we should note that current and proposed curricular changes provide for explicit integration across these sub-units, which we expect to eventually result in a reorganization of director/coordinator positions.

The mission and learning outcomes for the Rhetoric program were crafted with input from all the department’s full-time faculty and a few representative part-time faculty, and
the learning outcomes were specifically intended to be aspirational, naming the direction where curricular changes are currently heading. Further, although these are formally the Rhetoric Program's mission and outcomes, they were crafted deliberately to include learning goals and practices related to AEM in an effort to further establish common cause among all three areas of the department.

The program’s mission and outcomes (see pages 2-4) are tightly integrated into the University’s. USF’s mission and vision statement directly highlights communication in a variety of ways, typically associating it with ethical and moral practice; for example, it advocates the freedom to follow evidence to its conclusion, to seek truth, to engage with others across difference, and to reflect on the moral dimensions of human choice. We see our core functions--teaching written and oral communication--as responding to these ethical considerations (and not just as skills classes). Our learning outcomes do not directly address the pursuit of social justice, but we understand the practices and values encoded in them to be essential to researching and communicating about social justice. Further, our second outcome--which grounds the analysis of communication in both effectiveness and ethics--is central to our faculty’s approach to the teaching of communication, which is always situated in context.

A1. Public Speaking/Oral Communication and the Speaking Center

The public speaking program is distinguished by its organization around a rhetorical approach and adherence to the Jesuit values that shape the USF Mission. Most faculty teaching these courses tend to put forefront the idea of rhetoric in service of social justice and the common good. Though our courses emphasize public speaking as a communicative civic, academic, and professional practice, they also emphasize rhetorical processes of invention, development, and extemporaneous presentation for various purposes and audiences. We also emphasize rhetorical concepts, theories and experiences in order to ask students to consider and reflect on the effectiveness and ethics of their own and others' communication. The rhetorical/ethical approach supports the USF core values statement, such as "understanding the ethical dimension of every human choice."

Our public speaking curriculum is largely organized around providing opportunities for students to earn Core A1 credit; we offer about 75 sections per year of RHET 103: Public Speaking, through which the majority of students complete Core A1. We also offer about 20 sections per year of RHET 130-131, a year-long combined writing and public speaking course, which meets both Core A1 and A2 upon completion of the 2-course sequence (currently, new admits who are in about the 80th percentile of SAT/ACT scores place into this class). Students also may earn Core A1 credit through a few specialized courses, such as RHET 104 Argumentation and Debate (which doubles as a recruitment tool for our debate team), RHET 111 Public Speaking for the Health Professions. Honors students in the St.
Ignatius Institute earn Core A1 credit through a 2-unit course (SII 325) that conforms to their great books/classics model and Rhetoric faculty (particularly Leigh Meredith) have been involved in creating a new Honors A1 sequence of courses as part of the new USF Honors program. Public Speaking faculty also participate in USF's first-year seminar program, offering several different options under the COMS 195 First Year Seminar title: recent options include: Sports Talk, Rhetoric and Performance, Speaking of Bicycles.

Over the course of the last two years, faculty have been revising the primary A1-completion course, RHET 103, to include streamlined Learning Objectives and a significant writing assignment. Faculty piloted the revised course in Spring 2018 and have been rolling out new guidelines via retreats and workshops for full and part-time faculty in 2018 - 2019. This work parallels the integration efforts in the Composition program, where previous years’ work was focused on incorporating speaking into the RHET 110 and 110N writing course.

Although Core A1 is central to the public speaking program, the department contributes to the teaching and learning of oral communication in a variety of ways beyond the Core requirement. First, our recent program initiative to integrate public speaking and writing leads us to include speeches as a formal, required element of certain composition courses (RHET 110, 110N--see Appendix D for sample syllabi). Second, we have begun to play a bigger role in speaking-across-the-curriculum efforts (though we haven't called them that): several of our faculty have been involved with University-wide Oral Communication assessment efforts, developing learning outcomes and rubrics for graduate competency in oral communication, and thereby influencing university-wide oral communication curriculum indirectly (e.g., assessment reports of USF graduates are based on outcomes and rubrics developed by rhetoric faculty). Some of our faculty have also been involved with assessment of the School of Management's "pitch competition," similarly influencing oral communication standards in that school. Third, our Speaking Center offers support for the oral communication/public speaking curriculum in a variety of ways--through workshops run by the speech tutors, professional development opportunities offered by the former director, Jacquelyn Horton, and direct service of USF students who visit the center several hundred times per semester. Under Horton's direction, the Speaking Center has become more professionalized and has grown tremendously since our last review, including development of curriculum that includes USF course credit. Finally, two of our faculty led a Center for Teaching Excellence Faculty Learning Community (FLC) on “Multimodal Rhetoric Across the Curriculum,” and three of our faculty participated in that year-long learning community (alongside faculty from other schools and departments). This FLC promoted the importance of oral communication instruction throughout the undergraduate and graduate curriculum.

The Speaking Center’s prime goal is to provide peer tutoring for all oral communication work at USF. Most of its appointments involve support for students in Core
A1 courses, but, increasingly, students doing oral communication projects in a variety of classes has received support at the center. The tutors and director have also been involved in a great deal of outreach, supporting oral communication at USF beyond the standard tutoring sessions: for example, tutors are available to do workshops in USF classes on such topics as using visual aids and proper oral citation and the Center has hosted a series of public speaking workshops (open to all students and faculty). The Speaking Center has also created a curriculum for tutors to further professionalize their work: for the past two years, new speech coaches have taken a 2-unit practicum developed by Horton in which they train to be responsive tutors and to sharpen their understanding of public speaking and their position (with an emphasis on speaking projects typically assigned in USF classes).

A2. Composition

The learning outcomes for Core A2 date to the establishment of USF’s core--circa 2002-- and have not been updated since, although the department has long planned to revise them. We expect that we’ll create new core learning outcomes as we finalize our revised curriculum, and we expect that the outcomes will be synchronized with the Rhetoric Program outcomes above. Any changes to the Core, large or small, must be approved by the Core Advisory Committee.

Although these outcomes are not particularly student-friendly, they still represent the essence of our composition sequence, which is centered around the rhetorical foundations of our discipline and which highlight academic reading and writing (with a focus on public argument rather than fiction, as many composition programs feature).

Though composition is organized around Core A2 and the flagship course, RHET 120 Written Communication II, most students begin by taking Written Communication I (Rhetoric 110); a minority of students, who need more time and intensity to achieve the learning outcomes, take an equivalent course: Written Communication I Intensive (Rhetoric 110N). Both Rhetoric 110 and Rhetoric 110N have the same learning outcomes, and both serve as prerequisites to the courses that fulfill Core A2 (for exceptions to this rule, see “Rhet 130/131 and Honors College” below). Rhetoric 110/110N introduces students to college-level rhetoric through the composition of projects that respond to important social and academic issues. Students gain practice in writing brief to medium-length essays—that are focused, clearly organized, and well supported. Several elements are taught to support the composition of these projects:

- incorporating multiple sources in the service of a unified argument;
- addressing multiple, often conflicting, points of view;
- developing skills in summary, paraphrase, and quotation;
- revising texts for coherence and clarity.
Students also learn elements of rhetorical theory and develop the ability to critically read a moderate number of instructor-assigned texts. The learning outcomes for Rhetoric 110/110N are:

1. integrate writing, speaking, listening, and reading for a central purpose;
2. develop and appropriately employ strategies for addressing the rhetorical situations for different audiences, purposes, and contexts;
3. demonstrate an awareness of their own and others’ rhetorical choices and audiences, as well as their drafting and revising processes.

Upon completion of Written Communication I (or Written Communication I Intensive), most students progress to Written Communication II (Rhetoric 120), where they are called on to compose more ambitious arguments responding to and incorporating sources of greater number, length, complexity, and variety. Students also (a) develop skills in critical analysis of challenging non-fiction prose from a range of disciplinary perspectives and subjects, with a particular focus on the linguistic and rhetorical strategies employed therein, and (b) conduct extensive research in the process of planning and composing sophisticated texts. Students also gain practice editing for stylistic fluency in accordance with conventions of Standard Edited English. Finally, students develop greater independence in formulating strategies for revision and expansion of written arguments while reflecting upon their own rhetorical knowledge.

**Course Placement and Sequencing**

If the 110-120 sequence told the whole story, this would be a pretty cohesive, but boring, program. There are considerable other options available to students, and, if you were to ask students or advisers to describe the placement and sequencing options in the composition program, the word they would likely use is *convoluted*. Over the years, we have tended not to make difficult choices between conflicting options for growing the program; instead, we’ve tended to tack on new course options, eliminating courses pretty much only when they consistently failed to get enrollment (with one major exception, RHET 108). It’s probably useful to discuss the courses historically to understand how the logic underlying the current sequence.

USF’s composition program was based on a rather standard *Writing I - Writing II* model since at least the late 90s. RHET 110 and 120 remains the primary two-course sequence through which most students receive Core A2 credit. But we've built on to that basic structure over the years: first, through "bridge" classes that provided developmental writing for students who had completed the AEM program or who entered USF with extremely low test scores (and more recently, who've been placed into these courses through our EPT). RHET 106 and 108 were pre-requisite to RHET 110 for many students, until 108 was replaced by two 6-unit “booster model” classes--106N and 110N.
Other groups of students take Rhetoric 130-131, our year-long **Written and Oral Communication** course instead of Rhetoric 110, 120, and 103. Students earn both Core A1 and A2 credit in this course; the course is accelerated, condensing what would normally be three semesters worth of courses into two, and so department faculty, over the years, have kept the course restricted to seemingly high-potential students (either with high SAT/ACT scores or students with AP credit in Composition). Students in this placement tranche have the choice of taking either RHET 130 or RHET 195 First-year seminar. The FYS is a stand-alone class that gives Core A2 credit; thus, students who select this option must also take a public speaking class. (Recent examples include **Sidewalk Rhetoric, Nature’s Rhetoric, Bohemia/Counter/Subculture, Writing about Human Rights, and Language and Power**.)

Transfer students are handled somewhat differently: students with no previous writing classes take our EPT or get placed through an informal directed placement system and start their writing sequence with either RHET 106 or RHET 110. (In rare instances, some may be placed in AEM courses). Students with previous writing classes historically were placed directly into RHET 120, but we found, over the years, that transfer students have an incredibly wide range of preparation for university-level writing at USF, and so we developed a transfer writing course--RHET 250--taught by instructors who were especially attuned to the demands of differentiated learning in composition. Later, the university began a transfer seminar program, and so RHET 295 was established as an alternative to RHET 250. USF programs may offer any FYS 195 course as a TYS 295, and we offer several such classes each semester.

Another variation to this sequence is the addition of WID classes into this mix. Originally, courses like RHET 310 (Business and Technical Writing) and RHET 203 (Writing in Psychology) were discipline-based courses that were required by majors and which carried Core A2 as a prerequisite. Eventually, though, we arranged for these courses to provide Core A2 credit for transfer students and added a number of other disciplinary classes--Writing for Sociology, Writing for the Sciences, Writing for the Performing Arts, Writing for Advertising and International Studies. The fates of these course have differed. Writing for Sociology has been taken over by the Sociology Department, as has Writing for Advertising. Writing for International Studies never supported sufficient enrollment and is now defunct. Writing for the Performing Arts and Writing for the Sciences have both been taught sporadically, by full- and part-time faculty in various departments. There are also a few non-disciplinary upper-division courses through which transfer students can earn Core A2: Rhetoric and Popular Culture and How English Works. After a few years, a decision was made to use RHET 110 or 110N a prerequisite for these classes, for our native students in addition to transfer students.
Because our placement structure, sequence of courses, and combination of possibilities is somewhat complicated, the following visual breakdown may facilitate quick comprehension.

Current System

The large number of faculty members teaching these rhetoric courses functions as a two-sided coin: on the one hand, the diversity of faculty ensures that the course will be infused with new ideas and fresh approaches to the learning outcomes; on the other hand, the Department of Rhetoric and Language must ensure that students get an equivalent experience in every section. Thus, the Composition Area of the Department of Rhetoric and Language requires writing course professors to explicitly link all major assignments to the stated course learning outcomes. We welcome many reasonable, justifiable, interesting, engaging, and rigorous ways to meet the learning outcomes. Each semester, the full-time faculty in Composition review all syllabi to ensure that the outcomes are being met in the spirit in which they were created.
B. AEM Curriculum

The University of San Francisco has a long history of educating students from around the world, and over the years, international students have contributed much to the University. The 1970s and 1980s were decades of growth in the number of international students in the United States, and like other U.S. universities, the University of San Francisco sought ways to better serve these students, prepare them for academic work in an English medium environment, and integrate them into the academic community. From Fall 1974 to the summer of 2012, AEM, or as it was known then, English Language Center, provided courses for both non-matriculated (20-25 hours a week of instruction) and matriculated students (a minimum of 12 credit hours). Through this period, a number of significant changes occurred in terms of the name and status of the program, faculty status at the university, and the curriculum (Appendix F for a fuller history).

Of particular relevance to the curriculum is that AEM currently only serves matriculated students and all courses are credit bearing, as elective credits for graduation. This is an important distinctive from many academic English preparation programs in the US, and this policy is in keeping with the mission of the university.

The AEM curriculum is based on fundamental principles of language, language learning, and language teaching. Language primarily serves as a means of communicating meaning in socially and culturally specific contexts. Successful L2 communication requires grammatical, socio-linguistic, pragmatic, discourse, and strategic competence in complementary proportion. Language learning is a process of making form-meaning connections that is best achieved when learners are actively engaged in the learning process because of their need to communicate meaning and function. In order to facilitate acquisition, learners need to be exposed to large amounts of the target language (input) and opportunities to use (output) it in meaningful ways (interaction). Although classroom language learning, particularly if it is explicit learning, is insufficient to acquire high levels of proficiency, but it can change the rate of development. By engaging in authentic communication and performing real-world tasks in a variety of contexts, learners are able to develop and recreate their social identities, as well as understand and build ties with the target culture and community. Such complex experience is likely to educate multi-competent individuals who are able to function appropriately in L2 contexts.

Language teaching from these perspectives of language and language learning positions the teacher in a facilitative role, providing models of the target language, tasks that promote meaningful use of the language in relevant and sustained content, embedded feedback and instruction to help learners make form-meaning connections, and creating contexts for authentic language use. Through dialogue, the teacher can adjust scaffolding support to promote learner development.
Distinguishing features of the AEM Program:

a. All courses are electives, bearing credit towards graduation.
b. All courses focus strictly on academic preparation.
c. All literacy courses align with the required composition courses to provide a logically sequenced path to complete the Core A2 requirement.
d. Students achieving an A- or better in their AEM courses have the opportunity to skip a course level of either literacy or oracy by submitting a portfolio for review by a faculty committee.
e. The full-time faculty are all applied linguists with expertise in second language learning and teaching.
f. Students can be in different levels of literacy and oracy courses as determined by the internal English Placement Test and in-class diagnostics.
g. The term “ESL” has been eliminated in the name of the program, the prefix of the courses, and all public information about the program.

AEM Course sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy</th>
<th>Oracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEM 110 Academic Reading/Writing I (8cr) *</td>
<td>AEM 111 Academic Oral Communication I (4cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEM 120 Academic Reading/Writing II (8cr)</td>
<td>AEM 121 Academic Oral Communication II (4cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEM 124 Academic Reading/Writing III (8cr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students required to take AEM 110 must also enroll in AEM 102 Fluency Development (4cr).

C. Curriculum Delivery and Management

The Rhetoric and Language curriculum is delivered primarily through conventional 4-unit courses; we run tens of sections of needed required courses—RHET 103, RHET 110, RHET 120, RHET 130—each semester. Core classes are on the schedule every semester, including summer and intersession for certain classes. The various sequenced courses in both AEM and RHET are offered based on student need; we are usually able to estimate how many sections we need on a semester-by-semester basis and able to adjust on-the-go because we have so many classes and so many part-time faculty always looking for courses (e.g., it’s easy enough to look at the number of students taking 106 and 106N in the Fall Semester and presume the 110/110N needs will be pretty similar, with CIPE providing information on new admits to help us make adjustments). For certain more specified content
classes, we often only offer them when expert faculty are able to add them to their schedule: for example, RHET 320, 323, 325.

As noted above, a good deal of our curriculum has been developed to appeal to or meet the needs of general classifications of students. A good example are the classes we’ve created for multilingual students who meet proficiency standards for admission without AEM courses: only about 10% of international students at USF are required to take classes in AEM. A casual survey would probably find most USF faculty both unaware of that fact and conflicted about it, as, in recent years, the readiness of international students—particularly those from China—has been a source of concern across campus. While international admissions has been successful in recruiting students who demonstrate academic excellence, these students often are not fully prepared for success in academic writing/reading and speaking/listening in English. Our department has responded to this need through a layer of composition courses between AEM and the Core (106, 106N, 110N) that are specially geared toward working with multilingual students. AEM faculty developed and manage RHET 106 and 106N, along with several 2-unit workshops for multilingual students on topics like “Academic Writing” and “Academic Discussion” (and more recently, “Vocabulary” and “Grammar.”). Unfortunately, we struggle every semester to fill these workshops, even though they are well-publicized and well-known to advisors and faculty across the university who would be best situated to identify ideal candidates.

We also offer courses that are geared toward high-achieving students who seek opportunities beyond the standard Core offerings. As noted in the composition section above, we participate in USF’s FYS program, with several seminars aimed at students who demonstrate academic skill through SAT scores and AP credits. That same group of students (about the top 20th percentile, by test score) also has the option of taking our accelerated speaking and writing class (RHET 130-131). We’ve come to think of these options, for better or worse, as a virtual Honors track over the years. RHET 130-131 also provides the basic structure for a living-learning community that our faculty support—the Martin Baro scholars program. David Holler and Kara Knafelc have teamed up in this course for several years, offering a version of 130-131 that also includes literature and service-learning credits to students in the program (unlike 130-131, these students have no test score requirements). More recently, our department has been involved in developing courses for the university’s new Honors program. Leigh Meredith played a leadership role in developing the curriculum for those courses, and they are being taught for the first time in AY 2019-2020.

One of the barriers for Rhetoric in developing more such courses that match the wide range of academic training and expertise of our faculty is that fact that we must typically offer classes for Core A credit in order to get students to take them. Classes like Rhetoric and Popular Culture and How Language Works are unable to consistently attract students as electives but have been fairly successful as Core A2 Composition courses (though we still must recruit to fill them).
Our faculty also play a crucial role in developing courses for the Master’s in Professional Communication. Some of our full-time faculty have taught in the program, most of them with a regular rotation of courses (Michelle Lavigne frequently teaches Foundations of Professional Communication; Ted Matula, Ethics of Professional Communication) while David Ryan is the Academic Director and has developed and taught six different courses in the program’s 3-year existence. Rhetoric and Language faculty have developed nearly every class taught in the program as well as devising the basic outline of the program itself. Further, the program gained faculty curricular approval with Rhetoric and Language as the unit of record. (the CBA states that Full-time faculty own the curriculum, and new courses and programs are routinely approved by faculty through a hosting unit). Developed by a committee of rhetoric faculty, the MAPC curriculum amplifies aspects of Rhetoric and Language’s, particularly with its emphasis on written, oral, and digital communication training necessarily carrying an ethical component.

Teaching assignments and courses at USF are formally given by the dean’s office, since faculty administrators must be buffered from director managerial responsibilities so as to remain in the bargaining unit. But chairs and directors, working as proxy for the Dean, actually do all the work of collecting faculty teaching preferences, crafting the schedule, managing schedule changes, etc. Historically, the chair handles course assignments with varying degrees of input from the Composition and Public Speaking directors, while the AEM Director schedules AEM classes. In recent years, we’ve tried to shift scheduling toward the directors but the amount of shuffling needed to get the many Rhetoric faculty into the right classes at the preferred times makes this task easier to be handled by one point person. Scheduling is a year-round task, with deadlines for early drafts, deadlines for final drafts, and adjustments to the active schedule all overlapping. New admits register in the summer, with first-time students mostly registering in June and transfers enrolling all summer; this creates the need for data analysis in May and adjustments to the schedule in June – August, in response to enrollment. Spring new admits register in the first week after New Year’s, so similar schedule prep and analysis takes place throughout December and in early January.

At the full-time level, course assignments are driven by faculty request, though faculty member’s area of expertise and experience, as well as their hiring letter, play a significant role; for example, faculty with expertise in composition have been asked to complete a period of class observations and professional development before teaching the stand-alone public speaking class. The size of the program, and need to offer multiple sections of many required classes, has typically meant that full-time faculty have a great deal of leeway in deciding both what to teach and when. Full-time faculty usually teach courses for which they were explicitly hired or which they developed expertise in their time at USF. Over the years, this has contributed to a situation where full-time faculty are under-represented in certain key classes, particularly in composition.
For example, from the 5-year AY period stretching from 2014-2019, full-time faculty taught 25% of the department’s core-granting classes (see pages 8-11 and 37 for further details, as well as Appendix B). This is not surprising, considering the great number of courses offered each semester, and it is telling about how inadequate the number of full-time faculty is in the department. But digging deeper, 70% of USF students take RHET 110 or 110N as a pre-requisite to their Core A2 class, and some 700-800 new admits will take these classes in their first semester at USF. But last year, only 14% of these sections were taught by full-time faculty, down from 22% in 2014-2015. Further, the ratio of classes taught by full-time faculty has also risen slightly in that time, from 20% to 28%. In our two booster classes--106N and 110N--the percentage of full-time faculty has shrunk from 33% to 19% over five years, despite the fact that we offered nearly half the number of sections last year (down from 39 to 21). Full-time faculty have been drawn away from RHET classes by administrative and teaching opportunities in other programs, and have scheduled themselves in more preferred “virtual honors” courses, such as RHET 130/131 and RHET 195/295 (see Appendix C for further details).

A new collective bargaining agreement for part-time faculty has resulted in a change in course assignment procedures, the impact of which are still being assessed in the department. Scheduling trends highlight a significant undercurrent of concern for our entire curriculum; it can be difficult to maintain cohesion and high standards when such a great number of faculty is teaching so many different sections, and when faculty preparation for a course (including formal training, experience, expertise) varies greatly. We deal with this in several ways, including:

- adherence to consistent hiring and onboarding practices: when we need to hire faculty, we carefully review applicant’s qualifications, ask for teaching materials, have them interview with some combination of two directors or chair. We then provide new faculty with sample syllabi, textbook lists, mentoring, workshops, etc.
- faculty/teaching observation and evaluation: new faculty are observed in their first semester of teaching; syllabi get extra scrutiny; course evaluations are reviewed.
- maintenance of a department Canvas site with sample syllabi, assignments, etc.
- maintenance of a department library (the “pod”), housing textbooks and other materials for faculty review as they prepare classes and assignments.
- review of syllabi: each semester, we review all part-time faculty syllabi, checking for appropriate textbooks, learning outcomes, assignments, rubrics, etc.
- professional development opportunities, including workshops, colloquia, discussion groups, etc.
- assessment: we run regular departmental assessment and participate in university-wide endeavors (such as Core Assessment) and use these processes to ask and answer questions about curriculum and faculty teaching.
Over the years, we’ve come to appreciate some level of diversity in the way our classes are taught; for example, we have textbook lists that include five or more options in some cases, and we are open to faculty proposing alternatives; our faculty is quite diverse in its training, so we try not to stamp out those differences even as we articulate a certain cohesiveness to make sure students in different sections get a comparable experience.

A final point about curriculum maintenance: while our program, like many others, often has moments of antagonism with administration, we generally have what we need to teach our classes. Standard class size is twenty for writing and public speaking classes, with smaller numbers for specialized classes, including the First-year Seminar program (16), the 6-unit Intensive classes (18), and required AEM classes (16-18). Unlike many other universities, USF has not pressured programs to create online versions of their required classes, although the distributed campus system is widely regarded as a problem (and has been a headache for the chair and composition director, even though we’ve averaged about one course per semester at distributed USF campuses). Class size became an issue in Summer 2018: because of significant budget cuts imposed on the College by the Provost, Rhetoric and Language (and the rest of the College) had been pushed to limit the number of classes it offered for Fall 2018. But when a surprisingly large class of new admits paid deposits and then found no classes available, RHET was directed by the Provost to raise caps by 1 on most of its classes to accommodate the new students. Our faculty remains concerned that this “one-time” increase could eventually pave the way toward larger class sizes across the board.

D. Curricular Revision

It’s a truism at USF that curriculum is “owned by the faculty,” even though it is ultimately managed by the College and the Provost’s office. USF has intensified efforts in recent years to streamline curricular change processes, though programs still, generally, initiate curricular development and revision processes. Thus, departments are the “seat” of the undergraduate curriculum, and any new courses with the RHET or AEM prefix must be approved by a majority of department faculty. Course proposals are, in essence, expanded syllabi and are generally approved via email vote by full-time faculty, though any controversial or significant additions or changes will get discussion at department meetings at the request of any faculty member. Other curricular changes are generated within the department’s three areas or programs and approved by the Full-time faculty. Beyond the department, the Area Associate Dean and Associate Dean for Academic Effectiveness are typically next in line to review new or revised courses. The Core A committee reviews any new classes that meet A1 or A2, a nominal process, as three of the four Core A members are Rhetoric Faculty (the chair and directors of public speaking and composition), with the
fourth being a representative of the School of Management. The Core A committee rarely
lets a class through the department if it does not meet Core A requirements as well.

Since our last program review, the whole department has become intimate with
curricular revision processes. We have revised or initiated several new undergraduate
courses since then along with an entire Master’s Program that was approved by department
faculty as the first step down the curricular path. But we’ve also been engaged in a
substantive re-thinking of the undergraduate curriculum, in a process that has actively
courted contributions of Full- and Part-time faculty alike.

After our last program review, the department created a committee to explore new
curricular possibilities. Months of committee work, research, meetings (with both internal
and external constituencies), and faculty retreats created three initiatives: 1) a minor in
Rhetoric; 2) an MA in professional writing; 3) and, a substantial reworking of the delivery of
Core A classes. Each initiative originated in one or more deeper issues that the department
has struggled with over time, including:

- The perception of Rhetoric and Language as strictly a “service department” offering
  introductory courses that students viewed as boxes to be checked, and which faculty
tended to view as a kind of “inoculation” of students against “bad writing.”
- Following our program review, we often spoke of integrating the “three areas” of our
department, because we saw this kind of integration as incredibly meaningful. Many
faculty in our program have studied and, for years, taught at the junction of one or
more focal areas in our department, and so our curriculum development was seen as
an attempt to engage with these overlapping areas of inquiry to see where they could
inform each other.
- The opportunity for faculty to teach more courses in line with their expertise: our
  faculty possess a diverse range of degrees, research interests, and teaching
experience, which we see as a strength, even though it often results in some
disjuncture between research/discovery and teaching. Our new programmatic
options would create the opportunity for more upper-division and graduate-level
“rhetoric of . . .” courses and other chances to integrate special knowledge and
expertise into a coherent curriculum.
- The placement of domestic and international students into Rhetoric classes: As noted
  above, we have been using SAT, ACT, and TOEFL as our primary placement
indicators, with the top 20% or so having access to special options like RHET 130 and
First Year Seminars. We note that, due to the inherent biases of standardized tests, our
“virtual honors” students are more likely to be white and/or privileged in other
ways. We have long been aware of the shortcomings of this model, especially for
international students. Many international students complete a very different track
through our writing program than do domestic students. The image below shows the
trends for the last five years.
With these issues in mind, but driven largely by the call to explore areas of deep integration of our disciplinary roots, we crafted three initiatives, got invited into a fourth initiative, and just initiated a fifth:

1. **Minor in Rhetoric and Language.** It’s widely assumed that communication skills are crucial to the employment of new college graduates; our minor sought to offer students the opportunity to build their capacity in professional communication (one of the core components of *Eloquentia Perfecta*). But it also would provide a deep dive into rhetorical theory and history, as well as offer a broad sampling of classes that related to the expertise of many of our faculty. In short, it was not necessarily a coherent program. But, still, it provided students with an organized way to develop and demonstrate facility in communication, and was approved at initial stages.

   Once the program was shopped around to a few related programs (including the Communication Studies Department), we ran into some turf issues . . . in particular, the
Communication Studies Department has a minor in Communication that offers some similar classes and which drives students toward their department's rhetoric courses. COMS faculty were concerned about the overlap between the two programs, and the Deans Office asked us to delay launching our minor online until some sort of détente could be worked out. After some initial positive conversations, our department embarked on a plan to re-craft some elements of the minor to accentuate the differences with the COMS minor. But as time passed, it became clear that the focus of the Rhetoric minor should reflect the broader curricular changes in the works; in fact, it became clear that one of the core minor classes should be our Core A “capstone” class (described below) which would bring together written, oral, and digital communication in an upper-division course. The minor was put on hold as we developed the new curriculum, but we’re seeing that this process may be extended for years until Core Assessment is completed and faculty weigh the prospect of changing the Core.

2. Master’s in Professional Writing. Some of our most meaningful discussions with our 2013 program reviewers revolved around the many possibilities for building our curriculum into organized programs for USF majors and graduate students. Because USF’s field of undergraduate majors is saturated, we prioritized creation of an MA program. Originally, we saw this program as building mostly from our writing and composition focus. But our committee researched potential competitor programs and began moving in the direction of professional communication. As our proposal reached the Dean’s level in Arts & Sciences, we were invited to some meetings to discuss a combination of our proposal with another proposal the Dean’s office had commissioned—an online MA in writing. Eventually, we were asked to combine our efforts with this commissioned proposal and revise our proposed MA to include a substantive online component; our department was asked to vote on housing the program, and we expanded the original proposal to create a Master’s in Professional Communication.

The proposal was accepted, and the MAPC begin offering classes in Fall, 2016, with Rhetoric and Language faculty member, David Ryan as the Academic Director. The program has been quite successful, recruiting a cohort of about 30 students in each of its three years, which exceeded expectations for a new program.

The program is, then, a significant financial boon to the college and the university; it also has several benefits to rhetoric faculty, meeting several of the needs described above. For example, it has provided faculty with the chance to develop and teach advanced courses in line with disciplinary expertise (e.g., Ethics in Professional Communication, Rhetoric of Doubt, Cross-Cultural Communication, Technical Writing); it has given multiple department faculty a chance to interact with graduate students and supervise capstone projects; it’s contributed to a change of perception of our department, as an area with subject matter expertise that goes beyond the service-department label. However, the full benefits of housing a graduate program have not been realized, even as the program drains from the
department. For example, every graduate program we’ve ever been affiliated with had a graduate faculty that was expected to do research in the fields it was training its students to become a part of, but the one new position the MAPC hired for was a term position; all the full-time faculty are term, teaching a 3-3 load with no research time. Meanwhile, the MAPC has been staffed largely by Rhetoric faculty with no compensatory hires being extended to rhetoric. The academic director is a Rhetoric faculty member, and most courses in MAPC are taught by Rhetoric faculty. Further, rhetoric faculty have been drawn into significant service for MAPC, serving on its board and assessment committee (service time that takes them away from Rhetoric Department service). Our last count showed that, between course releases for MAPC service and course duties “borrowed” from Rhetoric, the equivalent of 2.5 full-time positions have moved from RHET to MAPC.

At USF, there’s long been a tradition of interdepartmental work and “borrowing” of faculty, something that has been quite beneficial to Rhetoric faculty who have expertise that exceeds RHET teaching possibilities. MAPC has provided this boon to many of our faculty, so we are quite conflicted about these developments, as faculty working in MAPC have been very happy to do so and the rest are happy for them. But we are not happy with the fact that we are doing all this work in advancing MAPC’s curriculum without benefit to rhetoric. RHET faculty put in significant time to developing the proposal, believing MAPC would get full time hires that would benefit RHET. But the one full-time faculty member they hired was not able to teach any RHET classes.

3. Changes to the undergraduate curriculum. The third of our major curricular initiatives is the ongoing revamping of the way we deliver Core A and pre-requisites. Following our last program review, a special committee was appointed to investigate how other universities sequenced their required written and oral communication courses. We were particularly interested in what happened at comparison schools (particularly other Jesuit universities) and in the integration of first-year seminars, WID classes, international students, and the intersection of written and oral communication. Full-time faculty discussed the different options at a faculty retreat and then voted on a new model that involved an explicit combination of written and oral communication along with a “vertical” curriculum that stretched Rhetoric offerings over three years and made intentional efforts to bring students of perceived different levels of ability together. A new working group—the “New Curriculum Committee”—was formed to develop and assess curricula, while the general concept of a vertical curriculum was shopped to some important constituencies outside the department, including the Core Advisory Committee, the Associate Dean and Dean of Arts and Sciences (where the Core is managed), various departments who would be most affected by the changes. Many of the substantive changes have already been instituted in courses like 110, 110N, and 103, while some of the changes that alter the basic delivery of the Core cannot be instituted without a vote of the entire faculty (something which has never happened since the Core was instituted circa 2003). As comprehensive Core
Assessment is completed this year, there is an expectation that faculty will seek a revision of the Core, which will create the opportunity for our changes to be instituted.

The curricular revision process has been a deliberate and inclusive one, with the NCC leading the changes, doing the action of drafting outcomes, syllabi, and assessment plans and the full-time faculty approving changes. The NCC includes full-time and part-time faculty, from all areas of the department. The following chart represents the goals achieved between 2016 and 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Spring 2016                                                         | 1. Created Rubric and assessed 99 essays from Rhetoric 110/110N  
2. Surveyed Rhet 110/N students in pilot and non-pilot classes  
3. Created, piloted, and revised new Rhet 110/N SLOs  
4. Asked AEM faculty who wants to serve on NCC next semester – no one was able to |
| 1. Assess Rhetoric 110/110N SLOs                                    | 1. Created Rubric and assessed 99 essays from Rhetoric 110/110N  
2. Surveyed Rhet 110/N students in pilot and non-pilot classes  
3. Created, piloted, and revised new Rhet 110/N SLOs  
4. Asked AEM faculty who wants to serve on NCC next semester – no one was able to |
| 2. Integrate concept of *eloquentia perfecta* into Rhet 110/N        | 1. Created Rubric and assessed 99 essays from Rhetoric 110/110N  
2. Surveyed Rhet 110/N students in pilot and non-pilot classes  
3. Created, piloted, and revised new Rhet 110/N SLOs  
4. Asked AEM faculty who wants to serve on NCC next semester – no one was able to |
| 3. Research other program with integrated speaking and writing      | 1. Created Rubric and assessed 99 essays from Rhetoric 110/110N  
2. Surveyed Rhet 110/N students in pilot and non-pilot classes  
3. Created, piloted, and revised new Rhet 110/N SLOs  
4. Asked AEM faculty who wants to serve on NCC next semester – no one was able to |
| Fall 2017                                                           | 1. Created, piloted, and revised new Rhet 110/N SLOs  
2. Rolled out Rhetorical Analysis writing assignment in all A1 courses  
3. Voted on new Rhet 110/N SLOs (Dec)  
4. Asked AEM faculty who wants to serve on NCC next semester – no one was able to |
| 1. Integrate more speaking into Rhet 110/N                          | 1. Created, piloted, and revised new Rhet 110/N SLOs  
2. Rolled out Rhetorical Analysis writing assignment in all A1 courses  
3. Voted on new Rhet 110/N SLOs (Dec)  
4. Asked AEM faculty who wants to serve on NCC next semester – no one was able to |
| 2. Integrate more writing into Rhet 103                              | 1. Created, piloted, and revised new Rhet 110/N SLOs  
2. Rolled out Rhetorical Analysis writing assignment in all A1 courses  
3. Voted on new Rhet 110/N SLOs (Dec)  
4. Asked AEM faculty who wants to serve on NCC next semester – no one was able to |
| 3. Gain department approval for new 110/N SLOs                       | 1. Created, piloted, and revised new Rhet 110/N SLOs  
2. Rolled out Rhetorical Analysis writing assignment in all A1 courses  
3. Voted on new Rhet 110/N SLOs (Dec)  
4. Asked AEM faculty who wants to serve on NCC next semester – no one was able to |
| 4. Coordinate with AEM                                              | 1. Created, piloted, and revised new Rhet 110/N SLOs  
2. Rolled out Rhetorical Analysis writing assignment in all A1 courses  
3. Voted on new Rhet 110/N SLOs (Dec)  
4. Asked AEM faculty who wants to serve on NCC next semester – no one was able to |
| Spring 2018 | 1. Get buy-in from adjunct faculty | 1 & 2. Paid meeting on January 18, 2018  
1 & 2. Semester-long Working Groups (Triads) |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
|             | 2. Provide professional development | 3. Piloted new 103 SLOs in 4-6 sections  
3. Created Rubric and assessed 19 speeches from Rhetoric 103  
3. Surveyed Rhet 103 students in pilot and non-pilot classes |
|             | 3. Continue to gather data about new SLOs | 4. Formed subcommittee to draft A2 SLOs, sample syllabus, assignments, etc. in anticipation of pilot  
5. Still not able to find AEM committee member |
|             | 4. Envision A2 course | 4. Formed subcommittee to draft A2 SLOs, sample syllabus, assignments, etc. in anticipation of pilot  
5. Still not able to find AEM committee member |
|             | 5. Coordinate with AEM | 5. Formed subcommittee to draft A2 SLOs, sample syllabus, assignments, etc. in anticipation of pilot  
5. Still not able to find AEM committee member |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>1. Implement integrated curriculum</th>
<th>1. Rolled out new CLOs for 110, 110N (including one required informative speech)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Continue professional development</td>
<td>2. Offered workshops for writing teachers on how to teach speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Write new SLOs in 103</td>
<td>3. Wrote new SLOs for 103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|           | 4. Continue to develop A2 course | 4. Attended Teaching Retreat to develop syllabus, units, assignments, and assessment strategies for Course A2  
4. Piloted 1 sections of A2 course |

The AEM program has also made several curricular changes since the last review. A fluency development course was implemented. Many of the students admitted to the AEM program have had considerable amounts of formal language instruction, but have had little opportunity to activate the knowledge they have. The fluency course promotes speed and ease of use across the skills through implicit and explicit language learning activity. This is the only course in the program that does not have a direct literacy or oracy focus, is not
primarily content-based, and is open to all students, but only required for students also required to take our lowest level of academic reading/writing (AEM 110).

Increasingly, both literacy and oracy courses are content-based, meaning the skill development occurs while students are investigating an academic theme for long periods of time, even for the entire semester. Particularly for academic purposes, the depth of inquiry that this approach requires promotes deeper and more complex engagement with language and ideas.

A series of academic workshops were designed and implemented for multilingual students who are not in AEM courses, but who still want support in some area(s). These workshops were designed as 2-credit eight week long courses, so that each one could be offered twice each semester, and so that they would fit into many students’ schedules without making a lot of changes. Finally, they were designed to support international students who realize that the courses they have registered for are too difficult for them and feel led to drop a course or two. In order to stay in compliance for full-time status, they are able to pick up these academic workshops. Unfortunately, since there is no mechanism to require struggling students to take these courses, they often are either under-enrolled or cancelled. Nonetheless, seven workshops have been developed and approved in the following areas: writing, discussion, listening, reading, academic grammar, vocabulary, and an eighth workshop on academic source-use is in development.

4. The new Honors College curriculum. Our curriculum revisions, long in the works, ironically will be instituted very rapidly first outside our department, as part of a new USF endeavor. In Fall 2018, USF announced that a large gift from Gordon Getty would help launch a new Honors College program. As part of this effort, Rhetoric and Language faculty were asked to develop a 6-credit course that would satisfy Core A1 and A2 for Honors students. This was a serious reduction in course and credit time, since USF students currently take at least 8 credits - and most take 12 or more - to complete those Cores. In extended discussions, department faculty expressed concern that this reduction in both courses and credits would move in exactly the opposite direction of our aim for a more “vertical” curriculum (extending rhetorical instruction into the junior year to develop more advanced and discipline-specific skills). Instead of a single 6-credit course, we counter-proposed an 8-credit, 3-course sequence (4-2-2), which would maintain the current minimum number of credit-hours for completing A1 and A2. In addition, the sequence was designed to fully integrate oral, written, and digital communication and to realize a more “vertical” curriculum. As such, the first two courses will be taken in students’ first year (like the current year-long 130/131 course). The final course, which requires junior standing, will provide rhetorical scaffolding for Honors students’ “capstone” projects. Three Rhetoric and Language faculty members (Leigh Meredith, Brian Dempster, and Michael Rozendal) are teaching the first course in Fall 2019. We hope that implementing this sequence in the
Honors College pushes us a step closer towards the university-wide vertical curriculum, and that feedback from these pilots can inform that larger project.

5. Directed Self-Placement. Quite recently (Spring 2019), an ad hoc committee was formed to study and propose a model for Directed Self-Placement (DSP). This was in response to the announcement that USF would go “test optional” as of Fall 2020. Five faculty members (Cathy Gabor, Nicole Gonzales Howell, Jonathan Hunt, Patrick McDonnell, and Julie Sullivan) worked from early 2019 through the summer to create a DSP portal complete with a survey and recommendation algorithm, an essay exercise, and placement instructions, as well as a prompt for a reflective narrative. The DSP tool was piloted with 63 students in August 2019 and a usability test was given to those students, largely organized and conducted by Julie Sullivan. Working with Strategic Enrollment Management, Information Technology Services, and the Center for Academic Success and Achievement, the ad hoc DSP Committee revised the tool and created a parallel tool for transfer student placement, which is scheduled to be piloted in January 2020. The enactment of Directed Self-Placement will address many of the inequities in student placement noted above and discussed during our last program review.

IV Faculty

We consider our faculty to be the bulwark and the primary strength of the Department of Rhetoric and Language. With more course offerings scheduled than any other department, we also have the largest faculty of any department. In AY 2019-2020, we have nineteen full-time faculty (two tenured, sixteen renewable term faculty, and one faculty on a one-year term—the equivalent of visiting professor; down from 21 the last two years after two one-year terms were not renewed). We also have 51 adjuncts with PHP (Preferred Hiring Pool; indicating they have passed a vetting and promotion process) and another 15-20 adjuncts without PHP (many of whom have taught at the university for a number of years). This distinction requires a brief explanation. When part-time faculty begin at USF, they must teach a course for a certain amount of time before being eligible to enter the “Preferred Hiring Pool” (the required number of years/semesters/units has varied from contract to contract over the years). Once a part-time faculty member is awarded PHP status, by the Deans Office, that person has seniority in scheduling and must be offered 4-8 units per semester (again, the exact number of units has varied from contract to contract). Part-time faculty who are not part of the Preferred Hiring Pool are scheduled last and often do not get an offer of classes every semester. The Department of Rhetoric and Language has made a concerted effort over the years to recruit faculty with credentials and degrees that match our courses. Our faculty tend to be dedicated, student-centered, and collegial.

Full-time faculty hired to permanent lines have terminal degrees, while our part-time faculty may have a PhD, EdD, or Master’s degree. Our full-time faculty includes a great variety of specialties in the broad areas of rhetoric, composition, and humanities, including
classical rhetoric, composition pedagogy, communication, political rhetoric, professional writing/editing, Asian-American studies, modernist studies, digital rhetoric, and literature. Our part-time faculty is just as diverse, although in the areas of public speaking and AEM, in particular, there is more direct alignment between degrees and teaching specialty. Composition faculty represent a variety of fields of study, but in the past 7 years or so, when we’ve hired part-time faculty to teach composition courses, we've been able to prioritize faculty with degrees or certificates in composition/writing studies.

The number of full-time faculty has increased slightly since the department's inception, and the percentage of full-time faculty teaching Rhetoric and Language classes has not kept pace with the university's enrollment (see pages 8-11 and 26, as well as Appendix B); this issue is further exacerbated by the fact that nine faculty members have regularly received from 4 to 8 units release time per semester for serving programs outside of Rhetoric and Language or have taught as many as eight units per semester in other programs. This leaves a relatively small percentage of Rhetoric and Language full-time faculty actually teaching Rhetoric and Language courses. Because so many of our classes meet Core A, we tend to compare favorably to other programs in terms of full-time faculty teaching in the Core. However, given the number of full-time faculty in the department, we tend to have a very small percentage teaching any of our "flagship" courses: RHET 103, 110, 120.

The chief consequence of this has been our need to constantly hire part-time faculty. Since teaching opportunities for these faculty varies from year-to-year and semester-to-semester, and many faculty are considered part of the department even if they haven't taught in several semesters. We can’t fix an exact number of adjuncts in the program, but we tend to have in the area of 60-70 adjuncts teaching in any given semester. As noted above, we have been increasingly pleased with the quality of these faculty, in terms of academic degrees and experience, and we recognize so many of our adjuncts as excellent instructors. However, dependence on such a high number of adjuncts to teach our classes leaves us conflicted for a variety of reasons:

- it's not possible for most adjuncts to devote the same kind of time and energy to USF that full-time faculty are privileged to, regardless of how excellent teaching is among adjuncts,
- because they are so frequently teaching multiple classes at multiple institutions, it's less likely that adjuncts will be able to participate fully in departmental programming--in particular efforts to keep the curriculum coherent,
- for those adjunct faculty who make an effort to take advantage of professional development and service opportunities that are mostly unpaid, there is always a concern that the department is complicit in the exploitation of unpaid labor; it also creates the potential for accusations of unfairness, if those adjuncts who aren’t able to participate as frequently aren’t able to get the same opportunities as those who do,
most of our adjuncts don't have the level of credentialing or level of experience as full-time faculty. In most cases, there is a difference between having a Master's degree and a lot of experience versus a PhD and all the disciplinary training implied. With that said, some of our adjunct faculty have terminal degrees (including specialized training in their teaching area); most are deeply experienced classroom teachers; and a few of our adjuncts regularly present at and participate in academic conferences and publish research and creative work),

we are concerned about our role in participating in a process that marginalizes other professional academics. Even though the CBA limits our role in managing adjunct faculty to serving as "proxies" for the Dean, we continue to benefit from the arrangement at USF and other schools. Although by most measures USF seems to treat its adjunct faculty better than most, the treatment of this class of faculty is not without problems, as indicated by recent labor negotiations that took over 10 months to complete.

Perhaps our sensitivity to adjunct faculty issues derives from a sharpened sense of marginalization among full-time faculty. The Rhetoric and Language full-time faculty is nearly devoid of tenure track faculty lines, and all indications are that we will not be granted tenured lines in the future. Even though term faculty at USF receive the same salary and benefits and tenure track faculty, as well as the opportunity to be promoted, they are marginalized in many ways: despite assurances that we are valued by the college and university, we are contract employees, and, as term faculty in a department that has no minor or major, we feel doubly marginalized.

**Teaching:** Most of our full-time faculty were hired through national searches conducted by the department or the pre-cursory Rhetoric and Composition program. Searches for one-year terms have been more local, and mostly internal. We’ve occasionally run position announcements to hire part-time faculty, but we generally receive unsolicited applications throughout the year, including referrals from current USF faculty (both inside and outside the department), so when we need to hire, we typically draw from our existing files to set up interviews. That said, we have drawn heavily on the San Francisco State University’s programs in Teaching Composition, Teaching Reading, ESL, and Speech Communication.

Our faculty are well-qualified to teach the courses, and courses are assigned, for the most part, on the basis of those qualifications. Because our department is moving towards more multimodal courses (integrating speaking, writing, and digital communication), composition faculty have been increasingly asked to incorporate public speaking assignments into their writing classes, and public speaking faculty have been asked to incorporate writing (though there have traditionally been written assignments expected in public speaking). Because these moves ask faculty to teach skills and concepts outside their
original area of expertise, the department has undertaken major professional development efforts to offer training and support. These efforts include an ongoing series of presentations, workshops, and working groups. Our primary goal in this effort is to ensure that every faculty member feels prepared to “stretch” their expertise into these new areas of rhetoric. (More detail on these efforts is provided in the “Professional Development” section below.)

We also provide senior mentors to integrate new faculty members and help them adjust to new teaching requirements and university cultures. Mentoring has been more formal with full-time faculty hires, for various reasons including the larger workload and long-term expectations of such faculty. Informal mentoring takes place in many ways as well—classroom visits, talks around the copier, or in offices, social gatherings, and other casual settings. Faculty have been willing and eager to work with newer counterparts on everything from grading practices to advice on commuting. It’s a collegial and caring group.

Teaching assignments for full-time faculty are based on expertise, as well as desire or willingness to teach certain classes. In a big department with multiple multi-section classes, full-time faculty are able to try out new classes almost at will, and request very specific schedules. Seniority sometimes plays a role. For part-time faculty, PHP status is prioritized, as required by the full-time and part-time union contracts, with seniority playing a significant role, just ahead of expertise and experience in a particular course. While the department respects seniority and follows the CBA, university rules, and its own past practice, there has been a growing disenchantment with the norm that seniority should play the large role it does; in a few instances, we’ve been required to place senior part-time faculty in courses for which they may not have the most appropriate degree or experience but where they’ve nevertheless accumulated enough units to be considered competent. The new part-time faculty CBA extends seniority to any course that PHP have taught without conditions being placed on by the Dean. In theory, someone who’s taught a class (perhaps unsuccessfully) once several years ago would have more seniority in that class than someone who’s taught it successfully for several years.

The department monitors teaching effectiveness through program assessment, classroom observations by area directors, and the use of the student evaluations (BLUE Course Evaluations), although the latter—which often seems preferred by administrators—has well-known shortcomings. We try to look at the whole picture when evaluating faculty, and, ostensibly, the Dean’s office asks us to do the same, yet we’ve seen faculty frequently not promoted or placed “on the radar” strictly based on teaching evaluation numbers. In addition, our teaching success and our assessment efforts received some outside corroboration when department faculty participated in recent university-wide Core assessment. Results for both Core A1 (Oral Communication) and Core A2 (Written Communication) indicate that over 78% of students are meeting or exceeding expectations for competency in those areas. This exceeds the set standard expectation of 70% competency.
In fact, while Core assessment is not quite complete, thus far Core A has very favorable results compared to any Core area yet evaluated. Full scores and analysis for the Core A assessment report are included in appendix X.

In turn, we are particularly proud of the many teaching awards Rhetoric and Language faculty members have won in the past 6 years. The most recent awards include the Full-time Faculty Award (2018), Innovation in Teaching and Technology Award (2017), two Provost’s Adjunct Faculty Distinguished Teaching Awards (2017). A number of our faculty have also won Faculty Research/Teaching awards from the Mellon Scholars program in 2018 and 2019.

One area in which we’ve development significantly since our last self-study is our professional development offerings. Since 2012, we’ve stepped up our live and virtual pedagogical resources. For the past three years, the composition and oral communication faculty have held monthly pedagogy meetings to share tips and troubles. The meetings are often themed around areas faculty have identified as problem-areas (assessment, dealing with controversial issues, etc). In the last year, we combined these groups to emphasize the increased integration of the curriculum. In addition, as part of training around these multimodal curricular changes, we’ve developed and hosted a series of targeted meetings and workshops that have included support for creating syllabi and assignments. These launched with an orientation meeting to introduce full and part-time faculty to new curricular requirements. The department secured funding to pay part-time faculty to attend this meeting (failure to pay part-time faculty for professional development, as was noted in the previous self-study, has been a real barrier to participation in the past). In the wake of this meeting, full and part-time faculty combined into working groups (“Triads”) tasked with developing syllabi, assignments, and lesson plans that integrated speaking and writing. Groups presented their work at the end of the Spring 2018 semester, resulting in an archive of integrated syllabi and assignment ideas. The success of this effort has inspired ongoing workshops to support the integration of writing into speaking classes.

In addition to these in-person events, other resources include a new department website that contains a growing repository of literature, syllabi, lesson plans, and other resources to support faculty development. We also maintain a small library of books on curriculum and pedagogy that is available to all faculty.

Finally, department member Jonathan Hunt as has also been the co-coordinator of the Center for Teaching and Learning and the Center for Instructional Technology (CTE) for the past 3 years. CTE offers teaching-focused reading groups, workshops, and weekend-long retreats, which many of the faculty regularly present at or participate in.

**Advising:** Per the CBA, Full-time faculty members at USF serve as academic advisors. In our department, this task is somewhat unique: since we don’t have a major. Faculty hired to the Rhetoric areas advise undeclared liberal arts students while AEM faculty advise students admitted to the AEM program. All full-time faculty devote considerable time to
advising students, especially during the pre-registration periods in November and April, but the advising load has been particularly intense for AEM faculty, whose advising work with multilingual international students extends far beyond the pre-registration periods. AEM students—particularly those who are new to the University and/or new to the U.S.—tend to require lengthier and repeated advising sessions, tend to require more explanation and planning, and see more challenges in scheduling classes due to the 8-12 required hours of AEM classes. They are also more likely to seek support in changing classes and withdrawing from classes and in keeping paperwork up to date with International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS). Depending on the university’s recruitment in a given academic year, AEM faculty advisors have carried a range of 20-40 advisees.

The advising role of faculty extends beyond the usual adviser-advisee relationships. Because of the complex placement requirements of composition and AEM classes, and because admissions often doesn’t collect transcripts or test scores from new students, the department does extensive advising for placement of new students. Much of this advising occurs in the summer months, as new students begin enrolling, and so falls onto the only faculty on duty in the summer—the chair and, in some years, the director of composition. Recently, we’ve set up a spreadsheet so that the department’s PA can help to manage this flow of advisees, but this doesn’t reduce the number of students seeking placement assistance. In AY 2017-2018, this number was around 200 students. Additionally, much of this placement support happens during the university’s webtrack advising sessions (each summer, faculty advisers spend three days calling new students to review their Fall schedules), during which the chair and program directors show up, not so much to advise, but to provide placement support for other advisers.

The advising work of our faculty has also, in recent years, extended through involvement in a number of university programs. Many of our faculty are involved with mentoring students through the First-Year Seminar program; we’ve also played an advising and mentoring role in the new Honors College. Also, faculty associated with the MAPC program have engaged in extensive advising with graduate students, on subjects ranging from capstone projects to internships.

Research and Discovery: Almost every full-time faculty member in Rhetoric and Language is term faculty, for whom research is not a required component of evaluation or promotions. Still, almost every one of our full-time term faculty is involved in research, and some of our part-time faculty have published research or presented at conferences. Our faculty participate in writing, presenting, and peer review with associations and journals that reflect the breadth of our academic fields, including CCCC, TESOL, AAAL, AERA, NCA, AASL, and NCTE (along with countless regional affiliates).
(See Appendix A for faculty publications and presentations)
Service: Term Faculty are evaluated based on teaching and service, and our program has a commitment to and culture of both. Our service contributions are realized through both organizational and individual effort, and it’s sometimes difficult to pry the two apart: for example, the Dean’s office has frequently approached the chair about the department providing support for one program or another, and that support was taken up entirely by an individual faculty member. We’ve broken this section into three parts, the first covering individual faculty’s major service contributions to college and university and the second focusing on program-to-program service and relationships, such as WID classes.

Matula  
Chair, Arts Council and College Council  
Core Advisory Committee member (5 years)

Hunt  
Co-director of CTE* (3 years)  
Co-Chair, Academic Integrity Committee

Rozendal  
Academic Director UG teacher Education Center, including Dual Degree Program*

Ewert  
Co-director of USF 101 (2 years)  
Co-Chair, Academic Integrity Committee (4 years, current)  
Member, Working Group on International Student Experience (WISE) (current)  
Member, Faculty Advisory Board for Internationalization (FABI) (current)

Gonzales-Howell  
Mellon Scholar Coordinator* (current)

Dempster  
Director of Administration, MA Asia Pacific Studies* (since June 2013)

Horton+  
Speaking Center Director, 2013-2019

Dennen  
Writing Center Director*

Ryan  
Academic director of MAPC*

Lavigne  
College Curriculum Committee

Lamsal  
College Curriculum Committee

Meritt  
Faculty Director of Curriculum Development for the Humanities; Communication Strategy Working Group
Several members of the department have served terms on the USFFA-FT Policy Board (including Ewert, Gabor, Holmes, Lavigne, and Matula), and part-time faculty are on the USFFA-PT Executive Board; department members have served on WASC preparation committees, and various ad hoc committees to address specific issues. Several department faculty played a significant role in university core competency assessment, writing outcomes and rubrics for oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking. Other department faculty also participated in the actual coding of student work, and this service task has become an ongoing contribution of our department to the university.

The department’s also seen numerous awards granted for faculty service: three members of the faculty have received the Frank Beach award for outstanding service to the College of Arts and Sciences, and one member received the award for outstanding service by a part-time faculty member. Further, both Rhetoric and Composition faculty and the AEM faculty have been awarded the Dean’s Award for Collective Achievement because of their ability to work together as a team to make significant contributions to the College, and the Writing for a Real World editorial committee received the university’s Team Merit award.

*Relationships with other Departments and Programs:* Considering that Rhetoric and Language is virtually synonymous with Core A, and that AEM is a required precursor to other programs for many USF students, it would be easy to imagine a fairly discrete existence for the department, one wherein we provide the box for students to check these requirements. The opposite is true: we are integrated with other programs across campus, at both the formal/institutional and individual faculty level.

Programmatically, the university depends on our department for certain key elements: first, the AEM program, though considerably smaller than it was just a few years ago, is essential for preparing about 10% of USF international students for success in their academic careers. Many academically qualified students would simply not be positioned to thrive in their majors without the benefit of this program, and, consequently, the university itself would financially suffer without this group of students, who are among the few USF students that pay full tuition. AEM also manages several classes that are listed as RHET classes, but which are served by AEM professionals—RHET 106 and 106N and several 2-unit workshops provide further support for international students, including the majority
that don’t get placed into AEM yet still need a good deal of work in writing/reading/speaking/listening to be successful in an English-language environment. 

AEM’s service in the area of multilingual student support has extended to formal and informal support, with AEM Director Doreen Ewert frequently called on to meet with individual faculty or departments to discuss ways to engage multilingual students. We’ve also sponsored colloquia and workshops on these topics and on second language writing.

The department’s Core A programming provides a similar benefit for students and other programs. The preparatory aspect is formalized by many programs, which actually require students to complete Core A2 as a co- or pre-requisite for major courses (a move that actually cuts against college policy and which we think will need to be revisited as we explore the benefits of a vertical curriculum in Rhetoric). In some cases, already mentioned several times above, our formal connection to these programs is centered on Writing in the Disciplines classes that are required of majors. The WID classes are the result of intense collaboration in some cases: we’ve met several times over the years with Psychology faculty to determine the role that RHET 203 would play in that program; the Writing for Performing Arts class was created through the ongoing collaboration of two faculty (Rhetoric’s Michelle Lavigne and Dance professor Megan Nicely) and co-taught by the pair. Other courses like Business and Technical Writing are run by Rhetoric with input coming, at times, from the School of Management dean’s office and support staff.

Until 2017-2018, our department offered a WID for Sociology, in which enrollment varied depending on how likely that program was to promote the class to its majors. In its final two years in Rhetoric, the Department of Sociology made the class a requirement for its majors and then took up the teaching of the course last year, a move we applauded, as we agree with our 2012 reviewers that disciplines should bear responsibility to teach their students disciplinary writing. Our curricular changes have not yet involved making decisions on what to do with our other WID classes, as the logic of our changes suggest we remove Core A2 credit from them, and perhaps pass these classes on to the programs they support. However, there are many consequences of such a move to sort through: faculty in those programs have stated they don’t think they can teach writing or cannot fit writing classes into their majors, faculty teaching those classes are mostly part-time and their status in the program would be affected by such a move (would they move with the class? Would they have retreat rights to Rhetoric and Language), removing Core credit would likely upset faculty in programs who’ve come to depend on their majors having the WID opportunity.

Our work with other programs also extends to offering graduate writing courses that serve several programs. Until Spring 2019, the AEM program regularly offered a Graduate Writing/Speaking Practicum for Multilingual Students (3cr). International graduate students in a variety of programs enrolled in this course. More recently, the course was cancelled a number of times for lack of enrollment, so a new course was designed to serve graduate students more broadly. The new course, Graduate Academic Writing (2cr), was
offered for the first time in Spring 2019 and is in the schedule for each semester moving forward.

Finally, already detailed above, the Speaking Center serves students across the university. Aside from the many individual meetings that are scheduled through the center, outreach workshops and class visits are common, and the Speaking Center (and its former director, Jacquelyn Horton) provided the nexus for engagement with the School of Management, as they sought to sharpen students’ oral presentation skills. Horton and Lavigne have worked on assessment projects with them, serving as judges in their “pitch” competitions. The School was instrumental in helping us get the Speaking Center running about 10 years ago, when they provided the space it needed to work and which was the only thing keeping us from launching.

Our faculty have been willing to offer their support to the college, university, individual programs, and other individual faculty seeking support on issues like writing or oral communication. We have a culture of service and, perhaps unfortunately, a culture of yes. Our faculty seem to be tapped constantly to offer support to other programs, and, particularly, to serve in important administrative roles in other programs. In the breakdown of faculty service a few pages back, we noted with an asterisk any faculty service contribution that involved release time from teaching in Rhetoric and Language. The numbers are staggering: at one point, we estimated that we would need to hire 2-3 full-time faculty members to replace the teaching from which faculty were released for their service and teaching outside Rhetoric and Language. Many faculty have cycled out of administrative/service roles identified above, but at present, there are still three faculty in heavy-duty (at least half time) administrative roles outside the department. Coupled with the many department faculty who regularly teach in MAPC and other programs, and it becomes clear why such a large group of full-time faculty teaches a relatively small amount of classes in their own program.

There are many implications of this: first, it must be noted flatly and clearly that individual faculty benefit tremendously from the opportunity to serve in these roles and teach across programs. Many of us have been renewed by the opportunity to devote so much work time to academic areas that may be our actual primary research/creative focus. Some of our faculty have had extensive experience teaching upper-division and graduate classes at other universities and have felt renewed by the opportunity to return to the subjects and students involved in such experiences. This kind of service also provides significant opportunities for growth and personal and professional development: for term faculty, without a research requirement (or frankly, significant support for research), the opportunity to continue building a career is important. We also expect that the benefits to these faculty will eventually return to the department as well: administrative service in other programs may be great preparatory work for taking a directorial or chair position in Rhetoric and Language.
Still, this trend is something that works in many ways against our department’s best interest. First, there is the obvious loss of full-time faculty teaching that comes with course releases or teaching appointments in other programs. Luckily, our part-time faculty are so dependable and solid that students don’t lose much in the classroom; however, part-time faculty just can’t be expected to be as available, as well-trained, as connected as full-time faculty. To cite just one example: students needing a reference letter may be better served by a letter from an Associate Professor who may be a known scholar in the field than from an adjunct who is an excellent teacher but does not have a disciplinary presence.

Second, though faculty who work in other programs are still expected to contribute departmental service in their home department, the likelihood of that being meaningful is somewhat diminished. Someone doing heavy administrative work or someone who is physically separated from the day-to-day of the department is less likely to have the bandwidth to jump into departmental efforts and is more likely to feel that their service commitments are already complete after all the administrative effort they put in elsewhere. There is often a fuzzy line at USF between service that is part of a faculty member’s contractual obligation (3 units per semester) and service that is performed with release time as compensation. Further, the nature of the CBA at a heavily unionized university prevents certain obvious checks on service “drift.” Faculty contractually cannot evaluate each other; and faculty would be loath to bring the Associate Dean into the picture as a micromanager of their colleague’s service contributions.

The university has made some initial attempts to take better stock of this kind of situation; at least one of our faculty who was asked to work with the new Honors College has been asked to sign a memorandum that carefully defines workload within and outside the department, and the chair’s signature was required on this document. So there is an effort to create a formal tracking measure that departments can control. All-in-all, the department does not wish to prevent its faculty from having opportunities to share their talent and expertise across the university, but we are concerned that the status quo contributes to inequity (as other faculty must pick up the service contributions) and a watering-down of our purpose.
V Governance

The department has organized itself into three areas: AEM (Academic English for Multilingual Students), Composition, and Public Speaking. An area director appointed by the Department Chair coordinates each area, and the Department Chair, in turn, coordinates all three areas. Per the CBA, it takes a majority of full-time faculty members to elect the Department Chair, and this occurs by secret ballot. Typically, the Chair appoints a committee to solicit nominations and run the election. The Chair serves a three-year term and may be re-elected for additional terms, but not consecutively. The Chair, in consultation with the area coordinators, schedules and staffs all sections. The USFFA contract, section 33, states the Chair is not a supervisor—rather s/he acts under the supervision of the Associate Dean. In this vein, the Chair makes staffing recommendations to the Area Associate Dean for approval. However, as articulated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the faculty makes all curriculum decisions.

The entire full-time faculty meet about once a month for formal meetings; generally, the Chair and Area Directors will meet a week or so in advance to plan the agenda. Faculty make decisions affecting curriculum and governance at these meetings, or, at times by email ballot. In accordance with USFFA contract, full-time faculty make decisions affecting curriculum. The department’s individual areas may hold meetings as well and these meetings often include part-time faculty. The USFFA-PT contract states part-time faculty are not required to attend these meetings. Changes affecting curriculum and governance may be suggested at area meetings, but area meetings cannot decide these issues; they must be referred to the entire department for decisions.

The department makes an effort to distribute its work fairly, with the understanding that the Chair and area directors do most of the administrative work, since they receive 4-8 units of course release each semester to bear this load. However, beyond that, we have several committees that assist in department programs—Writing for a Real World, the Cotchett Speaker Showcase, International Week events, the Adjunct Rhetoric Conference, and other special programs and promotions. The department makes an effort to help newer faculty get the service credit they need for promotion by asking them to serve on search committees, special projects, and other committees. In addition, we make an effort to inform new faculty about opportunities for service outside our department in the college and the university.

In accordance with the CBAs governing the role of part-time faculty, full-time faculty take responsibility for most decision making but make an effort to solicit input from part time faculty. The department invites part-time faculty to meetings twice each year and posts the minutes of all meetings so that part-time faculty have access to them.
The department generally makes decisions by consensus, and independent decision-making by chairs and directors typically reflect the mood and wishes of the department’s full-time faculty. Since we’ve become a department, we’ve worked to distribute decision-making and governance, encouraging inclusion and collaboration. Historically, the chair was ceded most administrative and decision-making power, an arrangement that provided simpler governance and less work for faculty. Lately, though, there has been greater involvement by directors in setting the agenda and priorities for the department, and more effort to seek consensus on issues. We’ve also begun to consciously create a pipeline for leadership positions. Several faculty could reasonably step into a director, or even the chair, position today, but this was not the case six years ago when our most recent former chair accepted nomination to the position.
VI Students

The department offers required speaking, writing, and reading classes that undergraduate students at all proficiency levels must take. In our classes, students develop their writing, speaking, and critical thinking skills. Through rigorous and focused assignments, students are given the necessary training and experience to read texts closely and to craft skillful oral and written arguments. In turn, our classes help students succeed at academic tasks in other courses and prepare them for their future professions.

We seek to serve all students and offer courses at many levels. First, we offer AEM (Academic English for Multilingual Students) courses that help students—primarily international students—to improve their reading comprehension and speaking and writing fluency in English. Second, we have a wide array of courses in composition and public speaking—along with a combined speaking/writing course—that all students take in order to complete their CORE A requirements. Third, we offer the Martin-Baró Scholars Program for first-year students interested in participating in service learning and a living-learning community. Fourth, we offer accelerated writing seminars for high-level first year students, writing courses for transfer students, and writing in the disciplines courses for those at the later stages of their education. Fifth, our department faculty planned, developed, launched, and teach in the MAPC (Masters in Professional Communication) program. Sixth, we are involved in graduate writing in several different ways, including developing and teaching graduate writing classes that are aimed at general audiences (MAPC 680), Nursing students (MAPC 602), and one specifically for students in the Masters of Arts in International Studies.

This range of engagements illustrates our goal of thinking about and offering curricula for a broad range of students, meeting them where they are. We are constantly re-evaluating our curricula and our mission to serve all the university’s students. For example, as discussed under “curriculum,” we are considering a more vertical curriculum to best benefit students. We also discuss the implications of the “tiered” system of classes that currently fulfills USF’s writing requirement: Is this best serving our students with their varied needs, or is this creating a kind of classed division among students?

Enrollment and Placement: Enrollment has remained strong, because all USF students take classes in our department. AEM enrollment has somewhat declined recently, as international student enrollment has declined at USF and elsewhere, due to such factors as the world economy, uncertainty about United States immigration and visa policies, and possibly parent concerns about safety (as they hear about school shootings and other such events).

Throughout the history of the university, of the department, and of the AEM Program, international student enrollment has grown and ebbed cyclically, depending on
various local, national, and international factors. We adjust accordingly to those fluctuating numbers. Among the challenges that faculty have for some years faced in teaching such courses are working in classes where all students come from the same language background (i.e., Mandarin Chinese) as opposed to a more traditional EAP (English for Academic Purposes) setting with a more diverse international student population, and ensuring that these students are armed with the academic skills and readiness that will translate into academic success outside of AEM settings. Note that only a small percentage of classes throughout the department are taught by full-time faculty. Although we have excellent and in many cases long-term adjunct faculty, in some ways students are shortchanged by this imbalance.

In AEM, we determine a student’s level of writing, reading, and speaking “quality” and, in turn, class placement based on a variety of factors, including IBT and TOEFL test scores taken prior to matriculation into the university and an English Proficiency Test (EPT), given once the students arrive in the U.S., whose battery includes in-person interviews and a writing sample from incoming students. The EPT is scored in-house with multiple trained raters. We believe that it would be helpful to have all new international students confirm their TOEFL and other test scores by taking the EPT when they arrive at USF. The Provost has approved USF’s schools to institute this policy locally, but Arts and Sciences has yet to make this adjustment.

In terms of RHET composition courses for the broader undergraduate population, we use SAT and ACT scores as the main basis for placement into the proper course in a tiered range of possibilities. The primary current writing pathway for students is a two-semester sequence of composition courses (RHET 110 & 120). For students entering the university with lower writing scores, we offer an intensive 110N “stretch” class with two additional units of directed lab time. For those coming in with higher scores, we have a long-standing curriculum (RHET 130 & 131) that blends both writing and speaking to satisfy both CORE requirements over two semesters. One of the highlights for students in the RHET 130-131 sequence is that they are designed as cohorts who continue together with a particular faculty for the full year, fostering community. Alternately, these higher-scoring students also have the opportunity to take a RHET 195 first year seminar which are focused on particular themes (like Writing about Human Rights, Language and Power, Race, Media, Pop Culture, Writing about Movements, etc.). The department is also proposing a specialized, integrated writing and speaking track for the new Honors College. Transfer student entering USF take a one-semester course, RHET 250, to satisfy their USF composition requirement even if they have completed their writing requirement at a previous institution. Alternately, they can take a themed Transfer-Year Seminars (Rhett 295), a program based on FYS, which actually utilizes many of the same topics. Many transfer students have another option—a Writing in the Disciplines course—if their choice of major allows (Writing in the Sciences, Writing for Performing Arts, Writing in Psychology, and Business and Technical
Writing). Finally, there are a few upper-division, subject-focused writing classes that are open to all qualified transfer students and any student who’s met the pre-requisite (110, 110N): Rhetoric and Popular Culture, How Language Works, History of the English Language, and Ethics of Care (a course developed by an adjunct faculty member, Ellen Thompson, which also meets the university’s service-learning requirement).

Student placement in the public speaking courses is more streamlined, with fewer options. The vast majority of students who do not take the RHET 130-131 sequence outlined above enroll in RHET 103, Public Speaking. We also offer a few specialized sections that also satisfy this requirement (such as RHET 104 “Argumentation and Debate” and RHET 111 “Public Speaking for the Health Professions”) as well as themed first year seminars (COMS 195, no minimum test score requirement).

Once students enter our courses, a variety of assessment measures our used to determine to what extent students have met the learning outcomes and final grades serve as an exit requirement. That is, the departmental passing policy for various RHET courses is a “C-.” In AEM, a passing grade is a “C.” If a student receives a lower grade, he or she must retake the appropriate course. Since we do not offer a major and our courses are required, we have no basis for comparison between majors and non-majors. Of course, in AEM courses, the demographic—composed mainly of multilingual international students—is different than for the other standard RHET speaking and writing classes, which are usually quite diverse in terms of race and gender and reflect the overall demographic of the university.

**Intellectual and Social Climate:** Our department creates and sustains “an intellectual and social climate that fosters student development and supports achievement of the program’s objectives” through several distinct activities and entities.

The Writing and Speaking Centers both actively support student learning. These two centers recently combined in terms of space, and moved into common space in Gleeson library, further cementing the connections between the two. Students now have a new opportunity to develop skills as peer tutors in these programs; they can take classes training them to tutor in the two programs. These are two unit classes. The class for writing center tutoring is open to grads for no credit and undergrads for 2 credits. Students who complete the class with a grade of B or higher are eligible to apply for a position in the Writing Center as a student tutor under the category of Student Assistant II. This category is described as students who have received some degree of training and can work under supervision but not close supervision.

The class for Speaking Center tutors is a two-unit Speaking Center Internship where students meet 20 hours in a class with cohort and professor, learning the theories behind effective peer-to-peer public speaking coaching and 20 hours working in the center with a coaching mentor observing coaching sessions. By the time a student completes RHET 328 they are prepared to accomplish the responsibilities of being a Speaking Center Coach,
including promoting the center, creation of an hour long workshop on a public speaking topic that they will present in RHET classes, and the public speaking coaching.

We are especially pleased with this new program (training student tutors who supplement the work of faculty tutors in the Writing and Speaking Centers) because it allows students to take what they have learned in writing and speaking classes, and “pay it forward” to teach other students. “Students teaching students” is a goal that enriches both teachers and learners.

One long-standing project that honors student development and accomplishments is our department journal, Writing for a Real World (WRW). Since 2002, this yearly journal has published the best USF student writing across the disciplines, including academic/critical essays, capstone thesis projects, business proposals, and scientific reports. Annually, approximately 90-150 students submit, and a small percentage of these pieces are chosen for publication. The Awards ceremony, at which Deans and other University officials participate, showcases the winning writers along with students named as honorable mention to the entire university community. WRW, available both in hard copy and digitally, is also used as a class text by various instructors in order to demonstrate excellent models of student writing. Moreover, the production process of WRW has been made into an actual class, in which students work together with the editor, David Holler, to edit and design the manuscript and prepare it for publication.

Not only does our department honor student writing, we also celebrate our outstanding student speakers. The annual Cotchett Speaker Showcase highlights the best speeches by students during the academic year. At this event, selected student speakers present their speeches to a large audience of faculty and peers. Our Conversation Partners Program promotes cultural and linguistic exchange at USF. The program pairs up English-speaking students who wish to develop their skills in a foreign language with bilingual and multilingual students who wish to continue strengthening their English skills.

Another more recent development is the relaunching of our Debate Team. The debate team at the University of San Francisco meets every week and competes in four major competitions each semester. Dons Debate includes every major style and format for academic collegiate debate, including policy, parliamentary, Lincoln Douglas, and Individual Speech Events. This year, students have conducted research and participated in debates related to presidential authority, the conflict in Yemen, renewable energy, the International Criminal Court, digital security, academic achievement in post-secondary education and more. This year, the USF debate team hosted its first debate tournament since the 1970s. The Tri-Force Intramural Debate Tournament provided the opportunity for “amateur” debaters from USF, San Francisco State, and City Colleges to experience competitive college debate and showcase their public speaking skills in a friendly and supportive environment.
AEM students participate in USF’s annual International Student week in at least two ways. During this week, there is an international storytelling session, in which students from AEM Oral Skills classes tell/perform stories from their countries. There is also an annual panel of international students who present on the topic of what it is like to be an international student at USF, and answer questions from faculty and from other students. Organized annually during the Rhetoric Week in February, this forum, called International Student Forum, has been well attended by students as well as faculty for a meaningful interaction on international students’ academic and cultural transitions to USF from their respective home countries. Also, some AEM students participate in the Conversation Partner Program, in which AEM students are matched with one or two domestic students to meet weekly for conversation. Some are members of clubs such as various Chinese Student clubs, who participate in cultural performances and sharing of food from their countries.

There are also often ad hoc initiatives to engage students in various ways, such as some of our faculty’s involvement in an on-campus push to get students and others registered to vote in the recent midterm election. They were extremely successful, in no small part due to faculty and students from our department.

Communication with Students: Instructors communicate expectations to students through their course syllabi, which include departmental learning outcomes, CORE learning outcomes (when appropriate), along with class policies regarding attendance and expected student behavior. Throughout the semester, expectations on individual assignments are demonstrated through class discussions as well as handouts and often rubrics that include evaluation criteria. Student conferences with students before a paper or speech is a common practice in the department, and the College has recognized the importance of this, allowing a percentage of classes to meet as individual or group conferences.

Written comments and grades on reading responses, drafts, essays, and speeches give extensive feedback to students regarding their level of progress. Discussions of class assignments, in which the instructor relates assignment requirements to fulfillment of learning outcomes, offer further assessment regarding progress.

Rhetoric and Language faculty also advise undeclared arts students, working to facilitate students’ successful start at USF and their navigation of the many major options. We see this as an opportunity to put the value of cura personalis into action.

Challenges and Opportunities: Our department is constantly re-evaluating what we offer our students, in response to developments in our academic disciplines, to developments on campus, and to observed needs of USF students. In some cases, we have recently implemented, or are in the process of implementing, new initiatives, and in other cases we are studying and discussing possible changes in our curricula. The focus is always on what is best for our students, acknowledging that this may vary according to various students’ needs. Although some of these are covered in other sections of this self-study, we want to emphasize the student aspects here. Below are some areas or issues or practices we
have changed, and/or we are exploring changing or implementing, and/or are urging the college and university to implement:

1. A few years ago we realized that students who started in AEM and/or the bridge classes (formerly ESL writing and another class) were hampered by taking so many language and writing classes that lasted into their junior years. So we devised a way of offering the same total number of units and hours, but spread out over at least one fewer semester. This system involves “stretch” classes, in which 2 units of lab time are added to Rhetoric 106 and Rhetoric 110, in “N” (extended) versions of those classes.
2. We have begun integrating the writing and speaking classes much more closely, with more speaking in writing classes and more writing in speaking classes.
3. We are exploring the idea of some form of directed self-placement. One of our faculty has done extensive research on this topic. (This is being implemented at several other universities.)
4. We are also exploring shifting to a “vertical” curriculum through the writing and speaking COREs. Instead of two writing classes and one public speaking class all taken within the first two or three undergraduate semesters, we envision that at least one class would be taken later in a students’ time at USF, ideally with one in the sophomore and one in the junior year. The new sequence of classes for the Honors College is an initial articulation of this vision which is being implemented at several other universities in various ways.
5. We are discussing the question of whether our various “strands” or ways to fulfill the CORE requirements are, on the one hand, meeting our students where we find them (and offering options) while also, on the other hand, perhaps unfairly stratifying students so that they have various degrees of access to enhanced curricula such as the themed First Year Seminar curriculum; the integrated, year-long 130-131 curriculum; or the “vertical” lower-unit Honors College curriculum.
6. The AEM program in particular is urging the administration to require the EPT (English Placement Test) for all incoming international students, not just those who have been admitted with a requirement to take AEM classes.
7. We are currently revisiting a proposal for a Rhetoric minor and have future aspirations to create a major that will attract students who are looking to pursue our discipline in graduate school and/or as a career.
8. We are proud of our classes, attention to individual students, associated programs, and opportunities for students, yet we believe that it would be better for students if our department had less of a lopsided ratio between full-time faculty and adjuncts. We have wonderful adjuncts, but they cannot be as invested in the university, or commit the time and attention to matters beyond their own classes, that full-time faculty can and do. Students would benefit from a higher percentage of full-time faculty in our department.
Conclusion: Rhetoric and Language is a cornerstone to the undergraduate curriculum and experience at USF. We are the only department that teaches all incoming undergraduate students, regardless of AP exams, IB courses, previous college courses, etc. As such, our courses are touchstone experiences for students that introduce them to USF, opening the possibilities that they can explore over their full education here. As such, our courses embody not only the values and breadth of the university but also engage the vibrant dynamics of the liberal arts. Similarly, Rhetoric and Language faculty, as the faculty with the most extensive, “all-round” vision of our diverse students, many have become involved in University and College campus initiatives for students in many different ways. With classes of twenty or less, our courses are often the kernel for student connections with each other and for their direct engagement with faculty.
VII. Staff

The department is supported by two Program Assistants, one for AEM, and one for the entire Rhetoric and Language Department (but generally supporting Rhetoric Program faculty needs). Having two PAs is necessary to handle the workload through busy periods and for such a large department. We also have student workers to support the PAs and faculty; the department has always liked having students available to greet other students visiting the office. Though we have a huge number of students in our classes, it is more difficult for faculty/staff to foster long-term relationships with them as do faculty/staff in programs where they may work with students continuously as majors. Any student visit to our office is likely to be the student’s first visit, and we want to be as welcoming as we can.

Our department has had a fairly high turnover rate for PAs; this is due mostly to the fact that Program Assistant jobs are not very well paid and offer no clear path for advancement. Many PAs at USF will take advantage of the chance to get a Master’s degree paid for (although they must pay taxes on the tuition waiver, which prices out many would-be graduate students); PAs frequently apply for other kinds of program support jobs within the university, so that this position is more of a stepping stone. We’ve lost PAs over the years for these reasons, and, frankly, because they frequently found better jobs or graduate school opportunities elsewhere. Our PAs have all seemed to enjoy the collegial atmosphere of the department, and we’ve had a pretty good run of competent and creative PAs. When hiring, we have tended to decide on sharp recent college grads who we think will learn the job quickly, do great things for us, and move on in a few years rather than finding a so-called “lifer” who might provide a lot of stability but might not have the same technological prowess or recent college experience to draw on.

In order to assess the experiences of PAs since our last program review in 2012, we sent out a survey to seven past and currently employed PAs. Of these surveys, we received four responses and two e-mail bouncebacks. The survey covered job responsibilities, training, keys to success, positives and challenges of job, workplace dynamics, and departmental support.

All respondents said that PA job responsibilities are clear as defined by the department; one noted that job postings are sometimes generic and not specific to PA departmental responsibilities, which fortunately, were clarified by our department. PA job training is good, especially within our department with the assistance of PA mentors and/or other forms of support. One respondent mentioned that a formal onboarding process and job checklist would be helpful, which the College has now instituted.

In order to be effective and successful, PAs use a variety of methods: constant communication; organizational tools and proactive planning; time management and prioritization of tasks; and spreadsheets. Respondents mentioned a number of positives
about their work, including the ability to be independent yet collaborate, the variety of tasks involved, and friendly interactions with faculty, colleagues, and students. PAs said that they felt respected and experienced good workplace dynamics.

In terms of challenges, one respondent emphasized that—while the majority of faculty were easy to work with and that department leadership and staff were great to work for—there were a handful of difficult faculty members. Moreover, one PA mentioned USF Administration’s policies towards PAs represented the biggest issue. All respondents expressed that they felt supported. Their main suggestions were that departmental leaders should be aware of administrative policies towards PAs and that continued professional development training would be beneficial.
VIII. Diversity and Internationalization

USF is the third most ethnically diverse university in the country, according to US News and World Report (https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/rankings/national-universities/campus-ethnic-diversity), and it is fourteenth in percentage of international students (https://www.usfca.edu/about-usf/what-you-need-to-know/facts-statistics.) As far as students go, the diversity and internationalization of the department matches that of the university itself, as virtually every USF undergraduate takes 2-3 classes in our department. International students are overrepresented in our department, since we house the AEM program and specialized writing-related courses for multilingual students who are mostly international. A handful of international students may complete as much as 25% of all their course units in our department.

The university’s full-time faculty is somewhat diverse, but not nearly close to the levels of ethnic diversity among undergraduate students. In Rhetoric and Language, the full-time faculty, likewise, is much less diverse in terms of ethnicity than that of the university at large. The context, then, is not an unfamiliar one for many colleges and universities: a mostly white faculty teaching a majority non-white student population. This reality informs the consciousness of our department, but it’s only recently become a more explicit focus for us (though, individually, many of our faculty have long been focused on issues of race, diversity, privilege, and equity).

Students come to Rhetoric and Language primarily to fulfill Core requirements, and these requirements apply to all undergraduates, so it’s expected that the demographics of our classes match those of the university. Further, because we don’t have a major or minor, recruitment and retention is not for the most part an organizational demand, except perhaps for our AEM program, which, if successful, should help to keep many international students at USF. We have participated in efforts to retain students (such as the FYS program), but the existence of the RHET program doesn’t depend on this. AEM is very successful in retaining the subset of international students required to complete the program, but, again, these numbers are determined more by international admission policies than by any kind of recruitment effort in the department.

All that said, AEM plays perhaps the most significant role in any diversity or internationalization efforts in Rhetoric and Language. Aside from the designated AEM class sequences, the program also offers developmental writing courses listed in RHET (106, 106N) which play a key role both in bridging AEM and RHET core classes and in grounding international students in American higher education norms and practices. Multilingual students in classes like 106 and 106N, many of whom should probably have placed into AEM, get important instruction in reading and writing for academic purposes, but they also
receive a sheltered place for acculturation into the American college classroom. This effect is buffeted by several 2-unit workshops for multilingual students (also offered by the AEM program, though listed in RHET). AEM also sponsors a “conversation partners” program that matches students, faculty, and staff of different backgrounds to engage in conversations to practice English. The Speaking Center provides further support; non-native speakers often call on the center for general help with oral English proficiency and not just public speaking support.

In the Rhetoric Program, inclusion and retention of under-represented groups has not been an explicit focus, but the department and individual faculty have been involved in courses and programs that aim, at least partially, to retain students who are economically disadvantaged or part of under-represented groups. For example, the Martín-Baró Scholars program, which invites first year students into an immersive and supportive living-learning community. The course stretches across two semesters, fulfills 16 units of credit, and emphasizes community-engaged learning. Muscat Scholars is a summer bridge program for first-generation college students, and Rhetoric faculty have played a significant role in it over the years (in particular, Julie Sullivan). The Humanities Mellon fellowship program is coordinated by Rhetoric faculty member, Nicole Gonzales Howell, and its purpose is to drive more diversity in the humanities, doing so by creating pathways for Foothill and De Anza Community College students to transfer to USF.

In terms of full-time faculty, our department has been able to increase its diversity somewhat through recent hires. The fairly conventional structure of our course sequences (i.e., the generic Writing I, Writing II,) does not create any built-in attraction to new hires from underrepresented groups. We have no obvious classes or tracks (e.g., African-American Rhetorical Tradition) that would overtly signal a focus on inclusion of minority groups. However, we have recently pursued opportunities to make faculty searches more inclusive structurally. For example, we participate in the university’s Gerardo Marin Fellow Program, which brings to USF each year a small number of ABD faculty who are part of underrepresented groups. The faculty receive a stipend and a very small teaching load. USF has attracted numerous excellent faculty through this program over the years, with Rhetoric and Language being awarded two fellows in the past 7 years, one of them turning into a full-time hire--Nicole Gonzales-Howell—who we probably would not have had a chance to hire otherwise, as we haven’t hired full-time in Composition in several years.

We’ve also made efforts to diversify through conscious recruitment of faculty from underrepresented groups. In a faculty search last year, we prioritized applicants who focused on diversity and under-represented rhetorics rather than emphasizing one subject area of our department (i.e., composition or public speaking). Unfortunately, that search was canceled due to budget cuts. At the part-time level, the department’s diversity is likewise
limited; here, the demographics of the Bay Area and our academic fields greatly shape the hiring possibilities.

Our support staff has historically been much more diverse than our faculty. Sadly, this is not surprising, given economic forces affecting the Bay Area and the social stratification produced. Further, program assistant positions are not very high paying jobs and hires who are willing to do them for the pay are also people who can’t usually afford to live in San Francisco.

Our turnover rate for program assistants is somewhat high as result: several recent PAs have left for better jobs or careers or graduate school. Many USF PAs earn degrees at USF, but the tuition waiver is often a surprisingly non-economical method of paying, as the full tuition amount waived is taxed as a gift to the employee.

Department faculty have long embraced USF’s social justice mission and have taken to heart the way the call for equity and justice for disenfranchised and underrepresented groups. A cursory review of the syllabi and textbooks used in Rhetoric and Language classes would reveal concerted efforts to expose students to social justice issues across a broad spectrum: our faculty address social justice in U.S. and international contexts, as part of the study of social movements and their rhetoric, in the rhetoric of social justice leaders, in critiques of rhetoric of domination and racism, in studies of privilege and whiteness, etc.

As a department, we’ve recently begun to take a more institutional approach toward addressing the ways that privilege and inequity are reinscribed by our own practices. First, we have made significant efforts to address the racial and social stratification that is endemic to using SAT scores to place students. We’ve long relied on this practice, despite being aware of the way it reproduces inequity and privilege--for example, students with better test scores are able to place into more advanced courses, completing Core A1 and A2 with only two 4-unit classes instead of three--mainly because we’ve bought into components of a meritocratic rhetoric that tells us only these “elite” students can keep up with the accelerated pace of these classes. Also, SATs are a much cheaper option than, say, reading placement essays, and use of them has fallen in line with the university’s admission policies. However, when the university last year began a move away from using test scores for admissions, our department launched a committee to actively pursue a new Directed Self-Placement plan for its Composition courses. We ran a pilot version (in the Muscat Scholars class) in Summer 2019 and are working on the rather complex data programming required to create the underlying structure for DSP.

Our second institutional move toward checking our reinscription of privilege has been through retreats and sharing of resources related to such topics as anti-racist grading practices and intersectionality (the topics of reading and discussion at our most recent faculty retreat). Inspired by the open letter on the Watson conference by Black, Latinx, American Indian, Queer Caucus, Asian/Asian American Caucuses asking programs to “disrupt . . . narratives of racism,” we organized this retreat around shared readings--offered
by several faculty members—related to race, social justice, and rhetoric and language pedagogy (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fsD-D5Y-KyQ007lLiMDrm1v7QV2TJ07qMuxJqQZ1zHk/edit). Several of our faculty also presented persuasively on contract grading as a method of anti-racist grading that promotes fairness and equity in our classes. We expect to continue providing such opportunities in future semesters, as one retreat could merely hope to get the conversation restarted.
IX Assessment

The Department of Rhetoric and Language has continued to engage in thoughtful and continuous assessment of student learning since before the previous program preview (2012). The program has assessed core composition and public speaking courses, the capabilities of incoming multilingual students, the preparation of multilingual students in developmental courses for later coursework, and graduate coursework in a new professional communication program. The program has also assisted in assessment in other schools and of the competencies of graduating students. All programs have well-developed program and course-level outcomes (recently reviewed and revised) communicated both on program web sites and course syllabi, respectively.

Composition: The Rhetoric and Language Department’s last program review explained in detail the Composition area’s efforts to assess student achievement of the university’s core Written Communication (A2) learning outcomes. Between 2006 and 2011, the department conducted yearly assessments of core first-year writing courses (RHET 110-120 and RHET 130-131), refining assessment methods to achieve greater validity (moving from reading of individual essays to evaluation of portfolio connections). In all assessments, samples of student work from first and second-semester writing courses were collected and scored by faculty raters in order to measure progress toward achievement of core learning outcomes.

Since the prior program review, the department has undertaken several composition-related assessment projects. During the 2013-2014 academic year, the Composition program introduced the RHET 110 N course, a six-unit booster version of RHET 110 (the “standard” first-semester core composition course) designed to provide additional support (extra class time in a “lab” format along with smaller class sizes) to students deemed somewhat less prepared for college writing. The course was assessed in two ways, one indirect and one direct. First, in the indirect assessment, grades of 110 N students in follow-up (second-semester) core writing courses taken after 110 N were compared with those of 110 students in the same types of courses. Results showed that 110 N students attained on average grades comparable to (only slightly lower than) those achieved by 110 students. Second, in the direct assessment, portfolios of student work from both 110 N and 110 courses were scored (each by two faculty members yielding a composite score) according to a common rubric measuring achievement of four of the course learning outcomes. In three out of the four areas, RHET 110 N students scored higher than their 110 counterparts, and 110 N students scored higher overall. These results were taken to suggest (at least tentatively) that the 110 N course was meeting its goal of enabling its students to meet the 110-level course outcomes at a level comparable to that achieved by students in 110 (who had higher placement test scores). Beginning in AY 2015-2016, assessment efforts in composition and speaking were combined as the program sought to develop a curriculum integrating speech and writing instruction. Those assessment efforts are described in a separate section below.

The Rhetoric and Language Department also played a central role in assessment of the Written Communication area (A2) of the university’s core curriculum (a requirement
met almost exclusively through courses offered by the Composition program. At the direction of the Core Assessment Working Group (appointed by the university’s Core Advisory Committee), syllabi from composition courses carrying A2 Core credit were collected in Spring 2017 in order to check alignment of assignments and course content with core learning outcomes. In addition, full and part-time faculty in composition aided extensively in drafting and revision of rubrics to be used in the evaluation of student work products drawn from core composition courses. These work products were scored by composition faculty raters in June 2018. In order to maximize inter-rater reliability, raters calibrated scoring practices through norming of sample products, and a portion of work products were scored twice (and scores compared).

Results of this assessment indicated that the majority of students met or exceeded expectations established for core area A2 learning outcomes and that the majority of those who did not meet expectations at least showed some competence in the skills assessed. Though students performed well in all areas, the lowest scores overall (by a slight margin) occurred in relation to outcomes focused on academic research in the writing process, a finding that points toward possible enhancements our program plans to incorporate in a revised core curriculum distributing writing coursework over different levels of the undergraduate program (i.e., moving the culminating core course to junior year).

The Rhetoric and Language Department also participated in the university’s first attempt to assess core graduation competencies in written communication and critical thinking established by our accreditation board, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in the 2016-2017 academic year. The project, directed by the university’s Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support, collected samples of student work from the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Management, and the School of Nursing and Health Professions. Samples of student writing were drawn from upper-division courses so that achievement of WASC’s graduation competencies could be assessed at or near the end of students’ undergraduate careers. Full and part-time faculty from Rhetoric and Language helped to design the rubrics used for the assessment and participated in the scoring of student work products.

**Public Speaking:** The Rhetoric and Language Department’s prior program review addressed assessment efforts in public speaking beginning in Academic Year 2009-2010. During that academic year, the public speaking program undertook the process of revising the Core A1 learning outcomes with the goal of producing more measurable behaviors. As these new outcomes were being developed, the program also assessed its students’ abilities in delivery (including extemporaneous delivery). Results generally revealed that students met the program’s standard for effective delivery, though with noticeable shortcomings in extemporaneous delivery. Beginning in AY 2015-2016, assessment efforts in composition and speaking were combined as the program sought to develop a curriculum integrating speech and writing instruction. Those assessment efforts are described in a separate section below.

The Rhetoric and Language Department also played a central role in assessment of the Oral Communication area (A1) of the university’s core curriculum (a requirement met virtually exclusively through courses offered by our department). At the direction of the Core Assessment Working Group (appointed by the university’s Core Advisory Committee), syllabi from courses carrying A1 Core credit were collected in Fall 2016 in order to check alignment of assignments and course content with core learning outcomes. In
addition, full and part-time faculty in public speaking aided extensively in drafting and revision of rubrics to be used in the evaluation of student work products drawn from public speaking courses. These work products were scored by faculty raters in January 2018. In order to maximize inter-rater reliability, raters calibrated scoring practices through norming of sample products, and a portion of work products were scored twice (and scores compared).

Results of the A1 core assessment were positive. A clear majority of students assessed were rated as meeting or exceeding expectations in the following four areas: evaluating effectiveness of communication, composing oral communication, presenting oral communication, and applying ethical and socially responsible principles to public address. Though results were generally positive, faculty raters reflected that students could improve significantly in presentation and that criteria for assessing application of ethical principles could be clarified. The assessment thus revealed general success in meeting the core A1 outcomes while also pointing toward possibilities for improvement.

**Composition and Public Speaking Combined:** In academic year 2015-2016, Composition and Public Speaking faculty in the department conducted an assessment project designed to achieve two goals: to determine whether RHET 103 (Public Speaking) students were meeting one of the program’s newly developed outcomes (“Students will articulate and interpret their own rhetorical choices and composing processes”) and to determine whether student learning is improved by intentional integration of speaking and writing. To achieve these goals, faculty selected sections of RHET 103 in which students were required to use writing techniques to prepare persuasive speeches, while students in all other sections students prepared the same speeches without the use of writing techniques. Students in all sections were given survey questions asking about the impact of writing and speaking, while students from sections required to complete preparatory writing exercises were also asked to reflect upon the role of a written topic proposal assignment on their speaking.

In 2016-2017, Composition and Speaking faculty again conducted a dual-purpose assessment project. Faculty assessed whether students in RHET 110/110N were achieving the outcome of writing research-based arguments (by examining student performance on four RHET 110/110N course outcomes) and whether RHET 110/110N students’ writing was improved when students were required to complete a speech assignment as part of their writing coursework. To explore these two questions, faculty required selected “pilot” sections of RHET 110/110N to integrate a formal speaking assignment into the course’s writing assignment sequence. Samples (99 essays) of student research writing were selected from both pilot and non-pilot courses and were scored according to a common analytic rubric. Students were also asked to take an online survey reflecting on their writing processes (and the role of oral rhetoric specifically in that process), and students in pilot sections also write reflections on their learning, particularly on the role of connections between speaking and writing in their learning. Results from this assessment project showed that students in RHET 110/110N (in both pilot and non-pilot sections) demonstrated “good” or “excellent” abilities in writing research-based essays (meeting the four RHET 110/110N learning outcomes selected for this assessment project). This direct assessment did not show statistically significant differences in student performance between pilot and non-pilot sections. However, indirect assessment results from pilot sections
(including survey results and reflective writing) indicated that students believed speech assignments improved their performance on essays (contributing to their abilities in research, organization, and audience assessment). It also demonstrated higher awareness of rhetorical choices and processes (metacognition) among students in the pilot sections. These latter findings helped to provide a basis for important curricular revision of the RHET 110/110 N course (i.e., incorporation of speech and writing).

Assessment during AY 2017-2018 continued this focus on integration of speech and writing. The Rhetoric and Language curriculum committee piloted new RHET 103/Public Speaking learning outcomes in four sections of the course. These four pilot sections also incorporated a formal writing assignment and student surveys and reflections in order to assess the impact of writing instruction on public speaking. Sample speeches collected from these sections were scored according to a common rubric to determine whether students were meeting expectations for three of the four new course learning outcomes. All work assessed was scored as meeting expectations for all three outcomes. In addition, surveys and reflections from pilot sections indicated that students in pilot sections of RHET 103 found that writing assignments enhanced their understanding and performance in public speaking. Assessment results therefore demonstrated student achievement of learning outcomes and provided further evidence in support of our department’s continuing efforts to integrate speaking and writing. In the context of this generally positive result, the assessment did point to opportunities for improvement in the area of academic research writing and for revision of learning outcomes to include application of content knowledge outside the classroom.

Academic English for Multilingual Students: In the previous Rhetoric and Language department program review, the Academic English for Multilingual Students (AEM) program outlined several goals for assessment. These included ensuring accurate placement of international students in developmental courses, revision of learning outcomes to ensure the program’s courses were designed to prepare students for success after exiting the program, development of mechanisms to assess student success in the university curriculum after exiting the program, and finding ways to assure consistency across different sections in meeting program outcomes. As of the last program review, AEM had already done significant work to increase accuracy of placement of conditionally admitted international students into introductory coursework by establishing on-campus testing of conditionally admitted international students.

For the past several years, AEM has engaged in significant and ongoing assessment of its curriculum. During the academic year 2015-2016, AEM assessed student progress toward the following learning outcome: “Communicate successfully in writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes.” AEM faculty measured achievement of this outcome directly by collecting samples of student work from sections of ESL 124 over several years and scoring those samples using a collaboratively designed rubric. Results showed that a strong majority of students were meeting the selected outcome, though faculty reviewers also felt that final assignments from the selected course (ESL 124) could be more standardized to assure students were reaching the outcome at similar levels.

In AY 2016-2017, AEM assessed three of its program learning outcomes: A) Communicate successfully in writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes, B) Understand the rationale and demonstrate means for using reliable sources of information,
and D) demonstrate and articulate typical expectations of a liberal arts education in US universities. AEM assessed student learning of these outcomes directly using a thoughtfully crafted pro-chievement task administered to students in its courses. All student work products were scored by multiple raters who had calibrated scoring practices prior to the evaluation of work products. Results showed that a significant majority of students were partly or fully achieving all three outcomes and that a strong majority were fully achieving outcomes A and D. On the other hand, roughly half of students assessed fully met outcome C, which led the program to consider modifications to pedagogy and course content to better address that outcome.

In AY 2017-2018, AEM assessed two program learning outcomes: 1) intelligibly communicate orally for a variety of academic and personal purposes, and 2) understand the rationale and demonstrate the means for using reliable sources of information. AEM faculty assessed achievement of these outcomes by students completing AEM 121 (the highest oral communication course offered) using a pro-chievement task requiring students to deliver a one-minute oral summary of a video file. Through this task, the majority of students completed the task adequately (or better), though AEM faculty felt that the majority had not “mastered” the outcomes. To address this issue, AEM required faculty to implement syllabus and materials development enhancing instruction in oral source selection, citation, and summary. Assessment results were thus employed to enhance curriculum and pedagogy.


X Technology, Informational Resources, and Facilities

In college, in the workplace, and as citizens, students need to use digital writing spaces critically and intellectually, as well as creatively and compellingly. Although the learning outcomes for the department and for the USF Core Curriculum do not explicitly refer to digital, multimedia, and online communication, many faculty in the department now include digital or multimedia assignments in their courses. Additionally, a strong majority of faculty include assignments that focus on topics related to 21st-century communication technologies.

To assess student and faculty use of technology in Rhetoric & Language classrooms, the department distributed a paper questionnaire at a semester-end retreat in December 2018 and distributed an online survey in January 2019. The paper questionnaire yielded 20 responses and the online survey yielded 44 responses (some faculty members may have completed both surveys). (See appendix E).

**Student Tools:** In every course, students use word processing tools to create and share documents, and use the web to access course materials and activities run through Canvas. Virtually all faculty include classroom activities involving computing technology such as laptops, tablets, or phones; many report that every class session includes some activity involving computing technology.

Most courses with a public speaking component invite or require students to use additional tools, most commonly slideware and other presentation tools. Many faculty include assignments that either require or invite students to develop skills in producing content with specific tools (such as WordPress or Wix to create websites, Audacity to create audio projects such as podcasts, iMovie or GoAnimate to create video projects). In many courses, students use additional software tools to share their works (such as Dropbox, Google Drive, or YouTube). At least six faculty include assignments requiring students to create content in specific venues (such as Wikipedia) or to analyze specific sites (such as Twitter). Several faculty introduce students to digital tools for inquiry and analysis of communication (such as Voyant).

**Faculty Tools:** Most faculty members report using a wide range of tools in their teaching, most commonly word-processing, Canvas, and slideware. USF has recently installed a small number of “active learning classrooms” (characterized by mobile furniture and some technological tools, such as large monitors available for student use). The department advocated strongly for this change and many faculty members seek to teach in these rooms, which are perceived as facilitating collaborative activities and teamwork among students. Our online survey indicated that there is some faculty interest in learning more about recording technologies such as Echo 360.
Canvas (Learning Management System): Learning Management Systems have continued to develop and evolve. In 2012, most faculty used the LMS (Blackboard) only as a repository for course materials. This is still a core use of the current LMS (Canvas), but increasingly faculty are integrating interactive functions of Canvas, such as grading & commenting tools, rubrics, audio comments, quizzes, discussions, groups, and other functions. A number of department faculty volunteer each year to open their Canvas sites to other faculty as part of a professional development program called “Open Canvas,” run by the Center for Teaching Excellence.

Professional Development in Educational Technology: Most faculty members remain satisfied with the technical and professional development support the university provides to the department. Dozens of faculty members, including an overwhelming majority of survey respondents, have participated in professional development workshops or institutes hosted at USF by Educational Technology Services or the Center for Teaching Excellence. In 2016, with support from the Dean’s Office in CAS, a team of three faculty members attended a 2-week digital media institute at the Ohio State University. Since 2012, more than a dozen department faculty have led educational technology workshops or presented their work with educational technology.

One faculty member, Cathy Gabor, won an annual teaching award for Innovation in Teaching with Technology in 2017. Two faculty members, Cynthia Schultes and David Ryan, are featured in faculty profiles on the Educational Technology Services website (https://myusf.usfca.edu/ets/casestudies-schultes; https://myusf.usfca.edu/ets/casestudies-ryan). The department’s goal is to supplement the university-provided workshops with more discipline-specific training.

Facilities. Facilities for some faculty in the Department of Rhetoric and Language are good to excellent, while for others they are problematic. Classrooms are generally well-equipped and adequate meeting rooms are usually available. One problem is that the tables-and-chairs furnishings in some classrooms (including all in Lone Mountain) cannot be easily reconfigured for small group discussions or peer review. In our last program review we suggested having chairs with desk tables and wheels, similar to those in Kalmanovitz (KA) 111 (which facilitate better logistics for groupwork), but that suggestion has not been implemented in furniture replacement options yet. The fact that various administrative units make decisions on such things without consulting faculty is not unusual.

The major problem we face with classroom facilities is the lack of them, which affects the Rhetoric and Language program in two particular ways: first, the university has a very high level of utilization of classroom spaces, but this means that classroom availability is not sufficient at many high-impact times, including most of Tuesday and Thursday, and late morning to mid-afternoon on Monday/Wednesday/Friday. Because our program is so large, we wind up with a significant amount of unroomed classes each semester. Many of
those classes get roomed before pre-registration but many of the faculty wind up being offered classes outside their availability. Part-time faculty without PHP are especially affected by this problem, as they have the lowest seniority. Many such part-timers were recruited and hired only to drift away because they already had teaching schedules on MWF at other universities and we were not able to offer them TR schedules. More senior faculty have wound up teaching barely workable schedules or losing a class due to lack of available rooms that fit their availability. This becomes a further burden on our program, as we have often had to hire new faculty just to meet the classes that these faculty couldn’t take.

As a result of this issue with available classrooms, we tend to get our classes scheduled into whatever rooms are available, and this is the second problem with facilities; there are a number of classrooms that are not reasonably maintained or come with basic structural disadvantages. For example, Lone Mountain 147 is a lovely old former library that is positioned off a staircase between the first and second floors; it has terrible acoustics and limited technological capabilities. In this room, nicknamed “The Harry Potter Room” or “Hogwarts,” by faculty and the scheduling office, the students and instructor sit around a large oval wooden table, in a fashion that would serve certain discussion classes well but which does not meet the basic needs of most faculty and few of them are willing to teach there.

Another room in Lone Mountain is a former testing facility with screens built into long rows of connected table tops. Other rooms are too small to accommodate conventional 20-student classes or have a constant hum from heating units (or heating units that cannot be switched off). These issues, of course, affect most academic units on the Hilltop campus, but this is one of the issues that is magnified in its effect on Rhetoric and Language because of the sheer size of our program.

On the other hand, office space for full-time faculty is generally considered to be adequate or better. Since the opening of Kalmanovitz in Fall 2008, office space for full-time faculty, for the Rhetoric and Composition office (KA 203), and for the ESL Program and Intensive English Program office (KA 204) has been quite satisfactory. It has been convenient that the department’s Chair’s office is located in KA 206 and the Director of the ESL Program office is located in KA 205 in a suite with the program assistants. Available office space continues to be an issue for the university, though, and one full-time faculty said being located in the “Panda Pit” (a somewhat hidden suite of offices in McLaren Hall, a 5-minute walk away) felt removed, not just from the department but from the rest of the university.

Office space for part-time faculty is another story: the accommodations for adjuncts is problematic, at best. Currently Rhetoric and Language adjuncts share a common space with adjuncts from several other departments and programs on the fourth floor of the Gleeson Library. There, access to computers is limited. The space can be loud at times, but there are
six private conference rooms available for meeting with students. One of the biggest problems with this space is access. The central door is kept locked so that students must knock and hope that someone hears them if they are there to meet their professor. These issues have not been addressed since the last R&L report. One faculty member remarked that the desks are not ergonomically designed and not adjustable for short people. The computers are old and slow. When faculty use their own computers, they cannot wirelessly access the printer. In addition, the elevator to the 4th floor of the library is old and breaks down at least once a semester. Accessibility to the adjunct offices is not ADA compliant. Several faculty expressed a desire to be located closer to the Rhetoric and Language Department.

The department is also quite fortunate to have up-to-date photocopying, faxing and scanning capabilities in its office complex. Our arrangement allows for congenial interaction among staff and all faculty (full-time and adjunct) who access the department office complex to check their mailboxes or to copy, fax or scan documents. The copy jobs can also be sent to any copier on campus via wireless connection and released using ID cards.
XI. Conclusions

While the Department of Rhetoric and Language is extremely proud of its accomplishments, we acknowledge that there is room for improvement. Moving forward, we will strive to recognize our blind spots, endeavor to brainstorm innovative solutions, and advocate for the resources we need and deserve. These general goals are articulated more specifically in the next section, Comprehensive Plan for the Future.

XII. Comprehensive Plan For The Future

Please indicate the program’s integrated plan for improvement over the next 5 years (curricular, research, facilities, faculty recruitment and development, diversity goals, etc.)

The department conducted a survey of full-time faculty in Fall 2019, asking them to list the top three priorities for the department. The top three priorities (each addressed more fully below) are:

• create an Institute for *Eloquenta Perfecta*;
• hire at least one more full-time faculty member;
• enact the vision of the “vertical curriculum.”

Each of these priorities helps answer the set of questions we were given to address in this section:

1. What are the core objectives and priorities and what is the sequence of action to be taken for each item?
2. How will the program position itself, given the changes likely to take place within the discipline over the next 5 to 10 years?
3. What opportunities exist to extend and build on present strengths and what are the major obstacles that impede the program’s progress?
4. What improvements are possible through reallocating existing resources?
5. What improvements can only be addressed through additional resources?
Institute for *Eloquentia Perfecta*

Creating an Institute for *Eloquentia Perfecta* is the quintessential instantiation of the Department’s Mission and would serve as the cornerstone of its contribution to the university and its larger Jesuit mission and vision (addresses Question 1 above). This institute, per the most recent faculty survey, is in fact our core priority. The creation of such an institute would position us not only at the forefront of Jesuit education in America, it would also put us in the vanguard of the field of Rhetorical Studies (addresses Question 2). Currently, leaders in our field are moving to “WOVE” or “WOVEN” curricula. In other words, they are fashioning curricula that integrate the following modes of rhetoric/communication: Written, Oral, Visual, Electronic, and—in some cases—Non-verbal. The institute would bring together certain existing resources and necessitate the addition of others. Current assets that we could bring under the “EP Institute” umbrella are: the Debate Team, the Speaking Center, and the Writing Center (addresses Question 3). These three entities could better serve our students (and better represent USF in the case of the Debate Team) if they could collaborate and cross-pollinate.

While USF has taken one step in the right direction with the physical combination of the Speaking Center and the Writing Center, there is still much room for improvement (as noted above). The Institute could be the site of our (future) “rhetoric across the curriculum” efforts. This seed was planted in AY 2018-2019 with the formation of a Faculty Learning Community (FLC) on “Multi-modal Rhetoric Across the Curriculum,” which was facilitated by two Rhetoric and Language faculty members (Cathy Gabor and Michelle LaVigne) and sponsored by USF’s Center for Teaching Excellence. To properly build up on the energy and interest generated by the FLC, the university would need to create a WAC Director-type position, ideally housed in—and possibly directing—the Institute for *Eloquentia Perfecta* (addresses Questions 2, 3, and 5).

In Fall 2019, a subset of the full Rhetoric and Language faculty will craft a mission and vision statement for the Institute for *Eloquentia Perfecta*, which will be used to guide those working on this initiative and will be given to USF’s Development Office to start fundraising. At the end of the Fall 2019 term, a meeting is planned to do scenario planning for the Institute; all Rhetoric and Language faculty will be invited to participate in this meeting, but most likely a subset of the full faculty will attend (addresses Questions 1 and 3). In tandem with these meetings, the department is conducting “eloquentia perfecta” workshops and other activities for staff at the Speaking Center and Writing Center. The planning and funding for those workshops is based on the USF Jesuit Pedagogy grant awarded to two Rhetoric and Language faculty members, Leigh Meredith and Julie Sullivan (addresses Question 3).

**Full-time Faculty Hire**

Given the high number of sections we offer each semester (150+), we need full-time faculty in all areas (addresses Question 5). Two full-time needs the department has discussed are hiring someone with a background in multi-cultural rhetoric and/or hiring someone to serve as the Speaking Center Director. The current tenuous role of the Speaking
Center Director and the growing demand for tutoring in oral rhetoric (both discussed above) clearly represent a core concern of our department (addresses Questions 1 and 3). The other position that has been discussed also represents the department’s commitment to educating for intersectionality and diversifying our own faculty make-up, intellectually and in other possible ways (addresses Questions 1, 2, and 3).

The most recent practice for faculty replacement lines has been thus: open lines in the colleges go back to the Provost who then redistributes them as he sees fit. Under previous administrations, there was a tendency to keep the line in the department. Given the new practice, we have been unsuccessful in securing replacement lines, let alone getting newly created lines. However, this remains a top priority of our department. The typical practice has been that the department is given a line and we deliberate on what subfield to hire in, with the Dean and the Provost getting final say on the job ad. We are in conversation about how we might integrate service needs into future job descriptions, as we implement curricular changes and emphases, we may want to discuss reallocation of NTA to better fit our current and anticipated faculty positions (addresses Question 4). At the same time, we may be more successful if we come up with a “vital need,” as it were, and pitch that to the Dean and/or the Provost (addresses Questions 1 and 5).

**Vertical Curriculum**

The idea of intentionally combining oral and written rhetoric in our curriculum began as a result of our previous Academic Program Review; in fact, it was one of the core suggestions from the reviewers. As detailed above, when studying how to refashion our curriculum, we decided the best practice would be to combine fields (oral, written, digital) and stretch our curriculum vertically (addresses Question 2). The details of our successful pilots and assessment are spelled out above. Said pilots have focused on integrating subfields in our current speaking and writing courses. We have just begun (in Fall 2019) piloting a course that would be taken after students have earned 60 units (“Junior” year). Making a change of this magnitude, i.e. requiring *when* students would take a core class, will necessitate votes of support—formal and informal—across the university. Our current plan is to begin the formal proposal process, moving through the appropriate curriculum committees, at the same time we begin a less formal “charm campaign”: talking to our colleagues around the university to help them see the educational benefits of this proposal. We are imagining this two-pronged plan because we truly want our colleagues in other disciplines to see the benefits for their students, and not just support it because they “owe us one” (addresses Question 1, 4, and 5).
Appendix A: Faculty CVs
CURRICULUM VITAE

Brian Komei Dempster
Professor, Department of Rhetoric and Language
Director of Administration, Master of Arts in Asia Pacific Studies Program
Kalmanovitz Hall 190
University of San Francisco
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080
(415) 422-6042   e-mail: dempster@usfca.edu

EDUCATION

Areas of emphasis: Creative Writing (Poetry), Asian American Literature.  

B.A.     American Ethnic Studies  
Areas of emphasis: Creative Writing, Asian American Literature and Studies.

EMPLOYMENT

Present Appointment:

Term Full Professor, Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco,  
September 2012-present (sabbatical, Fall 2017).

Director of Administration, Master of Arts in Asia Pacific Studies Program, June 2013-present.

Previous Appointments:

Term Associate Professor, Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco,  

Term Assistant Professor, Program in Rhetoric and Composition, University of San Francisco,  

Term Instructor, Program in Rhetoric and Composition, University of San Francisco,  

Adjunct Instructor, Expository Writing Program, University of San Francisco, August 2001- 
August 2002.
Lecturer, University of Michigan, English Department, September 1995-May 1997.

Graduate Student Instructor, University of Michigan, English Department, September 1994-May 1995.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ENDEAVORS

Subjects of research/creative interest and activity include Asian Pacific American poetry and literature, Asia Pacific Studies, disability literature, Japanese American wartime incarceration and post-war resettlement, poetry and nonfiction writing.

AWARDS AND HONORS

Post-Sabbatical Merit Award, April 2019.


Sabbatical Support Award, July 2017.


University of San Francisco Collective Achievement Award for the College of Arts and Sciences, Master of Arts in Asia Pacific Studies Program, May 2015.


15 Bytes Book Award for Poetry, Topaz, July 2014.


Bread Loaf Writers' Conference, Tuition Scholarship, August 2011.

California Civil Liberties Public Education Program Grant under the fiscal sponsorship of the Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Northern California (JCCNC) for project, Collecting Nisei Stories, April 2011.

Investing in Artists grant from the Center for Cultural Innovation, Artistic Innovation Category (Literature), March 2011.

University of San Francisco Distinguished Teaching Award, 2010.

Finalist for George Bogin Memorial Award, Poetry Society of America, 2010.
University of San Francisco Team Merit Award (along with *Writing for a Real World Committee*), 2008.

California Civil Liberties Public Education Program Grant under the fiscal sponsorship of the Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Northern California (JCCCNC) for publication of *Making Home from War*, June 2007.


Finalist for Alice Fay di Castagnola Award and George Bogin Memorial Award, Poetry Society of America, 2005.


California Civil Liberties Public Education Program Grant in conjunction with the Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Northern California (JCCCNC) for publication of *From Our Side of the Fence: Growing Up in America’s Concentration Camps*, 2000.

Creative Artist Grant, Arts Foundation of Michigan and Michigan Council for Arts and Cultural Affairs, 1996.

**PUBLICATIONS**

**Nonfiction:**


**Art Catalogs:**


Refereed Publications:


Poems (Books):


Poems (Anthologies):


Poems (Journals):

“A Boy” and “Tangle.” Accepted for publication. Forthcoming in *Shenandoah*. Eds. Beth Staples, Lesley Wheeler. Forthcoming fall 2019 (tentative date).

“Storm Music” and “Bird Cries.” Accepted for publication. Forthcoming in *Southern Humanities*


Articles and Interviews (Topaz):

Hyphen blog
Northwest Asian Weekly
Ploughshares blog
The Rafu Shimpo

Features (Topaz):

Discover Nikkei
Four Way Review Monthly
The Poetry Foundation Website (Poem of the Day)
Writing like an Asian blog

Reviews (Topaz):

15 Bytes
Beloit Poetry Journal
Crab Creek Review
Hyphen blog
International Examiner
Nichi Bei Weekly
Open Letters Monthly
Poetix
The Huffington Post
Warscapes

PRESENTATIONS

Conferences:

Presented Topaz and other projects at Association for Asian American Studies Conference. San Francisco, California, April 17-20, 2014.


“The Breaking of Silence as Survival: Fusion of the Non-Verbal and Verbal Realms in the Prose

Nonfiction:

Making Home from War: Stories of Japanese American Exile and Resettlement and Collecting Nisei Stories

University of San Francisco. San Francisco, California, September 14, 2017.


Kensington Library. Kensington, California, October 20, 2012

Foster City Library. Foster City, California, May 26, 2012.

San Francisco Main Library. San Francisco, California, May 16, 2012.

University of San Francisco. San Francisco, California, March 20, 2012.


Making Home from War: Stories of Japanese American Exile and Resettlement

San Francisco Main Library. San Francisco, California, October 3, 2018.


Oregon Nikkei Legacy Center. Portland, Oregon, October 9, 2011.


Oakland Museum of California. Oakland, California, June 6, 2011.


Yu-Ai Kai Senior Center. San Jose, California, April 16, 2011.
San Francisco Main Library. San Francisco, California, April 8, 2011.


PS #1 Pluralistic School. Santa Monica, California, March 11, 2011.

Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Northern California. San Francisco, California, February 27, 2011.

From Our Side of the Fence: Growing Up in America’s Concentration Camps

University of San Francisco. San Francisco, California, February 27, 2008.


Noe Valley Ministry. San Francisco, California, February 27, 2006.


San Francisco State University. San Francisco, California, October 25, 2001.


Poetry:

2019 Presentations, *Seize*

AWP Conference in Portland, *TriQuarterly* Offsite Reading

2017-2018 Presentations, *Seize* and *Topaz*:

*Bay Area and Northern California*
LitCrawl, J-Sei


*Bay Area and Northern California*

*Los Angeles (March 2014)*
University of Southern California, Japanese American National Museum

*New Hampshire (July 2015)*
Frost Place Conference on Poetry

*Portland (June 2015)*
Oregon Nikkei Legacy Center, Literary Arts (presentation and workshop)

*Seattle and Bainbridge Island (June 2014)*

*Other*
New Hampshire, New Orleans Webinar, World War II Museum

2013 Presentations, *Topaz*:

*Bay Area and Northern California*
Friends of the Albany Library Meeting, Green Apple Books, Mrs. Dalloway's, Eastwind
Books, San Francisco Main Library

Additional Poetry Readings:

“3rd Annual Faculty, Staff, and Student Poetry Reading.” Read poems to University of San Francisco students, faculty, staff, and guests. Gleeson Library, University of San Francisco, April 27, 2011.


“San Francisco Arts Commission readings.” Read poems with fiction writer and fellow San Francisco Arts Commission grant recipient, Jay Dayrit, at the following San Francisco venues: Noe Valley Ministry (September 17, 2007); the Chinese Culture Center of San Francisco (June 27, 2008); the Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Northern California (August 17, 2008).


“11th Annual Conference, Association for Asian American Studies.” Read with Marilyn Chin and Russell Leong at Resounding Voices: Asian Pacific American Art, History, Literature

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Undergraduate Courses Taught:

University of San Francisco
  Written Communication I
  Written Communication II
  Written and Oral Communication
  Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition
  First-Year Seminar: Language and Power
  Freshman Seminar: San Francisco in Words and Pictures
  Asian American Literature Survey
  Introduction to Creative Writing
  Writing Seminar I
  Poetry Writing Workshop
  Modern American Poetry
  Asian American Studies: Capstone Seminar
  Advanced Workshop in Creative Writing: Poetry
  Special Topics in Literature: Asian American Literature

University of Michigan
  College Writing
  Argumentative Writing
  Introduction to Creative Writing
  English Literature Survey (section leader)
  Beat Generation course (section leader)

Graduate Courses Taught:

University of San Francisco
  MA in Asia Pacific Studies (MAPS) Capstone Seminar
  MAPS Research Methods Seminar
  MAPS Internships
  MAPS Research Projects
  MFA in Writing Major Project I

Teaching Assessment:
  Blue Evaluations
  Narrative Evaluations (Midterm, Final)
SERVICE

Service to the MAPS Program and Center for Asia Pacific Studies:
   MAPS Faculty Steering Committee (2013-2015)
   MAPS All-Faculty and Pedagogy Committee, Co-Chair (2013-2015)
   Search Committees (2014)
   Co-organizer, Career and Networking Forum (2014-Present)
   Presentation Organizer, *Honor and Sacrifice* Screening (February 2014), *The Charm Buyers* Book Launch (February 2017)

Service to the RHET Department and Program:
   Curriculum Development
      Rhetoric and Composition Program Curriculum Committee (2006-2009)
   Committees
      Teaching Group, Chair (2011-2013), Co-Chair (2002)
      *Writing for a Real World* Committee, Member, Co-Chair (2011), Team Leader (2002-2011)
      Departmental By-Laws Subcommittee, Department of Rhetoric and Language (2010)
      Nomination and Election Committee, Co-Chair, Department of Communication Studies (2008)
      Search Committee, Program in Rhetoric and Composition (2004)

Participation in Departmental Programs
   Responding to Student Writers Workshop, Nancy Sommers (2009)

Service to the University:
   Committees
      Dean’s Medal Chair (2009), Committee Member (2007-2008)
      MFA in Writing Nonfiction Search Committee (2008-2009)
      MFA in Writing Poetry Search Committee (2011)

   Student Transitions
      Faculty Advisor for Undeclared Major Students (ongoing)
      Undeclared Liberal Arts: Orientation to Your Major (2010, 2011)
      New Student Orientation (2007, 2008)

Asian Pacific American Studies Program
   Faculty Program Member (ongoing)
Event Leader and Organizer, Garrett Hongo, Asian American poet, memoirist, and editor reading (2012)
Former Faculty Co-Advisor for Asian Pacific American Student Coalition
*Day of Remembrance* presentations (2005-2006)

Presentations and Outreach
Event Leader and Organizer, Richard Tillinghast, poet and nonfiction writer reading (2013)
*Teach-In: The Congressional Hearings on Radicalization in the American Muslim Community: Religion, Race, and the Enemy Within* (2011)
3rd Annual Faculty, Staff, and Student Poetry Reading, Gleeson Library (2011)
National Week on Writing, USF Reading of "Howl" (2009)
*Life After the MFA* Program (2007)
Faculty Development Luncheon, *Structuring Writing Assignments Across the Disciplines* (2002)
Book Discussions for Incoming Students

Service to the Profession:
Publications, Awards, and Grants
(Please see AWARDS AND HONORS and PUBLICATIONS for more detail)
*Making Home from War* (Heyday, 2011)
California Civil Liberties Public Education Program Grant for *Making Home from War* (2007-2009)
Investing in Artists grant from the Center for Cultural Innovation (2011-2012)
Bread Loaf Writers’ Conference Tuition Scholarship (2011)

Conferences (also see PRESENTATIONS)
Service to the Community:

Presentations and Projects
(Please see AWARDS AND HONORS and PRESENTATIONS for more detail)

Presentations of Making Home from War and From Our Side of the Fence
California Civil Liberties Public Education Program Grant for community project, Collecting Nisei Stories (2011-2012)

Community and Religious Organizations
Member of Nichiren Buddhist Church of America (ongoing)
Former Co-Treasurer, Co-Caretaker of Nichiren Buddhist Church of America
Former Board Member, Japanese American Religious Federation
Former Secretary of Japanese American Religious Federation
Former Board Member of Kokoro Assisted Living

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Associated Writing Programs
Poetry Society of America
Leslie Dennenn
593 Headlands Court
Sausalito, CA 94965
415-422-6011
dennenl@usfca.edu

Education


Publications
Writing Center for Credit: A Correlation Study Updated. Sound Instruction Book: Writing Center Theory and Practice. 2015

Professional Presentations
Spring Semester 2018: Presentation to Northern California Writing Center Conference: Conferencing on-line with Zoom and Google Docs.
Spring Semester 2009: Presentation to Northern California Writing Center Conference: The Role of Writing Centers in Shaping Cognitive Development.
Spring Semester 2001: Presentation panel Northern California Writing Center Conference: Working Beyond The Boundaries Of The Writing Center
Spring Semester 1999: Presentation at the Northern California Writing Center Conference: The Retention Spectrum: Serving Students From Basic Skills Through Honors
Fall Semester 1994: Presentation to the Expository Writing Department, USF: Responding To ESL Student Writers
Fall Semester 1993: Presentation to the ESL Department, USF: Helping Writers Develop With Specific Detail

Awards
Distinguished Lecturer Award, USF, 1999.
Administrative
1999 - Present
   Director, Writing Center, University of San Francisco
1999 - 2004
   Course Coordinator, Introduction to Composition, Department of Rhetoric and Composition, University of San Francisco
1999 - 2006
   Coordinator of Writing Placement Test, USF. Coordinated placement test reading for all incoming students. This included hiring and training readers, choosing training materials, and supervising placement exam readings.

Teaching
2010 - Present
   Full-time term Associate Professor, Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco.
2007 - 2010
   Full-time term Assistant Professor, Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco.
1999 - 2007
   Full-time term Instructor, Rhetoric and Composition, University of San Francisco
1992 - 1999
   Lecturer, Expository Writing Department, University of San Francisco
1990 - 1995
   Lecturer, English as a Second Language Department, University of San Francisco
1995 USF Law School – Taught ESL and American Culture and Law to Cambodian law students
1991 - 1994
   Tokai University Summer Program– Taught ESL and American Culture to Japanese students at San Francisco State University
1990 - 1991
   Lecturer, Department of English (ESL), San Francisco State University, SF, CA

Courses Taught
Courses Taught 2014-2019: Rhetoric: 100, 102, 099, 110, 120, 130-131, 327
   Editing and Proofreading (undergraduate)
   Introduction to Composition (undergraduate)
   Written Communication I (undergraduate)
   Written Communication II (undergraduate)
   Oral and Written Communication (undergraduate)
   Writing Center Tutoring (cross-listed both undergraduate and graduate)

Overseas Teaching Experience
December 2002: Instructor, American Culture Class for Chinese Teachers of English. Masters in Education program, University of San Francisco in Xiamen, China
September 1988 – August 1989: English Instructor, Four Seasons Language School, Hamamatsu, Japan
Professional Development
Seminars attended:
July 2004: Summer Institute for Writing Center Directors and Professionals
Clark University, Worcester, MA

Service
To the department
2007-2014: Rhetoric and Communication Program Assessment Project Committee: We rate selected papers from first and second semester composition classes to see if students showed significant improvement on four separate variables.
Fall 2011: Committee Leader: Writing Assessment Committee: Department of Rhetoric and Language. Reevaluated appropriate writing placement for incoming freshman.

To the college
University Committee Work:
2012-2015: College Curriculum Committee, USF.
2014-2015: College Curriculum Committee Faculty Chair:

To the profession
Board Member: Northern California Writing Center Association (NCWCA)
Member: College Composition and Communication
Biographical Information

Doreen E Ewert
Professor
Department of Rhetoric & Language
August 2018-present
University of San Francisco
415-422-2607 (office)
2013 Fulton Street, KA 205
415-422-
San Francisco, CA 92117
dewert@usfca.edu

Education
Ph.D. Linguistics Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, May 2006
Program in TESOL and Applied Linguistics
Dissertation: Temporal Expression in the Non-Narrative Written Discourse of Tutored Adult Learners of English.


B.A. English/History Fresno Pacific College, Fresno, California, May 1978, Summa Cum Laude.

Employment
a. Present appointment:
   University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Professor (2018-present) and Director, Academic English for Multilingual Students Program (2012-present)

   LCC International University, Klaipeda, Lithuania, Visiting-Professor, MA TESOL Program (2009-present)

b. Previous appointments:
   University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Associate Professor (2012-2018)

   Indiana University, Department of Second Language Studies, Associate Professor, and Director of English Language Instruction (2007-2012)

   Fresno Pacific University, Director, Intensive English Language Program (1993-2007)
   Chair of Humanities Division (1997-2000; 2004-2007)

   Indiana University, Center for English Language Training, Associate Instructor (1989-93; 2000-2003).

Research/Creative Work
Areas of research include second language reading and writing, vocabulary and fluency development, language assessment, and curriculum design and implementation. Two studies are currently in progress: vocabulary development of undergraduate students (longitudinal, quantitative); fluency development (mixed methods).

Recent Award
Mellon Scholars Program Award: Humanities Across the Disciplines, Spring 2019.
Refereed Publications

Articles


Chapters


**Referred Conference Presentations, 2012-2020**


(2019, August). *Benefits of ER for matriculated students in a US university*. Extensive Reading World Congress, Feng Chia University, Taichung, Taiwan.


(2016, September). *Classroom fluency activity for vocabulary learning*. Poster presented at Vocab@Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan.


**Invited Conference Presentations, 2012-2019**

(2020, March) Getting more English into your head: The need for more implicit learning. Plenary at Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching. King Zayed University, Abu Dhabi, UAE.


With Hardy, J. (2015, November). Three Plenaries: *Introduction to Extensive Reading; Grading and Assessing Extensive Reading; and Integrating Extensive Reading Models into Curricular Programs*. Center for Study of Languages and Cultures Symposium on Extensive Reading: Empowering Autonomous Learners. November 5-6, 2015, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.


**Refereed Workshops**


(2018, March). *Academic Content and Fluency Development*. 4-hour post-convention workshop for the
International TESOL Association Convention, Chicago, IL.


**Invited Workshops**


(2014, October). *The Path from Fluency to Accuracy: SL/FL Vocabulary Development*. 90-minute hybrid workshop for the Associated Colleges of the South at Washington and Lee University, Lexington, VA.


With Burghardt, B. (2012, January) Current perspectives on foreign/second language teaching.” Two-hour workshop for the Center for Languages of the Central Asian Region, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
With Zahler, T. (2012, February). *Building reading fluency*. Two-hour workshop for the Center for Languages of the Central Asian Region, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

With Azimova, N. (2012, February) *Texts and Tasks for Materials and Teaching*. Two-hour workshop for the Center for Languages of the Central Asian Region, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

**Teaching**

**New Course Development**

AEM 100 Introduction to US Culture  
AEM 101 Introduction to USF  
AEM 102 Fluency Development  
RHET 101 Academic Writing Workshop for Multilingual Students  
RHET 105 Academic Discussion Workshop for Multilingual Students  
RHET 107 Academic Reading Workshop for Multilingual Students  
RHET 111 Academic Listening Workshop for Multilingual Students  
RHET 114 Academic Vocabulary Workshop for Multilingual Students  
RHET 115 Academic Grammar Workshop for Multilingual Students  
RHET XXX Academic Sources Workshop for Multilingual Students (in development)

**Courses Taught at USF**

**Department of Rhetoric & Language**

AEM 102 Fluency Development (Spring 2013, Fall 2013- 2017)  
AEM 103 Pronunciation (Spring 2014, Fall 2015)  
AEM 105 Vocabulary & Idioms (Spring 2014, Fall 2015, Spring 2016)  
AEM 111 Academic Oral Communication I (Fall 2012)  
AEM 121 Academic Oral Communication II (Spring 2016, Fall 2017)  
RHET 106 Introduction to Composition (Spring 2018, Fall 2018)  
RHET 114 Academic Vocabulary Workshop (Fall 2016)  
RHET 115 Academic Grammar Workshop (Fall 2016)  
RHET 120 Written Communication (Spring 2019)  
USF 101 Expedition USF (Fall 2015, Fall 2016, Fall 2017)

**Intercultural & Multicultural Education, School of Education**

IME 638 TESOL Thesis/Field Project (Spring 2014, Fall 014)

**Service**

**To the Department/College**

Chair, Adjunct Faculty Conference, Department of Rhetoric & Language, University of San Francisco, Fall 2014-present.  
Integrating Multilingual Students Committee, Department of Rhetoric & Language, University of San Francisco, Fall 2014-present. (Giving many talks and workshops)  
MA TESOL Field Project Supervisor, University of San Francisco, Fall and Spring 2014.
Faculty Search Committee Member, Humanities Division, Fresno Pacific University 1995-2007; Second Language Studies, Indiana University 2007-2010; Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco, 2013-14.

To the University

Co-Chair Academic Integrity Committee Member, University of San Francisco, 2016-present.  
Academic Integrity Committee Member, University of San Francisco, 2012-2016  
Faculty Advisory Board for Internationalization, Member, University of San Francisco, 2017-present  
Working Group on International Student Experience, Member, University of San Francisco, 2017-present  
University of San Francisco Faculty Association, Policy Board Elected Member, University of San Francisco, 2017-present

To the Profession (2012-2019)

Proposal Reviewer: American Association of Applied Linguistics; TESOL International Convention  
Commissioner, Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (CEA). January, 2018-present.  
Chair, TESOL Professional Development Professional Council, 2016-2017.  
Member, TESOL Standing Committee for Professional Development, 2011-2016  
Executive Committee, Extensive Reading Foundation, Fall 2015-present  
Associate Board Member, Extensive Reading Foundation, Fall 2013-Fall 2015.  
CEA Site Reviewer, Commission on English Language Program Accreditation of English Language Programs (CEA), 2013-present.  
Language Program Reviewer. Northern Ohio University, November 2009; Oklahoma University, May 2016; GO Project Summer Intensive Language Program, Indiana University, June 2016.  
Interim Coordinator, CATESOL Bay Area Chapter, January-June 2015  

To the community 2012-2018

Founding member, Interfaith Refugee Welcome, San Francisco, 2017-present  
Member, Sanctuary Huddle, St. John’s Presbyterian Church

Professional Affiliations 2012-2019

AAAL, 2002-present.  
TESOL, 1989-present.  
CATESOL Bay Area Chapter, 2013-present.  
Extensive Reading Foundation, 2012-present.
Biographical Information

Name: Catherine Gabor  
Associate Professor  
University of San Francisco  
Department of Rhetoric and Language  
August 2017-present  
cgabor@usfca.edu  
P: (415) 422-6684; F: (415) 422-3830  
2130 Fulton Street  
San Francisco, CA  94117  
https://sites.google.com/site/drcathygabor

Education

Ph.D., English  
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, May 2004  
Specialty: Rhetoric and Composition  

Dissertation:  
Leave the Room! Teaching Writing Beyond the Four Walls of the Classroom.

M.A., English  
Indiana University, Bloomington, May 1992

B.A., English  
Bethany College, Bethany, WV, May 1989, summa cum laude

Employment

a. Present appointment: University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Associate Professor (2017-present) and Department Chair (2019-2022)

b. Previous appointments:
   University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
   Assistant Professor, 2012-2017
   Director of Composition (2014-2019)

San Jose State University, San Jose, CA
   Associate Professor and Director of Composition, 2012
   Assistant Professor and Director of Composition, 2009-2011
   Assistant Professor, 2008-2009

California State University, Sacramento, CA
   Assistant Professor, 2004-2008

Research/Creative Work

Research/Creative Endeavors

Research interests center on community-based learning, digital authorship, and the scholarship of administration. Of recent interest is the link between digital reading and writing as well as the overlap between the ethos of Wikipedia editing and Jesuit rhetorical principles, especially eloquentia perfecta.
Awards/Honors/Grants/Fellowships

Mellon Scholars Program Award: Humanities Across the Disciplines, Spring 2019.
Faculty Award for Technology Innovation, University of San Francisco, May 2017.
Distinguished Honorary Member, National Society of Collegiate Scholars, Sept 2016
Digital Media and Composition Faculty Institute, The Ohio State University, May 2016
Grant Co-Recipient, "Give Students a Compass" Grant, Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009-2011, $25,000
Community Engagement & Service-Learning Award, San Jose State University, 2010
Faculty Fellow for Service-Learning and Political Engagement, Carnegie Foundation /CA Campus Compact, 2007-2009
Faculty Fellow, Teaching using Technology (TuT) Institute, California State University Sacramento, Summer 2005
Jim Corder Memorial Fellowship, Texas Christian University, Spring 2004
Distinction, Comprehensive Exams, Texas Christian University, 2001
Distinction, Comprehensive Exams, Bethany College, 1989

Refereed Publications

Articles


"Writing Partners: Service Learning as a Route to Authority for Basic Writers." *Journal of Basic Writing* 28.1 (Spring 2009): 50-70.


Chapters

“Reading, Writing, Produsing: Fostering Student Authors in the Public Space.” *Digital Reading and Writing in Composition Studies*, edited by Mary Lamb and Jennifer M. Parrott. Routledge, 2019, 144-160.


**Non-refereed Publications**

**Invited Scholarly Blog Posts**


**Book Reviews**


**Conference Presentations, 2015-2019**


“Tweet On, Cloud Up, and Program In! Righteous Risks in Creating Communities via Online and Hybrid Interfaces as Assignment, Course, and Program Levels.” Conference on College Composition and Communication. March 2015. Tampa, FL. (w/ Stacia Dunn Campbell and Carol Johnson).
Invited Lectures

External

Internal


“Writing Across the Curriculum and Writing in the Disciples” (w/ Michael Rozendal). Department of Rhetoric and Language Lecture Series. University of San Francisco. March 6, 2014.


Teaching

New Program Development
University of San Francisco
Multi-section Course Coordinator and Curriculum Developer– Rhetoric 110/N, 2014-2018
Rhetoric Minor (with Michelle LaVigne), Approved 2015

New Course Development
University of San Francisco
Academic Writing for Graduate Students (graduate)
New Media/You Media: Writing in Electronic Environments (undergraduate)
Writing for Social Sciences (undergraduate)

Courses Taught
University of San Francisco
Written Communication I (undergraduate)
Written Communication I Intensive (undergraduate)
Written Communication II (undergraduate)
Oral and Written Communication I (undergraduate)
Oral and Written Communication II (undergraduate)
Academic Writing at USF (undergraduate)
New Media/You Media: Writing in Electronic Environments (undergraduate)
Writing for Social Sciences (undergraduate)
Academic Writing for Graduate Students (graduate)

**Professional Development**
- Numerous workshops on teaching, Center for Teaching Excellence
- Numerous workshops on teaching with technology, Education Technology Services
- Numerous workshops on community-based learning, Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good
- Numerous workshops on assessment, Provost’s Office

**Service**

**To the department**
- Chair, Fall 2019-
- Director of Composition, Fall 2016-Spring 2019
- Acting Chair, Dept. of Rhetoric and Language, June 2016, October 2016
- Chair, New Curriculum Committee, Dept. of Rhetoric and Language, Fall 2014-Fall 2018
- Chair, Assessment Committee, Dept. of Rhetoric and Language, Fall 2016-Fall 2018

**To the College/School**
- Arts Representative, USF-FA Policy Board, Fall 2018-
- Writing Across the Curriculum Developer, School of Nursing and Health Professions, May 2017-December 2018
- Writing Coach, School of Nursing and Health Professions Writing Retreat, Spring 2014

**To the University**
- Steering Committee, Center for Teaching Excellence, Fall 2018-
- Advisory Board, Educational Technology Services, Fall 2018-
- Learning Spaces Committee, Educational Technology Services, Fall 2018-
- Leader, Faculty Book Circle on *Where Good Ideas Come From: The Natural History of Innovation*, Center for Teaching Excellence, 2017-2018

**To the profession**

*National Council of Writing Program Administrators*
- Chair, National Affiliates Committee, 2018-
- Co-Chair, Local Planning Committee, Annual National Conference (2018), 2016-2018
- Member, Conference Siting Committee, National Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2012-2013

[insert journal reviews]

*Northern California Affiliate, National Council of Writing Program Administrators*
- Co-founder and President, May 2011 – May 2012
Secretary/Treasurer, May 2014 – August 2017
Liaison to the National Council of Writing Program Administrators, May 2012 – August 2013

Conference on College Communication and Composition
Proposal Reviewer, Summer 2017, San Jose, CA

To the community
Amador Valley Scholarships, Inc., Pleasanton, CA
Board Member, 2015-

Organizing for Action (OFA), www.ofa.us
Co-organizer, Tri-Valley Women’s March, Pleasanton, CA, January 2019
Organizer and Emcee, Families Belong Together Rally, Pleasanton, CA, June 2018
Voter Registration Coordinator, Pleasanton Farmers Market, Pleasanton, CA 2017-2018
Co-organizer, Looking for Our America: Open Conversations, Livermore, CA, Feb-Mar 2018
Fellowship Graduate, 2017

March for Science, Livermore, CA
Member, Executive Planning Committee, 2016-2017

Professional Affiliations
Conference on College Composition and Communication
Council of Writing Program Administrators
National Council of Teachers of English
Devon C. Holmes

Department of Rhetoric and Language 20 Redwood Ave.
University of San Francisco Corte Madera, CA 94925
San Francisco, CA 94117 (415) 297-7673
dcholmes@usfca.edu

EDUCATION

Director: Roxanne D. Mountford.


TEACHING EXPERIENCE

2012-present  Full Professor of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco.
Courses taught: RHET 130/131 (Oral and Written Communication), RHET 110 (Written Communication I), RHET 120 (Written Communication II), and RHET 103 (Public Speaking).

2008-2012  Associate Professor of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco.
Courses taught: RHET 130/131 (Oral and Written Communication), RHET 195 (“Where’s the ‘You’ in University?”), RHET 297 (Writing in Sociology), RHET 140 (Seminar in First-Year Composition), and RHET 120 (Written Communication II).
Course developed: RHET 297 (Writing in Sociology).

2002-2008  Assistant Professor of Rhetoric and Composition, University of San Francisco.
Courses taught: first-year composition courses, including 110, 120, and 140. Also substitute taught a graduate course in methods of teaching college writing.

2002  Instructor, Saddleback College. Course taught: writing fundamentals.

2001-2002  Writing Facilitator, Johns Hopkins University, Center for Talented Youth. Course facilitated: writing analysis and persuasion (Web-based format).


SERVICE / ADMINISTRATIVE AND COMMITTEE WORK

University of San Francisco

2019-present  Faculty Advisor, National Society of Leadership and Success (NSLS). Am working with students to launch a chapter of this national organization here at USF. Responsibilities include the following: helping students gain an increasing degree of initiative, judgement, and autonomy in terms of planning events and activities for NSLS; making sure that the group and its executives understand expectations for student behavior and activities as laid out in the Fogcutter Student Handbook; meeting with the NSLS executives in order to discuss expectations for our respective roles and responsibilities.

2010-2014  Area Director/Co-Director of Composition, Department of Rhetoric and Language. Responsibilities include but are not limited to the following: collaborate with Department Chair and other Directors to hire part-time faculty; review book orders and syllabi of instructors teaching 108, 110, 120, 195, 250, 295, and Writing in the Disciplines courses; revise Faculty Handbook in collaboration with other Area Directors; observe classes of new part-time faculty and meet with those faculty to assess performance; plan workshops on issues relevant to Rhetoric and Language faculty.

2009-present  Policy Board Representative. Attend bi-monthly meetings to discuss USFFA business, including discussions about contract negotiations.

2007-present  Member of Assessment Team, Department of Rhetoric and Language. Work with two other members of the Rhetoric and Language faculty each summer to assess extent to which Core A2 learning outcomes are being met for 110/120 and 130/131.

2004-present  Undergraduate Advisor, University of San Francisco. Assist undeclared first-year and transfer students in creating schedules during registration that meet the university’s core requirements.

2013  Academic Success Workshop: “Getting Help from Professors: How and Why to Reach Out.” Teamed up with Keith Hunter, Assistant Professor in the School of Management, to deliver this one-hour presentation.

2011-2012  Chair, Rhetoric and Language Search Committee. Responsible for locating candidates for two renewable term positions in the Department of Rhetoric and Language.

2011-2012  Faculty Mentor for Ana Rojas, Term Assistant Professor in Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco.

2010  Speaker at International Student Orientation in August 2010. Delivered presentation on “American Classroom Culture,” including how to address faculty, importance of and strategies for participating in discussions, and approaches to expressing different viewpoints.

2009-2010  Co-Chair of University of San Francisco Reading Project. Used Diego Rivera’s “Man at the Crossroads” mural as a common text for incoming first-year students. Held committee meetings throughout the spring 2009 semester and delegated tasks to committee members; collaborated with another committee member to write questions.
used for essay contest and Orientation discussion sessions; served as a judge for the essay contest.

2009 Member of Search Committee for Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco. Subsequent to phone interviews, the search was cancelled due university-wide budgetary challenges.

2009 Participant in two-hour, videotaped workshop led by Nancy Sommers, Director of the Harvard Writing Program.


2008-2010 Chair, Writing for a Real World Committee, University of San Francisco. Planned and directed committee meetings; wrote and disseminated Call for Papers (CFP); organized all-day scoring sessions to choose winning entries; planned and hosted the awards ceremony; created budget.

2008-2009 Member of the University of San Francisco Reading Project. Used Greg Mortensen’s *Three Cups of Tea* as the common text for incoming first-year students. Attended committee meetings; collaborated with another committee member to write questions used for essay contest and Orientation discussion sessions; served as a judge for the essay contest.

2007 Chair of Search Committee, Rhetoric and Composition, University of San Francisco. Served on committee responsible for locating candidates for two term Assistant Professor positions in the Rhetoric and Composition program. Duties included reviewing candidates’ files, meeting with other committee members and with the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, observing candidates’ teaching demonstrations, and conducting phone and in-person interviews.

2006-2007 Faculty Mentor to Sarah Burgess, then a Term Assistant Professor in Rhetoric and Composition Program, Department of Communication Studies.

2006 Search Committee, Rhetoric and Composition, University of San Francisco. Served on committee responsible for locating a candidate to fill a term position for Assistant Professor in the Rhetoric and Composition program. Duties included reviewing candidates’ files, meeting with other committee members and with the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, observing candidates’ teaching demonstrations, and conducting phone and in-person interviews.

2005 Reviewer of Rhetoric and Composition Textbook. Served as a peer reviewer of a manuscript being published by Thomson/Wadsworth.

2004-2006 Rhetoric and Composition Curriculum Committee, University of San Francisco. Duties included developing and refining first-year composition curriculum and clarifying distinctions between the learning outcomes of the three primary courses in the composition sequence.

2004 Search Committee, Visual and Performing Arts, University of San Francisco. Served on committee responsible for locating a candidate to develop the new Architecture and Community Design program. Duties included reviewing candidates’ files, meeting with
other committee members and with the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, observing candidates’ teaching demonstrations, and conducting phone and in-person interviews.

2002-2008 Writing for a Real World Committee, University of San Francisco. Duties included promoting the journal and encouraging teacher and student involvement from across the curriculum, planning and hosting the awards ceremony, budgeting, participating in all-day scoring sessions to choose winning entries, and editing and writing introductions for selected works.

2002-2003 RC 220 Course Committee, University of San Francisco. Duties included developing and refining learning outcomes for 220 and collaborating with other committee members on individual assignments, assignment sequences, and syllabi.

University of Arizona


1999-2001 University Composition Board Intern, University of Arizona. Assisted University Composition Board in developing and administering placement and proficiency exams for the undergraduate population. Duties included writing assessment prompts, training readers to score exams holistically, evaluating the upper-division writing proficiency exam, and designing documents and presentations for Arizona high school teachers and students involved in the Portfolio Placement Project.

1999-2001 Workshop Facilitator, University of Arizona. Led workshops designed to prepare students for Upper-Division Writing Proficiency Exam.

1998 Writing Consultant, The Writing Center, University of Arizona. Consulted with undergraduate and graduate students on a variety of writing projects and helped conduct interviews for fall 1998 consultant positions.

1997 Composition Tutor, New Start Summer Program, University of Arizona. Worked as in-class tutor in basic writing course for ethnic minority and financially disadvantaged incoming first-year students.


Carnegie Mellon University

1995 Mentor, Community Literacy Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Participated in Community Literacy course taught by Linda Flower at Carnegie Mellon University that involved helping inner-city, college-hopeful teens learn broadly applicable writing strategies.

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Composition curriculum and pedagogy; combining instruction in written and oral communication.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


UNIVERSITY PRESENTATIONS


1997  “Problems with Speaking for and about: Revising the Goals and Methods of Community Literacy Work.” Invited to give a presentation to graduate seminar in Cultural Studies and Composition. University of Arizona, October 20, 1997.

HONORS AND AWARDS

2015  Professor of the Month, Xi Lambda Chapter of the Delta Zeta Sorority, University of San Francisco.

2006  Collective Achievement Award, Program in Rhetoric and Composition, University of San Francisco.

2006  Guest at 4.0 Banquet, University of San Francisco. Each undergraduate earning a 4.0 invites a professor who has made a significant impact on his or her undergraduate education.

2004  Guest at 4.0 Banquet, University of San Francisco. Each undergraduate earning a 4.0 invites a professor who has made a significant impact on his or her undergraduate education.

2003  Guest at 4.0 Banquet, University of San Francisco. Each undergraduate earning a 4.0 invites a professor who has made a significant impact on his or her undergraduate education.

2000  Dean’s Dissertation Fellowship, University of Arizona.
Hunt, Jonathan CV for Program Review

Biography
Jonathan P. Hunt
Associate Professor (Term), Department of Rhetoric and Language
jhunt2@usfca.edu

Education
PhD World Literature and Cultural Studies, University of California, Santa Cruz, 1996
Specialty: Comparative US/French 19th-Century Novel
Dissertation: “Naturalist Democracy”
BA English, Dartmouth College, 1988

Employment
Associate Professor (Term), Department of Rhetoric and Language, USF (2015-present)
Co-Director, Seeley Center for Teaching Excellence, USF (2016-2019)
Assistant Professor (Term), Department of Rhetoric and Language, USF (2012-2015)
Associate Director, Program in Writing and Rhetoric, Stanford University (2010-2012)
Lecturer, Program in Writing and Rhetoric, Stanford University (2005-2010)
Consultant, Hume Writing Center, Stanford University (2005-2010)
Lecturer, Department of English, Santa Clara University (1999-2005)
Lecturer, Department of Literature, University of California, Santa Cruz (1996-1999)

Research/Creative Work
“The Classroom Observation: Attitudes and Practices.” The goal of this IRB-approved study is to find out more about the experiences and attitudes of writing instructors regarding classroom visits by colleagues (including both visits for evaluative purposes and other visits). Better information about the subjective experience of writing program faculty (as visitor and visited) may help us understand what changes (whether procedural or cultural) would result in more effective policies and procedures for classroom visits, leading to improved faculty morale, cohesiveness, and performance, and thus to a stronger writing program and a better experience for students.

Awards/Honors/Grants/Fellowships
Open Educational Resources Mini-Grant
Mellon Scholars Program Grant

Refereed publications
B. Refereed journal articles

C. Chapters in books

Papers presented at meetings and symposia
• “Bicycling Across the Curriculum” National Bicycle Summit, Washington DC, March 2019
• “Re-imagining Rhetoric: A New Curriculum Rollout Integrating Written and Oral Instruction,” Council of Writing Program Administrators, Sacramento, CA, July 2018
• “Faculty-Led Teaching Centers: Peer-to-Peer Leadership Strategies,” International Consortium on Educational Development. Atlanta, GA, June 2018
• “Defining the Needs of Adjunct Faculty: Understanding Paths for Development,” Professional and Organizational Development in Higher Education Network annual conference. Montreal, Quebec, October 2017
• “Ghostwriting and the Credibility of Students and Writing Programs,” Conference on College Composition and Communication, Houston TX, March 2016
• “Rhetoric’s Trespasses: Discipline and Area in the Study of the Global Left,” Western States Rhetoric and Literacy Conference, University of Nevada, Reno, October 2014
• “The Classroom Visit: Attitudes and Practices,” Conference on College Composition and Communication Qualitative Research Network Forum, Indianapolis, IN, March 2014
• “Fostering Undergraduate Research First-Year Writing Courses,” Third Writing Research across Borders (WRAB) Conference, Paris, France, February 2014
• “Faculty Citizenship in Writing Programs,” Council of Writing Program Administrators, Savannah, GA, July 2013
• “Feminisms and the Party Line: New(er) Activist Rhetorics and the Old Left,” Feminisms and Rhetorics, Mankato, MN, October 2011
• “Undergraduate Research as Text, Activity, and Goal,” Rhetoric Society of America, Minneapolis, MN, May 2010
• “Young Scholars in Writing: Mentoring, Publishing, and Celebrating Student Writing,” Roundtable, Conference on College Composition and Communication, Louisville, March 2010
• “Remixing Rhetoric: Graffiti Literacies and Pedagogies,” Conference on College Composition and Communication, Louisville, March 2010
• “Real and Ideal in the Conversation on Grading Writing,” Conference on College Composition and Communication, New Orleans, April 2008
• “Centered Teaching, or How I Learned to Teach Writing in the Writing Center,” Northern California Writing Centers Association, Santa Rosa Junior College, March 2008
• “A School of a New Type: Holland Roberts and the California Labor School,” Conference on College Composition and Communication, New York City, March 2007
• “Mike Quin’s ‘Machine-Gun Diction’: Talking Left in Wartime San Francisco,” Talking Culture, California American Studies Association, Sacramento, CA, April 2003
• “Mike Quin: Communist Journalism, Socialist Realism, and Detective Fiction,” Fifth Congress of the Americas, University of the Americas, October 2001
• “The Bike Lane,” On the Edge, California American Studies Association, UC Santa Barbara, April 1999

Invited lectures (list in reverse chronological order under the categories of local, regional, national, and international).
• “The Faculty Role in Reducing Inequality.” Foothill/DeAnza-USF Collaborative Social Justice Teaching in the Humanities Faculty Workshop. April 2018.
• “From the Popular Front to the Cold War.” Shaping San Francisco history series, October 2017.
• “From the Other Side of the Desk: The Challenges Writing Teachers Face When They Move from Teacher to Tutor” (Respondent), Conference on College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, 2012.
• “Red Rhetoric: Discipline and Area in the Study of Global Left Cultures,” Art and Politics of East Asia Colloquium Series, University of Chicago, October 2006
• “What Is This Sh*t? The Scholarly Conversation on Swearing,” First International Swearing Festival, San Francisco, February 2006
• “Instructional Technology and Disciplinary Knowledge,” Teaching Scholar Symposium: Online, Hybrid, and Traditional Pedagogies: How Does Technology Help Students Learn? Santa Clara University, April 2005
• “Critical Pedagogy and Disciplinary History in Composition,” Composition
Colloquium Series, Santa Clara University, October 2004
- “Writing on the Left,” Envisioning California, Center for California Studies, CSU Sacramento, October 2004
- “The Imperial Bicycle,” Empire and Imperial Cultures, California State University Stanislaus, February 2004
- “The Ominous Bicycle,” UC Santa Cruz Center for Cultural Studies Colloquium, UC Santa Cruz, April 1999

Teaching

University of San Francisco (2012-present) - courses taught
RHET 110N, an intensive version of a first-year writing course
HONC-390, a 2-unit “forum” seminar in USF’s Honors College
RHET 120, a first-year writing course satisfying USF’s Core A2 requirement
COMS 195, a themed first-year seminar in public speaking
RHET 103, a public speaking course satisfying USF’s Core A1 requirement
RHET 130-131, a two-semester rhetoric-based first-year writing and speaking course
USF 101, a pilot one-unit first-year course in undergraduate life

Stanford University (2005-2012) - courses taught
ENG 397: Rhetoric and Composition Pedagogy, a graduate pedagogy course
PWR 1, a required first-year writing course focused on research-based writing
PWR 2, a required second-year writing and speaking course focused on research-based writing and research-based oral and multimedia communication

Santa Clara University (1999-2005) - courses taught
Composition and Rhetoric 1 & 2
Literature and Composition
Reading Film
The Greatest Hits of Cultural Studies

Presentations, research and publications on teaching
See above

Brief description (bullet points) of any steps taken to assess and improve teaching.
- I currently serve as Director of Composition, which includes planning and executing professional development workshops and events for writing faculty.
- I served three years as Faculty Co-Director of the Seeley Center for Teaching Excellence.
- I served one year as a faculty pedagogy consultant in the College of Arts and Sciences
- I planned, implemented, designed, managed, and/or assessed dozens of faculty development events and programs serving more than 1000 USF faculty
- I presented at national and international conferences on faculty development
Service

Service to the department

- Rhetoric and Language Directed Self-Placement Committee (Chair, 2019)
- Rhetoric and Language New Curriculum Committee (Co-chair, 2019)
- Rhetoric and Language Curriculum Committee, 2014-present
- Rhetoric and Language Assessment Committee, 2014-present
- Rhetoric and Language Multilingual Student Integration Committee, Chair 2014-present
- Journal Club, Department of Rhetoric and Language (Organizer) 2013-2015

Service to the College of Arts and Sciences

- Steering Committee, USF Writing Center, 2017-present
- Junior Scholar Speaker Series Committee, 2013-2015
- Pedagogy Consultant, College of Arts and Sciences, 2013-2015

Service to the University

- Faculty Co-Director, Tracy Seeley Center for Teaching Excellence, 2016-2019
- University Academic Integrity Committee, 2016-present; Co-chair, 2018-present
- University Assessment Committee, 2016-2019
- University Learning Spaces Committee, 2016-2019
- Center for Teaching Excellence Open Classrooms Host, 2012-2019

Service to the profession

- Associate Editor, Perspectives on Writing book series, WAC Clearinghouse/University of Colorado Press, 2018-present
- Program Reviewer, POD Network Conference, 2018
- CCCC Committee on Undergraduate Research, 2016-2018
- Council of Writing Program Administrators Affiliates Committee, 2015-present
- Editorial Board; Faculty Advising Editor, Young Scholars in Writing, 2009-2015
- President, Northern California-Nevada Regional Affiliate, Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2013-14
- Editor, Comment & Response Section, Young Scholars in Writing, 2013-2015
Michelle LaVigne
Department of Rhetoric and Language
University of San Francisco

Education

Ph.D. Communication Arts (Rhetoric), University of Wisconsin – Madison, 2010.
M.A. Communication Arts (Rhetoric), University of Wisconsin – Madison, 2005.
B.A. English, University of Texas – Austin, 2002, Cume Laude.

Academic Appointments

2015-Present Associate Professor, Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco
2016-Present Affiliate Faculty, MA in Professional Communication, University of San Francisco
2010-2015 Assistant Professor, Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco
2007-10 Instructor, Department of Communication Studies, University of San Francisco
2003/05 Lecturer, Department of Communication Arts, University of Wisconsin – Madison
2002-07 Teaching Assistant, Department of Communication Arts, University of Wisconsin – Madison

Administrative Positions

2013-Present Coordinator, Public Speaking Program, Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco

Publications

Peer Reviewed

Forthcoming
LaVigne, Michelle “Repeating Classical Forms: Why The Nutcracker (Still) Matters” in *Oxford Handbook of Contemporary Ballet* (Accepted for publication 2020, *Oxford University Press*).

**Book Reviews**


**Works in Progress**

Article, “Framing Events as Tragic: Mediating Distance and Closeness,” in collaboration with professor Kati Hannken-Illjes, Philipps-Universität Marburg.

Article, “Between Rhetoric and Performance: The Mimetic Movement of Alvin Ailey’s Revelations.”

White Paper, “Co-Teaching at the University of San Francisco”

**Invited Papers and Presentations**

2019 “Referencing America: The Common Topos of Rodeo in and between Aaron Copland, Agnes de Mille, and Justin Peck,” Dance Studies Association Conference, Dancing in Common, Evanston, IL.

2018 “Playing with Form: Searching for (Better) Dance Criticism,” National Communication Association Annual Conference, Salt lake City UT.

2018 “Bodies Moving, Thinking and Communicating: A Workshop on Embodiment,” in collaboration with Megan Nicely (University of San Francisco), International Colloquium on Communication, Marburg, Germany.

2017 “A Relevant Future: Discussing the Honors Basic Course” National Communication Association Annual Conference, Dallas, TX.

2017 “Bodies Moving Thinking: A Workshop on Embodiment,” in collaboration with Megan Nicely (University of San Francisco), Pacific Association for the Continental Tradition Annual Conference, San Francisco, CA.

2017 “Framing Events as Tragic: Mediating Distance and Closeness,” in collaboration with Kati Hannken-Illjes (University of Marburg) Conference of the Rhetoric Society of Europe, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom.

2016 “Tragic Frames and Responses: Perspectives from Germany and the U.S..”
in collaboration with Kati Hannken-Illjes (University of Marburg) International Colloquium on Communication, University of Fulda, Germany.

2015 "Affective Architecture Workshop." In collaboration with Julian Carter (CA College of the Arts), Selby Wynn Schwartz (Stanford University), and Rebekah Edwards (Mills College). Affect Theory Conference: Worldings/Tensions/Futures, Millersville University, Lancaster, PA.


2014 “Public Speaking and Diversity: Challenges and Opportunities," National Communication Association Annual Conference, Chicago, IL.

2014 "Exploring Choreographic Thinking: A Spectator's Perspective," a dialog with Megan Nicely (University of San Francisco), Society of Dance History Scholars + Congress on Research in Dance Joint Conference, Iowa City.

2014 “Moving from Performance to Performativity: Reconsidering the Rhetoricity of Mimesis and Alvin Ailey's Revelations," International Colloquium on Communication, University of Münster, Germany.

2013 “Choreographing Potential between Rhetoric and Dance." Tactical Bodies: The Choreography of Non-Dancing Subjects, Congress on Research in Dance (CORD) and Dance Under Construction (University of California dance studies graduate student conference).


2010 “Rhetorical Movement of Subjectivity in German Modern Dance: Kurt Joss' 'The Green Table.'" Rhetoric Society of America Biannual Conference, Minneapolis, MN.


2007 “German Modern Dance – Political Consequences of a Moving, Visual Subject." National Communication Association Annual Conference, Chicago, IL.

2006 “Creating a Place of Citizenship: The International Court of Justice and The Legal Consequences of a Wall." National Communication Association Annual Conference, San Antonio, TX.


2005  “The Performance, Performativity, and Mimesis of Revelations.” National Communication Association Annual Conference, Boston, MA

Courses Taught

University of San Francisco
Master of Arts in Professional Communication:
   PC 608: Capstone/Culminating Experience.
   PC 600: Foundations of Communication.
   PC 602: Ethics in Professional Communication.
   PC 620: Strategic Communication.
Department of Rhetoric and Language:
   Rhetoric 304: Theories and Methods of Argumentation.
   Rhetoric 103: Public Speaking.
   Rhetoric and Composition 130: Written and Oral Communication.
   Rhetoric and Composition 131: Written and Oral Communication.
   Rhetoric and Composition 202: Writing for Performing Arts.
   Rhetoric and Composition 120: Written Communication II.
Saint Ignatius Institute:
   325: Public Speaking – Great Speakers and Speeches.
Davies Seminar:
   Embodied Activism: Dance, Subjects, and Mobilization in Contemporary American Performing Arts and Social Justice:
   Dance 195: Dance in San Francisco.

University of Wisconsin - Madison
Teaching Assistant:
   Communication Arts 370: Great Speeches and Speakers
   Communication Arts 360: Introduction to Rhetorical Theory and Criticism
   Communication Arts 262: Theory and Practice of Argument and Debate
Instructor:
   Communication Arts 262: Theory and Practice of Argument and Debate.
   Communication Arts 100: Introduction to Speech Composition

Courses Developed
University of San Francisco

Maters in Professional Communication:
  PC 600: Foundations of Communication.

Department of Rhetoric and Language:
  Rhetoric 304: Theories and Methods of Argumentation.
  Rhetoric 202: Writing for Performing Arts.

Saint Ignatius Institute:
  SII 325: Public Speaking – Great Speakers and Speeches.

Davies Seminar:
  Embodied Activism: Dance, Subjects, and Mobilization in Contemporary American Society.

Performing Arts and Social Justice:
  Dance 195: Dance in San Francisco.

Guest Lectures and Workshops

2017  “Public Speaking in the American Context: Lecture and Workshop.” University of Marburg, Germany.
2012-11 “Writing for Dance and Performance Studies.” For Dance 150: Appreciation of Performance Arts, Dance, University of San Francisco.
2010  “The Dance Aesthetic as Movement.” Philosophy 209: Aesthetics, University of San Francisco.

Awards and Research Grants

2019  Sabbatical Leave. University of San Francisco.
2015  Jesuit Foundation Pedagogy Grant. University of San Francisco.
2007-18 College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Development Fund. University of San Francisco.
2003/06 Pearce Award for Outstanding Graduate Research in Rhetoric. University of Wisconsin.
2005  “The Performance, Performativity, and Mimesis of

2004 Helen K. Herman Teaching Award. University of Wisconsin – Madison.

2003-06 McCarty Graduate Research Travel Award. University of Wisconsin – Madison.

Academic Service

**Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco**

2016-2018  *Rhetoric Week Committee*, Chair.

2015-Present  *New Curriculum Committee*

2014-Present  *Steering Committee, Master of Arts in Professional Communication*.

2017-2018  *Master of Arts in Urban and Public Affairs Writing Workshop*

2018  *Master of Arts in Professional Communication Writing Workshop*

2010-15  *Department of Rhetoric and Language Colloquium Co-Chair*.

2008-10  *Rhetoric and Composition Curriculum Committee*.

**College of Arts and Sciences, University of San Francisco**

2017-Present  *College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee*. Co-Chair

2013-14  *ACE Public Speaking Training*, Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good.

**University of San Francisco**

2013-Present  *Core A Advisory Committee*.

2008-Present  *Undergraduate Academic Advisor*.

2017-18  *Core A Assessment*, University of San Francisco

2017-18  *WSUCS Graduation Competencies Assessment*, University of San Francisco

2017-18  *ACP Task Force*, Co-Chair.


2013-15  *Student Success Workshop: Effective Presentations*.

2011-12  *Facilitator, School of Nursing Writing Retreat*.

2009-12  *USF Faculty Association*, Policy Board Member.

Professional Development and Service

2013-Present  *Public Speaking Pedagogy Workshops*, University of San
Faculty Learning Community: Multimodal Communication Across the Disciplines, Co-Chair.

2018
CTE Teaching Café, Teaching Controversial Issues: Framing Issues and Choosing Pedagogical Approaches.

2017-18
Created Canvas Site, Public Speaking Resources, University of San Francisco.

2018
International Colloquium on Communication, Marburg Germany, Co-Organizer.

2017-18
Faculty Learning Community: Teaching Controversial Issues, University of San Francisco.

2016-17
Faculty Learning Community: Student Engagement, University of San Francisco.

Professional Organizations

National Communication Association
Rhetoric Society of America
Dance Studies Association
University of San Francisco Faculty Association
Genevieve Yuek-Ling Leung (梁若玲)
University of San Francisco
2130 Fulton Street, KA 246
San Francisco, CA 94117
Office: (415) 422-6674
gleung2@usfca.edu

EDUCATION
2012 Ph.D., Educational Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania
Dissertation title: Hoisan-wa reclaimed: Chinese American language maintenance and language ideology in historical and contemporary sociolinguistic perspective
Committee: Drs. Nancy Hornberger (chair), Betsy Rymes, Katherine Chen
2007 M.A., Education (Language and Literacy), University of California, Davis
Thesis: Hong Kong Cantonese speakers’ language ideologies and the use of written Cantonese
Committee: Drs. Yuuko Uchikoshi, Julia Menard-Warwick, Robert Bayley
2007 M.A., Linguistics (TESOL), University of California, Davis
Qualifying Paper: The Cantonese vernacular and popular music in Hong Kong
Advisor: Dr. Vaidehi Ramanathan
2004 B.A., Linguistics (High Distinction), University of California, Berkeley

PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS
University of San Francisco
2018 – present  Associate Professor, Rhetoric and Language
2012 – 2018  Assistant Professor, Rhetoric and Language
2016 – 2017, 2018 – present  Director, Asian American Pacific Studies
2015 – 2016, 2018 – present  Director, Critical Diversity Studies
2014 – present  Faculty Affiliate, MA Program in Asia Pacific Studies

RESEARCH SUBJECT(S) OF INTEREST
Cantonese sociolinguistics, Chinese American language and cultural maintenance, Hoisan-wa/Toishanese/Taishanese, language and identity, heritage language education

AWARDS/HONORS/GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS
2019  USF Faculty Development Fund: Chinese American Soup Talk (co-PI)
Amount awarded: $2,400
2019  Mellon Faculty Research/Teaching Award & Collaboration Workshop
Amount awarded: $500
2018  ICCS-NCTU/IICS-UST Short-Term Visiting Scholar (National Chiao-Tung U.)
Amount awarded: NTD 20,000
2018  Telluride Association Summer Program Teaching Fellow (UMichigan)
Amount awarded: $14,500 (declined)
2017 – 2018  Foundation for Scholarly Exchange/Fulbright Teacher Training Award (Taiwan)
Amount awarded: $32,000
2017  Asian Pacific American Studies James Catiggay Faculty Changemaker Award
2017  Collective Achievement Award (for Critical Diversity Studies)
2016  Association for Asian American Studies Int’l Exchange Delegate (S. Korea)
2016  *Bilingual Research Journal* Early Career Reviewer Award
2016  USF Faculty Development Fund: Int’l Students’ Political Identities (PI)

**Amount awarded:** $2,400

2015  Collective Achievement Award (for MA in Asia Pacific Studies Program)
2015 – 2017  *Language Learning* Small Grant: Cantonese-English Immersion Project (co-PI)

**Amount awarded:** $10,000

2015 – 2016  USF Faculty Development Fund: SF Chinese American Chinese (PI)

**Amount awarded:** $4,800

2014  University of Western Australia Perth USAsia Centre Scholarship

**Amount awarded:** $3,000

2014  Russ Campbell Young Scholar Award in Heritage Language Education

**Amount awarded:** $500

2013  USF Faculty Learning Community Facilitator/Teaching Fellow

**PUBLICATIONS**

**REFEREED JOURNAL ARTICLES (asterisk indicates collaboration with USF students)**


Ho, E. Y., Acquah, J., Chao, C., **Leung, G., Ng, D., Chao, M., Wang, A., Ku, S.*, Chen, W.*, Yu, C. K.*, Xu,


**CHAPTERS IN BOOKS**

**UNPUBLISHED WORK**


**PRESENTATIONS**


Leung, G., & Chen, M.* (2016). From ear-cleaning to asking how to say I love you: Metalinguistic discussions and positive affective stance on the “Hoisan Phrases 學講台山話” Facebook site. Paper at the Workshop on Innovations in Cantonese Linguistics-3, Columbus, OH.


**TEACHING**

2012 – present University of San Francisco, Associate Professor
- ESL 030/601 (Graduate Speaking and Writing Practicum, 5 semesters)
- ESL 103 (Pronunciation I, 1 semester)
- ESL 124 (Academic Reading and Writing III, 2 semesters)
- ESL 195-02 (First Year Seminar: Chinese in California, 1 semester)
- RHET 105 (Academic Discussion, 3 semesters)
- RHET 106/N (Introduction to Composition/Intensive, 2 semesters)
- RHET 110/N (Written Composition I/Intensive, 6 semesters)
- RHET 195-06 (First Year Seminar: Language and Power, 2 semesters)
• APS 600 (Research Methods in Asia Pacific Studies, 2 semesters, co-taught)
• APS 690 (Ideologies and Encounters in East Asia, 1 semester, co-taught)
• APS 698-73 (Directed Study: Interdisciplinary Research Methods, 1 semester)
• CDS 398-16 (Directed Study: Masculinities in Asian American Identities, 1 semester)
• CDS 398-22 (Directed Study: Vietnamese American Histories and Identities, 1 semester)
• COMS 254 (Qualitative Research Methods, 2 semesters)
• COMS 360 (Language and Social Interaction, 3 semesters)
• SOC 228 (Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the U.S., 1 semester)

2007 – 2016 Stanford University, Summer Lecturer, English for Foreign Students
• EFS683 (American Language and Culture, 7 summers)
• EFS687R (Reading and Vocabulary, 5 summers)
• ESF687W (Writing, 1 summer)

Formal Academic Mentoring to Students
2018 – present Samuel Lee (M.A. candidate, Asian American Studies, San Francisco State Uni.)
2016 – present Nathan Chew (B.S. candidate, Nursing)
2018 – present An Pei Peng (M.A. candidate, Asia Pacific Studies)
2018 – present Christy Ho Ching Li (M.A. candidate, International and Multicultural Education)
2015 – 2018 Ashley Liu (B.A., Psychology)
2016 – 2018 Rita Ewing (M.A., Migration Studies, thesis chair)
2016 – 2018 Ashley Lin (B.A., Advertising)
2015 – 2017 Melissa Chen (M.A., Asia Pacific Studies)
2015 – 2017 Damon Do (M.A., Asia Pacific Studies, second reader)
2016 – 2017 Michaela Ruiz (B.A., Sociology)
2016 – 2017 Brianna Cockett-Mamiya (B.A., English)
2015 – 2016 Lesley Wynn (M.A., Asia Pacific Studies)
2015 – 2016 Joshua Lin (B.A. candidate, Business Administration)
2015 – 2016 Brittany Tinaliga (B.A., Communication Studies)
2014 – 2016 Siyuan Huang (M.A., Asia Pacific Studies)
2013 – 2015 Tina Tan (M.A., Asia Pacific Studies)

SERVICE TO THE DEPARTMENT
2012 – present Rhetoric and Language Election Committee (co-chair)
2013 – present English Placement Test Rating Committee
2013 – present Writing for a Real World Reviewer
2015 – present AEM Representative to Tottori University Visiting Faculty/Students
2015 – present AEM/Critical Diversity Studies Webtrack Summer Advising
2015 – 2016 USF Gaokao Rating Committee
2012 – 2015 Rhetoric Week Voices of International Students Organizer (Chair)
2014 – 2015  Rhetoric & Language Ethnic Minority Fellow Interview Committee
2014  Academic English for Multilingual Students Search Committee

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY
2017  “Crafting Something from Nothing” Thatcher Gallery Exhibition Committee
2016 – present  Pan-Asian American Student Alliance Faculty Co-Advisor
2015 – present  J1 Visa Oral Interview Committee
2015 – present  N. California Forum for Diversity in Graduate Education USF representative
2014 – present  Critical Diversity Studies Forum Planning Committee
2014 – present  Asian Pacific American Studies Day of Remembrance Planning Committee
2013 – present  Academic Integrity Committee (formerly Academic Honesty Committee)
2013 – present  School of Management Interdisciplinary Studies Assessment reviewer
2014 – 2016  Friends of Tibet Student Club Faculty Advisor
2015 – 2016  Learning Technologies Subcommittee

SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION AND COMMUNITY
Editorial Board Member  
  History and Perspectives Journal (Chinese Historical Society of America)
Ad hoc Reviewer  
Conference Site Committee  
  Association for Asian American Studies annual conference, Community Awards Subcommittee (2018)
Guest Lectures  
  SF Unified School District PTA Guest Speaker (2015 – present), North American Taiwan Studies Association panel on professionalization in the field (2017), Tamkang University English Language and Culture department (2017), National Chiao-Tung University Graduate Institute of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (2017), Taipei City Government
Consultant  
  UCSF Cantonese language consultant (2014 – present). Funded projects include:
  • NIH R01 (Zhou & Uchikoshi), pending: Bidirectional Relations: Bilingual and Socio-Emotional Development in Dual Language Learners
  • PCORI (Karliner): Clinical Language Concordance and Interpreter Use: Impact of a Systems Intervention on Communication and Clinical Outcomes
  • NIH R21 (Chao & Ho), July 2017 – June 2019: Improving Diet Self-Management among Chinese Americans with Type 2 Diabetes Through Integrative Nutritional Counseling
• **NICHD R01** (Hoeft, Kovelman, Siegel, McBride, & Pugh), September 2016 – June 2019: Understanding Reading Acquisition through Immersion in Foreign Languages

• **Mt. Zion Health Fund** (Jih & Ho), July 2016 – June 2017: Developing and Implementing a Heart Healthy Integrative Diet for Chinese American Patients

• **UCSF RAP, Asian Health Institute** (Seligman & Ho), January 2014 – December 2014: Feasibility and Acceptability of an Integrative, Chinese Medicine Diet for Chinese Americans with Type 2 Diabetes

**Volunteer**


**Member**

Association for Applied Linguistics (since 2007), Association for Asian American Studies (since 2007), American Anthropological Association (since 2009), North American Taiwan Studies Association (since 2016)

**LANGUAGES**

Native: English, Cantonese
Advanced: Hoisan-wa/Toishanese, Mandarin
Intermediate: Spanish, Japanese
Beginning: Holo/Taiwanese
Tika R Lamsal

Academic English for Multilingual Students (AEM) Program
Department of Rhetoric and Language
University of San Francisco
2130 Fulton St
tlamsal@usfca.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D. in English Rhetoric and Composition, 2014
University of Louisville, Louisville, KY
Advisor: Bruce Horner

M. A. in English (Rhetoric/Composition), 2009
University of Louisville, Louisville, KY,
Culminating Project: “Education and Fast Capitalism: Resisting the Commodification of Knowledge.”
Advisor: Bruce Horner

M. A. in English (Literature), 1997
Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Advisor: Shreedhar Lohani

B. A. in English and Political Science, 1994
Tribhuvan University, Nepal

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2014- Assistant Professor, Academic English for Multilingual Students (AEM) Program, Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco

2008-2014 Composition Instructor, Department of English, University of Louisville (UofL)

2012-2014 Assistant Director of Graduate Student Writing, Writing Center, UofL

2007-2008 Writing Tutor/Consultant, Writing Center, UofL

2002-2007 Academic Director, Humanities Department, National Integrated College, Nepal

1998-2007 Lecturer of English, Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

PUBLICATIONS

Refereed Publication:
Bender, A., Lamsal, T., Robinson, A., & Williams, B.T. (2018). ‘Find something you know you can believe in’: The effects of dissertation retreats on graduate students as writers. In S. Lawrence & T. Zawacki (Eds.), Re/Writing the center: Pedagogies, practices, partnerships to support graduate students in the writing center (pp. 204-222). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.


Non-Refereed Publication:


CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


“Ideological and Multimodal Literacies among Refugee Youth in the U.S.” Thomas R. Watson Conference. October 2014. Louisville, KY.


“Imagining Alternatives: Cross-cultural and Multilingual Mediations in Refugee Literacies.” Conference on College Composition and Communication. March 2013. Las Vegas, NV.


“Remapping Composition in Transnational Contexts.” Conference on College Composition and Communication. April 2011. Atlanta, GA.


“Genre as a Discursive Practice: Cross-Cultural Mediation and Ethnographic Spectacle in Yojimbo.” The Louisville Conference on Literature and Culture since 1900. Feb. 2011. Louisville, KY.


“Global Audiences, Local Images: The Question of Exoticization in Slumdog Millionaire.” Joint Conference of the National Popular Culture and American Culture Associations. March/April, 2010. St. Louis, MO.

“Blair as a Colonialist: Revisiting Blair’s Lectures on Taste.” Conference on College Composition and Communication. March 2010. Louisville, KY.


INVITED TALKS/WORKSHOPS

University of San Francisco


International Student Forum: moderated an international students panel discussion on the challenges faced by international students for academic and cultural transition, at the Rhetoric Week organized by Rhetoric and Language Department. Feb. 22, 2018.

International Student Forum: moderated an international students panel discussion on the challenges faced by international students for academic and cultural transition, at the Rhetoric Week organized by Rhetoric and Language Department. Feb. 21, 2017.


“Teaching Multilingual Students in Philosophy.” Department of Philosophy Faculty Meeting. April 21, 2015.

“Multilingual Writing in the Disciplines,” for Interdisciplinary Faculty Across the University. March 3, 2015.

“Strategies for Helping Multilingual Students Across the Disciplines.” Faculty Luncheon for Arts and Sciences Faculty. Feb. 26, 2015.

“Responding to Multilingual Student Writing,” at the Faculty Workshop Series for Rhetoric and Language Department Faculty. Nov. 11, 2014.

University of Louisville


“Writing a Literature Review,” for the graduate students in Health Sciences Campus. School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies. Feb. 27, 2013.


Public Forums/Communities


“Value of Native Languages in Shaping Children’s Academic and Cultural Future.” Invited as a USF faculty featured speaker at the meeting of Creative Nepal Youth Organization (CNYO) at Albany, CA. March 19, 2017.


Nepal
“Effective Communication Across Cultures.” DAV School of Business. January 15, 2019


“Writing and Rhetorical Strategies: Teaching Writing and Research Methodology,” at First Year (M. A.) Teaching Workshop, Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University. March 5, 2000
TEACHING

COURSES TAUGHT

University of San Francisco
- MAPC 628: Cross-Cultural Business Communication
- AEM 601/030: Grad Writing/Speaking Practicum
- RHET 120: Written Communication II
- RHET 110N: Written Communication I Intensive
- RHET 106: Intro to Composition
- RHET 106N: Intro to Composition Intensive
- AEM 124: Academic Reading/Writing III

University of Louisville
- ENGL 306: Business Writing
- ENGL 102: Intermediate College Writing
- ENGL 101: Introduction to College Writing

Nepal

Tribhuvan University
- English 504-2: Rhetoric/Composition
- English 503-1: Linguistics
- English 508-2: Non-Western Studies
- English 501-1: History of British and American Literature

Pokhara University
- Business Writing and Communication
- Globalization and Its Cultural Implications
- Discourse in Disciplines: Literary Theory & Criticism

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

MAPC 628: Cross-Cultural Business Communication
- Created this M.A. in Professional Communication course
- Students explore rhetorical traditions, practices, and resources from different cultures and languages to examine the efficacy of current theories and practices in professional communication
- Students learn the skills and values crucial to communicating with diverse audiences across languages and cultures

AEM 103: Strategies for Academic Writing Success at USF
- Created this freshman online course to help new international students be familiar with academic and cultural contexts in the U.S.
- The objective of this course is to provide new international undergraduate students with the writing process, academic written genre, and the appropriate use
of sources while getting to know USF faculty members and other new international students

SERVICE

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO


Member, Integration of Multilingual Students (IMS), Rhetoric and Language Department Committee. Sept. 2014 – current.


COMMUNITY

Executive Member, 4C-3 California Lions District Student Speakers Program. July 2017 – current.


Advisor, Nepalese Association of Northern California (NANC). 2015-2017

Coordinator, MD-4 California Lions Student Speakers Program (Lions Club of Berkeley Annapurna) for 2015-2016. Berkeley, CA.


PROFESSION

Chair, Research Network Forum, Second Language Writing Caucus at Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). 2017-2018


Reviewer, Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies

Reviewer, Writing for Real World: A Multidisciplinary Anthology by USF Students

Nepal


PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CIT Tech Intensive Program, USF. May 31-June 2, 2016.

DMAC (Digital Media and Composition) Workshop on Professional Digital Communication. The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. May 9-18, 2016.

DMAC (Digital Media and Composition) Workshop. The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. May 31st – June 12, 2012.

GTA Academy (a year-long interdisciplinary teaching workshop seminar), University of Louisville. Fall 2008 – Spring 2009.

Teaching College Composition Workshop, Composition Program, University of Louisville. Aug. 18-22, 2008.


Workshop for English Lecturers Teaching M. A. English, Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University. March 5-12, 2000.

**ACADEMIC HONORS/AWARDS**

CRASE (Center for Research, Artistic and Scholarly Excellence) Research Grant (jointly with other inter-school colleagues), University of San Francisco, for conducting a symposium on USF for Freedom: Symposium on Refugees, Forced Migrants, and Human Security. May 23, 2016.

Dissertation Fellowship Award. Summer 2014. School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY.

Scholarship Award from Bedford/St. Martin’s to participate in DMAC (Digital Media and Composition) Workshop at the Ohio State University. Columbus, OH. May 31st – June 12, 2012

*Mahendra Bidhya Bhusan*, National Academic Excellence Award/Honor (Gold Medal), 1998, for holding the first-class first position in M. A., Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Meritorious Student Scholarship for studying M. A., 1995, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Meritorious Student Scholarship for studying B. A., 1993, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

**PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATION**

- Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC)
- Rhetoric Society of America (RSA)
- Symposium on Second Language Writing (SSLW)
- National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)
- Modern Language Association (MLA)

**LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**

- English (high proficiency in speaking, reading and writing)
- Nepali (high proficiency in speaking, reading and writing)
- Hindi (good proficiency in speaking, reading and writing)
- Sanskrit (good proficiency in reading)
THEODORE MATULA, PhD
Department Chair
Associate Professor
Department of Rhetoric and Language

2130 Fulton St.
Kalmanovitz Hall 206
University of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94117

tmatula@usfca.edu
415-422-5809
415-513-2307 (cell)

EDUCATION

PhD Communication: The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, June, 1998.
(Committee: Sonja Foss, Mary Garrett, Dale Brashers)


BA English Composition and Communication: Dominican University (formerly Rosary College), River Forest, IL, 1988.
PROFESSIONAL HISTORY

Assistant Professor/Associate Professor, Program in Rhetoric and Composition/Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco; San Francisco, CA, 2005-current.

Chair, Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco 2013-2019.

Director of Public Speaking, Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco; San Francisco, CA 2010-2013.

Previous:

Adjunct Faculty, Department of Communication Studies, University of San Francisco; San Francisco, CA, 2004-2005.

Adjunct Faculty, Department of Communication, CSU East Bay; Hayward, CA, 2005.

Assistant Professor, Department of Communication, University of Illinois, Springfield; Adviser of Student Newspaper, The Journal. Springfield, IL, 2001-2004.

Acting Assistant Professor, Department of Speech Communication, University of Washington; Seattle, WA, 2000-2001.

Lecturer, Institute for Human Communication, California State University Monterey Bay; Seaside, CA, 1997-2000.

Teaching Assistant/Coordinator of Public Speaking Course, Department of Communication, The Ohio State University; Columbus, OH, 1993-1997.

Instructor, Ohio State University Office of Continuing Education; Columbus, OH, 1997.

Instructor, Department of Communication, Loyola University of Chicago; Chicago, IL, 1992.

Instructor, Department of Speech Communication, St. Xavier U; Chicago, IL, 1991.

Instructor, Department of English and Speech, Daley College; Chicago, IL, 1991.

Teaching Assistant, Department of Communication, Illinois State University; Normal, IL, 1989-1991.
TEACHING EXPERIENCE

USF Courses

Courses Developed at USF:


3. Presentational Speaking (Rhet 112): This course introduces students to rhetorical concepts that are fundamental to the study and practice of ethical and effective public speaking. Emphasis is on oral communication—including group discussion, interviews, presentations—in business and professional contexts. Meets Core A1.

4. Professional Communication Ethics (PC 602): Provides graduate students with an introduction to ethical theory and frameworks and their application in general and professional communication settings. Focus on contemporary communication and social media issues and controversies. Meets MAPC Core requirement.

5. Communication and Conflict (PC 606): Other Courses Taught at USF:

Written and Oral Communication (Rhet 130-131): Introduction to written and oral argument in an integrated context featuring both study of rhetorical models and ample opportunities for written and oral skill performance. Meets Core A1 and Core A2.

Public Speaking (Rhet 103): Introduction to the practice of public speaking with emphasis on rhetorical components. Areas of focus include researching, writing, and presenting ideas; examining the role of communication ethics and critical thinking in public speaking. Meets Core A1.

Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition (Rhet 140): Advanced first year student writing course emphasizing critical reading and analysis of texts. Assignments include rhetorical analysis, research writing, integrating sources. Meets Core A2.
**Written Communication II** (Rhett 120): Continuation of Rhetoric 110; more advanced writing course that emphasizes research methods, analysis, style, and revision. *Meets Core A2.*

**Argumentation** (COMS): Introduction to theory and practice of argumentation, in oral and written settings. Students research argumentative issues to prepare for debates and Rogerian essays.

**Rhetoric and the Public Sphere** (COMS 202): Required orientation to rhetoric for Communication Studies majors, which combines a historical overview of rhetorical theory with 20th Century public sphere theory.

**Capstone** (MAPC 602): Final core class in the MAPC sequence, focused on direction of students writing thesis-like independent capstone projects.

**Courses taught at Other Universities**
- Public Speaking
- Presentational Speaking
- Advanced Public Speaking
- Business and Professional Speaking
- Freshman Proseminar
- Cooperative Argumentation
- Reasoning and Communication
- Intercultural Communication

- Free Speech and Responsibility
- The Rhetoric of Western Thought
- Classical Rhetoric
- Interpersonal Communication and Conflict Resolution
- Communication Ethics
- Popular Music and Communication
- Rhetoric and Popular Culture Graduate Seminar
- Introduction to Graduate Studies in Communication

**SERVICE: University of San Francisco**

**Departmental Service:**
Chair, Department of Rhetoric and Language (2013 - 2019)
- responsibility for scheduling over 100 faculty into approximately 200 classes each semester
- hiring, orientation, evaluation of adjunct faculty in department with over 70 adjuncts
- facilitate department meetings, serve as floating member on several department committees
- curriculum development, assessment, advising, student placements,
- served as Arts Council and College Council chair in AY 2014 - 2015
- other duties, as determined by CBA, chair memo, Associate Dean

Director of Public Speaking (2010 - 2013)
- hired and trained 15 part-time faculty, supervise 27 full and part-time faculty teaching Rhett 103 (Public Speaking)
  - Rhett 112 (Presentational Speaking) and
  - Rhett 130-131 (Written and Oral Communication)
--review syllabi each semester
--maintain faculty resources--wiki, pool of syllabi, assignments, sample syllabi, etc
--meeting regularly with public speaking and Written and Oral Comm faculty
--class observations and review of all new faculty
--Speaker Showcase organizer (competitive event for students each semester)

Special Projects
--composition curriculum committee
--Graduate Program (MAPC) steering committee
--revising and updating program's teaching handbook and online resources
--authored Revisions of Core A1 Learning Outcomes, 2012
--managed Assessment Activities for Core A1 Public Speaking 2011-2012
--oversaw founding of Speaking Center, offering public speaking tutoring to all USF students 2012
--revised curriculum for Written and Oral Communication course
--created new classes to serve School of Management (Rhett 112 Presentational Speaking) and Advertising (Rhett 323 Rhetoric and Popular Culture)

Search Committee Member, MA Professional Communication (2016)
   --hired Myo Chung

Search Committee Chair, Dept of Rhetoric and Language (2015-2016)
   --hired Leigh Meredith

Search Committee Chair, Dept of Rhetoric and Language (2016)
   --hired Sheri McClure-Baker, Cynthia Schultes, and Patrick McDonnell

Search Committee Chair, Ethnic Minority Dissertation Fellowship (2015)
   --hired IK Udekwu to Marin Fellowship

Search Committee Chair, Ethnic Minority Dissertation Fellowship (2014)
   --hired Nicole Gonzales Howell to Fellowship, Full-time Term Position

Search Committee Member, Dept of Rhetoric and Language (2011-2012)
   --hired Jonathan Hunt and Cathy Gabor

Search Committee Chair, Dept of Rhetoric and Language (2011)
   --hired Ana Rojas

Bylaws committee member/author, Dept of Rhetoric and Language (2009-2012)

Led "norming" session for EPT faculty testers (2011)
Search Committee Member, Program in Rhetoric and Composition (2006-2007)
--hired David Holler and Michelle Lavigne

Curriculum Committee Member, Program in Rhetoric and Composition (2007-2010)


University Service:
University ILO assessment; developed rubrics for written and oral communication assessment; faculty rater for written and oral communication assessment (2017-2018)


MAPC Board, member (2015-2018)

Advertising Department Board, member (2015-2017)

Core Advisory Committee (2014-current)

Chair, Arts Council (2014-2015)

Co-Chair, College Council (2014-2015)

Chair, Core A Committee, (2013-current): Member (2009-current)

Reviewer, Writing for the Real World (2006-current)


National Day of Writing committee (2010)

Summer Reading Project (2008-2010)

Editor, University Capacity Review for WASC reaccreditation (2007)

Academic Adviser, incoming undeclared First-year students (2006-current)

Summer webtrack adviser (2010-2015)

Lecture/Presentations

Speaker Showcase awards ceremony (2014). Invited keynote presenter.

Syllabus Workshop (Spring 2013)

"Just Words? Ethics, rhetoric and politics": Colloquium presentation (2008)

Academic/Community Service
At The Crossroads -- fundraised for non-profit organization through an "I think I can" campaign, focused on completing an academic writing project.

Participated in focus group/videotaping on responding to student writing, with Nancy Sommers.

Editorial Board, Communication Studies, 2012-2015

Manuscript Reviewer, Popular Music and Society, 2005-2010


Textbook Reviewer
Conversations; Practically Speaking; National Geographic: Global Voices.

RESEARCH

REFEREED PUBLICATIONS


Theodore Matula

CONFERENCE PAPERS AND PRESENTATIONS


Leigh Meredith  
Assistant Professor, Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco,  
2130 Fulton St, San Francisco, CA 94117  
Lmeredith@usfca.edu  
(415) 422-6485

EDUCATION

Ph.D. 2016 Northwestern University, Evanston, IL  
Communication Studies; Program in Rhetoric and Public Culture  
Dissertation: Reconstructing Identity: Reading the Digital Persona in the News

M.A. 2010 Northwestern University, Evanston, IL  
Communication Studies; Program in Rhetoric and Public Culture

B.A. 2003 Princeton University, Princeton, NJ  
English Literature. Magna Cum Laude.

PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS

2016-Present University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA; Rhetoric and Language, Assistant Professor

2014-2016 Northwestern University, Evanston, IL; Communication Studies, Coordinator of Public Speaking

PUBLICATIONS (Non-refereed)


CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


2017. Decoding the Bully: Tyler Clementi and the Rhetoric of Cyberbullying. National Communication Association annual meeting, November 17-20, Dallas, TX.


2014. *Searching for the Tsarnaevs: News Narratives and Online Identity in the Case of the Boston Bombers*. Midwest Popular Culture Association annual meeting, October 3-5, Indianapolis, IN.


**HONORS/AWARDS/FELLOWSHIPS/GRANTS**

2019: Jesuit Research and Teaching Grant, University of San Francisco
2019: Faculty Technology Spotlight, University of San Francisco
2019: Center for Teaching Excellence Teaching Retreat, University of San Francisco
2018: Tech-Intensive Certificate Completion, University of San Francisco
2018. Mellon Faculty Research Award, University of San Francisco - Foothill/DeAnza
2016. Sexualities Project at Northwestern (SPAN) Grant, Northwestern University
2015. Sweetwater Digital Rhetoric Fellowship, University of Michigan
2015. Graduate Teaching Mentor, Searle Center for Advancing Learning and Teaching, Northwestern University
2014. Teaching Certificate Program Graduate, Searle Center for Advancing Learning and Teaching, Northwestern University
2013. Graduate Writing Fellowship, Northwestern University
2010; 2007. Graduate School Fellowship, Northwestern University
2003. Phi Beta Kappa, Princeton University
2001. Sophomore Poetry Prize, Princeton University

**TEACHING AND RESEARCH EXPERIENCE**
Fall 2019 | COMS 252: Critical and Rhetorical Methods, USF (*Department of Communication Studies*)
---|---
Fall 2019 | HONC 130: Rhetoric Across Border (*Honors College*), USF
Fall 2018; Fall 2017 | RHET 295: You Media/New Media (*Transfer Seminar*), USF
Spring 2019; Fall 2018; Spring 2018; Fall 2017, Spring 2017; Fall 2016 | RHET 130: Oral and Written Communication, USF
Spring 2018; Spring 2016; Fall 2016 | RHET 103: Public Speaking, USF
Spring 2015; Winter 2014; Winter 2013; Fall 2012; Fall 2011; Spring 2009; Fall 2008 | Public Speaking, Northwestern University
*Guest Instructor*
Winter 2016 | Rhetoric, Democracy, Empire; Northwestern University Advanced Undergraduate Communication Studies Seminar (1 session)
Spring 2014 | High School in U.S. Public Culture; Northwestern University Advanced Undergraduate American Studies/Communication Studies Seminar (2 sessions)
Fall 2013 | Girls in U.S. Public Culture; Northwestern University Advanced Undergraduate Gender Studies/Communication Studies Seminar (2 sessions)
Spring 2010 | Cold War Affect: Architecture, Domesticity, and Design in the 1950s and 60s; Northwestern University, School for Continuing Studies Graduate Seminar for M.A. in Liberal Studies (1 session)
*Teaching Assistant*
Spring 2010 | Oprah, Books, and Middlebrow Culture; Northwestern University Advanced Undergraduate Communication Studies Seminar
Spring 2010 | British Cultural Studies; Northwestern University Graduate Communication Studies Seminar
Winter 2009 | Argumentation; Northwestern University Intensive Writing Undergraduate Communication Studies Lecture Course
*Research Assistant* | Janice Radway
Leigh Meredith
Fall 2009; Fall 2010

**ACADEMIC SERVICE**

**Department Committee Service**
Committee Leader, *Adjunct Rhetoric Conference*, 2019
Committee Leader, *Rhetoric Week*, 2019
Committee Leader, *Speaker Showcase*, 2019
Committee Member, *New Curriculum Committee*, 2017-19
Committee Member, *Social Media Committee*, 2019

**Department Presentations**
Presenter, *Grading Practicum*, Department Workshop. 2019
Co-presenter, *Triad Presentations*, Department Workshop, 2018

**Department Review**

**College of Arts and Sciences**
Department Coordinator of Public Speaking, Spring 2019
Core A1 and A2 Program Assessment Reviewer, Summer 2018

**University**
Workshop Designer and Presenter for Speaking/Writing Center, *Eloquentia Perfecta for All: Integrating Ignatian Pedagogy into the Writing and Speaking Centers*, 2019
Invited Talk: Ed-Tech Peer-to-Peer Presenter, *Using Spark Video to Engage Students*, 2018

**Field**
Reviewer for: Harlot: A Revealing Look at the Arts of Persuasion (online journal); National Communication Association Critical and Cultural Studies division; Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR). 2015-18.

**Previous**
Organizer, *Discipline-Specific Writing Workshop – Northwestern University*. 2014. Developed and facilitated workshop on transforming academic papers into publishable articles in the field of rhetoric and communication studies.
Organizer, *Interdisciplinary Professional Development – Northwestern University*. Fall and Winter 2013. Developed and facilitated 2 interdisciplinary graduate and faculty workshops on designing and managing an online academic presence.
*Workshop Host Committee – Northwestern University*. 2014; 2010. Participated in organization, hosting, and panel facilitation for Graduate Student Midwest Winter Workshops.
Panelist, Phd Prep Panel – Northwestern University. 2013. Provided guidance on applying to, and expectations for, graduate school in communication studies.

Communication Studies First Year Mentor – Northwestern University, 2010-11. Provided orientation, ongoing assistance, and professional development resources to first-year graduate student.

Organizer and Panelist, Public Speaking orientation – Northwestern University. 2009. Helped develop and facilitate training for new public speaking graduate instructors.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR), member since 2014
Midwest Popular Culture Association (MPCA), member since 2014
Western States Communication Association (WSCA), member since 2011
National Communication Association (NCA), member since 2007

REFERENCES

Janice Radway
Walter Dill Scott Professor of Communication Studies
Professor of American and Gender Studies
Northwestern University
1800 Sherman Ave
Evanston, IL 60208
919-549-0661
j-radway@northwestern.edu

Kate Baldwin
Associate Professor of Communication, Rhetoric, and American Studies
Northwestern University
Annie May Swift Hall
1920 Campus Drive
Evanston, IL 60208
847-491-5855
k-baldwin@northwestern.edu

Dilip Gaonkar
Professor of Culture and Communication Studies
Director of the Center for Global Culture and Communication
Northwestern University
Annie May Swift Hall
1920 Campus Drive
Evanston, IL 60208
847-491-5853
d-gaonkar@northwestern.edu

Elizabeth Lenaghan
Assistant Director, The Writing Place
Assistant Professor of Instruction, The Writing Program
555 Clark St.
Evanston, IL 60208
CURRICULUM VITAE

Mark D. Meritt, Professor
Department of Rhetoric and Language
Kalmanovitz 244
University of San Francisco
2130 Fulton St.
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080
(415) 422-5029 e-mail: meritt@usfca.edu

EDUCATION

Areas of emphasis: British Romantic Literature.
Dissertation: Body-Snatchers of Literature: Embodied Genius and the Problem of Authority in Romantic Biographical Sketches

M.A.  English, University of California, Santa Barbara, July 1995.
Areas of Emphasis: British Romantic Literature.

Major: English

EMPLOYMENT

Present Appointment:
Term Assistant Professor (Term Associate Professor effective Fall 2007) and Curriculum Coordinator, Program in Rhetoric and Composition, University of San Francisco, August 2004.

Previous Appointments:
Graduate Teaching Fellow, Department of English, University of Oregon., September 1997-2001
Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of English, University of California, Santa Barbara, September 1992-May 1994

RESEARCH AND CREATIVE WORK

Honors:
Best Essay Presented at Fourth Annual International Graduate Student Romanticism Conference, University of Washington, April 1997 for “Natural History, Manfred, and the Critique of Knowledge.”

Research Interests:

Nineteenth-Century British literature (mainly non-fiction prose); composition theory and pedagogy; literacy studies.

Refereed Publications:

Articles:


Book review:


Presentations: *


Participant in National Conversation on Key Knowledge and Skills for University Success, Eugene, OR, January 2001.
“Classroom Authority and the University Community: Confessions and Anxious Reflections.” University of Oregon Composition Conference, Eugene, OR, September 2000.


Guest Speaker for University of Oregon Composition Graduate Teaching Fellows Seminar, Eugene, OR, Fall 1999.


TEACHING

Undergraduate Courses Taught

University of San Francisco
  Written Communication I
  Written Communication II
  Academic Writing at USF
  Introduction to Literary Study

University of Oregon
  College Composition I
  College Composition II
  College Composition III
  Introduction to Literature: Poetry
Introduction to Literature: Fiction
Introduction to the English Major: Medieval and Renaissance British Literature
Introduction to the English Major: Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century British and American Literature

University of California, Santa Barbara
Science Fiction Literature
Shakespeare for non-English Majors
The Art of Narrative
The Novel in English

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Service to the Department

“The Owl Has Flown – Again: Rhetorics of Literacy Crisis in the Early Nineteenth and Late Twentieth Centuries.” Brown Bag Lecture Presented to Department of Communication Studies, University of San Francisco, November 16, 2006.

Organizer with Freddie Wiant, Western States Rhetoric and Literacy Conference, University of San Francisco, fall 2005.


Chair/Organizer for University of San Francisco Program in Rhetoric and Composition Faculty Orientation, fall 2003.


Service to the University

Committees
WASC Working Group (2006-7)
Search Committees 3

Faculty Development Luncheon with Joseph Harris

“Structuring Writing Assignments across the Disciplines: Asking for the Kind of Writing You Want to Read.” Faculty Development Lunch, University of San Francisco, College of Arts and Sciences, October 2002.
Advising, Registration, and New Student Orientation, faculty mentor twice

Policy board

Murry Assessment Project

Service to the Profession

Organizer with Freddie Wiant, Western States Rhetoric and Literacy Conference, University of San Francisco, fall 2005.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

National Council of Teachers of English
Pacific Ancient and Modern Language Association
STEPHANIE VANDRICK

Professor
Department of Rhetoric and Language
University of San Francisco

CONTACT INFORMATION

KA-204
University of San Francisco
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080
(415) 422-2407
vandricks@usfca.edu

EDUCATION

1974 M.A. (Double) in English Literature and in Teaching English as a Second Language, Michigan State University
1971 B.A. English Literature (With High Honors; Phi Beta Kappa), Michigan State University

ACADEMIC POSITIONS

2003-present Professor, ESL Program, Department of Communication Studies, then (2009-present) Department of Rhetoric and Language, University of San Francisco
1996-2003 Associate Professor, ESL Program, Department of Communication Studies, University of San Francisco
1986-1996 Assistant Professor, ESL Program/Department, University of San Francisco
1978-1986  Instructor, ESL Program, University of San Francisco (tenured 1982)
1976-1978  Assistant Professor, English Department, Lincoln University, San Francisco
1974-1976  Instructor, ESL Program, University of San Francisco
1971-1974  Graduate (Teaching) Assistant, English Language Center, Michigan State University

---

RESEARCH

BOOKS


REFEREED JOURNAL ARTICLES


**CHAPTERS and OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS**


NONREFEREED PUBLICATIONS


**REVIEW ESSAY**


**BOOK REVIEWS**


OTHER PUBLICATIONS (Magazine, Newsletter and Other Articles/Essays/Pieces)

Vandrick, S. (2005, January). Feminist pedagogy and TESOL in a “postfeminist” age. TESOLers for Social Responsibility Newsletter, 5.1 (online). (This is a revised, shortened version of a TESOL 2004 paper with the same title.)


Vandrick, S. (1999, April/May). The Case for More Research on Female Students in the ESL/EFL Classroom. TESOL Matters, 9, 16. (Reprinted in Language Teacher (Japan) - 2000)


Vandrick, S. (1998 September). A Call for Increased Sensitivity to Gender Bias in ESL
Materials.” *TESOL Materials Writers Interest Section Newsletter*, 12, 6.


**ERIC PUBLICATIONS**


**WORLD WIDE WEB PUBLICATIONS/RESOURCE LISTS**


**IN-HOUSE PUBLICATIONS**


EDITED MEMOIR


UNPUBLISHED WORK


REFEREED PAPERS/PRESENTATIONS AT ACADEMIC CONFERENCES


Vandrick, S. Paper as part of a colloquium “Pressed for Time: Strategies for Writing for


Vandrick, S. Co-organizer and presenter on panel on “Social Class in Language Learning and Teaching.” With Yasko Kanno, Bonny Norton, Hyunjung Shin, Bill Sugruha [co-presenter with Mario Lopez, but unable to be there], Mario Lopez-Gopar, Ron Darvin, Alice Astarita, David Block. American Association for Applied Linguistics Conference, March 2014, Portland, OR.


Vandrick, S., & Casanave, C. P. “The Role of Personal Narrative in TESOL Scholarship and Teacher Education.” TESOL International Annual Convention, New Orleans, March 2011. [Casanave couldn’t be there, but I presented our joint paper]


Vandrick, S. “Gender, class, language status, and college enrollment.” Paper as part of a panel, “Language, privilege, and poverty in gender identity.” (Other panelists:


(This paper was also posted on the Gender and Language Awareness – GALE – website – Summer 2003)


Hafernink, J. J., Messerschmitt, D. S., & Vandrick, S. “Integrating Ethical Awareness into Teacher Education.” TESOL International Annual Convention, Salt Lake City, Utah, April, 2002.

Vandrick, S. “On Being a ‘Late’ Published Writer.” Paper presented at a colloquium (of which Vandrick is also Organizer and Moderator) on “Issues in Writing for Scholarly Publication.” (Other panelists: Linda Lonan Blanton, Ryuko Kubota, Ena Lee, Bonny Norton; Discussants: John McLaughlin, Sandra Silberstein.) AAAL Annual Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, April, 2002.


Vandrick, S. “Teaching Sexual Identity Issues in ESL Classes.” TESOL International Annual Convention, St. Louis, Missouri, February, 2001. (also included in the ERIC database of educational documents: ED 474 464)


Vandrick, S. “Language, culture, class, gender, and class participation.” TESOL International Annual Convention, Vancouver, Canada, March, 2000. (also included in the ERIC database of educational documents: ED 473 086)


Vandrick, S. “Teaching the ‘Spirit’ of Research to ESL University Students.” CATESOL Regional Conference, San Pablo, October, 1989. (paper accepted but not given because of earthquake)


Vandrick, S. “Teaching Pre-Writing Skills to the Advanced ESL Student.” CATESOL...
State Conference, Los Angeles, April, 1983.


INVITED PLENARIES AT PROFESSIONAL CONFERENCES


Vandrick, S. “Interleaving Personal Narratives: Memoir and Method.” Plenary Address at the Qualitative Research Conference, Guanajuato, Mexico, June 2012.

INVITED PAPERS PRESENTED AND OTHER INVITED ROLES AT PROFESSIONAL CONFERENCES


Vandrick, S. Paper as part of a panel on “IEP to Degree Program Transitions.” TESOL
International Annual Convention, Portland, March 2014.

Invited (by the TESOL Committee on Diversity) colloquium on social class,
TESOL International Annual Convention, Philadelphia, March 2012.

Vandrick, S. “On Being An Ally.” On Panel at Academic Session of the ILGBT Forum,
TESOL International Annual Convention, Boston, March 2010.

Vandrick, S. “Compiling and Publishing an Edited TESOL Collection.” Invited panel

Vandrick, S. “Reexamining ‘Post-feminism in TESOL Contexts.’” Paper as part of a


Vandrick, S. Invited panelist for Intercultural Interest Group’s featured colloquium on


CONFERENCE SESSIONS ORGANIZED/CHAIRRED


TEACHING

CLASSES TAUGHT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

**ESL**

I have taught almost every class offered in our ESL/Academic English for Multilingual Students Programs, in all their iterations, but most commonly have taught advanced reading and writing classes, especially in recent years.

**Rhetoric and Composition**

I have mainly taught transitional classes (from ESL to Composition); the borders among these classes are porous.

**Literature**

I have taught several women’s literature classes.

**Freshman Seminar**

Feminist Perspectives

**Internship Classes Supervised/Wrote Curricula**

Dual Degree Internship in Budapest
Culture and Education in Hungary
Dual Degree Internship in Manila
Culture and Education in the Philippines
Dual Degree Internship in Tijuana
Culture and Education in Mexico
Dual Degree Internship in San Francisco
Culture and Education in San Francisco

**Curriculum Work/Creation of Classes**

Since there have been only three to four full-time faculty members for most of the 45-year duration of our program, we have all been closely involved in the creation of, revisions of, and divisions of all the classes we have offered.

**Presentations, Research, and Publications on Teaching**

Many of my publications and conference papers have related to pedagogy.

**Steps Taken to Assess and Improve Teaching**

- My classes have been visited by various coordinators/directors/colleagues
- We frequently discuss pedagogy in our program and department
- I have participated in some CTE (Center for Teaching) activities at USF
- I attend some sessions on pedagogy at the conferences I attend
- I try to learn from the student evaluations we receive each semester

---

**SERVICE**

**SERVICE TO ESL PROGRAM /DEPARTMENT & COMMUNICATION STUDIES DEPARTMENT/RHETORIC AND LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT (ESL Department became part of new Communication Studies Department in Fall 1999; it became part of the new Rhetoric and Language Department in Fall 2010.) (ESL became AEM – Academic English for Multilingual Students in 2015)**

(Administrative position in bold type)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/18-</td>
<td>Member, Department Self-Study Group (subsection on “Students”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>Submissions Reader, <em>Writing for the Real World</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16 onward</td>
<td>Literacy Coordinator, AEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16</td>
<td>Submissions Reader, <em>Writing for the Real World</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16</td>
<td>Coordinator, USF visit of faculty and students from Tottori University, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>Co-organized event on AEM History and Founder – 2/17/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/14</td>
<td>Lecture, Department of Rhetoric and Language Lecture Series: Memoirs, Coloniality, and a TESOL Career: The Evolution of a Research Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2013-February 2014</td>
<td>Member, Search Committee, new AEM/Rhetoric and Language position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013-May 2014</td>
<td>Coordinator, Rhetoric 106 and 106N classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>Submissions Reader, <em>Writing for the Real World</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10, 2013</td>
<td>Co-facilitator, department workshop on syllabi and assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013-present</td>
<td>Coordinator, planning and coordinating new Rhet 106-N class (coordinating the approximately 10 instructors of this new class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>Panelist at Dept. Professional Development Session on Place of Grammar in Composition Classroom (Discussion of Matsuda 2012 WPA article)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012-Spring 2013</td>
<td>Wrote a portion of self-study for, and assisted in other preparation for and participation in, Dept. Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012-</td>
<td>Mentor, new ESL faculty member, Genevieve Leong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011-</td>
<td>Coordinator, Academic Reading/Writing Classes; Holding regular curricular meetings for faculty of 15; Providing support for faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Wrote proposals for new ESL Grammar classes: Introductory and Level I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 2011  Member, Search Committee, ESL – Two New Term Positions  
(One will be coordinator of ESL)

Summer 2011-  Multiple meetings with colleagues, Deans and others re  
assessment, new system for students’ moving through program and  
exitng program, new placement policies, etc.

2011-2012  Mentor, new ESL faculty member, Bob Bathrick

Summer 2011  Member, Search Committee, ESL One-Year Term Position

May 2011  Submissions Reader, Writing for the Real World

Nov. 2010-  Member, Committee to Investigate a Rhetoric Major and/or Minor

Fall 2010  Wrote proposals for new Grammar II and III classes

Summer of 2010 and 2011  Advising and placing 50-70 new students by email throughout  
summers

May 2010  Submissions Reader, Writing for the Real World

Fall 2009  Wrote proposals for new Academic Reading/Writing II and III  
classes

2008-present  Member, Department Speaker Series Planning Committee

5/05-8/06  Chair, Communication Studies Department

5/05-8/06  Coordinator, ESL Programs

4/05  Creator of Resource List for workshop on social class for  
Communication Studies Department Lecture Series

3-4/05  Member, Chair Election Committee, Communication Studies  
Department

1/20/05  Co-organizer/facilitator of, and presenter at, workshop on diversity  
for Communication Studies Department faculty

9/18/03  Gave first lecture in Communication Studies Department’s new  
Lecture Series – “The Role of Personal Narrative in Current  
Scholarship”

Spring 2003  Chair, Communication Studies Dept. subcommittee on revising  
department bylaws
2000  Assisted with merger to new Department of Communication Studies
1999  Guest Lecture In Freshman Seminar for International Students, on “Girls’ Education in the United States”

**1998-1999**  Chair, ESL Department
1994-2000  Coordinator, Reader, Portfolio Reading
1993-1995  Co-writer (with J.J. Hafernik), ESL Department Program Review, and co-implementor of ensuing recommendations
1992-2000  Occasional acting chair during chair’s vacations or other absences
1991-2000  Took minutes at ESL Department/Program Faculty Meetings
1991-1992  Revising Department Master Syllabus (with colleagues)
1990  Administering SILL Test for outside researcher (Victoria Phillips)
1987-1988  Revising IEP handbook
1986-1990;  Program Textbook Coordinator
1995  
early 1980s  Member, Search Committee for Director
early 1980s  Member, Search Committee for Faculty members
1974-present  ESL Curriculum Development (various committees)
1974-present  Level Coordinator (various levels, generally Advanced)
1974-present  Advising, Orientation, Testing, Placement of students
1974-2000  Recruiting, assisting prospective and new students
1974-2000  Hosting visiting/observing MATESOL students in my classes
1974-present  Updating policies and forms

**SERVICE TO COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**

*(Administrative Position in bold type)*

Fall 2018-Spr 2021  Member, Arts Peer Review Committee (elected Fall 2018)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018-Spr 2021</td>
<td>Member, College Curriculum Committee (elected Spring 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Thursday Faculty Writing Day Captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>Host, College Writing Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 2017</td>
<td>Co-presenter (with Jen Dever and Paula Birnbaum) of faculty café entitled &quot;The keys to a successful, research productive summer&quot; (sponsored by Faculty Research Office, director Marjolein Oele)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Team Captain, Thursday Writing Group (sponsored by Faculty Research Office, director Marjolein Oele)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-present</td>
<td>I have consulted with, and/or read, at their requests, the narratives of faculty (from my and other departments all over the college) applying for tenure and/or promotion and giving them feedback and advice, at their requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 2014</td>
<td>Carry the ceremonial University Mace at graduation (invited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2013</td>
<td>Co-presenter (with June Clausen), Faculty Development Luncheon on “How to Write a Lot”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>Panelist, Teaching Multilingual Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Panelist, Teaching Multilingual Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>Judge, Gender and Sexualities Essay Award Contest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>Presenter on my research, Writing Salon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>Panelist, Faculty Lunch on Writing (“Finding and Protecting Your Writing Time”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>Judge, Ralph Lane Essay Contest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/09-present</td>
<td>Member, Rhetoric and Composition Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/06-5/15</td>
<td>Member, Faculty Development Fund Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/05-8/06</td>
<td>Member, CORE Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/05-8/06</td>
<td>Chair, CORE A Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/05-8/06</td>
<td>Member, CORE E Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/05-5/09</td>
<td>Member, College Tenure and Promotion Peer Review Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5/03-5/04  Member, Committee on Possible Comparative Literature Major

Spring 2000  Co-coordinator and speaker, Junior/Senior Women’s Faculty Lunch

1999-2000  Coordinator, Women’s Studies Program, University of San Francisco

1999-2002  Member, Faculty Development Fund Committee

1999-2000  Mentor, New Faculty Member

Fall 1999  Chair, (Renewed) Search Committee, Expository Writing Program Coordinator

Fall 1999  Member, Committee to evaluate a College Graduate Student’s Fulbright Application

Spring 1999  Chair, Search Committee, Expository Writing Program Faculty Member to Coordinate EWP 185 and Writing Center

Spring 1999  Member, Search Committee, Two Expository Writing Program Faculty Members to Coordinate EWP 205 and EWP 215

Spring 1999  Member, Search Committee, Expository Writing Program Coordinator


October 1998  Member, Committee to evaluate a College Faculty Member’s Fulbright Application

Fall 1998  Member, Search Committee, Expository Writing Program Interim Coordinator

Fall 1998  Member, Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Curriculum Grant Proposals for Promising Pedagogies

1996-present  Judge, Ralph Lane Peace and Justice Essay Award Contest (several times, most recently 5/10)

1996-present  Member, Advisory Board, Peace and Justice Studies Program
Fall 1996  
Member, Search Committee, Language Learning Laboratory Coordinator

Spring 1994  
Member, Search Committee, Communication Department/Mass Media Faculty

Fall 1993  
Expository Writing Program’s Placement Readings

1992-present  
Judging Women’s Studies (later Gender and Sexualities Studies) Essay Award Contest many years

1992-present  
Member, Women’s Studies Faculty; Member (1992-2001) and (1999-2000) Chair, Women’s Studies Advisory Board; Member (early 2000s) Committee to Study a Possible MA in Women’s Studies at USF.

SERVICE TO UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

(Administrative Position in bold type)

Fall 2018-Spr 2021  
Member, Arts Peer Review Committee (elected Fall 2018)

2018-  
Member, USFFA Retirement Action Group on retirement issues

2/14-2/15  
Recorder/Member, Committee on Mentoring and Faculty Alliances (originating through And Still We Rise group, and requested by Provost Turpin for recommendations

2012  
Member, Committee on Application for USF Membership in Phi Beta Kappa

8/15/12  
Interviewed for President’s Committee on the Status of Women video on the status of women at USF

8/12  
Wrote tip sheet for faculty for helping international students in class succeed (with J. J. Hafernik), at request of Associate Provost Peter Novak

5/09-present  
Member, DDTP Strategic Advisory Committee

2009-2011  
Member, Distinguished Research Award Committee

2006-2007  
Member, USF Human Rights Fellowship Evaluation Committee

2005-2007  
Member, USF Human Rights Working Group; Council of Faculty Advisors, Center for Global Justice
2005-2009  Member, University-wide Tenure and Promotion Peer Review Committee

2004-2007  Member, Distinguished Teaching Award Committee

2003       Member, School of Education Dean Search Committee

2002-2003  Member, USF/Sacred Heart Elementary Advisory Board

2001-2003  **Director, Dual Degree in Teacher Preparation Program, University of San Francisco**

2001-2003  Attend all Teacher Education Department (School of Education) Faculty Meetings

2001-2003  Member, Teacher Education Department Advisory Council

1998-present Member, Childcare Funds Allotment Joint Committee

1998-1999  Member, Orientation, Advising, and Registration Committee

1998-1999  Member, International Student Services Committee

1996-1999  Member, Acquaintance Rape Prevention Committee

1996-1998  Member, President’s Advisory Committee on the Status of Women

1995-1998  Member, Joint University Committee on Curriculum (including several subcommittees and task forces)

1995-1998  Member, USF Phi Beta Kappa Application Committee

1995       Co-organized (with Karen Bouwer) presentation to USF Community by Anita Alkhas, Michigan State university, on “Out of the Book and into the Classroom: Personalizing and Enlivening Language Texts.”

1993-1994  Member, Joint University Academic Career Prospectus Revision Committee

1993-1994  Member, Student Grade Appeal Policy Committee

1992-1995  Member, Faculty Diversity Committee

Fall 1992   Member, GEC Committee on World and Minority Literature

1991-1993  Member, Faculty Association Policy Board
1991  Member, Affirmative Action Committee

SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION

Editorial Positions/Editorial Work


2015-  Member, Critical Inquiry in International Studies Editorial Advisory Board

2014-2017  Member, TESOL Quarterly Editorial Advisory Board

2009-  Member, Editorial Review Board, TESOL Journal


2000-2001  Senior Consulting Editor, Journal of Engaged Pedagogy

1993-2000  Book Review editor, Peace Review

1992-2002  Associate editor, Peace Review

1981-1983  Editorial Staff Member, CATESOL News

Reviews of Manuscripts and Proposals

I have reviewed numerous mss. for the four journals whose editorial boards I have been on (TESOL Quarterly; Critical Inquiry in Language Studies; TESOL Journal; Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes), as well as many others (e.g., Modern Language Journal; Journal of Language, Identity, and Education; Gender and Education; International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism; Journal of English for Academic Purposes; Journal of Second Language Writing; International Journal of the Sociology of Language).

I have reviewed book proposals and book manuscripts for several publishers (e.g., Lawrence Erlbaum, Routledge, University of Michigan Press, Teachers College Press, Multilingual Matters, McGraw Hill).

I have very frequently (most years) reviewed paper proposals for several conferences, most regularly for TESOL and AAAL.
**External Reviews of Tenure And Promotion Cases**

I have been an external reviewer for tenure and promotion cases at several universities in the United States, England, and Australia.

**Professional Committee and Board Memberships Outside USF**

- **2006-2007** Member, AAAL Resolutions Committee
- **April 1998-present** Member, Steering Committee, TESOL Teachers for Social Responsibility Caucus
- **May 1995-present** Member, Board of Directors, Tamalpais Research Institute
- **1995** Member, Committee for the Teaching and Learning of English in Diverse Contexts, NCTE International Consortium
- **Spring 1994** Member, CATESOL Conference Stipend Committee
- **1983** Member, CATESOL Liaison Committee on English for the Articulation Council of California

**Other Service to the Profession**

- **2016-2019** Co-organizer (with C. P. Casanave), International Writing Retreats, Monterey, CA
- **2014-2018** Hosted visiting groups of professors and students from Tottori University, Japan; planned their visit, met with them, advised them. Their focus was field work on multiculturalism, social justice, and particularly Japanese American life. (several times)
- **1990s-present** Mentored many graduate students at USF and, especially, from around the U.S. and the world; meeting with them, corresponding with them, giving them feedback on their work, etc.

**Other Conference Roles: Organizing/Volunteering/Plenary Introduction**

- **2016 Oct.** Introduced Diane Belcher’s Plenary, SSLW 2016, Tempe
- **1995-96** Publicity Chair, CATESOL 1996 State Conference
- **1994** Moderator, Peace Studies Association Sixth Annual Meeting, San Francisco
1981 Volunteer, CATESOL Regional Conference, Kentfield
1980 Registration Chair, CATESOL Regional Conference, San Francisco
1980 Volunteer, TESOL International Convention, San Francisco
1975 Volunteer, CATESOL Regional Conference, San Francisco
1990s-present Organizing and moderating many conference panels, especially at TESOL, AAAL, ISLS

Memberships in Professional Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2008</td>
<td>PJSA</td>
<td>(Peace and Justice Studies Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-present</td>
<td>ISLS</td>
<td>(International Society for Language Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-present</td>
<td>AAAL</td>
<td>(American Association of Applied Linguistics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-2004</td>
<td>ATAC</td>
<td>(Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late-70s-2018</td>
<td>NCTE</td>
<td>(National Council of Teachers of English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late-70s-2018</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>(College Composition and Communication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-70s-present</td>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td>(Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-70s-2018</td>
<td>CATESOL</td>
<td>(California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Full-time/Part-time Teaching Ratios, 2015-2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of Courses</th>
<th>FT Faculty</th>
<th>PT Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All courses designated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET, AEM, ESL, SII 325, COMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>279.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>216.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>215.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Granting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>155.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>128.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET 106/106N</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET 110/110N</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>FT Fac Ratio</td>
<td>PT Fact Ratio</td>
<td>Staff Ratio</td>
<td>Researcher Ratio</td>
<td>Other Ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Full-time Faculty Assignments, 2015-2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>START_TERM</th>
<th>END_TERM</th>
<th>ACADEMIC_P</th>
<th>NON_INSTRUC</th>
<th>NON_INSTRUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dempster, Brian K.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201540</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempster, Brian K.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201620</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempster, Brian K.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201640</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempster, Brian K.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201720</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempster, Brian K.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201820</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempster, Brian K.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201840</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewert, Doreen</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201540</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewert, Doreen</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201620</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewert, Doreen</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201640</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewert, Doreen</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201720</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewert, Doreen</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201720</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewert, Doreen</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201720</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewert, Doreen</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201740</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewert, Doreen</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201820</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewert, Doreen</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201840</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabor, Cathy</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201540</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabor, Cathy</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201620</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabor, Cathy</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201640</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabor, Cathy</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201720</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabor, Cathy</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201740</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabor, Cathy</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201820</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabor, Cathy</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201840</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabor, Cathy</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201840</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holler, David M.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201740</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holler, David M.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201740</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holler, David M.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201820</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holler, David M.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201840</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, Devon C.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201540</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, Devon C.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201620</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell, Nicole G.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201820</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Special Projec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Jonathan</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201540</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Director of a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Jonathan</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201620</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Director of a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Jonathan</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201640</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Director of a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Jonathan</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201720</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Director of a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Jonathan</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201740</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Director of a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVigne, Michelle R.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201540</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVigne, Michelle R.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201620</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVigne, Michelle R.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201640</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVigne, Michelle R.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201720</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVigne, Michelle R.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201740</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVigne, Michelle R.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201820</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVigne, Michelle R.</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201840</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leung, Genevieve</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201540</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leung, Genevieve</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201620</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program Direc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leung, Genevieve</td>
<td>201440</td>
<td>201930</td>
<td>201840</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor/Concer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Start Year</td>
<td>End Year</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT_DESC</td>
<td>CONTRACT_TYPE</td>
<td>CONTRACT_TYPE_DESC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:tor/Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spring Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHET</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fall Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Sample Syllabi
NOTE: I have revised this syllabus to reflect the new RHET 103 Guidelines that are in effect starting Fall 2019.

Public Speaking
Rhett 103: Section 13 - Spring 2018

Michelle LaVigne
Office: Kalmanovitz Hall 238
Phone: 422-4366
Email: mrlavigne@usfca.edu

The ability to “speak-up” and “be heard” makes it possible for us to become participants rather than spectators in public life, and helps to shape our beliefs about who we are and the world around us. With the capacity for speech and the freedom to speak we discover the potential to create relationships, deepen tradition, foster dissent, and undertake collective action. Public speaking is an art; it calls on our imaginations and passions while also requiring certain performative and argumentative skills. This course is an introduction to the theory and practice of public speech. Through an inquiry into the nature and dynamics of speech, including ancient concerns of rhetoric and contemporary argumentation skills, this course offers the chance to methodically develop practices that enable the creation, performance, and critical assessment of public speech. This course aims to offer a view of public speech not as an act of one-way communication, but as part of a larger, on-going public dialogue.

Department of Rhetoric and Language Course Description

In Public Speaking (RHET 103), you have an opportunity to develop an understanding of public speaking as a component of civic life and to strengthen skills for oral presentations. Civility and ethical speech-making are foundational aspects of this course, which correspond to the Jesuit value of eloquentia perfecta - speaking and writing for the common good. Thus, this course emphasizes the assessment and practice of oral communication for various purposes and in response to rhetorical situations that require public words to advocate, inform, and celebrate. In total, this class is an opportunity for you to cultivate critical communication skills and gain confidence to speak out in your classes, communities, and professions.

Required Course Materials

1) A Pocket Guide to Public Speaking, O’Hair, Rubenstein, Stewart (PG)
2) Additional readings on Canvas (C)
3) A USF e-mail account that is checked regularly.
4) Regular access to the course Canvas page.
Learning Outcomes

At USF, the core curriculum is not a bunch of boxes to be checked; each class that meets the core is organized around a set of learning outcomes that students can expect to accomplish by the end of the course. This course meets the Public Speaking Core requirements, and learning outcomes for those are found below.

Real learning is associated with mastery of skills and the ability to critically think about subject matter. Look carefully at these learning outcomes, then, and how they are met—they describe practices and ideas that are vital to practices of communication and rhetoric. We will revisit these later in the semester, so that when you do the course evaluation, you can assess your own success in achieving them.

**RHET 103 Learning Outcomes**

Students who apply themselves will:

1. Use rhetorical strategies toward specific purposes in making and presenting written and oral products for public audiences.
2. Develop a style of oral delivery that is attentive to audience engagement and rhetorical situations.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the broader ethical and civic dimensions in communication emphasizing accountability, judgment, and attention to diverse voices.
4. Listen to, reflect on, analyze, and critique communication processes, practices and events.

This course meets the requirements for Core A1: Oral Communication. Hence, the following Core A1 Learning Outcomes also apply to this course

**Core A1 Learning Outcomes**

Students will:

2. Present well-reasoned and appropriately supported oral arguments that are responsive to topic, purpose, audience, and occasion.
3. Deliver speeches using an audience-centered, extemporaneous approach.
4. Use rhetorical concepts and principle to evaluate the effectiveness of their own and others' communication in both academic and civic contexts.
5. Use rhetorical concepts and principles to practice ethical and socially responsible public speaking, and to identify and evaluate ethical problems in public address.
How This Course Meets the Learning Outcomes

In addition to class discussions, readings, and videos, the learning outcomes are met with the following assignments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Course Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Core A1 Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>StoryTelling Speech</td>
<td>Feb 5</td>
<td>Addresses 1,2</td>
<td>Addresses 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative Speech</td>
<td>Mar 5-9</td>
<td>Refinement of 1,2</td>
<td>Refinement of 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Deliberation Speech</td>
<td>Apr 9-13</td>
<td>Refinement of 1,2</td>
<td>Refinement of 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Occasion Speech</td>
<td>May 2-7</td>
<td>Mastery of 1,2</td>
<td>Mastery of 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Practicums</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Refinement of 2</td>
<td>Refinement of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Report</td>
<td>Feb 12</td>
<td>Addresses 1,3,4</td>
<td>Addresses 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Proposal</td>
<td>Mar 30</td>
<td>Refinement of 4</td>
<td>Refinement of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Analysis</td>
<td>Apr 20</td>
<td>Refinement of 1,3,4</td>
<td>Refinement of 4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviews</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Addresses 4</td>
<td>Addresses 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection Essays</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Refinement and Mastery 3, 4</td>
<td>Refinement and Mastery 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignment Descriptions

All Assignment details will be discussed in class and posted on Canvas including rubrics.

Speeches

Storytelling Speech (10pts) - The purpose of this speech is to practice speaking about something you know. In a small group, you will tell a story that aims to raise awareness about an issue. (2-3 minutes).

Informative (75pts) - The purpose of this speech is to inform the class about a significant event. Your aim is simply to teach or increase understanding of a recent phenomenon or act. (5-6 minutes).
Public Deliberation (100pts) – You will work in small groups to prepare and present a persuasive speech and facilitate class discussion on a controversial issue. The speech will enhance your rebuttal and group communication skills (5-6 minutes).

Special Occasion speech (75pts) - With this speech you will chose a particular situation, event, or person to pay tribute to (i.e. celebrate) using all the modes of persuasion. This last speech will allow you to demonstrate how much you’ve learned about speech and speaking (5-6 minutes).

Speaking Practicums (5pts each)

Throughout the semester classes will involve a number of in-class speech practicums that will help reduce nervousness and enhance public speaking skills. There will be 8 of these throughout the semester and are listed on the course schedule. You have to be in class and participate in these practicums to receive the full 40pts.

Writing

Media Report (25pts) - In order to speak out on matters of common concern, it is important to know what issues (social, political, etc.) people are talking or concerned about and how the media reports on those issues. You will present your findings to the class.

Topic Proposal (25pts) - You will write a brief paper explaining the rhetorical situation for your public deliberation speech and an overview of your particular position.

Rhetorical Analysis (25pts) - You will write a short paper, analyzing a speech that you observe in person.

Peer Reviews #1 & #2 (5pts each) - For the first two major speeches, you will be asked to complete a peer evaluation, a critical and thoughtful analysis of how a fellow students particular speech addressed its topic and its audience (10 pts total).

Reflection Essays #1, #2, #3, #4 (10pts each) - Throughout the semester you will be asked to reflect on your speech practice and rhetorical learning. These writings will be completed in class (40 pts total).

Extra Credit

At random times throughout the semester I will assign extra credit. These opportunities will only be announced in class.
Your final grade will be based on the total points earned throughout the semester (425). The following grading scale will apply:

- A: 100 – 92.5%
- A-: 92 – 89.5%
- B+: 89 – 86.5%
- B: 86 – 82.5%
- B-: 82 – 79.5%
- C+: 79 – 76.5%
- C: 76 – 72.5%
- C -: 72 – 69.5
- D: 69 – 59.5%
- F: 59% and Below

The following grading rubric will be applied to all speeches:

- **A**: In addition to the requirement for B speeches, A speeches goes beyond merely providing information on a generic topic; it adopts interesting, audience-aware angles of vision; they are well supported with sound reasoning and a variety of well-researched evidence, are delivered extemporaneously and in an audience-centered manner, with clear and astute organization revealed through main points, signposts, and transitions. A speeches are exceptional performances and well-argued.
- **B**: B speeches attend all the basic assignment requirements, and features sound reasoning and emotional engagement in an audience-centered manner. They use transitional elements, and possess an adequate amount of internal coherence and B speeches are coherent and primarily delivered in an extemporaneous manner.
- **C**: C speeches follow the basic requirements of the assignment, but may be significantly deficient in one or more ways in the areas described above. (e.g., a speech with well-researched content but no discernible main points may get a "C" grade; a well-crafted speech that otherwise may be an "A" or "B" speech will probably get a "C" if it is delivered from a manuscript rather than extemporaneously).
- **D and F**: D and F speeches are deficient in several ways. They are usually deficient in meeting one or more basic requirements of the assignment (e.g., an organized, interesting speech may receive a D or F grade if it seriously violates time restraints).

**Course Expectations**

This class will be challenging on several levels. Of utmost importance is maintaining a high level of respect for each other as we share our ideas, opinions and stories. It is probable that we will encounter views and opinions that differ from our own as each of us have our own unique standpoint. This is a valuable process and does not mean we must agree with every idea presented, but we must create and maintain a respectful, inclusive, and productive learning environment. Our goal is to co-create a learning community, public of thinkers and doers. Toward this effort, please be aware of the following expectations as members of our learning community.
Preparation:
- **Before** each class, complete the reading assignments. Lectures will not be the primary mode of class interaction; therefore, completing the assigned reading is vital for learning and engagement. Be prepared to discuss/speak about the main points of each reading or speech and raise questions about things you did not understand, find problematic, thought interesting, etc.
- **Bring your readings to class in a format you can easily read.** I strongly discourage the use of smartphones to read PDF’s as large and dense texts are often difficult to read. Students often miss class discussion because they are too busy looking for a sentence or a quote.
- **Be on time.** Our time together is limited so please be on time and ready to work.
- **Be prepared to meet all deadlines.** Put all due-dates and reminders for assignments on your calendar.

Participation:
- Participation does not equate attendance. Rather, it entails **active engagement and critical reflection.**
- **Listen and be open to change your mind.** I don’t expect everyone to have the same opinions, interpretations, or perspectives, but building an engaged learning community requires that we listen to each other and be open to the possibility of changing your mind in the face of ideas or opinions that you may not always want to hear.

Communication:
- **Effective communication** with me and your classmates throughout the semester will ensure your success in this class.
- I will use Canvas as a place to make important announcements, distribute various class readings, post grades, and class assignments; it the archive of the class. **It is your responsibility to check the course Canvas site often.**
- I strongly encourage students to take advantage of office hours. They are an opportunity for you to receive one-on-one attention and craft strategies to address your particular needs.
- Email is a limited form of communication and cannot replace the value of actual live discussion. For all email, you should allow 24-48 hours for a response.

Course Policies

*Attendance:*
You get three (3) free missed classes: after that your grade will be reduced one full grade with every miss (e.g., miss 4 classes and grade goes from A- to B+). Exceptions: When representing the University of San Francisco in intercollegiate competition (e.g., athletics, debate), students shall be excused from classes on the hours or days such competition takes them away from classes. However, such students shall be responsible for advising their professors regarding anticipated absences and for arranging to complete course work for classes and/or examinations missed.
An absence does not exempt you from meeting assignment deadlines.

** The above policy makes no distinction between excused and un-excused absences; they affect your work in the course equally. If, however, you find yourself facing exceptional circumstances (i.e. an unanticipated medical or personal problem that requires immediate attention) during the semester, please see your instructor about possible accommodations. Such situations might include prolonged illness or family crises such as major illness, death, or other unusual circumstances. In these cases, we will work together to preserve your participation in the course, or to determine if an “incomplete” is advisable. In some cases, dropping the course may be the best alternative. Communicate with me. I know life happens - the demands of life, work and family sometimes prevent us from having perfect attendance. If you become aware that an illness or ongoing conflict will cause you to miss more than two consecutive class sessions, let me know as soon as possible. We can often work around serious conflicts with advance notice, but not if you simply "disappear."

If you must miss a class, you are responsible for the readings and turning in assignments. Please do not ask “what happened in class when I was absent?” You are responsible for obtaining accurate notes from your classmates (even if you had a valid excuse for being absent), which includes finding out about assignments given on the day you were absent. In the event of sickness or an emergency, please contact me ASAP.

Missed Assignments and Speeches:
The schedule for various speech assignments will be distributed in class and posted on Canvas. It is your responsibility to know when you are scheduled to speak and to arrive ready to deliver your speech. Students that miss their scheduled speaking time will fail (with a grade of zero) the particular assignment. This does not apply in cases of documented illness, documented bereavement, or documented family emergency. In such cases, notification before class and a meeting with the professor are required.

Written assignments received later than 48 hours after the due date will receive a grade no higher than 50%.

Class Decorum:
Naturally, ipods, cell phones and other unnecessary gadgetry should be stowed out of sight during the class period, and set to silent mode. Refrain from text-messaging, “facebooking” and the like; they are distractions as well as disrespectful to the class. Computers and ipads are allowed for class purposes (readings, note-taking, etc.). If they are consistently used for other purposes, I reserve the right to ban them at any time during the semester.
Schedule of Events

Readings and assignments are subject to change. Additional readings may be added. All reading assignments should be completed for the class period for which they are assigned. C = readings found on Canvas. PG = reading from textbook, *A Pocket Guide to Public Speaking*.

**SPEAKING MATTERS**

**Week 1 Orientation(s)**

Mon, Jan 22
Course Overview

Wed, Jan 24
Why (Free) Speech Matters
Read: What Does Free Speech Mean?” (C) and Hess, “America is Still Struggling” (C)

Fri, Jan 26
Speaking with Integrity
Watch: Alicia Garza, SFSU 2017 Commencement Address (C)
Read: Manning and Stroud, “Communicating with Integrity” from *A Practical Guide to Ethics* (C).
**DUE: Speaking Practicum #1**

**Week 2 Rhetorical Foundations**

Mon, Jan 29
The Rhetorical Tradition
Read: Keith and Lundberg, Ch. 1 “The Rhetorical Tradition” (C) and Selections from Aristotle, “The Rhetoric” (C)

Wed, Jan 31
Eloquence and Oratory
Read: Selections from Cicero, “On Oratory” (C)
**DUE: Speaking Practicum #2**

Fri, Feb 2
Speech Analysis
Read: “Analysis” from *Writing and Thinking Analytically* (C)
Watch: TBA
**DUE: Speaking Practicum #3**

**SPEAKING OUT**

**Week 3 Listening and Bias**

Mon, Feb 5
Listening
Read: Ch. 5 (PG)
**DUE: StoryTelling Speech**
Wed, Feb 7  
Bias
Watch: Verna Myers, Ted Talk: “How to Overcome our Biases? Walk Boldly Toward Them” (C)
DUE: Reflection Essay #1

Fri, Feb 9  
Media Bias and Ethics
Read: Ch. 4 (PG) and TBA

Week 4 Speech Development

Mon, Feb 12  
Topics and Interests
Read: Ch. 7 (PG)
DUE: Media Report

Wed, Feb 14  
Organization
Read: Ch. 11-14 (PG)

Fri, Feb 16  
Study Group Meetings to Discuss Informative Speech

Week 5 Preparing to Speak

Mon, Feb 19  
No Class - President’s Day

Wed, Feb 21  
Fundamentals of Delivery
Read: Ch. 16-18 (PG)

Fri, Feb 23  
Speech Practice
Read: Ch. 2-3 (PG)
DUE: Speaking Practicum #4

THE ART OF INFORMING

Week 6 Group Conferences

Mon, Feb 26  
Groups 1 and 2
DUE: Draft Informative Speech Preparation Outline

Wed, Feb 28  
Groups 3 and 4
DUE: Draft Informative Speech Preparation Outline

Fri, Mar 2  
Speech Practice
DUE: Speaking Practicum #5
**Week 7 Informative Speech**

Mon, Mar 5  
DUE: Informative Speech  
DUE: Peer Review #1

Wed, Mar 7  
DUE: Informative Speech  
DUE: Peer Review #1

Wed, Mar 9  
DUE: Informative Speech  
DUE: Peer Review #1

**Week 8 - Semester Break**

Mon, Mar 12  
No Class – Spring Break

Wed, Mar 14  
No Class – Spring Break

Wed, Mar 16  
No Class – Spring Break

**THE ART OF DELIBERATION**

**Week 9 Rhetorical Situations**

Mon, Mar 19  
Situations
Read: Bitzer, “The Rhetorical Situation” (C)  
DUE: Reflection Essay #2

Wed, Mar 21  
Audiences
Read: Ch. 6 (PG)
Watch and Read: Bush, Wellsesly Commencement Address

Fri, Mar 23  
Public Controversy
Read: Ch. 27 (PG) and TBA  
DUE: Speaking Practicum #6

**Week 10 Persuasive Arguments**

Mon, Mar 26  
Research and Evidence
Read: Ch. 8-9 (PG)

Wed, Mar 28  
Persuasive Reasoning Part I
Read: Ch. 23-24 (PG)  
DUE: Draft Topic Proposal
Fri, Mar 30  Persuasive Reasoning Part II
Read: Herrick, Ch. 5 (C)
DUE: Topic Proposal

Week 11 Modes of Persuasion

Mon, Apr 2  Appeals of Ethos
Read: “Ethical Proofs: Arguments from Character” from Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students (C)

Wed, Apr 4  Appeals of Pathos
Read: Pathetic Proofs: Passionate Appeals” from Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students (C)
DUE: Speaking Practicum #7

Fri, Apr 6  Preparing to Deliberate
Read: Ch. 10 (PG) and TBA

Week 12 Public Deliberation Speeches

Mon, Apr 9  DUE: Public Deliberation Speeches
DUE: Peer Review #2

Wed, Apr 11  DUE: Public Deliberation Speeches
DUE: Peer Review #2

Fri, Apr 13  DUE: Public Deliberation Speeches
DUE: Peer Review #2

THE ART OF CEREMONY

Week 13 Public Deliberation Speeches, Cont.

Mon, Apr 16  DUE: Public Deliberation Speeches
DUE: Peer Review #2

Wed, Apr 18  Honoring Others and Ideas
Read: Ch. 25 (PG)
Watch: TBA
DUE: Reflection Essay #3

Fri, Apr 20  Visuals and Digital Media
Read: Ch, 19-21 (PG)
DUE: Rhetorical Analysis Paper
Week 14 Language, Meaning and Framing

Mon, Apr 23  Language and Meaning
  Read: Ch. 15 (PG) and Michael Ruhlman, “No Food is Healthy. Not Even Kale” (C)

Wed, Apr 25  Choosing Better Words
  Read: TBA

Fri, Apr 27  Framing
  Read: TBA
  DUE: Video Outline of Special Occasion Speech

Week 15 Special Occasion Speeches

Mon, Apr 30  In-Class Work Day/Practice
  DUE: Speaking Practicum #8

Wed, May 2  DUE: Special Occasion Speech

Fri, May 4  DUE: Special Occasion Speech

Week 16 Special Occasion Speeches, Cont.

Mon, May 7  DUE: Special Occasion Speech

Wed, May 9  Class Party!
  DUE: Reflection Essay #4

Student Resources and University Policies

Speaking Center: Located in the lower level of Gleeson Library, The Speaking Center is available to help all USF students prepare for speeches--such as oral presentations, team presentations, and visual aid demonstrations. The coaches / tutors are USF students, selected because of their skill and experience (and excellent grades) in public speaking, and they can help you with a variety of aspects of public speaking, including delivery, topic selection, research, and outlining. Speaking Coaches are available for appointments Monday through Friday 9:00am to 6:00pm; to make an appointment, please use the salesforce scheduling system at myusf.force.com, visit the library, call (415) 422-6713, or email speakingcenter@usfca.edu. For more information on the USF Speaking Center or help making appointments, please check out our home page.

https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/lwc/speaking-center
**Writing Center**: is located in lower level of Gleeson Library. The primary goal of the Writing Center is to help students develop their writing skills in rhetoric, organization, style, and structure, through one-on-one interactive conferences with writing consultants. Students are encouraged to come to the Writing Center if they would like to think through ideas, revise their work for clarity and organization, or work on editing and proofreading skills. Please call (415) 422-6713, use the Salesforce scheduling system at myusf.force.com, or visit the library for an appointment.

Various Workshops in Reading and Writing are available to assist students with academic writing, reading, and speaking: See the schedule of classes for times and days for RHET 100, 101, 105, 107.

Various Students Success Workshops are offered by CASA.

**Students with Disabilities**:  
If you are a student with a disability, please contact USF Student Disability Services (SDS) at 415 422-2613 within the first week of class, or immediately upon onset of disability, to speak with a disability specialist. If you are determined eligible for reasonable accommodations, please meet with your disability specialist so they can arrange to have your accommodation letter sent to me, and we will discuss your needs for this course. For more information, please visit:  
http://www.usfca.edu/sds

**Academic Integrity - USF Honor Code**:  
As a Jesuit institution committed to *cura personalis-* the care and education of the whole person- USF has an obligation to embody and foster the values of honesty and integrity. USF upholds the standards of honesty and integrity from all members of the academic community. All students are expected to know and adhere to the University’s Honor Code. You can find the full text of the code online at [www.usfca.edu/fogcutter](http://www.usfca.edu/fogcutter). As it particularly pertains to the Department of Rhetoric and Language, the policy covers:

- Plagiarism—intentionally or unintentionally representing the words or ideas of another person as your own; failure to properly cite references; manufacturing references
- Working with another person when independent work is required
- Submission of the same paper in more than one course without the specific permission of each instructor
- Submitting a paper written by another person or obtained from the internet.

The penalties for violation of the policy may include a failing grade on the assignment, a failing grade in the course, and/or a referral to the Dean and the Committee on Student Academic Honesty. In addition, a letter will be sent to the Associate Dean for Student Academic Services; the letter will remain in your file for two years after you graduate, after which you may petition for its removal.
Confidentiality, Mandatory Reporting, and Sexual Assault:
As an instructor, one of my responsibilities is to help create a safe learning environment on our campus. I also have a mandatory reporting responsibility related to my role as a faculty member. I am required to share information regarding sexual misconduct or information about a crime that may have occurred on USF's campus with the University. Here are other resources:

- To report any sexual misconduct, students may visit Anna Bartkowski (UC 5th floor) or see many other options by visiting our website: www.usfca.edu/student_life/safer
- Students may speak to someone confidentially, or report a sexual assault confidentially by contacting Counseling and Psychological Services at 415-422-6352.
- To find out more about reporting a sexual assault at USF, visit USF's Callisto website at: www.usfca.callistocampus.org.
- For an off-campus resource, contact San Francisco Women Against Rape (SFWAR) (415) 647-7273 (www.sfwar.org).

Time Management and Planning:
Students are expected to spend 2 hours outside of class in study and preparation of assignments. In a 4-unit class, assignments have been created with the expectation that students will engage in approximately 8 hours of out-of-class work per week; in a 2-unit class, students should expect to spend approximately 4 hours per week outside of class in study and preparation. Intensive classes may count the 2 hours of lab time as part of the out-of-class work.
RHET106: Intro to Composition (Section 01)
Class: LM 346B (MWF 9:15am-10:20am)
Instructor: Dr. Tika Lamsal
Fall 2017

Office: Kalmanovitz 231
Office hours: W (12:00-2:00pm)
(and by appointment)
Office # 422-2576
tlamsal@usfca.edu

Course Description
This course, designed for students who need additional practice in writing and reading, focuses on preparing students for academic writing at the college level. The course emphasizes the connection between reading and writing. They learn and practice finding and evaluating sources, summarizing, paraphrasing, quoting, citing, and documenting conventions. Individualized attention is given to reading, fluency, vocabulary development, and rhetorical style. The minimum passing grade for this course is C-.

Learning Outcomes and Grading Rubric
1. Identify main ideas and supporting details in a variety of types of multi-page academic texts. (Reading)
   A. Student demonstrates, through answering written or verbal questions, a highly accurate ability (90% or better) to identify main ideas and supporting details.
   B. Student demonstrates, through answering written or verbal questions, a mostly accurate ability (80-89%) to identify main ideas and supporting details.
   C. Student demonstrates, through answering written or verbal questions, an accurate ability (70-79%) to identify main ideas and supporting details.
   D. Student cannot demonstrate, through answering written or verbal questions, an ability (69% or lower) to identify main ideas and supporting details.

2. Summarize multi-page texts, and synthesize information from multiple related texts, both orally and in writing. (Reading)
   A. Summaries are concise, well paraphrased, and accurate.
   B. Summaries are clear, but lack concision and/or some accuracy.
   C. Summaries are clear, but lack concision, accuracy and/or not paraphrased enough.
   D. Summaries lack clarity and accuracy due to lack of concision, accuracy and not being paraphrased enough to not be considered plagiarism.

3. Use source information accurately. (Paraphrasing, quoting, citing). (Academic Skills)
   A. Source information is integrated and cited with very high accuracy.
   B. Source information is integrated, and cited well, with a few noticeable gaps.
   C. Source information is integrated and cited well with a number of noticeable gaps.
   D. Source information is not integrated or cited clearly.

4. Use the writing process (pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing) in a multiple draft assignment, to improve iterations. (Writing)
   A. Corrections made are complete, accurate and appropriate throughout the text and reflect not only a response to feedback, but also editing beyond what the student was explicitly told in feedback from peers or professor.
   B. Corrections made are mostly complete, accurate and appropriate throughout the text and reflect not only a response to feedback, but also some editing beyond what the student was explicitly told in feedback from peers or professor.
   C. Corrections made may be complete, accurate and appropriate throughout the text but do not
reflect a response beyond the feedback from peers or professor.

D. Corrections made lack an attempt to follow feedback from peers or professor, thus making few meaningful corrections.

5. Write coherent texts with topic sentences and supporting details in order to describe, narrate, report and inform. (Writing)
   A. The text is very coherent because the topic sentences relate directly back to the thesis and the supporting details relate directly to the topic sentences.
   B. The text is coherent, but minor breakdowns in the relationship between topic sentences and thesis, or supporting details and topic sentence, exist.
   C. The text is coherent, but minor breakdowns in the relationship between topic sentences and thesis, and supporting details and topic sentence, exist.
   D. The text lacks coherence because the relationship between the thesis and topic sentences and/or the supporting details and topic sentences is so unclear that the meaning is obscured.

6. Write 2-4 page texts to make an argument using different types of support (e.g., description, narration, report, inform) (Writing)
   A. The text articulates a clear and consistent argument using a variety of types of support.
   B. The text articulates a clear or consistent argument using a variety of types of support.
   C. The text does not articulate a clear or consistent argument.

7. Recognize and correct some common grammatical and mechanical errors in written texts. (Writing)
   A. Grammar and lexical use is consistently accurate and completely appropriate.
   B. Grammar and lexical use is mostly consistent, accurate and appropriate.
   C. Grammar and lexical use is minimally accurate enough to give clear meaning and not prevent reader from being unable to understand the content.
   D. Grammar and lexical use is problematic to the degree that understanding of the content is obscured behind errors.

**Required Texts**
- *Writer’s Help* online (see Announcements on Canvas for instructions to join this online book)
- Other postings on Canvas (In addition to regular readings from the textbook above, you will also have additional reading materials based on the themes of learning – mostly multilingual and multicultural literacy topics – that I will make available on Canvas. I will choose these supporting materials out of several sources as they become pertinent to the week’s themes, readings, and writing practices in order to enhance the learning outcomes for this course.)

**Due Dates for the Major Assignments and Assessment of Learning Outcomes**
- First Essay Draft (Narration): Helps assess Learning Outcomes 1, 5, 6, and 7
  Due: Peer Response (Sept. 11)
    Revised draft (1000 words) (Sept. 20)
- Second Essay Draft (Summary and Response): Helps assess Learning Outcomes 2, 4, 6, and 7
  Due: Peer Response (Oct. 2)
    Revised draft (1,250 words) (Oct. 9)
  Due: Peer Response/presentation (Nov. 3)
    Revised draft (Transcript 1,000 words + 2-3 min. video essay) (Nov. 8)
- Fourth Essay Draft (Research and Argument): Helps assess Learning Outcomes 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7
  Due: Peer Response (Nov. 29)
    Revised draft (2,000 words) (Dec. 8)
- Reflection Paper (750 words): (Nov. 27)
Grading Policy:  
The final semester grades will be based on the following grading scale:

A+ 100-97  A 96-93  A- 92-90  
B+ 89-87  B 86-83  B- 82-80  
C+ 79-77  C 76-73  C- 72-70  
D+ 69-67  D 66-63  D- 62-60  
F 59 and below

Explanation of Grading Rubric

Homework 20  
(There will be homework based on your readings from the textbook and other outside reading materials posted on Canvas. I will explain to you in detail about all HWs in class before they are due.) – Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 5, and 7

Reading Response 125  
(Every class when you have reading assignments, you’re required to write and post on Canvas a short response (about 250-350 words) to the readings based on the questions for the day. Then, we will have individual and group discussions and presentations on those responses in class. All of you are required to be fully prepared to discuss the issues you’ve written on your response. If you miss your class and daily response both, you will lose 5 points for this.) – Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 4, and 7

Peer Response 30  
(All the major assignments, i.e. Three Essays, will be due for peer response at least a week before the final version is due; you will read each other’s draft and offer feedback for revision. You will have at least two of your peers read the draft in addition to me for this review and offer you feedback both online and in class. After you’re done with peer response in class, you will also post your reflective response under the thread Peer Response on Canvas to some questions, such as how the discussion went, what feedback you received, what seemed to work or didn’t work, how you plan to revise the draft based on this peer response, etc.) – Learning Outcomes 1, 4, 5, and 7

CP/In-class Writing (Blog) 50  
(Class Participation includes your engagement in class activities – successfully completing all the class assignments – and your response to reading assignments for the day; there will also be in-class writing practices on your individual blog.) – Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 5, and 7

Presentation of Essay 3 25  
(You will get to work in groups for Essay#3 and create a multimodal essay, which you need to first present to class for feedback. I will also grade it in class based on your spoken and presentation skills.) – Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 3, and 6

Journal Writing 50  
(Almost every three weeks, you will get to reflect on your learning process based on your experiences on academic, cultural, linguistic, and social growth as well as on any topics of reading for the week. This is an informal writing where you learn to write and reflect on topics of your interest with grades assigned to them!) – Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 3, and 6

First Essay 100  
Second Essay 100  
Third Essay 100  
Fourth Essay 200  
Reflection Paper 50  
Extra Credit 10

Attendance Policy: Participation in all the class sessions is vital to successful completion of this course. Much of the work is done collaboratively in class. Alternative assignments are generally not given, nor can the instructor ‘re-teach’ missed classes for individual students. If you miss more than THREE classes, your grade will be negatively affected. Exception: When representing the University of San Francisco in intercollegiate competition (e.g., athletics, debate), students shall be excused from classes on the hours or days such competition takes them away from classes. However, such students shall be responsible for
advising their professors regarding anticipated absences and for arranging to complete course work for classes, laboratories, and/or examinations missed. As such, missing more than SIX classes during this semester will prepare grounds for receiving failing grade for this course. Chronic tardiness is unacceptable (coming to class 5 minutes later thrice will count one absence, and 15 minutes later twice will be considered an absence), as are coming to class unprepared, doing work that is not for this course during class, sleeping in class, or using the computers or other personal electronic devices for personal messaging, research, or entertainment. Please turn off cellular/ mobile phones, pagers, and other personal electronic devices during class unless asked for in-class activities and writings.

**Behavioral Expectations:** All students are expected to behave in accordance with the Student Conduct Code and other University policies (see http://www.usfca.edu/fogcutter/). Open discussion and disagreement is encouraged when done respectfully and in the spirit of academic discourse. There are also a variety of behaviors that, while not against a specific University policy, may create disruption in this course. Students whose behavior is disruptive or who fail to comply with the instructor may be dismissed from the class for the remainder of the class period and may need to meet with the instructor or Dean prior to returning to the next class period. If necessary, referrals may also be made to the Student Conduct process for violations of the Student Conduct Code.

**Late Work and Revision Policy:** All work is due when assigned. If you miss any deadline, one-third of a letter grade will be reduced for that assignment for the first three days, half a letter grade until one week, and no assignments will be accepted after one week, unless you notify me about it before the paper is due and manage an alternative date for late work submission. In addition, if you are dissatisfied with a grade you receive on a major assignment, you have up to ONE WEEK from the date that assignment was returned to revise and resubmit it for a new grade. All revised essays must be accompanied by a cover letter explaining how you have addressed my comments and what has been significantly improved through revisions.

**Time Management and Planning:** Students are expected to spend 2 hours outside of class in study and preparation of assignments for each hour in class. In a 4-unit class, assignments have been created with the expectation that students will engage in approximately 8 hours of out-of-class work per week; in a 2-unit class, students should expect to spend approximately 4 hours per week outside of class in study and preparation. Intensive classes may count the 2 hours of lab time as part of the out-of-class work. When using lab hours for digital/ multimodal writing practices, we will also use Wordpress web portal aligned with Canvas to complete most of the assignments for this course. In our 4-unit class, therefore, you should plan to spend at least 8 hours of out-of-class work per week.

**Confidentiality, Mandatory Reporting, and Sexual Assault:** As an instructor, one of my responsibilities is to help create a safe learning environment on our campus. I also have a mandatory reporting responsibility related to my role as a faculty member. I am required to share information regarding sexual misconduct or information about a crime that may have occurred on USFs campus with the University. Here are other resources:

- To report any sexual misconduct, students may visit Anna Bartkowski (UC 5th floor) or see many other options by visiting our website: [www.usfca.edu/student_life/safer](http://www.usfca.edu/student_life/safer).
- Students may speak to someone confidentially, or report a sexual assault confidentially by contacting Counseling and Psychological Services at [415-422-6352](tel:415-422-6352).
- To find out more about reporting a sexual assault at USF, visit USFs Callisto website at: [www.usfca.callistocampus.org](http://www.usfca.callistocampus.org).
- For an off-campus resource, contact San Francisco Women Against Rape (SFWAR) (415) 647-7273 ([www.sfwar.org](http://www.sfwar.org)).

**Academic Integrity**

**USF Honor Code:** As a Jesuit institution committed to *cura personalis*- the care and education of the whole person- USF has an obligation to embody and foster the values of honesty and integrity. USF upholds the standards of honesty and integrity from all members of the academic community. All students are expected to know and adhere to the University’s Honor Code. You can find the full text of the code
online at www.usfca.edu/fogcutter. As it particularly pertains to the Program in Rhetoric and Language, the policy covers:

- Plagiarism—intentionally or unintentionally representing the words or ideas of another person as your own; failure to properly cite references; manufacturing references Working with another person when independent work is required
- Submission of the same paper in more than one course without the specific permission of each instructor
- Submitting a paper written by another person or obtained from the Internet.

The penalties for violation of the policy may include a failing grade on the assignment, a failing grade in the course, and/or a referral to the Dean and the Committee on Student Academic Honesty. In addition, a letter will be sent to the Associate Dean for Student Academic Services; the letter will remain in your file for two years after you graduate, after which you may petition for its removal.

**Students with Disabilities:** If you are a student with a disability or disabling condition, or if you think you may have a disability, please contact USF Student Disability Services (SDS) at 415 422-2613 within the first week of class, or immediately upon onset of disability, to speak with a disability specialist. If you are determined eligible for reasonable accommodations, please meet with your disability specialist so they can arrange to have your accommodation letter sent to me, and we will discuss your needs for this course. For more information, please visit: [http://www.usfca.edu/sds](http://www.usfca.edu/sds)

**Counseling and Psychological Services:** Our diverse staff offers brief individual, couple, and group counseling to student members of our community. CAPS services are confidential and free of charge. Call 415-422-6352 for an initial consultation appointment. Having a crisis at 3 AM? We are still here for you. Telephone consultation through CAPS After Hours is available between the hours of 5:00 PM to 8:30 AM; call the above number and press 2.

**Student Accounts - Last day to withdraw with tuition reversal:** Students who wish to have the tuition charges reversed on their student account should withdraw from the course(s) by the end of the business day on the last day to withdraw with tuition credit (census date) for the applicable course(s) in which the student is enrolled. Please note that the last day to withdraw with tuition credit may vary by course. The last day to withdraw with tuition credit (census date) listed in the Academic Calendar is applicable only to courses which meet for the standard 15-week semester. To find what the last day to withdraw with tuition credit is for a specific course, please visit the Online Class Schedule at [www.usfca.edu/schedules](http://www.usfca.edu/schedules).

**Financial Aid - FAFSA priority filing deadline (undergraduates only):** March 2 - Priority filing deadline for FAFSA (The Free Application for Federal Student Aid - [https://fafsa.ed.gov/](https://fafsa.ed.gov/)) for continuing undergraduates.

**Student Resources**

**Learning, Writing, and Speaking Centers**

The Learning, Writing, and Speaking Centers at USF provide individualized support to assist you in better understanding course material and to aid you on your path to success. Services are free and include one-on-one tutoring, group tutoring, and one-on-one Academic Skills Coaching appointments to discuss effective study strategies. The Learning Center supports over 80 courses each semester. The Writing Center helps students develop writing skills in rhetoric, organization, style, and structure, through one-on-one interactive conferences. The Speaking Center helps students prepare for public speaking - including
speeches, oral presentations, team presentations, and visual aid demonstrations. International students may also contact the Centers to learn more about communicating with professors and general academic study skills.

The Learning, Writing, and Speaking Centers are located on the Lower Level of Gleeson Library. Please contact them at (415) 422-6713 for further assistance or visit: https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/lwc to make an appointment.

Various Workshops in Reading and Writing are available to assist students with academic writing, reading, and speaking: See the schedule of classes for times and days for RHET 101, 105, 107, 113.

- Various Students Success Workshops are offered by CASA.

### DAILY SCHEDULE

#### WEEK 1  
_Aug 23, and 25 (Aug. 28: Last Day to add classes)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Introduction, Policy Statement, Syllabus, Course Introduction, Interviewing each other for introduction, Diagnostic Essay (in-class writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Read America Now (The Persuasive Writer, pp. 1-10); and The Persuasive Writer (pp. 20-29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WEEK 2  
_Aug 28, 30, and Sept. 1 (Weekly Theme: How Social Media Affect Us)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Read The Persuasive Writer (pp. 30-42), and Santella’s essay “This Is Not About You” (pp. 45-48); class activities: reading and writing critically: asking “so what” question, outlining, and summarizing a written text from <em>WH</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Read Gonzalez’s essay “Technology Taking Over?” (pp. 50-52); and Stornaiuolo and Leblanc article “Local Literacies, Global Scales” on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class activities: summary/analysis of a written text from <em>Writer’s Help</em> (WH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Read pp. 55-59 (including short essays by Clive Thompson, and Henry David Thoreau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class activities: examining sentences, paragraphs, and organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assign the First Essay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WEEK 3  
_Sept. 4, 6, and 8 (Sept. 8 – Census Date: last day to drop classes with a refund) (Weekly Theme: Why Language Matters)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>NO CLASS: Labor Day Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Read Sanders’s “Language Versus Lies” (pp. 78-83); and Amy Tan’s essay “Mother Tongue” (pp. 1-4) on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class activities: using examples and student writer at work (pp. 75-77); APA format intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Read Hughes’s “That Word Black” (pp. 85-87); and Peter Elbow article “Why Deny Speakers of African American Language a Choice Most of Us Offer Other Students?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar practice: verb forms and tenses (exercises 1 and 2) from <em>WH</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WEEK 4  
_Sept. 11, 13, and 15_  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>First Essay Assignment Due in class for peer response (bring 2 printed copies to class) In-class writing and practice from <em>WH</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Individual conferences in my office (KH 231) on the First Essay Assignment; come with both drafts, the draft with peer response and your revised version, to discuss ideas for revision and other questions on the essay and your performance in the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Conferences contd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WEEK 5  
_Sept. 18, 20, and 22 (Weekly Theme: Personal Identity, Rights and Freedom)_
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Read Paula Mirando’s article “Shared Experiences of Multiethnic Children in <em>Stealing Buddha’s Dinner</em>” (pp. 126-138) from <em>Writing for a Real World</em> on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Revised draft of the First Essay Due on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read Medina’s essay “Warning: The Literary Canon Could Make Students Squirm” (pp. 91-94); LearningCurve on run-on sentences from <em>WH</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Read Bloomberg’s essay “On the Repression of Free Expression” (pp. 102-107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class activities: APA format in academic writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sept. 25, 27, and 29 (Weekly Theme: Diversity and Difference)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Read Nasser’s essay “The Changing Face of America” (pp. 117-19), and Granados’s “True Colors” (pp. 121-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class activities: grammar exercises on sentence emphasis (coordination/subordination) on <em>WH</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assign the Second Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Read Yook’s essay “Positive Stereotypes Are Hurtful, Too” (pp. 126-27), and Lopez’s “Six Thousand Lessons” (pp. 132-34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LearningCurve practice in class (subordination and coordination) from <em>WH</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Read <em>The Nation</em> Editorial “The Proper Sieve for Immigrants” (pp. 136-38); punctuation practice (comma and semi-colon) from <em>WH</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oct. 2, 4, and 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Second Essay Due in class for peer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Individual conferences on Second Essay Assignment (KA 231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Conferences contd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oct. 9, 11, and 13 (Weekly Theme: Race and Identity)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Read Zack’s essay “More Than Skin Deep” (pp.144-50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LearningCurve: comma and sentence fragments from <em>WH</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Essay Assignment Due on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Read Amber Floyd’s essay “A ‘Dream’ Deferred: An Exploration of the Scarlet Title ‘Undocumented’” (pp. 180-190) on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Read Douglass’s excerpt from “What to a Slave Is the Fourth of July?” (pp. 164-68); in-class writing practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oct. 16, 18, and 20 (Weekly Theme: Marriage and Family Culture)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>NO CLASS: Fall Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Read Chin essay “Monologue: Grandmother Wong’s New Year Blessings”(pp.323-28)on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation practice: stereotypical jokes based on cultures and languages (p. 214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read Charen’s “Modern Family?” (pp. 224-26), and Solnit’s “More Equal Than Others” (pp. 228-31), in-class writing practice: Integrating sources in APA/MLA papers on <em>WH</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Watch video on using Audacity: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dbqJVC6kQ50">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dbqJVC6kQ50</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watch video on using iPhone for recording: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uOwqXfBGYml">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uOwqXfBGYml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practices on editing music by using Audacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oct. 23, 25, and 27 (Weekly Theme: Multimodal Composition)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Read guidelines for making a video essay by using iMovie on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watch model video essay: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qafnYLZdCzQ">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qafnYLZdCzQ</a>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and guidelines to make a video by using iMovie:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qDh6d4DisNM">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qDh6d4DisNM</a> (on Canvas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions on group presentations; Assign Third Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Read and watch/listen “Global Digital Divide: From Nigeria and the People’s Republic of China” by Selfe, Hawisher, Berry, Lashore, and Song on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://cedigitalpress.org/transnational/ch5.3.html">http://cedigitalpress.org/transnational/ch5.3.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Group meetings to prepare for presentations on video essay project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WEEK 11</strong> Oct. 30, Nov. 1, and Nov. 3 (Multimodal Composition contd.): Nov. 3: Last day to drop or withdraw courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Read Fulwiler and Middleton essay “After Digital Storytelling: Video Composing in the New Media Age” on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td><strong>Project presentations;</strong> LearningCurve from WH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td><strong>Project presentations contd.</strong> (Presentations Due on Canvas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 12</strong></td>
<td>Nov. 6, 8, and 10 (Weekly Theme: Research and Argument Writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Read a sample research and argument essay (by Merlla McLaughlin’s essay “Leadership Roles in a Small-Group Project”) on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Third Essay Due on Canvas; research and argument writing practices from WH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Group activities on research and argument essays from the book and WH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 13</strong></td>
<td>Nov. 13, 15, and 17 (Weekly Theme: Gender and Equality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Read “Don’t Act Crazy, Mindy” (pp. 315-19); and WH writing practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Read Sommers’s “No, Women Don’t Make Less Money Than Men” (pp. 321-23), and Potter’s “#YesAllWomen” (pp. 325-28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Read Brady’s “I Want a Wife” (pp. 330-32); Brainstorming and outlining the Fourth Essay Assign the Fourth Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 14</strong></td>
<td>Nov. 20, 22, and 24 (Weekly Theme: American Dream and Its Challenges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Read Obama’s “A Fundamental Threat to the American Dream” (pp. 338-42), and Surowiecki’s “The Mobility Myth” (pp. 344-46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Read Tushnet’s “You Can Go Home Again” (pp. 353-56) Assign Reflection Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>NO CLASS: Thanksgiving Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 15</strong></td>
<td>Nov. 27, 29, and Dec. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Group discussions on Essay 4 Reflection Paper Due on Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Fourth Essay Due in class for peer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Individual Conferences on Fourth Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 16</strong></td>
<td>Dec. 4, 6, and 8 (Dec. 6 – last day of classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Conferences contd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Last day of the class: goodbyes, reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td><strong>Fourth Essay</strong> Assignment Due on Canvas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor has the right to make changes to the course schedule/syllabus if necessary.
INTRODUCTION TO COMPOSITION INTENSIVE, Section 1
RHET 106N-01 (CRN 40104) (6 units)
Department of Rhetoric and Language
University of San Francisco
Fall 2017

Tuesday and Thursday 8:00-9:45 a.m. Lone Mountain 352
Tuesday 9:55-11:45 a.m. Cowell Hall 214
Instructor: Professor Masterson

Office: KA (Kalmanovitz) 204
Phone: 422-2120
E-mail: dlmasterson@usfca.edu
Office Hours: Tuesday and Thursday 12:00 to 1:00 p.m. and by appointment

Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2013.
I will also provide some extra readings and exercises in the form of handouts.

Recommended Dictionary:

1. Course Description:
This course, designed for students who need additional practice in writing and reading, focuses on preparing students for academic writing at the college level. The course emphasizes the connection between reading and writing. In addition to four units of classroom instruction, students learn and practice the writing process, from idea to final essay (e.g., prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing) in a two-hour computer writing lab each week. They learn and practice finding and evaluating sources, summarizing, paraphrasing, quoting, citing, and documenting conventions. Individualized attention is given to reading, fluency, vocabulary development, and rhetorical style. The minimum passing grade for this class is C-.

1. Learning Outcomes:
2. Identify main ideas and supporting details in a variety of types of multi-page academic texts. (Reading)
3. Summarize multi-page texts, and synthesize information from multiple related texts, both orally and in writing. (Reading)
4. Use source information accurately. (Paraphrasing, quoting, citing). (Academic Skills)
5. Use the writing process ((pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing) in a multiple draft assignment, to improve iterations. (Writing).
6. Write coherent texts with topic sentences and supporting details in order to describe, narrate, report and inform. (Writing)
7. Write 2-4 page texts to make an argument using different types of support (e.g., description, narration, report, inform) (Writing)
8. Recognize and correct some common grammatical and mechanical errors in written texts. (Writing)
9. Articulate the advantages and disadvantages of a liberal arts education
10. Evaluate how the USF curriculum and policies demonstrate the USF mission.

1. **Course Requirements:**
2. Regular reading assignments in the textbook and in supplementary materials.

2. Four major papers, of at least two drafts each (1500-2000 words); a fifth major paper written in class; and a sixth paper that is a reflection letter, reflecting on your writing all semester. (NOTE: You should be working on this reflection letter the entire semester. This is a 1000-word letter to me detailing what you have learned in the class. Be sure to refer back to the Course Objectives written above. For example, you might want to talk about the organizing, drafting, tightening, revising, and editing process; peer editing; rhetorical strategies; grammar (giving examples, perhaps, of incorrect sentences from your previous drafts and then showing how you corrected them); time management (how you allowed time for revision); any another component of the class that helped you develop your reading, writing and critical thinking skills.)

Essays should be at least as long as the required number of words (in all essays, longer is fine). When you submit the second draft of a paper, be sure to submit the first draft and the peer edit sheet as well, along with a brief typed note summarizing the changes you have made in the second draft. You are required to submit an electronic copy of each draft of each essay to the Canvas website. All essays must have your name on it, the date, and the name of the assignment. All essays and other written work should be kept together by the student until the end of the semester. You are always welcome to turn in a third draft, within a week of receiving the second draft back from me; if the third draft is substantially better than the second, you will receive a slight increase in your grade.

3. Two tests, each covering approximately one-half of the semester.

4. Frequent homework assignments, including (but not limited to) reading, answering questions on, and commenting on the assigned readings; writing exercises; vocabulary exercises; grammar exercises; writing short paragraphs or papers (in addition to the major papers); prewriting activities preparing for writing the major papers.

5. Frequent quizzes (both announced and unannounced); these are most often on vocabulary, but also may be on the content of the day’s reading, or on grammar.

6. Frequent in-class summaries and/or responses to the readings done for that day’s homework, as well as other short in-class writing.
7. In-class activities such as group discussions and tasks, short reports, etc.

8. A NOTE on the Tuesday LAB classes: These classes will provide time for working on your class essays, doing pre-writing, writing, and revising. Since they will be in a computer lab, you can work on the computers there. (Be sure to save all your work on a flash/google drive, or email it to yourself.). This time will also be used for grammar (often from Part Four in the textbook) and vocabulary practice and other activities that will help your writing. In addition, three times during the semester, we will do some (not all) of the individual conferencing on Essays 2, 3, and 4 during the Tuesday lab time. On those days, if your conference time is not scheduled during the class, you don’t need to attend (but you may, if you have quick questions for me). Also, on one Tuesday lab day, class is cancelled in lieu of the out-of-class conferences (per the policy for writing classes in the Rhetoric and Language Department). On all other Tuesdays, you are required to attend the lab just as you are required to attend the Tuesday and Thursday “regular” class times.

1. **Grades:**

   **Major Papers** (including multiple drafts and peer editing)

   - Essay One: Summary and Response (750 words) 10%
   - Essay Two: Developing an Argument Based on a Text Read in Common (1000 words) 10%
   - Essay Three: Developing an Argument Based on a Text (1500 words) 10%
   - Essay Four: Proposing a Solution (2000 words) 10%
   - Essay Five: In-class Final Essay (2000) 5%
   - Essay Six: Reflective Essay on your writing the whole semester (1000 words) 10%

   **Tests** (2): 20%

   **Quizzes** (7+): 10%

   **Other homework** (short in-class essays; grammar and vocabulary work, etc.); Preparation and participation 15%

In order to proceed to the next level next semester, students must receive a grade of at least C- in this class. If you receive a B+ or higher, you will go to RHET 110. If you receive a C- to a B you will go to RHET 110N.

1. **Grading Standards for Essays**

   **A essays** meet requirements of the assignment, be coherent, make significant claims that are justified by appropriate support. They are responsive to audience and meet typical expectations of academic readers, including research, meaningful claims, sufficient organizational signals, and a writing style that is linguistically precise and grammatically complex.

   **B essays** meet major requirements of the assignment: their major claims are justified in a reasonable way, and they are generally responsive to the audience. Essays that meet a significant portion of, but not all of, the expectations, tend to fall into the "B" category. An otherwise "A" essay that argues an obvious claim, or offers insufficient support, or contains a number of stylistic or mechanical faults are the typical characteristics of a "B" level essay.


**C essays** meet at least some of the necessary requirements of the assignment, and are comprehensible, exhibiting enough structure, organizational signals, and appropriate style to shape meaning. When essays fall significantly short in one or more of the most significant areas described above, or fall short in most areas, they tend toward a "C." Failing to meet basic assignment requirements--such as summarizing and responding to particular readings, meeting page- or word- minimum limits, failing to use proper research--will also lead a paper to get a "C" (or below).

**D and F essays** are deficient in many ways.

1. **Class Policies:**

1. Regular attendance is essential for progress in this class. More than three unexcused absences will affect a student’s grade; a student with more than six unexcused absences may fail the class. If you must be absent from class, please call or e-mail me ahead of time if at all possible; if not, please call or e-mail me afterward. (However, notifying me, or the department office, of your absence does not necessarily mean that your absence is excused; excused absences generally require a doctor’s note.) You are responsible for knowing and doing all homework assignments, even if you are not in the class when assignments are made, so please check with me and/or classmates if you have to miss class. I suggest you obtain the email addresses and/or telephone numbers of at least two of your classmates. If you miss class, work done in class, including tests and quizzes, may not be made up.

Exception: When representing the University of San Francisco in intercollegiate competition (e.g., athletics, debate), students shall be excused from classes on the hours or days such competition takes them away from classes. However, such students shall be responsible for advising their professors regarding anticipated absences and for arranging to complete course work for classes, laboratories, and/or examinations missed.

2. Promptness is also important for your progress and for the best use of the class time for you and your classmates. Two times late equals one absence.

3. Students will very occasionally be required to buy additional materials such as newspapers and magazines. These will not be expensive.

4. All written work must be typed, 12pt, Ariel font, double-spaced, with 1 inch margins.

5. All work must have a proper heading (name, date, class in the upper right hand corner) and title (centered above the essay). For the major essays, write the number of the
essay, and “First Draft” or “Second Draft,” in parentheses after the titles. (e.g., “Essay Two, Second Draft”). Write the word count at the end of each paper (including journals).

6. **ALL WORK MUST BE HANDED IN ON TIME.** Late work will not be accepted unless you have written proof of a medical or other emergency.

7. No make-up tests or quizzes will be given.

8. Please make sure cell phones, I-pods, I-pads, laptops, and any other electronic devices are turned off and PUT AWAY during class. DO NOT TEXT, AND DO NOT USE OR CHECK YOUR PHONE OR OTHER DEVICES FOR TEXTS OR OTHER MESSAGES, DURING CLASS.

9. Please do not bring food to class. Drinks are OK. Please dispose of any drink containers or other trash properly when you leave class.

10. Please do not leave during class time unless it is absolutely necessary.

11. Please show respect for your fellow students and your professor; for example, please give your full attention to your professor and classmates when they are speaking.

12. Please use gender-neutral language in your writing and speaking.

13. Please respect your classmates’ opinions during class discussion, even if you do not agree with them. Respectful sharing and discussion of ideas and experiences are essential parts of academic life. We can all learn a lot from each other.

14. Please see me if you have problems or questions. I want you to be successful in this class!

15. Please ask me if you want information about resources on campus, such as the Counseling Center, Career Services, etc.

1. **Department and University Policies**

   Time Management and Planning: Students are expected to spend 2 hours outside of class in study and preparation of assignments. In a 4 unit class, assignments have been created with the expectation that students will engage in approximately 8 hours of out-of-class work per week; in a 2 unit class, students should expect to spend approximately 4 hours per week outside of class in study and preparation. Intensive classes (such as this one) may count the 2 hours of lab time as part of the out-of-class work.

**Academic Integrity:**

USF Honor Code: As a Jesuit institution committed to cura personalis- the care and education of the whole person- USF has an obligation to embody and foster the values of honesty and integrity. USF upholds the standards of honesty and integrity from all members of the academic
community. All students are expected to know and adhere to the University’s Honor Code. You can find the full text of the code online at www.usfca.edu/fogcutter. As it particularly pertains to the Program in Rhetoric and Composition, the policy covers:

- Plagiarism—intentionally or unintentionally representing the words or ideas of another person as your own; failure to properly cite references; manufacturing references; working with another person when independent work is required
- Submission of the same paper in more than one course without the specific permission of each instructor
- Submitting a paper written by another person or obtained from the internet

The penalties for violation of the policy may include a failing grade on the assignment, a failing grade in the course, and/or a referral to the Dean and the Committee on Student Academic Honesty. In addition, a letter will be sent to the Associate Dean for Student Academic Services; the letter will remain in your file for two years after you graduate, after which you may petition for its removal.

Students with Disabilities: If you have a disability for which you are or may be requesting an accommodation, you are encouraged to contact both your instructor and Student Disability Services, (SDS) 422-6876 as early as possible in the semester.

Student Resources:
The Writing Center is located in Cowell Hall, Room 215. The Center is staffed with faculty Writing Consultants who work with students to help them improve their writing skills. They provide feedback on the drafts that students bring to review, and they can tailor a program of instruction to meet individual needs. Students are encouraged to come to the Writing Center if they would like to build their self-confidence, discover strategies of invention to overcome writer’s block, learn how to revise their work, develop editing and proofreading skills, and understand and apply the conventions of standard written English. Please call (415) 422-6713 for an appointment. On designated days (usually Mon-Thurs, 1pm-4pm), you also can find a writing consultant in the Gleeson library computer room on the main floor, accessible through the Thatcher Art Gallery.

The Speaking Center is located in Malloy Hall, Room 106, which is available to help all USF students prepare for speeches, such as oral presentations, team presentations, and powerpoint demonstrations. The coaches are USF students, selected because of their skill and experience (and excellent grades) in public speaking, and they can help you with a variety of aspects of public speaking, including delivery and outlining. Tutors are available on a drop-in basis (hours announced in the second week of the semester) as well as for special appointments; please visit the tutoring center or email speakingcenter@usfca.edu to make an appointment.

Various Workshops in Reading and Writing are available to assist students with academic writing, reading, and speaking: See the schedule of classes for times and days for RHET 100, 101, 105, 107.
Various Students Success Workshops are offered by CASA.
WELCOME TO THE CLASS! I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH YOU THIS SEMESTER.

1. **Class Schedule:**
   Please note:
   1. Only major assignments and tests are listed here (additional quizzes and homework will be assigned in class).
   2. Even if no assignment or activity is listed for a certain day, we still have class.
   3. This schedule may need to be adjusted slightly during the semester as needed.
   4. Bring the textbook to class every day, unless I specifically say that it is not needed that day.
   5. **IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT YOU DO THE READING ASSIGNMENTS BEFORE THE DAY THEY ARE ASSIGNED; THE CLASS DISCUSSIONS AND ACTIVITIES WILL DEPEND ON YOUR HAVING READ THEM, AND ON YOUR BEING PREPARED FOR CLASS. THERE WILL OFTEN BE QUIZZES OR THE WRITING OF BRIEF SUMMARIES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CLASS PERIOD FOR WHICH THE READING IS ASSIGNED.**

Italics = in-class topics or activities
Regular type = reading and other homework assignments
Bold type = assignments to be handed in or given in class; tests and quizzes; special dates

**NOTE:** We will also do selections and exercises from Part Four in the textbook, as well as other grammar instruction and exercises, generally on the Tuesday LAB days.

**Week One**
Tues: Introduction to class, syllabus, and textbooks
The Writing Process; Pre-Writing; Peer Editing
Unity and Coherence
Audience and Purpose
Introductory/Diagnostic essay in class
Thurs: 8/26 Read pp. 1-16 (in Chapter One: The Writing Process)

**Week Two**
Tues: Read pp. 16-32 (in Chapter One: The Writing Process)
LAB: writing practice; grammar practice
Clauses and Phrases; Types of Sentences
Start on Notes/Plans for Essay Six (Reflective Letter)
Thurs: 9/2 Read pp. 35-55 (Chapter Two: Crafting Paragraphs)
Run-ons, Comma Splices, and Fragments

**Week Three**
Tues: LAB: writing practice; grammar practice
Pre-writing for Essay One (Writing from Experience)
Thurs: Read pp. 57-77 (Chapter Three: Patterns of Development)
The Importance of Vivid and Specific Description

Week Four
Tues: Read pp. 79-90; 100-104; 108-110 (in Chapter Four: Remembering)
LAB: writing practice; grammar practice
Working on Essay One
Vocabulary Quiz # 1
Thurs: Essay One (Writing from Experience), First Draft due
Peer Editing Essay One
Read pp. 116-126; 139-145; 148-152 (from Chapter Five: Explaining)

Week Five
Tues: Read pp. 157-167; 186-190 (from Chapter Six: Analyzing)
Vocabulary Quiz #2
LAB: writing practice; grammar practice
Revising Essay One
Thurs: Essay One, Second Draft due (Reminder: for this essay as with all essays 1-4, with first draft attached, and a note explaining changes/revisions you have made from the First Draft; also send as an email attachment)
Read pp. 327-331 (Chapter 11: Summary)
Read pp. 349-365 (from Chapter 12: Conducting Research)

Week Six
Tues: Read pp. 564-571 (Extra readings supplementing Chapter Six: Analyzing)
Pre-writing for Essay Two (Summary and Response) (Based on Chapter 7 readings and Chapter Seven extra readings)
Prepare for Library Orientation
LAB: In-class conferencing Essay 2
Thurs: LIBRARY ORIENTATION – meet Mr. Joe Garity, Librarian, in Gleeson Library lobby at 9:50 a.m.

Week Seven
Tues: Read pp. 237-240 (from Chapter 8: Arguing a Position)
Essay Two (Summary and Response), First Draft due
Peer Editing Essay Two
LAB:
Conferencing on Essay Two
Thurs: Review for First Test
Read pp. 241-245 (from Chapter Eight: Arguing a Position)
Vocabulary Quiz # 3
**Week Eight**
Tues: Essay Two, Second Draft due
Read pp. 581-589 (extra readings for Chapter Eight: Arguing a Position)
Read pp. 246-268 (from Chapter Eight: Arguing a Position)
Vocabulary Quiz # 4
LAB: writing practice; grammar practice
Pre-writing for Essay Three (Argument based on common sources) (using readings from Chapter Eight, and extra readings from Chapter Eight)
Thurs: First Test

**Week Nine**
Tues: LAB: writing practice; grammar practice
Working on Essay Three, First Draft
Thurs: Essay Three (Developing an Argument), First Draft due
Peer Editing Essay Three, First Draft
Read pp. 333-348 (from Chapter 12: Conducting Research)

**Week Ten**
Individual conferences Monday, Wednesday on Essay Three
Tues: In-class conferencing time Week 10
LAB: In-class conferencing on Essay Three
Thurs: Essay Three, Second Draft due
Read pp. 275-287 (from Chapter 9: Proposing a Solution)

**Week Eleven**
Tues: Read pp. 590-598; 287-306 (from Chapter 9: Proposing a Solution)
LAB: writing practice; grammar practice
Pre-writing for Essay Four (Proposing a Solution)
Vocabulary Quiz # 5
Thurs: Read pp. 367-385 (Chapter 13: Taking Timed Writing Tests)

**Week Twelve**
NOTE: On Sunday, November 6th, set your clock back one hour for daylight savings time. Be sure you get to your classes on Monday at the proper time.
Tues: Read pp. 195-205; 228-230 (from Chapter 7: Evaluating)
LAB: writing practice; grammar practice
Checking in on Essay 5
Working on Essay Four
Vocabulary Quiz # 6
Thurs: Essay Four (Proposing a Solution), First Draft due
Peer editing Essay Four

**Week Thirteen**
Optional conferencing on Wednesday on Essay Four
Tues: Read pp. 389-396 (Chapter 14: Writing Resumes and Cover Letters)
LAB: Optional conferencing on Essay Four
Thurs: Essay Four, Second Draft due
Read pp. 315-324 (Chapter 10: Keeping Journals)

**Week Fourteen**
Tues: CAREER SERVICES – Career Services, will come to the class to speak on, and help you practice, writing resumes and cover letters
LAB: writing practice; grammar practice
Preparing for Essay Five
Working on Essay Six
Thurs: NO CLASS – THANKSGIVING – USF HOLIDAY

**Week Fifteen**
Tues: Resumes and Cover Letters due
Catch-up
LAB: Essay 5 – IN-CLASS
Thurs: Review for Test Two
Working on Essay Six

**Week Sixteen**
Tues: Test Two
Thurs: LAST DAY OF CLASS
Essay 6 (Reflective Letter) due
Department In-Class Essay
**SYLLABUS: RHET 110.06 SPRING 2018**

**Instructor:** Nicole Brodsky  
**Email:** nbrodsky@usfca.edu  
**Phone:** +15/422-6243 (Department of Rhetoric and Language)

**Course:** Written Communication I / RHET 110.06 / MWF 1:00-2:05 p.m. / Education 310

**Office Hours and Location:** Monday and Friday 10:30-11:30 a.m., and by scheduled appointment. My office is located on the 4th floor of the Gleeson Library, and you can drop by without an appointment during those times. Please contact me at least 24 hours via email or in class before you want to schedule an appointment outside of my office hours.

**Textbooks and Other Materials:**
- **USF Bookstore:** 1 textbook required—Lunsford & Ruszkiewicz's *Everything’s an Argument* 7th Edition (WITHOUT Readings) (Bedford/St. Martin’s).
- **CANVAS** is USF’s online interface that you will use to submit all major assignments and rough drafts. All essays must be uploaded to CANVAS by the due date/time, and CANVAS only accepts Word Docs or PDFs, so please Save As a .doc or .docx or .pdf before you upload. I do not accept hard copies. If you want a tour of CANVAS, please go to the following address—https://resources.instructure.com/courses/32
- Three-Ring Binder with printed out hard copy of the course Workbook (I will provide this on CANVAS as a PDF)

**Course Description:**
Rhetoric 110/110N introduces students to college-level rhetoric through the composition of projects that respond to important social and academic issues. Students will compose and revise three brief to medium-length written projects—and one informative speech—that are focused, clearly organized, and well supported. Several elements will be taught to support the composition of these projects: incorporating multiple sources in the service of a unified argument; addressing multiple, often conflicting, points of view; developing skills in summary, paraphrase, and quotation; revising texts for coherence and clarity. Students will learn elements of rhetorical theory and develop the ability to critically read a moderate number of instructor-assigned texts. Also, students are introduced to the library as a site of research, academic inquiry, and information literacy. The minimum passing grade for this course is C-.

In this particular section of RHET 110, we will be guided by the Jesuit theory of *eloquentia perfecta:* “the classical ideal of the good person writing and speaking well for the public good."

**Student Learning Outcomes:**
Students who apply themselves will be able to meet the following learning outcomes:
1. integrate writing, speaking, listening, and reading for a central purpose;
2. develop and appropriately employ strategies for addressing the rhetorical situations for different audiences, purposes, and contexts;
3. demonstrate an awareness of their own and others’ rhetorical choices and audiences, as well as their drafting and revising processes.
How we will meet the student learning outcomes for this course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Corresponding Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1—<em>Eloquentia Perfecta</em> in Two Written Arguments</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes: 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2—<em>Eloquentia Perfecta</em> in Your Own Argument: A Letter to the Artinians</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3—Speaking and Writing Your Way Toward Your Hidden Intellectualism: Informative Speech and Persuasive essay</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 3,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assignment Guidelines:**
- 4000-5000 words of revised prose (Each essay must indicate the word count below the title);
- 3 written projects total; 1 informative speech
- All projects incorporate sources: class readings and/or library research and/or primary research.
- 500 pages maximum assigned reading for semester.
Major Assignments and Tentative Due Dates:

- **Unit 1**—*Eloquentia Perfecta* in Two Written Arguments **due 3/5/18**

In a **1250 word essay** (minimum), students will explore the answers to the following questions: How, why, and to what effect does a particular author use rhetorical choices in their writing to persuade the audience(s) to agree with the main point of the text?

- **Unit 2**—*Eloquentia Perfecta* in Your Own Argument: A Letter to the Artinians **due 4/6/18**

In a **1250 word letter** (minimum), students will practice their own rhetorical skills in an attempt to convince a deaf couple to either get a cochlear implant for their five-year-old daughter or not get it.

- **Unit 3**—Speaking and Writing Your Way Toward Your Hidden Intellectualism: Informative Speech and Persuasive essay

For this **3-5 minute speech due 4/18/18 and 4/20/18**, students will be visually and orally informing the class about a non-academic hobby they have a passion for and the skill(s) that they have developed while practicing this hobby. Then in a **1500 word essay (minimum) due 5/11/18**, students will describe and analyze a hobby or interest through which one can develop academic, career, or life skills. Students will consider their audience (student's choice) in order to make wise rhetorical decisions.

- **Optional Revision of Essay #1 or #2**: If you would like to revise one of the first two essays, you may do so at the end of the semester, as long as it was submitted on time (the original due date). This must be submitted on or before **5/11/18**, with all changes and additions highlighted, and a cover letter explaining what you changed and why.

**Course Grade Breakdown:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%

---

**Final Grade calculation and individual essays/participation/speeches will be based on the following percentages:**

- 92.5%–100% = A
- 89.5%–92.4% = A-
- 86.5%–89.4% = B+
- 82.5%–86.4% = B
- 79.5%–82.4% = B-
- 76.5%–79.4% = C+
- 72.5%–76.4% = C
69.5%–72.4% = C-
69.4% and below is considered Not Passing for this class.

**A essays** meet requirements of the assignment, exhibit structural coherence, make significant claims that are justified by appropriate support. They are responsive to audience and meet typical expectations of academic readers, including research, meaningful claims, sufficient organizational signals, and a writing style that is linguistically precise and grammatically complex.

**B essays** meet major requirements of the assignment: their major claims are justified in a reasonable way, and they are generally responsive to the audience. Essays that meet a significant, but not all, of the expectations, tend to fall into the "B" category. An otherwise "A" essay that argues an obvious claim, or offers insufficient support, or contains a number of stylistic or mechanical faults are the typical characteristics of a "B" level essay.

**C essays** meet at least some of the necessary requirements of the assignment, and are comprehensible, exhibiting enough structure, organizational signals, and appropriate style to shape meaning. When essays fall significantly short in one or more of the most significant areas described above, or fall short in most areas, they tend toward a "C." Failing to meet basic assignment requirements—such as summarizing and responding to particular readings, meeting page- or word- minimum limits, failing to use proper research—will also lead a paper to get a "C."

**D and F essays** are deficient in many ways.

All major assignments must be completed in order to pass this course. It is university policy that students receiving a grade lower than C- (69.4% and below) will not be permitted to proceed to the next level.

**A speeches** go beyond merely providing information on a generic topic; they adopt unique, audience-aware angles of vision; they are well supported with sound reasoning and a variety of well-researched evidence, are delivered extemporaneously and in an audience-centered manner, with clear organization revealed through main points, signposts, and transitions.

**B speeches** attend all the basic assignment requirements, and provide well-reasoned arguments in an audience-centered manner. They use transitional elements effectively, and possess an adequate amount of internal coherence and consistency.

**C speeches** follow the basic requirements of the assignment, but may be deficient in one or more ways in the areas described above. (e.g., a well-crafted speech that otherwise may be an "A" or "B" speech will probably get a "C" if it is delivered from a manuscript rather than extemporaneously).

**D and F speeches** are seriously deficient in meeting one or more basic requirements of the assignment. (e.g., an organized interesting speech may receive a "D" or "F" grade if it seriously violates time restraints).
Late Essay and Assignment Policy: You may turn in one late essay (letter-graded), but it must be turned in within a week of the original due date; it cannot be revised; and it will not receive margin comments. The last unit cannot be turned in late! Any late essay after that will suffer the same consequences in addition to being marked down 10 points automatically. You must complete all essays and speeches in order to pass this course.

All other assignments that have exact due dates (quizzes and written responses) will be marked down by half if they are late, and given a zero if they are not submitted within 48 hours.

Attendance Policy: In accordance with the Program in Rhetoric and Language’s recommendations, the attendance policy for this class is as follows:

A. Absences may affect the final grade. Students who miss more than 20% of scheduled classes (four MW or TR classes, six MWF classes, or 12 MTWR classes) may be requested to withdraw from the course; if they do not do so, they may be given a failing grade. Students who miss more than 3 class meetings will have 5 points deducted per class from his/her participation grade. In short, every absence over 3 will deduct 5 participation points.

B. Exception: When representing the University of San Francisco in intercollegiate competition (e.g., athletics, debate), students shall be excused from classes on the hours or days such competition takes them away from classes. However, such students shall be responsible for advising their professors regarding anticipated absences and for arranging to complete course work for classes, laboratories, and/or examinations missed.

Participation: Your participation grade includes all homework, class discussion, quizzes, classroom behavior, and attendance. The following will affect your participation grade and possibly your final course grade: not turning in assignments, not coming to class prepared with readings, not participating in class discussion, missing more than three classes, coming late or leaving early, disrupting the class. Your participation grade is generated based on the following breakdown: 50 points for attendance + 30 points for attendance at three peer-response sessions + 20 points for participation in the learning community (class preparedness, discussion, board work, writer’s chair, lab work) = 100 points.

Behavioral Expectations: All students are expected to behave in accordance with the Student Conduct Code and other University policies (see http://www.usfca.edu/fogcutter/). Open discussion and disagreement is encouraged when done respectfully and in the spirit of academic discourse. There are also a variety of behaviors that, while not against a specific University policy, may create disruption in this course. Students whose behavior is disruptive or who fail to comply with the instructor may be dismissed from the class for the remainder of the class period and may need to meet with the instructor or Dean prior to returning to the next class period. If necessary, referrals may also be made to the Student Conduct process for violations of the Student Conduct Code.

Peer Response: At best this class is a community of thinkers openly exchanging their thoughts and ideas and finding new ways to express themselves. Peer response (some sessions will be face-to-face some will be fully online) is a chance for you to get feedback from your classmates on your rough drafts before turning in the essays. I will expect that you treat each other with respect and offer constructive, thoughtful help in the peer-review process. You must attend all 3 of the peer-response sessions with rough drafts uploaded before peer response begins in order to receive full credit for
participation. If you know in advance that you will miss a peer-response session, I may be able to allow you to complete the assignment online from elsewhere though you will still be counted as absent. If you do miss all or part of peer response, your participation grade will be deducted by 10 points for every missed session. You can get partial credit (5 points) if you participate even if you do not upload a draft.

Conferences: I am available to meet with you to discuss your work during my office hours and by appointment with 24 hours notice of request. Please don’t hesitate to contact me for help with the course; I am eager to assist you with many aspects of the assignments. Always let me know in advance by email if you must cancel a conference, so I can use the time to meet with someone else.

Time Management and Planning: Students are expected to spend 2 hours outside of class in study and preparation of assignments for each hour in class. In a 4 unit class, assignments have been created with the expectation that students will engage in approximately 8 hours of out-of-class work per week; in a 2 unit class, students should expect to spend approximately 4 hours per week outside of class in study and preparation. Intensive classes may count the 2 hours of lab time as part of the out-of-class work.

Confidentiality, Mandatory Reporting, and Sexual Assault: As an instructor, one of my responsibilities is to help create a safe learning environment on our campus. I also have a mandatory reporting responsibility related to my role as a faculty member. I am required to share information regarding sexual misconduct or information about a crime that may have occurred on USFs campus with the University. Here are other resources:

- To report any sexual misconduct, students may visit Anna Bartkowski (UC 5th floor) or see many other options by visiting our website: www.usfca.edu/student_life/safer
- Students may speak to someone confidentially, or report a sexual assault confidentially by contacting Counseling and Psychological Services at 415-422-6352.
- To find out more about reporting a sexual assault at USF, visit USFs Callisto website at: www.usfca.callistocampus.org.
- For an off-campus resource, contact San Francisco Women Against Rape (SFWAR) (415) 647-7273 (www.sfwar.org).

Academic Integrity:
USF Honor Code: As a Jesuit institution committed to cura personalis—the care and education of the whole person—USF has an obligation to embody and foster the values of honesty and integrity. USF upholds the standards of honesty and integrity from all members of the academic community. All students are expected to know and adhere to the University’s Honor Code. You can find the full text of the code online at www.usfca.edu/fogcutter. As it particularly pertains to the Department of Rhetoric and Language, the policy covers:

- Plagiarism—intentionally or unintentionally representing the words or ideas of another person as your own; failure to properly cite references; manufacturing references Working with another person when independent work is required
- Submission of the same paper in more than one course without the specific permission of each instructor
- Submitting a paper written by another person or obtained from the internet.
The penalties for violation of the policy may include a failing grade on the assignment, a failing grade in the course, and/or a referral to the Dean and the Committee on Student Academic Honesty. In addition, a letter will be sent to the Associate Dean for Student Academic Services; the letter will remain in your file for two years after you graduate, after which you may petition for its removal.

USF Student Resources

**Students with Disabilities:** If you are a student with a disability or disabling condition, or if you think you may have a disability, please contact USF Student Disability Services (SDS) at 415-422-2613 within the first week of class, or immediately upon onset of disability, to speak with a disability specialist. If you are determined eligible for reasonable accommodations, please meet with your disability specialist so they can arrange to have your

**Counseling and Psychological Services:** Our diverse staff offers brief individual, couple, and group counseling to student members of our community. CAPS services are confidential and free of charge. Call 415-422-6352 for an initial consultation appointment. Having a crisis at 3 AM? We are still here for you. Telephone consultation through CAPS After Hours is available between the hours of 5:00 PM to 8:30 AM; call the above number and press 2.

**Speaking Center:** Located in the lower level of Gleeson Library, The Speaking Center is available to help all USF students prepare for speeches—such as oral presentations, team presentations, and visual aid demonstrations. The coaches / tutors are USF students, selected because of their skill and experience (and excellent grades) in public speaking, and they can help you with a variety of aspects of public speaking, including delivery, topic selection, research, and outlining. Speaking Coaches are available for appointments Monday through Friday 9:00am to 6:00pm; to make an appointment, please use the Salesforce scheduling system at [myusf.force.com](https://myusf.force.com), visit the library, call (415) 422-6713, or email speakingcenter@usfca.edu. For more information on the USF Speaking Center or help making appointments, please check out our home page, [https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/lwc/speaking-center](https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/lwc/speaking-center).

**Writing Center:** is located in lower level of Gleeson Library. The primary goal of the Writing Center is to help students develop their writing skills in rhetoric, organization, style, and structure, through one-on-one interactive conferences with writing consultants. Students are encouraged to come to the Writing Center if they would like to think through ideas, revise their work for clarity and organization, or work on editing and proofreading skills. Please call (415) 422-6713, use the Salesforce scheduling system at [myusf.force.com](https://myusf.force.com), or visit the library for an appointment.

Various Workshops in Reading and Writing are available to assist students with academic writing, reading, and speaking: See the schedule of classes for times and days for RHET 101, 105, 107, 113. And various Students Success Workshops are offered by CASA.

**Financial Aid - FAFSA priority filing deadline (undergraduates only):**
Rhetoric 120: Written Communication II
University of San Francisco- Fall 2017

Contact Information:
Nicole Gonzales Howell, PhD (ncgonzaleshowell@usfca.edu)
Department of Rhetoric and Language | University of San Francisco
Office: KA 281 | Phone: 415.422.4984 | Office Hours: W 9:30a-12:30p and by appointment

Section 03-40163: TR 9:55-11:50 p.m. | LM 141A
Section 07-40166: TR 12:45-2:30 p.m. | LM 345

Required texts and materials

- Assigned readings, videos, websites as made available
  - Available electronically through Canvas
- Films may be required to rent if necessary
- Students may be asked to print hard copies of written assignments

About the course: Written Communication II (RHET120) Fulfills Core A2

Written Communication II
With a firm basis in the elements of rhetoric, critical reading, written argumentation, and library research established in RHET 110, students in RHET 120 learn to compose more ambitious arguments responding to and incorporating sources of greater number, length, complexity, and variety. In order to meet the demands of advanced academic discourse, students also (a) develop skills in critical analysis of challenging non-fiction prose texts from a range of disciplinary perspectives and subjects, with a particular focus on the linguistic and rhetorical strategies employed in these texts, and (b) conduct extensive library research in the process of planning and composing sophisticated academic papers. Students will also gain practice editing for stylistic fluency in accordance with conventions of advanced academic prose. Finally, students develop greater independence in formulating strategies for revision and expansion of written arguments. The minimum passing grade for this course is C-. This course fulfills Core A2, the University writing requirement.
Student Learning Outcomes:
Core A2 Outcomes: Rhetoric and Composition
1. Critical analysis of academic discourse: Students critically analyze linguistic and rhetorical strategies used in long and complex texts from a variety of genres, subjects, and fields.
2. Integrating multiple academic sources: Students incorporate multiple texts of length and complexity within a unified argumentative essay, addressing connections and differences among them.
3. Academic research: Students develop sophisticated research questions and compose substantial arguments in response to those questions, incorporating extensive independent library research and demonstrating mastery of standard academic documentation modes.
4. Style: Students edit their own prose to achieve a clear and mature writing style in keeping with the conventions of academic and/or professional discourse.
5. Revision: Students develop their own revision strategies for extending and enriching early drafts and for producing polished advanced academic writing.

Course work:
This class is a Project-based course. You will select a project you’re interested in “taking public” and complete all the tasks necessary to have an ethical and successful final project. Thus, this course is not set up by unit projects. Instead, it is organized by emphases and required tasks.

Writing and Rhetorical theory
- Writing theory readings and writing practices
- Rhetorical theory readings and rhetorical practices
  - Review: rhetorical situation (exigence, audience, constraints, and more) and rhetorical triangle Ethos, Pathos, Logos, Kairos
- Audience
  - Discourse communities
- Genre
  - Oral communication
TASKS: Readings, academic summary, analysis, formal oral presentation “Storytelling to make change”

Information Literacy
- What is Information Literacy?
- Fake news
- Why do research?
TASKS: Readings, discussion boards, annotations, quizzes, citation work

Project Research (on-going but prioritized here)
- Delve into your “passion project”
Research the “conversation”
Visual Rhetoric
Understanding audience

TASKS: Annotated bibliography, 5-6 page research paper that details the “current conversation”, 3-4 page project proposal (media, audience, message, purpose)

Crafting Public Project
Working with technology
Multimedia
Reflection

TASKS: Public project completion, oral presentation (rhetorical analysis of public project)

Formatting Requirements:
Most written tasks must be typed, double spaced, with 1” margins on all sides, using a 12-point standard, non-cursive font on white, non-erasable 8.5 x 11 paper. MLA or APA style will be designated for each paper.

Grading and Evaluation

Grades:
For this course we will not be using a traditional grading scale and instead we will use a grading contract (see the grading contract for more details).

We will discuss the grading contract in depth during class and a copy of the contract will remain on our Canvas page throughout the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Absences</th>
<th># of Late/re-do Assignments</th>
<th># of Overdue Assignments</th>
<th># of Ignored Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4 or less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6 or less</td>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Earning an A
As you see, the grade of B depends on behaviors*. The A course grade, however, depends on behavior, impeccable attention to the details, and working beyond standard expectations. Thus, students earn a B if they put in good time, effort, and thought; I will support all students in earning a B. But to get an A, students will excel in all expectations.

*Understand that “behaviors” refers to actions such as showing up to class consistently, being actively engaged while in class, turning work in on time and as assigned, etc.
Part of the requirements for getting an A include:
- Students meet with me to discuss their writing, especially before a paper is due. Students will go to the tutoring centers listed on the syllabus if they desire to receive additional help.
- Students move above and beyond the requirements of the assignments and the class, which might include doing extra research, extra writing, and extra revising.
- Students participate and contribute significantly to the class discussion (every class, several times per class) by bringing in additional information or examples (putting writing samples on the board/projector) that will enhance the class’s knowledge of the subject or material being discussed during class.
- Students demonstrate an awareness of audience, critical thinking, argumentation, and use of evidence in the writing.
- Students submit closely edited final drafts.

In-class/Attendance:
1. Attendance/Participation. You’ll attend and fully participate in at least 90% of our scheduled class sessions and their activities and assignments (that’s at least 29 sessions). You may miss (for whatever reason) 3 class sessions. For our class, attendance equates to participation. Therefore, it is not enough for you simply to come to class. If you come to class unprepared in any way (e.g. without work done, assignments unread, etc.), it will be counted as an absence, since you won’t be able to participate fully in our activities. This means any informal assignment given, or ones not outlined on our syllabus, fit into this category of attendance and participation.

2. Lateness. You’ll come on time or early to class. Walking into class late 2 or 3 times in a semester is understandable, but coming habitually late every week is not. If you are late to class, you are still responsible to find out what assignments or instructions were made, but please don’t disrupt our class by asking about the things you missed because you were late.

*EXCEPTION: When representing the USF in intercollegiate competition (e.g., athletics, debate,) students shall be excused from classes on the hours or days such competition takes them away. However, such students shall be responsible for advising their professors regarding anticipated absences and for arranging to complete course work for classes, laboratories, and/or examinations missed.

Student Services

Students with Disabilities
If you are a student with a disability or disabling condition, or if you think you may have a disability, please contact USF Student Disability Services (SDS) at 415 422-2613 within the first week of class, or immediately upon onset of disability, to speak with a disability specialist.

If you are determined eligible for reasonable accommodations, please meet with your disability specialist so they can arrange to have your accommodation letter sent to me, and we will discuss your needs for this course. For more information, please visit: http://www.usfca.edu/sds or call (415) 422-2613.
Counseling and Psychological Services
Our diverse staff offers brief individual, couple, and group counseling to student members of our community. CAPS services are confidential and free of charge. Call 415-422-6352 for an initial consultation appointment. Having a crisis at 3 AM? We are still here for you. Telephone consultation through CAPS After Hours is available between the hours of 5:00 PM to 8:30 AM; call the above number and press 2.

Confidentiality, Mandatory Reporting, and Sexual Assault
As an instructor, one of my responsibilities is to help create a safe learning environment on our campus. I also have a mandatory reporting responsibility related to my role as a faculty member. I am required to share information regarding sexual misconduct or information about a crime that may have occurred on USFs campus with the University. Here are other resources:

☐ To report any sexual misconduct, students may visit Anna Bartkowski (UC 5th floor) or see many other options by visiting our website: www.usfca.edu/student_life/safer
☐ Students may speak to someone confidentially, or report a sexual assault confidentially by contacting Counseling and Psychological Services at 415-422-6352.
☐ To find out more about reporting a sexual assault at USF, visit USFs Callisto website at: www.usfca.callistocampus.org.
☐ For an off-campus resource, contact San Francisco Women Against Rape (SFWAR) (415) 647-7273 (www.sfwar.org).

Learning & Writing Center
The Learning & Writing Center is located in lower level of Gleeson Library. The primary goal of the Writing Center is to help students develop their writing skills in rhetoric, organization, style, and structure, through one-on-one interactive conferences with writing consultants. Students are encouraged to come to the Writing Center if they would like to think through ideas, revise their work for clarity and organization, or work on editing and proofreading skills. Please call (415) 422-6713, use the Salesforce scheduling system at myusf.force.com, or visit the library for an appointment. For more information visit https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/lwc

The Speaking Center
The Speaking Center is located in the lower level of Gleeson Library, The Speaking Center is available to help all USF students prepare for speeches--such as oral presentations, team presentations, and visual aid demonstrations. The coaches / tutors are USF students, selected because of their skill and experience (and excellent grades) in public speaking, and they can help you with a variety of aspects of public speaking, including delivery, topic selection, research, and outlining. Speaking Coaches are available for appointments Monday through Friday 9:00am to 6:00pm; to make an appointment, please use the salesforce scheduling system at myusf.force.com, visit the library, call (415) 422-6713, or email speakingcenter@usfca.edu. For more information
on the USF Speaking Center or help making appointments, please check out our home page.
https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/lwc/speaking-center

Academic Expectations and Important Deadlines

Academic Integrity
As a Jesuit institution committed to cura personalis—the care and education of the whole person—USF has an obligation to embody and foster the values of honesty and integrity. USF upholds the standards of honesty and integrity from all members of the academic community. All students are expected to know and adhere to the University's Honor Code. You can find the full text of the code online at www.usfca.edu/academic_integrity. The policy covers:

- Plagiarism — intentionally or unintentionally representing the words or ideas of another person as your own; failure to properly cite references; manufacturing references.
- Working with another person when independent work is required.
- Submission of the same paper in more than one course without the specific permission of each instructor.
- Submitting a paper written by another person or obtained from the internet.
- The penalties for violation of the policy may include a failing grade on the assignment, a failing grade in the course, and/or a referral to the Academic Integrity Committee.

Behavioral Expectations
All students are expected to behave in accordance with the Student Conduct Code and other University policies (see http://www.usfca.edu/fogcutter/). Open discussion and disagreement is encouraged when done respectfully and in the spirit of academic discourse. There are also a variety of behaviors that, while not against a specific University policy, may create disruption in this course. Students whose behavior is disruptive or who fail to comply with the instructor may be dismissed from the class for the remainder of the class period and may need to meet with the instructor or Dean prior to returning to the next class period. If necessary, referrals may also be made to the Student Conduct process for violations of the Student Conduct Code.

Student Accounts - Last day to withdraw with tuition reversal
Students who wish to have the tuition charges reversed on their student account should withdraw from the course(s) by the end of the business day on the last day to withdraw with tuition credit (census date) for the applicable course(s) in which the student is enrolled. Please note that the last day to withdraw with tuition credit may vary by course. The last day to withdraw with tuition credit (census date) listed in the Academic Calendar is applicable only to courses which meet for the standard 15-week semester. To find what the last day to withdraw with tuition credit is for a specific course, please visit the Online Class Schedule at www.usfca.edu/schedules.
Financial Aid - FAFSA priority filing deadline (undergraduates only)
March 2 - Priority filing deadline for FAFSA (The Free Application for Federal Student Aid - https://fafsa.ed.gov/) for continuing undergraduates.
OBJECTIVES: This course is designed to familiarize you with the discourse modes of the physical and life sciences and to give you the opportunity to develop writing skills for these disciplines, including writing reviews of scholarly articles, writing for the general public and writing a research paper. Through class discussion, group activities, writing, review and revision, you will improve your critical thinking and writing skills and be able to communicate with audiences in a variety of genres.

Our goals include:

1) Critical analysis of academic discourse: critically analyze linguistic and rhetorical strategies used in long and complex texts from a variety of genres, subjects, and fields.

2) Integrating multiple academic sources: incorporate multiple texts of length and complexity within a unified argumentative essay, addressing connections and differences among them.

3) Academic research: develop sophisticated research questions and compose substantial arguments in response to those questions, incorporating extensive independent library research and demonstrating mastery of standard academic documentation modes.

4) Style: edit your own prose to achieve a clear and mature writing style in keeping with the conventions of academic and/or professional discourse.

5) Revision: develop your own revision strategies for extending and enriching early drafts and for producing polished advanced academic writing.

REQUIRED TEXTS: A Student’s Guide to Writing in the Life Sciences, on Canvas
Other resources are available on the class site on Canvas.
GRADING: Your grade is calculated as follows:

Homework : 15%
Peer Reviews: 10%
Genre Analysis: 15%
Article Review: 15%
Article for the Public: 20%
The Research Paper 25%

Grade Scale:
A       = 94-100%
A-      = 90-93.9
B       = 84-86.7
B-      = 80-83.9
C       = 74-76.9
C-      = 70-73.9
B+      = 87-89.9
C+      = 77-79.9
D       = 60-69.9
F       = less than 60%

ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION: Attendance is a crucial part of this class, as we will be doing a good amount of in-class collaboration, including class discussion, group activities and peer review. In addition, your absence negatively affects group dynamics and class community. Similarly, your presence in body but not in spirit in class has the same effect, so you are expected to participate in class discussions and work, rather than acting as a passive participant/spectator.

Taking the above into consideration, you should be prompt as well. Anyone arriving more than 10 minutes after class has started will be counted absent. Anyone leaving class early without having first asked for permission ahead of time will be counted absent.

I understand that absences are often unavoidable, but I should receive written notice of any absences you know of ahead of time and written explanations for absences that are unplanned. You are allowed three absences, whether they are explained or not. After that, I drop your grade by 3 points per absence.

Exception
When representing the University of San Francisco in intercollegiate competition (e.g., athletics, debate), students shall be excused from classes on the hours or days such competition takes them away from classes. However, such students shall be responsible for advising their professors regarding anticipated absences and for arranging to complete course work for classes, laboratories, and/or examinations missed.

READER'S RESPONSE PAPERS AND HOMEWORK: You will turn in reader's responses to reading assignments on a regular basis. All reading and homework assignments will be posted on Canvas. The directions and due date will be stated for each assignment. Late submissions will not be allowed. All reader's response papers must be at least 200 words and no more than 400 words. Not meeting or exceeding the word-count requirement will result in no credit for the assignment. If there is only a textbox in the homework, you do not have to create a document. If an upload option is available, the homework must be submitted in PDF format. Most often your word processing program will have an option in “Save as” or "print." You can create a copy of the document as a PDF. In Microsoft word, you would go to “Print As...” and then find the option for PDF.
Note: If you try to submit your work on Canvas on time and have technical difficulties, **copy the screen with the error message, print that out, along with a hard-copy of your assignment, and submit it to me the following class session. No other late submittals will be accepted. Do not email me your assignments directly unless I specifically ask you to. They will not be counted as turned in.**

**PEER REVIEW:** One of the most important parts of the writing process involves engaging our peers in review of our work, asking others for feedback on what we have written, what works well, and what doesn't work so well. With this in mind, we will review each other's papers, three times, in order to develop a better understanding of our own work and how to help others with their work. During the class session before a major paper is due, we will trade rough drafts and, following specific criteria, review them and provide feedback. We will first do a mock peer review to anchor us.

**ESSAY FORMATTING:** Your papers should be typed, **double-spaced**, with fonts no larger than 12 point. Your margins should be no narrower or wider than 1 inch top and bottom, left and right. We will cover APA formatting for cover pages and running heads. Your essays should have titles as well.

The final drafts of your papers will be submitted in PDF format on Canvas. All major paper assignments will be posted on Canvas, with specifications regarding length, rough draft due dates, content, and other requirements.

**LATE WORK:** I teach a multitude of classes and am as busy as you are, so I don't take late work. However, I **allow you to turn in one essay late, one class session late, no more,** and I reduce the grade automatically by one letter grade. After that, you are on your own. If you fear that you are not going to make a due date, come talk to me ahead of time.

**REVISIONS:** Revision is an integral part of the writing process, and definitely beneficial at the beginning of the semester, when students are still familiarizing themselves with their teachers' expectations. Therefore, **you may revise either the first or second paper of the semester** for a better grade. The revision of a paper will be due two weeks after I give it back to you. I will announce the due date in class for each revision, so that you know exactly when it's due. The due date for the revision will also be available on Canvas, and you will turn the revision in there. If you receive a "Revise" on a paper instead of a grade, you must come see me during office hours before beginning the revision and ultimately receiving an actual grade. Papers that received a "Revise" but never actually get revised—even if you turn the paper in again—will be recorded as a N/C.

**INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY:** I encourage people to take pictures of any notes that end up on the board. I also encourage you to use the technology available to you to enhance the learning experience. You may use your laptops in class to participate in group projects and to take notes. However, if I catch you surfing the net for entertainment, checking your Facebook page, tweeting, chatting or otherwise using your laptop in ways that do not relate directly to what we are doing in class, I will mark you absent and ban you from using your device for the rest of the semester.

If your cell phone rings or vibrates, I will also mark you absent. Ringing and vibrating cell phones are a huge distraction and disrespectful to everyone trying to pay attention. If you have
some kind of situation that requires you have your cell phone on, let me know at the beginning of class. And then set it on vibrate.

If my phone rings or vibrates during class, you get brownies the next class session. Fair is fair.

**TIME MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING**: Students are expected to spend 2 hours outside of class in study and preparation of assignments for each hour in class. In a 4 unit class, assignments have been created with the expectation that students will engage in approximately 8 hours of out-of-class work per week; in a 2 unit class, students should expect to spend approximately 4 hours per week outside of class in study and preparation. Intensive classes may count the 2 hours of lab time as part of the out-of-class work.

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

**USF Honor Code**: As a Jesuit institution committed to *cura personalis*—the care and education of the whole person—USF has an obligation to embody and foster the values of honesty and integrity. USF upholds the standards of honesty and integrity from all members of the academic community. All students are expected to know and adhere to the University’s Honor Code. You can find the full text of the code online at [www.usfca.edu/fogcutter](http://www.usfca.edu/fogcutter). As it particularly pertains to the Program in Rhetoric and Composition, the policy covers:

- Plagiarism—intentionally or unintentionally representing the words or ideas of another person as your own; failure to properly cite references; manufacturing references
- Working with another person when independent work is required
- Submission of the same paper in more than one course without the specific permission of each instructor
- Submitting a paper written by another person or obtained from the internet.

The penalties for violation of the policy may include a failing grade on the assignment, a failing grade in the course, and/or a referral to the Dean and the Committee on Student Academic Honesty. In addition, a letter will be sent to the Associate Dean for Student Academic Services; the letter will remain in your file for two years after you graduate, after which you may petition for its removal.

**STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES**: If you are a student with a disability or disabling condition, or if you think you may have a disability, please contact USF Student Disability Services (SDS) at 415 422-2613 within the first week of class, or immediately upon onset of disability, to speak with a disability specialist. If you are determined eligible for reasonable accommodations, please meet with your disability specialist so they can arrange to have your accommodation letter sent to me, and we will discuss your needs for this course. For more information, please visit: [http://www.usfca.edu/sds](http://www.usfca.edu/sds)

**RESOURCES:**

The Writing Center is located in 215 Cowell, and they are open 10:00-8:00 Monday through Thursday and until 5:00 on Friday. Please call 422-6713 to make an appointment with a Writing Center Consultant to talk over your paper. They can be extremely helpful in providing additional reader feedback at any stage of your writing process. The Writing Center also has drop-in consultant to help you from 1:00-4:00 Monday through Thursday in Gleeson Library. The Writing Center table is located in the computer room on the main floor, accessible through the Thatcher Art Gallery. Remember, the best time to bring your paper in for feedback is well before it is due.

Located in Malloy Hall, Room 106, The Speaking Center is available to help all USF students prepare for speeches—such as oral presentations, team presentations, and powerpoint
demonstrations. The coaches are USF students, selected because of their skill and experience (and excellent grades) in public speaking, and they can help you with a variety of aspects of public speaking, including delivery and outlining. Tutors are available on a drop-in basis (hours announced in the second week of the semester) as well as for special appointments; please visit the tutoring center or email speakingcenter@usfca.edu to make an appointment. Various **Workshops** in Reading and Writing are available to assist students with academic writing, reading, and speaking: See the schedule of classes for times and days for RHET 100, 101, 105, 107.

**STUFF HAPPENS:** No doubt there will be times during the semester when things become overwhelming, when the unexpected happens, when all the things that can go wrong will go wrong. As long as you communicate with me and keep me apprised of your situation when the going gets tough, I can help you create a plan to get through, and we can find some reasonable compromise. But no communication gets no compassion. Do not skip the majority of class, or perform badly without explaining why, and then ask me at the end of the semester how you can make up 10 weeks’ worth of work in order to pass the class. It won't happen. But if you talk to me, early and often, and let me know what's going on with you, I am quite amenable to a number of solutions.

"If you're going through hell, keep going."
-- Winston Churchill

Remember: we are going to have an awesome time in this class!
The schedule below plots out our weekly goals and assignments, but does not by any means serve as an adequate substitute for inquiring about exact assignments and due dates. All that information will be given in class and then posted on Canvas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Assignments Due</th>
<th>Goals, Activities</th>
<th>Readings and Assignments Scheduled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 25-29</td>
<td>Mon:------------- Mon: Syllabus quiz on Canvas.</td>
<td>Introduction to Course; What makes a good lab report? Basic sentence structure, the use of passive and active voice.</td>
<td>Wed: Radiolab Pick 1. Choose listen to a Radiolab episode and summarize it in 150-200 words. Upload on Canvas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1-5</td>
<td>Mon: Response to Videos Mon: Read: PP 7-16 in A Student’s Guide… (ASG) In-text pagination!</td>
<td>Writing Lab Reports, In-Class Experiment</td>
<td>Wed: Lab Report Assignment posted on Canvas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 8-12</td>
<td>Mon: Lab Report Mon: Read “The Teeming Metropolis of You” and summarize in 100 words.</td>
<td>Genre Analysis In-Class genre analysis with Radiolab, Sentence Combining 1: NPAs</td>
<td>Wed: A mini genre analysis of Neil DeGrasse Tyson’s, “The Most Astounding Fact” Use the guidelines in the assignment. Submit on Canvas as .doc or PDF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed: “The Teeming Metropolis of You” Mon: Read “The Teeming Metropolis of You” and summarize in 100 words. Wed: A mini genre analysis of Neil DeGrasse Tyson’s, “The Most Astounding Fact” Use the guidelines in the assignment. Submit on Canvas as .doc or PDF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 15-19</td>
<td>DeGrasse-Tyson Genre Analysis</td>
<td>Outlining</td>
<td>Radiolab 2, Genre Analysis pick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Paper Assignment; Brainstorming—SEE POSSIBLE ARTICLES POSTED ON CANVAS!</td>
<td>Wed: Mock peer review: Read the papers posted on Canvas and be prepared for class discussion and review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NPAs, ctd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 22-26</td>
<td>Presidents’ Day—No classes</td>
<td>“to be” verbs</td>
<td>Prepare for mock peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mock peer review</td>
<td>Wed: Rough review of Genre Analysis, 2 copies for peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 29-Mar. 4</td>
<td>Rough draft, genre analysis</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Final draft, genre analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conventions and Rhetorical Goals for Review Writing.</td>
<td>Wed: ASG PP 35-39; Read the articles posted for in-class review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 7-11</td>
<td>ASG reading summary, article</td>
<td>In-class review of article</td>
<td>Brief statement of what article you’ll be reviewing, with citation and basic thesis statement. Turn in on Canvas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraphrasing Exercise</td>
<td>Wed: Radiolab 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Phrases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 14-18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 21-25</td>
<td>Radiolab 3</td>
<td>Outlining</td>
<td>Rough Draft, 2 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Phrases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 25</td>
<td>Rough Draft</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Final Draft, Paper 2 due Sunday, Mar. 20, 11:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Mar. 28-Apr. 1** | **Mon:** | Writing for the Public  
Comparison/Contrast genre analysis  
Choosing a topic  
Paraphrasing, Analogies, metaphors and similes.  
“to be” verbs  
**Wed:** | ASG reading, Radiolab 4  
**Mon:** | ASG, 39-42. Be prepared to discuss in class. Radiolab 4  
**Wed:** | Identify the topic you will be writing about. Upload to Canvas |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Apr. 4-8** | **Mon:** Identify topic  
**Wed:** | Group work—  
Historical discoveries  
Language that is more spoken than written.  
**Mon:** | | **Wed:** Outline, article for the public |
| **Apr. 11-15** | **Mon:** Outline, article for the public  
**Wed:** **Rough Draft, article for the public**  
**Outlining**  
**Peer Review** | Outlining  
**Peer Review** | **Mon:** | **Rough draft, article for the public**  
**Wed:** Final Draft Due Sunday, April 17, 11:00 p.m. |
| **Apr. 18-22** | **Mon:**  
**Wed:** ASG 53-60; APA website  
Introduction to the research paper (Literature Review)  
Paragraphs  
Inserting quotes, templates  
Refining the topic  
Adjective Clauses | Mon: ASG PP 53-60; Go over the APA website and watch the tutorial, and write 125-150 words about what you discovered on the tutorial and the website.  
**Wed:** Identify the topic you might write your review of the literature about.  
Radiolab 5  
**Mon:** | **Wed:** |
| **April 25-29** | **Mon:** Topic choice  
**Wed:** ASG 61-68; Initial bibliography  
Organization of the review of the literature.  
Research Question 1  
Paragraph Focus | Mon: ASG 61-68; Initial bibliography assignment. Provide at least 4 sources, using APA citation;  
**Wed:** | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Monday Event</th>
<th>Tuesday Event</th>
<th>Wednesday Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2-6</td>
<td>Answers to research question 1</td>
<td>Research question 2</td>
<td>Radiolab 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon:</td>
<td>Wed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research question 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19-13</td>
<td>Outline of research question 2</td>
<td>Discussion and conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon:</td>
<td>Wed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research question 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16-20</td>
<td>Final Draft Research Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Writing at USF  
Fall 2017  
"Creating Change with Agency and Voice"

Program: Rhetoric and Composition  
Instructor: Christopher DeLorenzo  

Section: 0102-250-03
Meetings: Club Ed & Malloy Lobby  
Office Hours: M/W/F 4:00-5:00 (and by appointment)  

Location: MH 129
E-mail: delorenzo@usfca.edu  
Phone: 415 422-6243 (Rhet office)  

Class Times: MWF 2:05 - 3:15
Class Dates: 8/23-12/06

Texts
A Sequence for Academic Writing (6th Edition), Behrens and Rosen (Required)  
A Pocket Style Manual, Nancy Sommers & Diana Hacker (7th Edition) (Suggested)

Course Description
With a firm basis in the elements of rhetoric, critical reading, written argumentation, and library research established in RHET 110, students in RHET 120 learn to compose more ambitious arguments responding to and incorporating sources of greater number, length, complexity, and variety. In order to meet the demands of advanced academic discourse, students also (a) develop skills in critical analysis of challenging non-fiction prose texts from a range of disciplinary perspectives and subjects, with a particular focus on the linguistic and rhetorical strategies employed in these texts, and (b) conduct extensive library research in the process of planning and composing sophisticated academic papers. Students will also gain practice editing for stylistic fluency in accordance with conventions of advanced academic prose. Finally, students develop greater independence in formulating strategies for revision and expansion of written arguments. Prerequisite: C- or higher in RHET 110, or permission by the Chair of the department.

Required Learning Outcomes (with noted corresponding assignments)
The University requires that all students who pass this class develop rhetorical strategies and skills beyond the level of Introduction to Written Communication. To do this you must master the following:

Critical analysis of academic discourse: Students critically analyze linguistic and rhetorical strategies used in long and complex texts from a variety of genres, subjects, and fields. (Rhetorical Analysis Essay and response papers)

Integrating multiple academic sources: Students incorporate multiple texts of length and complexity within a unified argumentative essay, addressing connections and differences among them. (Environmental Project, opposing sources workshop, response papers)
Academic research: Students develop sophisticated research questions and compose substantial arguments in response to those questions, incorporating extensive independent library research and demonstrating mastery of standard academic documentation modes. (*Human Rights Investigative Research Essay, response papers*)

Style: Students edit their own prose to achieve a clear and mature writing style in keeping with the conventions of academic and/or professional discourse. (*Rhetorical Analysis Essay, meetings, peer workshops, and homework assignments*)

Revision: Students develop their own revision strategies for extending and enriching early drafts and for producing polished advanced academic writing. (*All final essays, meetings, peer workshops, and homework assignments*)

**Course Structure and Approach**

This course will fulfill the Core writing requirement and adheres to the standards and research methods expected at USF. Together, we will look at the various ways powerful writing can create change. There will be an emphasis on developing arguments with conviction, and establishing claims that develop agency and voice for each writer.

We will look at the published writings of others and examine that writing critically. Some of the questions we'll consider are:

What factors affect a writer's position on a topic?
Do nationality and cultural identity play a part in defining human rights and freedom?
How might we benefit from considering the experiences and positions of others when arguing our own?

To develop effective, sophisticate argument essays, we will focus on the writing process itself: brainstorming, focusing, planning, drafting and revision. Classmates will focus on writing as an action, and utilizing peer review sessions in constructive ways will be one tool to develop essay writing. We'll encourage each writer to think and read critically.

**Course Requirements**

**A. Essays and Projects:**
You will write two longer essays in this course, and two shorter essays. The longer essays include a Rhetorical Analysis essay and an in-depth, Investigative Research essay that addresses a human rights issue and proposes change. Your shorter essays will include an Argument for a Public Audience, and an Environmental Research Project. The latter will include source evaluation and a brief presentation, as will the Human Rights essay. Students are also required to write self-evaluations and create goals for revision. Each essay will include a checklist to help you stay focused on the requirements for the assignment. You will be given a final grade on the final draft or each assignment, but you will also be graded
on your drafting process, and you must hand in each draft on the due date. If you do not bring a draft to class on the assigned day, your final draft grade will be lowered significantly.

**B. Reading Response Papers:**
You will be required to submit a minimum of one page (double-spaced, typed), responses to the scheduled reading assignments. Responses will be evaluated for your ability to identify the arguments presented in the readings, to evaluate the sources utilized in each reading, and respond in writing. You are responsible for having paper copies of—or electronic access to—the readings when we discuss them in class.

**C. Workshops/Peer Review:**
As fellow writers you will sometimes respond to each other's writing in pairs and smaller peer editing groups. You will sometimes be required to share your writing with other class members.

**D. Presentations:**
Each student will be required to present information on a topic relevant to the Environmental Project and the Human Rights essay. This will be brief (5-10 minutes), and will be guided by a series of questions given to you ahead of time. These questions will be relevant to the scaffolding and requirements of the current assignment.

**E. Quizzes:**
There will be one quiz, which will focus on MLA citation requirements and source evaluation. The quiz will follow several lectures and class activities on these topics.

**F. Participation and Attendance:**
Students will be encouraged to develop and articulate their positions and ideas in class discussions, and need to be present for class activities. Being excessively late for class, or missing many classes will significantly lower your grade. Students who miss more than two weeks of scheduled classes may be encouraged to withdraw from the course to avoid a failing grade. Students who are more generally quiet during class will be gently encouraged to participate and have a voice in our class discussions.

**Evaluation Methods and Major Deadlines**
Your grade will be based on the work you produce for this class and your participation in class discussions and presentations. The grading procedure for this class is broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response papers and homework</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Analysis essay</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Project: Essay &amp; Presentation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative Research essay</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument for a Public Audience</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation &amp; Attendance</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grading Scale
100-93 = A; 92-90 = A-; 89-87 = B+; 86-83 = B; 82-80 = B-; 79-77 = C+; 76-73 = C; 72-70 = C-; 69-67 = D+; 66-63 = D; 62-60 = D-; 59 and below = F

Policies and Procedures

Cell phones, tablets and laptops
Cell phone use is not permitted in the classroom, except in rare cases when we are doing hands-on research and there are no other electronic sources available. Phones should be put away and silenced during class. Laptops and tablets may be used in class for note taking, but multi-tasking—checking Facebook or email—is not allowed. I will occasionally ask you to close the lid on your laptops or cover your tablets during discussion, brief lectures, or announcements.

Attendance

A. Attendance and participation for all classes, conferences, and other class activities is extremely important, and is 15% of your grade, so please take this seriously.

B. Exception: When representing the University of San Francisco in intercollegiate competition (e.g., athletics, debate), students shall be excused from classes on the hours or days such competition takes them away from classes. However, such students shall be responsible for advising their professors regarding anticipated absences and for arranging to complete course work for classes, laboratories, and/or examinations missed.

A limited number of documented medical or emergency absences may be allowed at my discretion. If you are going to be absent, I expect you to contact me before class and explain.

If I have to be in class on time so do you, so please don't be late. If you are, stay after class and speak with me. Excessive late arrivals or early departures will lower your grade significantly.

Assignments

I do not accept late papers or assignments. If you do not hand in an assignment on the due date, you will not get credit for the assignment. If you are absent, you may hand in the work you missed at the next meeting, or upload it to our Canvas site. If you do not hand in a final essay when it is due, you will fail the essay and fail the course.

If you have a circumstance beyond your control (i.e. an urgent situation), I will grant you an extension, but only if you call me before class that day and explain (extensions apply only to final essay assignments). If you do not contact me before class begins on the day the assignment is due then I will not grant the extension. An email message is acceptable, but it must be before class begins. I have never denied an extension when it is requested in this way.
All assignments must be typed on white 8.5 x 11 paper with one-inch margins and double-spaced. Include your name, the date, my name, the assignment, and the draft number in the upper right hand corner of the first page. Number and staple all pages.

**Meetings**
It is important that we meet during the semester to discuss your essays, concerns, struggles and accomplishments. We can meet as often as you like, but three of these meetings are mandatory; you are responsible for scheduling additional meetings on your own.

**Time Management and Planning**
Students are expected to spend two hours outside of class in study and preparation of assignments for each hour in class. In a four unit class, assignments have been created with the expectation that students will engage in approximately eight hours of out-of-class work per week outside of class.

**Behavioral Expectations**
All students are expected to behave in accordance with the Student Conduct Code and other University policies (see http://www.usfca.edu/fogcutter/). Open discussion and disagreement is encouraged when done respectfully and in the spirit of academic discourse. There are also a variety of behaviors that, while not against a specific University policy, may create disruption in this course. Students whose behavior is disruptive or who fail to comply with the instructor may be dismissed from the class for the remainder of the class period and may need to meet with the instructor or Dean prior to returning to the next class period. If necessary, referrals may also be made to the Student Conduct process for violations of the Student Conduct Code.

**Academic Integrity**

**USF Honor Code:** As a Jesuit institution committed to *cura personalis*—the care and education of the whole person—USF has an obligation to embody and foster the values of honesty and integrity. USF upholds the standards of honesty and integrity from all members of the academic community. All students are expected to know and adhere to the University’s Honor Code. You can find the full text of the code online at www.usfca.edu/fogcutter. As it particularly pertains to the Department of Rhetoric and Language, the policy covers:

- Plagiarism—intentionally or unintentionally representing the words or ideas of another person as your own; failure to properly cite references; manufacturing references Working with another person when independent work is required
- Submission of the same paper in more than one course without the specific permission of each instructor
- Submitting a paper written by another person or obtained from the internet.
The penalties for violation of the policy may include a failing grade on the assignment, a failing grade in the course, and/or a referral to the Dean and the Committee on Student Academic Honesty. In addition, a letter will be sent to the Associate Dean for Student Academic Services; the letter will remain in your file for two years after you graduate, after which you may petition for its removal.

**Students with Disabilities**
If you are a student with a disability or disabling condition, or if you think you may have a disability, please contact USF Student Disability Services (SDS) at 415-422-2613 within the first week of class, or immediately upon onset of disability, to speak with a disability specialist. If you are determined eligible for reasonable accommodations, please meet with your disability specialist so they can arrange to have your accommodation letter sent to me, and we will discuss your needs for this course. For more information, please visit: [https://www.usfca.edu/student-disability-services](https://www.usfca.edu/student-disability-services)

**Counseling and Psychological Services**
Our diverse staff offers brief individual, couple, and group counseling to student members of our community. CAPS services are confidential and free of charge. Call 415-422-6352 for an initial consultation appointment. Having a crisis at 3 AM? We are still here for you. Telephone consultation through CAPS After Hours is available between the hours of 5:00 PM to 8:30 AM; call the above number and press 2.

**Confidentiality, Mandatory Reporting, and Sexual Assault**
As an instructor, one of my responsibilities is to help create a safe learning environment on our campus. I also have a mandatory reporting responsibility related to my role as a faculty member. I am required to share information with the University regarding sexual misconduct or information about a crime that may have occurred on campus. Here are other resources:

- To report any sexual misconduct, students may visit Anna Bartkowski (UC 5th floor) or see many other options by visiting our website: [www.usfca.edu/student_life/safer](https://www.usfca.edu/student_life/safer)
- Students may speak to someone confidentially, or report a sexual assault confidentially by contacting Counseling and Psychological Services at 415-422-6352.
- To find out more about reporting a sexual assault at USF, visit the USF Callisto website at: [www.usfca.callistocampus.org](http://www.usfca.callistocampus.org).
- For an off-campus resource, contact San Francisco Women Against Rape (SFWAR) (415) 647-7273 ([www.sfwar.org](http://www.sfwar.org)).

**The Writing Center** is located on the second floor of Gleeson Library, and they are open 10:00-8:00 Monday through Thursday and until 5:00 on Friday. Please call 422-6713 to make an appointment with a Writing Center Consultant to talk over your paper. They can be extremely helpful in providing additional reader feedback at any stage of your writing process. Remember, the best time to bring your paper in for feedback is well before it's due. Make appointments here: [https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/lwc/writing-center](https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/lwc/writing-center)
The Speaking Center is also located on the second floor of Gleeson Library, and is available to help all USF students prepare for speeches—such as oral presentations, team presentations, and PowerPoint demonstrations. The coaches are USF students, selected because of their skill and experience (and excellent grades) in public speaking, and they can help you with a variety of aspects of public speaking, including delivery and outlining. Tutors are available on a drop-in basis as well for appointments. To make an appointment or to call or email for more info, begin here https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/lwc/speaking-center

Quick References
Rhetoric and Language Dept. Kalmonovitz Hall 202 422-6243
Counseling Center Gilson Hall/Lower Level 422-6352
Student Services Gleeson Library LL20 422-2613
Course Schedule

Week One
8/23-8/25

Wednesday  8/23  Introductions
Friday      8/25  Syllabus and Schedule Review
              Writing sample

Week Two
8/28-9/1

Monday  8/28  Writing Samples due
          In class: groups review analysis terms
          LAST DAY TO ADD A COURSE

Wednesday  8/30  In class: read and discuss sample essay for analysis
              Read assigned essays for class discussion: Rhetorical Analysis
              First Response handed out
              Reading/Textbook: Chapter 5: Analysis pp. 170-200

Friday   9/1  First Response due: class discussion of essays

Week Three
9/4-9/8

Monday  9/4  NO CLASS: LABOR DAY

Wednesday  9/6  Essay #1 assigned: Rhetorical Analysis
              Homework Assignment: Creating a first draft for the Rhetorical Analysis Essay
              Class discussion and activities: a thesis statement vs. a claim

Friday  9/8  Writing and Criticism: Class contract and workshop
            Lecture and activities: the writing process (freewriting/discussion)

Week Four
9/11-9/15

Monday  9/11  Feedback: Role Playing
            Homework Assignment due: Creating a first draft for the Rhetorical Analysis Essay. Bring THREE copies to class
            Workshops
Wednesday 9/13  Revision: goals and process
Second Draft Checklist handed out
Second Response Handed out: your writing and revision process
Bring tablet or laptop to class Friday

Friday 9/15  Bring tablet or laptop to class
Second Response due
Works Cited, MLA and in-text citations: an introduction
Ethos, Pathos, Logos and reasoning: examples

Week Five
9/18-9/22

Monday 9/18  Rhetorical Analysis Second Draft + Checklist due:
Bring TWO copies to class
Workshops
Homework Assignment: Grammar and Syntax
SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Wednesday 9/20  NO CLASS: SCHEDULED MEETINGS
(Wednesday and Thursday)

Friday 9/22  TBA: Check Canvas site

Week Six
9/25-9/29

Monday 9/25  TBA: Check Canvas site

Wednesday 9/27  Rhetorical Analysis Essay due: Final draft
Homework Assignment due: Grammar and Syntax
Environment Project assigned: Review in class
Third Response handed out
Sign up for class presentations

Friday 9/29  Third Response Due: Class Discussion
Homework Assignment: Creating a Prose Outline
(Part One of Environment Project)
Free writes: sharing and group dialogue (topics)
Introduction to the three-point parallel claim

Week Seven
10/2-10/6

Monday 10/2  Prose Outline due: Bring THREE copies to class
Workshops
Wednesday 10/4  Homework Assignment: Opposing sources  
(Part Two of Environment Project) 
Fake News: tools for checking source credibility  
Groups evaluate credibility of sources handed out in class

Friday 10/06  LIBRARY CLASS: WE MEET IN LIBRARY LOBBY

Week Eight  
10/9-10/13

Monday 10/9  Homework Assignment due: Opposing Sources  
(Part Two of Environment Project) 
Groups evaluate credibility of sources

Wednesday 10/11  NO CLASS: SCHEDULED MEETINGS  
(Wednesday and Thursday)

Friday 10/13  TBA: Check Canvas site

10/16-10/17  FALL BREAK

Week Nine  
10/18-10/20

Wednesday 10/18  In class presentations

Friday 10/20  In class presentations

Week Ten  
10/23-10/27

Monday 10/23  Environment Project due  
Review UDHR: group work  
Fourth Response handed out: Human Rights Violations  
Reading/Textbook: Chapter 2: Critical Reading pp. 54-8

Wednesday 10/25  Fourth response due: Articles: Human Rights Violations  
Class discussion

Friday 10/27  Essay #3 assigned: Investigative Research Essay:  
Human Rights and an Argument for Change  
Library class follow-up: Evaluating outside sources and integrating maps, images, charts, graphs, statistics, and government documents  
Reading/Textbook: Chapter 7: Sources pp. 236-280
Week Eleven
10/30-11/3

Monday 10/30
Three-point parallel claim revisited
Brainstorming and mapping for a topic
Group dialogue (topics)
Homework Assignment: Creating a Prose Outline for the
Human Rights Essay

Wednesday 11/1
In class Presentations

Friday 11/3
Homework Assignment due: Creating a Prose Outline for the
Human Rights Essay. Bring THREE copies to class
Workshops
LAST DAY TO DROP A CLASS AND RECEIVE A "W"
A note about Course Evaluations

Week Twelve
11/6-11/10

Monday 11/6
Sources and MLA revisited
Reading/Textbook: Chapter 4: Argument Synthesis pp. 122-169

Wednesday 11/8 Quiz in class

Friday 11/10
In class Presentations

Week Thirteen
11/13-11/17

Monday 11/13
In class Presentations

Wednesday 11/15 Human Rights Essay Draft due: Bring TWO Copies
SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Friday 11/17 NO CLASS: SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Week Fourteen
11/20-11/24

Monday 11/20
Homework Assignment: Organization and Transitions
SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Wednesday 11/22 TBA: Check Canvas site
Friday  11/24  NO CLASS: THANKSGIVING BREAK

Week Fifteen  11/27-12/1

Monday  11/27  Investigative Research Essay Final Draft due
Finding your civic voice:
Argument for a Public Audience assigned
Review USF Mission Statement and letter samples
Homework Assignment: Annotated Address List
SCHEDULED MEETINGS (Optional)

Wednesday  11/29  Freewriting and dialogue
SCHEDULED MEETINGS (Optional)

Friday  12/1  Course Evaluations
Homework Assignment due: Annotated Address List
Letter draft due: Bring TWO copies
Workshops
SCHEDULED MEETINGS (Optional)

Week Sixteen  12/4-12/6

Monday  12/4  Revised draft of Letter Due: Bring TWO copies
Workshops
SCHEDULED MEETINGS (Optional)

Wednesday  12/6  Argument for a Public Audience due in final draft folders
Party and good-byes
Rhetoric 310: Business and Technical Communication

Class: 12:45 pm – 2:30 pm Tues/Thurs Lone Mountain 358

Instructor:
Sheri McClure-Baker
Office: McLaren 113
Office: 415.422.5479
Mobile: 559.943.READ (7323)
smcclurebaker@usfca.edu
Office Hours: Wed: 1:00 pm – 5:00 pm
By appointment on site or via Skype

Required Texts
   Technical Communication by Mark Markel

Required Materials
   USB drive or cloud-based storage
   Highlighter
   Non-spiral bound paper for in class writing

USF Official Course Description
Students will learn the practices of writing in business and technical fields and contexts. Students will produce several major documents (at least one of them collaboratively) typically used in business and technical environments (such as a proposal, a report, an instruction manual, a trade journal article or a web site, a portfolio of correspondence), and will complete a variety of minor assignments (e.g., a Power Point presentation, an oral presentation, or an instruction sheet). Students will also develop skills in editing for correctness, clarity, and appropriateness of style and tone. Fulfills Core A2.

Instead of simply focusing on document production, we will learn about professional communication practices. In RHET110 you should have learned about how to use your audience to construct your rhetoric, and we will apply that same practice to different types of professional communication in various mediums, such as presentations, resumés, emails, and websites. I will ask you to reflect on how you have constructed individual pieces of rhetoric and compile your best works into a professional online portfolio, which you can either keep private or use for professional development outside the classroom.

Assessment

Grading
A ‘C-’ or better must be obtained for this course. We will use a grading contract in this course, so please see the Grading Contract document for specific details.

The Professional Portfolio
There are no grades in the business world; there is only success or failure. However, this is academia. The Grading Contract will give you the freedom to build your skills throughout the semester, but the
professional portfolio is where you will present yourself and your communication skills to an outside audience.

The Grading Contract explains the three basic steps to passing this class:

- For a “C” grade, complete everything in the spirit it is assigned, come to class, be engaged.
- For a “B” grade, do everything for a “C” grade and be a show quality engagement in class and during external group time.
- The portfolio comes into play for the “A” grade. At the end of the semester, groups from a different class will use a rubric your class has created to assess the strength of your professional portfolios. If you have met the requirements for the “B” and your portfolio shows you have a strong grasp of business and technical writing, then you have earned an “A” in the class.

In other words, the portfolio is very important. But the goal of the professional portfolio is not just to get you a good grade; it is to help you create a professional website that features you and your work that you can use to apply for jobs, internships, and other opportunities. We will all use Wordpress.com because it is free, customizable, and can be made entirely private (if you so desire).

The portfolio will be a place to showcase what you have learned and begin to construct your professional persona. It also allows you to continuously develop and revisit your writing throughout the semester, so that you can put your best work forward when quality matters most. You will get feedback from me and from your classmates throughout the semester. What you learn from this class is largely dependent upon how engaged you choose to be; what you earn in the class is dependant upon engagement and mastery.

**Rubrics**

Each of the four projects will come with additional details about what is expected during the completion of that assignment. We will only use a clearly defined rubric for the professional portfolio read and preparation, but there will be general requirements used to guide your writing and revision. This information will be provided with the assignment of each project.

**Official Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)**

Department-wide SLOs ensure that sections of the same course maintain consistency despite being taught by different professors. These outcomes guide all of the assignments in this course.

1. Critical analysis of academic discourse: Students critically analyze linguistic and rhetorical strategies used in long and complex texts from a variety of genres, subjects, and fields.
2. Integrating multiple academic sources: Students incorporate multiple texts of length and complexity within a unified argumentative essay, addressing connections and differences among them.
3. Academic research: Students develop sophisticated research questions and compose substantial arguments in response to those questions, incorporating extensive independent library research and demonstrating mastery of standard academic documentation modes.
4. Style: Students edit their own prose to achieve a clear and mature writing style in keeping with the conventions of academic and/or professional discourse.
5. Revision: Students develop their own revision strategies for extending and enriching early drafts and for producing polished advanced academic writing.
Attendance
Each student is a vital member of our conversation and therefore the entire class suffers when any one person is missing. For this reason, you are expected to attend and participate in each class session. As stated in the Grading Contract, each student may miss up to four class, which is 86% of our class time, and still maintain a C. Excessive absences throughout the semester will affect your grade. You cannot learn if you do not attend.

Exception
When representing the University of San Francisco in intercollegiate competition (e.g., athletics, debate), students shall be excused from classes on the hours or days such competition takes them away from classes. However, such students shall be responsible for advising their professors regarding anticipated absences and for arranging to complete course work for classes, laboratories, and/or examinations missed.

Assignments
All final drafts must be typed. As for daily assignments, typing is always preferred to hand writing in this class. If, however, it is difficult for the student to obtain access to a computer, papers must be written legibly in blue or black ink on paper with a clean tear on the left – no fringed paper please.

Group Work & Reflections
You will form groups in Week One and stay with those groups throughout the semester. They will be like your family, and you will be required to meet together outside of class for one hour each week. After these meetings, each of you will write a ½-1 page reflection (150 words minimum) about what you did and how it helped you with that week’s work/class concepts. Some reflections will be more guided than others.

Final Self-Assessment
You must complete a guided self-assessment before meeting with your instructor for your arranged final conference. The assessment will ask you to reflect critically on your progress in the class as evidenced through your portfolio. It will also ask you to assign yourself a letter grade. We will discuss this document, your portfolio, and your overall engagement with the class in your final conference in order to determine your final grade.

The Units & their Projects
Each unit contains smaller assignments that lead to a larger assignment, which I will refer to as the project. The project might be a mini-portfolio or a paper, and the final unit culminates in a professional portfolio you’ll create through wordpress.com. More details will be given at the start of each project.

Unit One: Introduction to Technical Communication (Weeks 1-3)
Technical communication provides an important framework (or way of thinking) about written and oral communication, which is why we will begin by reading some foundational tech comm texts. Each week, you will write a 1 page reflection in which you try to make sense of what we have read. At the end of three weeks, you will revise those reflections and add to them to create a more focused document in which you define a few key tech comm concepts and explain how/why they are important to successful business
communication practices. The draft submitted in Week Three should be 3+ pages and reference at 4-6 sources we have read and discussed as a class.

Unit Two: Constructing a Professional Identity (Weeks 4-7)
In this unit, we will apply technical communication theories to traditional job-related documentation, like resumes, emails, letters, graphics, and memos. You will write a variety of short business-related documents along with brief reflections during these four weeks. You will then choose 2-3 of these documents to revise and include in your professional portfolio, which is your final project for this course.

Unit Three: Communicating to a Global Audience (Weeks 8-11)
This unit will help you move from communicating with a local and more known audience to thinking about a larger, global audience. The large project in this unit will be a combination group presentation and proposal or recommendation report. More details will be provided as we get closer to this unit.

Unit Four: Building a Professional Portfolio (Weeks 12-14)
We will spend this final unit preparing for, building, and assessing your professional portfolios. We will discuss how to write survey questions, and the class will create an assessment questionare we will use to read professional portfolios as outside businesspeople. As noted above, the professional portfolio will be a place to show off what you have learned throughout the class and create a professional website you can use and develop throughout your professional career.

Important Dates
All dates are subject to change. This calendar represents only major events in the class. Modules will be posted in Canvas for each project, and will contain all important material along with a detailed calendar of in-class activites and homework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues. Jan. 24</td>
<td>First day of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. Feb 20</td>
<td>Begin Unit One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres. Day: No Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues. Feb. 21</td>
<td>Begin Unit Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues. March 6</td>
<td>Due: Project Two Draft One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13-17</td>
<td>Spring Break: No Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. March 20</td>
<td>Due: Project Two, Draft Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. March 27</td>
<td>Due: Project Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues. March 28</td>
<td>Begin Unit Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th-F Apr. 13-14</td>
<td>Easter Holiday: No Classes from 4pm on Thurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. Apr. 17</td>
<td>Due: Project Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues. Apr. 18</td>
<td>Begin Unit Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. May 8</td>
<td>Due: Project Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &amp; Th May 9-11</td>
<td>Group Portfolio Assessments and Conference Prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon-Wed May 15-17</td>
<td>Final Conferences: 15 Minute Time Periods Arranged (Details TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due: Final Self-Assessment Materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Policies and Resources

Confidentiality, Mandatory Reporting, and Sexual Assault

As an instructor, one of my responsibilities is to help create a safe learning environment on our campus. I also have a mandatory reporting responsibility related to my role as a faculty member. I am required to share information regarding sexual misconduct or information about a crime that may have occurred on USFs campus with the University. Here are other resources:

- To report any sexual misconduct, students may visit Anna Bartkowski (UC 5th floor) or see many other options by visiting our website: www.usfca.edu/student_life/safer
- Students may speak to someone confidentially, or report a sexual assault confidentially by contacting Counseling and Psychological Services at 415-422-6352.
- To find out more about reporting a sexual assault at USF, visit USFs Callisto website at: www.usfca.callistocampus.org.
- For an off-campus resource, contact San Francisco Women Against Rape (SFWAR) (415) 647-7273 (www.sfwar.org).

Time Management and Planning

Students are expected to spend 2 hours outside of class in study and preparation of assignments for each hour in class. In a 4 unit class, assignments have been created with the expectation that students will engage in approximately 8 hours of out-of-class work per week; in a 2 unit class, students should expect to spend approximately 4 hours per week outside of class in study and preparation. Intensive classes may count the 2 hours of lab time as part of the out-of-class work.

Academic Integrity

USF Honor Code: As a Jesuit institution committed to cura personalis--the care and education of the whole person--USF has an obligation to embody and foster the values of honesty and integrity. USF upholds the standards of honesty and integrity from all members of the academic community. All students are expected to know and adhere to the University’s Honor Code. You can find the full text of the code online at www.usfca.edu/fogcutter. As it particularly pertains to the Department of Rhetoric and Language, the policy covers:

- Plagiarism—intentionally or unintentionally representing the words or ideas of another person as your own; failure to properly cite references; manufacturing references Working with another person when independent work is required
- Submission of the same paper in more than one course without the specific permission of each instructor
- Submitting a paper written by another person or obtained from the internet.

The penalties for violation of the policy may include a failing grade on the assignment, a failing grade in the course, and/or a referral to the Dean and the Committee on Student Academic Honesty. In addition, a letter will be sent to the Associate Dean for Student Academic Services; the letter will remain in your file for two years after you graduate, after which you may petition for its removal.

Students with Disabilities
If you are a student with a disability or disabling condition, or if you think you may have a disability, please contact USF Student Disability Services (SDS) at 415 422-2613 within the first week of class, or immediately upon onset of disability, to speak with a disability specialist. If you are determined eligible for reasonable accommodations, please meet with your disability specialist so they can arrange to have your accommodation letter sent to me, and we will discuss your needs for this course. For more information, please visit: http://www.usfca.edu/sds

**Behavioral Expectations**

All students are expected to behave in accordance with the Student Conduct Code and other University policies (see http://www.usfca.edu/fogcutter/). Open discussion and disagreement is encouraged when done respectfully and in the spirit of academic discourse. There are also a variety of behaviors that, while not against a specific University policy, may create disruption in this course. Students whose behavior is disruptive or who fail to comply with the instructor may be dismissed from the class for the remainder of the class period and may need to meet with the instructor or Dean prior to returning to the next class period. If necessary, referrals may also be made to the Student Conduct process for violations of the Student Conduct Code.

**Learning & Writing Center**

The Learning & Writing Center provides assistance to all USF students in pursuit of academic success. Peer tutors provide regular review and practice of course materials in the subjects of Math, Science, Business, Economics, Nursing and Languages. Other content areas can be made available by student request. To schedule an appointment, log on to TutorTrac at https://tutortrac.usfca.edu. Students may also take advantage of writing support provided by Rhetoric and Language Department instructors and academic study skills support provided by Learning Center professional staff. For more information about these services contact the Learning & Writing Center at (415) 422-6713, email: lwc@usfca.edu or stop by our office in Cowell 215. Information can also be found on our website at www.usfca.edu/lwc.

**Counseling and Psychological Services**

Our diverse staff offers brief individual, couple, and group counseling to student members of our community. CAPS services are confidential and free of charge. Call 415-422-6352 for an initial consultation appointment. Having a crisis at 3 AM? We are still here for you. Telephone consultation through CAPS After Hours is available between the hours of 5:00 PM to 8:30 AM; call the above number and press 2.

**Student Accounts - Last day to withdraw with tuition reversal**

Students who wish to have the tuition charges reversed on their student account should withdraw from the course(s) by the end of the business day on the last day to withdraw with tuition credit (census date) for the applicable course(s) in which the student is enrolled. Please note that the last day to withdraw with tuition credit may vary by course. The last day to withdraw with tuition credit (census date) listed in the Academic Calendar is applicable only to courses which meet for the standard 15-week semester. To find what the last day to withdraw with tuition credit is for a specific course, please visit the Online Class Schedule at www.usfca.edu/schedules.

**Financial Aid - FAFSA priority filing deadline (undergraduates only)**

March 2 - Priority filing deadline for FAFSA (The Free Application for Federal Student Aid - https://fafsa.ed.gov/) for continuing undergraduates.
Theme: **Soldiers, Students, Resisters, Rebels: Considering Relationships to Authority**

In 2017, San Francisco’s mayor, Ed Lee, joined the mayors of many other major U.S. cities in publically affirming his commitment to keeping San Francisco a “Sanctuary City.” In so doing, Lee and others were broadcasting their “non-compliance” with federal immigration officials - in effect, refusing to share information that might lead to increased deportations. But this was as much a *rhetorical* move as a policy statement. For these mayors were also declaring their cities’ resistance to what many saw as the anti-immigrant ideology that lay beneath President Trump’s own rhetoric and policy platform. Why did these mayors choose to signal their “resistance” to the president, the ultimate authority figure? Why did other mayors and other cities choose instead to comply? This semester, we will explore attitudes towards authority. When and why do individuals and groups obey - even if it means violating their deepest moral codes? Why and when do they challenge authority - even if it means risking their lives and livelihoods? How do we weigh the benefits and consequences of each course of action? We will read, watch and discuss texts representing various disciplinary approaches (sociological, psychological, literary, philosophical, cinematic) to these questions. In turn, we will learn to identify, explain, analyze, and argue about these questions in our speech and writing.

This course explores these questions through the lens of rhetorical theory. Rhetoric, the study of what language *does*, will help us identify and analyze arguments about when and why we obey or rebel. In turn, we will use rhetoric to take action in the world. This semester, we’ll focus on analyzing theories, arguments, and contexts. Next semester, we’ll use these analytical tools to actually *advocate* for change in the world.

**Course Description:**

*Written and Oral Communication (130/131)* is a two-semester course that meets the university Core requirements for writing and public speaking. In the first semester, students learn the basic practices of oral and written argument, writing 5000 to 6000 words of revised prose and delivering 2-3 graded speeches totaling 15-20 minutes of speaking time. In the second semester, students learn more elaborate approaches to argument, rhetoric, and analysis, writing 6000 to 7000 words of revised prose and delivering at least two presentations, totaling at least 15 minutes of speaking time.

The first semester of the course introduces students to the challenges and opportunities of academic writing and speaking. Within a context of rhetorical processes and vocabulary, students claim a voice in public discourse, learning to
connect purpose to audience, anticipate audience response, and develop rhetorical texts that are responsive to social, political, and rhetorical contexts. Emphasis is on written and oral argument, and, in particular, reading critically, using textual support in arguments, and backing up key ideas using audience-centered support—including inductive and deductive reasoning, narratives, illustrations, anecdotes, visual images, testimony, and factual evidence, such as statistics. Students engage in critical writing practices, such as drafting, revising, and editing to achieve focused and coherent writing, and they learn fundamental oral communication practices, such as creating speeches that are organized around a thesis and a focused set of main points, and delivered in an extemporaneous manner.

In the second semester, having mastered basic public speaking skills, students prepare oral presentations for more complex contexts, which may include more detailed argumentative speeches, debates, research reports, facilitation of class discussion, or other appropriate assignments. In both written and oral contexts, they learn to make arguments in an ethical manner, balancing emotion and reason, while fairly and accurately representing (and responding to) opposing views. Additionally, they analyze more complex cultural texts and learn to adapt arguments to audience and occasion, studying the rhetorical use of style and diction.

**Learning Outcomes:**
By the end of this course, you should be able to:

Core A1 Outcomes:
1: Craft and present well-organized, thesis-driven speeches.
2. Present well-reasoned and appropriately supported oral arguments that are responsive to topic, purpose, audience, and occasion.
3. Deliver speeches using an audience-centered, extemporaneous approach.
4. Use rhetorical concepts and principles to evaluate the effectiveness of their own and others’ communication in both academic and civic contexts.
5. Use rhetorical concepts and principles to practice ethical and socially responsible public speaking, and to identify and evaluate ethical problems in public address.

Core A2 Outcomes:
1: Critical analysis of academic discourse: Students critically analyze linguistic and rhetorical strategies used in long and complex texts from a variety of genres, subjects, and fields.
2: Integrating multiple academic sources: Students incorporate multiple texts of length and complexity within a unified argumentative essay, addressing connections and differences among them.
3: Academic research: Students develop sophisticated research questions and compose substantial arguments in response to those questions, incorporating extensive independent library research and demonstrating mastery of documentation in MLA and APA modes.
4: Style: Students edit their own prose to achieve a clear and mature writing style in keeping with the conventions of academic and/or professional discourse.
5: Revision: Students develop their own revision strategies for extending and enriching early drafts and for producing polished advanced academic writing.

**Required Textbooks:**
The following text is available for purchase or rent from the campus bookstore: *Writing Analytically*, 8th ed, by David Rosenwatter and Jill Stephen.

We will also be using: *Stand Up, Speak Out: The Practice and Ethics of Public Speaking* (Saylor Academy, 2012). This text is available for free at: [https://saylordotorg.github.io/text_stand-up-speak-out-the-practice-and-ethics-of-public-speaking/index.html](https://saylordotorg.github.io/text_stand-up-speak-out-the-practice-and-ethics-of-public-speaking/index.html) (link is also posted on Canvas)

Note that these texts will be used for both semesters. **Other readings and materials will be posted on Canvas.**

**Assignments:** Because this class is designed to develop your speaking AND writing skills, speaking and writing assignments are designed to work together, complementing and expanding on similar topics or skill-sets. The descriptions below suggest how assignments will help you achieve (and assess your progress towards) course learning outcomes (LOs).

*Details, guidelines, and internal grade breakdowns (point values of proposals, drafts, etc) will be posted on Canvas and discussed in class. **Unless otherwise specified, all assignments should be submitted on Canvas before class the day that they are due.**

**3 Major Writing Assignments (45%):** Writing assignments will increase in value and complexity throughout the semester. Final grades for assignments will sometimes incorporate “building-block” elements, such as freewrites, drafts, and peer reviews. *Visiting the Writing Center for coaching on your writing* (see “Student Resources” below for more info on the Writing Center) will earn you 5% extra credit for the relevant essay.

- **He Said, She Said: Comparative Critical Analysis:** For your first paper, you will write a comparative analysis of two of the critical/theoretical texts we have read together so far. Your essay should do two things: (1) Carefully explain each thinker’s main claims about obedience to authority. (2) Discuss the extent to which each thinker agrees or disagrees about the reasons why we obey and/or the consequences of that obedience. Focus is on summarizing complex texts, developing a nuanced thesis, and using close-reading as evidence. 4-5 pages. 10% (LO. A2.1,2,4,5)

- **Into the Archives: Intrinsic Rhetorical Analysis.** You will find and select an editorial from the digitized archives of USF’s student newspaper, *The Foghorn*. The editorial should be historical, not contemporary, and should advocate for either rebelling against, or obeying, some specific authority, rule, or norm (e.g., Anti-Labor laws in the 30s, the Vietnam War draft in the 70s, Catholic Church curricula in the 90s). You will identify the article’s
argument and evaluate its efficacy, focusing on internal characteristics like structure, tone, appeals, and authorial voice. Focus is on close reading/descriptive analysis and applying rhetorical concepts. 4-5 pages. 15% (LO A2.1, 4, 5; A1. 4, 5)

- **Inside Out: Final Rhetorical Analysis of Artifact** You will combine your intrinsic analysis with information from your Flashback speech (see below), providing a contextual/historical analysis that situates your article in a particular place and time. Expanding on your previous thesis, you will explain and evaluate the artifact’s argumentative strategies as a response to that specific historic and inter-textual context. You will present this work as an Adobe Spark webpage, creating a multi-media text with links, images, and video. ~8-10 pages. 20% (LO A2.1, 2, 3, 4, 5; A1. 4, 5)

3 Major Speeches (35%): Like writing assignments, speech assignments will increase in value and complexity throughout the semester. Also like writing assignments, final grades will sometimes incorporate “building-block” elements, such as freewrites, drafts, outlines, and final reflections. *Visiting the Speaking Center for peer coaching on preparing or delivering your speeches (see “Student Resources” below for more info on the Speaking Center) will earn you 5% extra credit for the relevant speech.*

- **TO re(BE)l OR NOT TO re(BE)l?** Narrative Speech Tell us a story about a time when you had to decide between obedience and rebellion. What did you decide, and why? What did you learn about the risks and/or rewards of that decision? Focus is on mastering speech basics, analyzing personal experience, and forming community with classmates. 3-4 mins. 5% (LO A1.1,2,3)

- **Newsflash: Impromptu News Debates** Scheduled throughout the semester (~2 per week), these speeches will require you to a) summarize a recent editorial on a controversial issue of civic importance, b) briefly analyze the argument/source bias, and c) lead the class in a quick debate/discussion about the issue. Extra credit if you connect your issue to the theme of “sanctuary” in some way. While the speech requires some advance preparation, the focus is less on a polished speech structure and more on effective summary, audience analysis, and discussion moderation. 4-5 mins (plus debate). 10% (LO A1.1, 2, 3, 5; A2.3)

- **Flashbacks: Group Informative Speech** This speech works in tandem with your intrinsic and final Rhetorical Analysis assignments. Working in small groups, you will provide historical, cultural, and discursive context for your Foghorn article. Focus is on collaboration, research, and making sources “speak” to each other. 7-8 min plus 2-3 mins Q&A. 20% (LO A1.1-5; A2.1-3)

Re-Writing the Reading: Canvas Posts and Weekly Writing Workshops (10%): On weeks when major assignments are not due, you will submit writing responses to class material on Canvas. These will require you to summarize, paraphrase, analyze, evaluate, and/or extend specific passages from the readings. They will
serve as the basis for Wednesday Writing Workshops, during which you will read your work and receive feedback from your peer writing group.

You will receive little or no written feedback from me on these assignments (credit is on a complete/incomplete basis). The point of this exercise is to help you continually stretch your analytical and writing muscles - the more you do it, the better you’ll be at making your writing talk to other texts, and to pin-point where writing works and doesn’t work. In addition, *points for this assignment derive BOTH from posting your writing AND participating in in-class writing workshops (getting and giving feedback from others).* In other words, if you post a response, but don’t come to class on Wednesday (or don’t really participate), you lose half of your points for that week’s assignment.

**Participation and Attendance (10%):** Participation will be crucial to your success in this class. It is particularly important in a writing and speaking course that is based on discussion, group work, and a variety of in-class activities. *You must come prepared to participate in each class, which means doing the readings and taking notes that summarize and respond to the readings even on days when you don’t have to post anything on Canvas.* Workshops (which may require you to bring in or create drafts in class), mini-presentations, and peer critiques will also be a component of this grade. Check out the Participation Guidelines on Canvas for more on what counts as participation in class discussion.

You have no “free” absences. If you choose not to come to class, you will lose participation and attendance points for that day. Attendance is tracked on Canvas, so you can check in every 2-3 weeks on your attendance grade (note that Canvas grades are based on a rolling fraction, so the more days of class we have, the larger the denominator. This means that absences early in the semester will seem like they count more. *You MUST attend all your scheduled speech days; if medical reasons or some other emergency event results in an absence during a speech day, please see the CASA Office on University Center 3rd Floor.* When warranted, they will distribute a letter requesting an adjustment of your absences. Your discussion with CASA will be considered confidential and only pertinent information will be released in such a letter.

**Exception:** When representing the University of San Francisco in intercollegiate competition (e.g., athletics, debate), students shall be excused from classes on the hours or days such competition takes them away from classes. However, such students shall be responsible for advising their professors regarding anticipated absences and for arranging to complete course work for classes, laboratories, and/or examinations missed.

**Grades and Adjustments:** *You must complete all graded speeches and writing assignments to pass the course.* Late written assignments will not be accepted unless you notify me via email beforehand with a viable reason. Late speeches will *not* be accepted because it affects the schedule for everyone (excepting the
emergency situations noted in the attendance policy above). I'm happy to address concerns about assignment grades within a week after you were notified of that grade.

**Grading**

**Range of Grades**

Letter grades will be calculated according to the following scale, although class participation may impact the rounding up or down of final grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>84-86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>74-76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70-73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87-89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77-79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60-69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>less than 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Grading Rubric**

*Writing Assignments: The following grading rubric will be applied to writing assignments in addition to grading parameters specific to individual assignments:*

A: A essays address the assignment prompt fully and thoughtfully, exhibit structural coherence, make significant claims that are justified by appropriate support. They are responsive to audience and meet typical expectations of academic readers, including research, meaningful claims, sufficient organizational signals, and a writing style that is linguistically precise and grammatically complex.

B: B essays meet major requirements of the assignment: their major claims are justified in a reasonable way, and they are generally responsive to the audience. Essays that meet a significant, but not all, of the expectations, tend to fall into the "B" category. An otherwise "A" essay that argues an obvious claim, or offers insufficient support, or contains a number of stylistic or mechanical faults are the typical characteristics of a "B" level essay.

C: C essays meet at least some of the necessary requirements of the assignment, and are comprehensible, exhibiting enough structure, organizational signals, and appropriate style to shape meaning. When essays fall significantly short in one or more of the most significant areas described above, or fall short in most areas, they tend toward a "C." Failing to meet basic assignment requirements--such as summarizing and responding to particular readings, meeting page- or word-minimum limits, failing to use proper research--will also lead a paper to get a "C."

D and F: D and F essays are deficient in many ways.

*Speech Assignments: The following grading rubric will be applied to all speeches in addition to grading parameters specific to individual assignments:*

A: A speeches goes beyond merely providing information on a generic topic; it adopts interesting, audience-aware angles of vision; they are well supported with sound reasoning and a variety of well-researched evidence, are delivered extemporaneously and in an audience-centered manner, with clear and astute organization revealed through main points, signposts, and transitions.

B: B speeches attend all the basic assignment requirements, and provide well-reasoned arguments in an audience-centered manner. They use transitional
elements effectively, and possess an adequate amount of internal coherence and consistency strong and carefully attentive to assignment requirements.

C: C speeches follow the basic requirements of the assignment, but may be significantly deficient in one or more ways in the areas described above. (e.g., a speech with well-researched content but no discernible main points may get a "C" grade; a well-crafted speech that otherwise may be an "A" or "B" speech will probably get a "C" if it is delivered from a manuscript rather than extemporaneously).

D and F: D and F speeches are deficient in several ways. They are usually deficient in meeting one or more basic requirements of the assignment (e.g., an organized, interesting speech may receive a D or F grade if it seriously violates time restraints)

**Expectations and Policies:**

*Technology:* Please put away phones, etc. when in class. I’ll often ask you to bring your laptop for classwork, but use it only for discussing readings, doing research, or participating in presentation or group work. When needed, you can also check out laptops from the Gleeson library.

*Classroom Etiquette:* Because this is a rhetoric class, we will consider how language issues from and impacts diverse audiences. Therefore, our single most important ground rule is to be respectful of others’ perspectives. While we are likely to touch on painful and controversial subjects, hostile speech directed against someone’s race, gender, religion, ethnicity, or sexual orientation is never acceptable. I may not catch every instance of hostile language, so if you notice a problem, please bring it to my/your classmates’ attention.

**University Policies**

*Time Management and Planning:* Students are expected to spend 2 hours outside of class in study and preparation of assignments for each hour in class. In a 4 unit class, assignments have been created with the expectation that students will engage in approximately 8 hours of out-of-class work per week.

*Students with Disabilities:*  
If you are a student with a disability or disabling condition, or if you think you may have a disability, please contact [USF Student Disability Services](https://www.usfca.edu/student-disability-services) (SDS) for information about accommodations.

*Behavioral Expectations:*  
All students are expected to behave in accordance with the [Student Conduct Code](https://www.usfca.edu/student-conduct-code) and other University policies.

*Academic Integrity:*  
USF upholds the standards of honesty and integrity from all members of the academic community. All students are expected to know and adhere to the University's [Honor Code](https://www.usfca.edu/honor-code).
Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS):
CAPS provides confidential, free counseling to student members of our community.

Confidentiality, Mandatory Reporting, and Sexual Assault:
For information and resources regarding sexual misconduct or assault visit the Title IX coordinator or USFs Callisto website.

Student Resources
The Learning, Writing, and Speaking Centers at USF provide individualized support to assist you in better understanding course material and to aid you on your path to success. Services are free and include one-on-one tutoring, group tutoring, and one-on-one Academic Skills Coaching appointments to discuss effective study strategies. The Learning Center supports over 80 courses each semester. The Writing Center helps students develop writing skills in rhetoric, organization, style, and structure, through one-on-one interactive conferences. The Speaking Center helps students prepare for public speaking - including speeches, oral presentations, team presentations, and visual aid demonstrations. International students may also contact the Centers to learn more about communicating with professors and general academic study skills.

The Learning, Writing, and Speaking Centers are located on the Lower Level of Gleeson Library. Please contact them at (415) 422-6713 for further assistance or visit: https://myusf.usfca.edu/Iwsc to make an appointment.

Various Student Success Workshops are offered by CASA.

Course Schedule: Written and Oral Communication (RHET 130)
* Note: Readings may be supplemented or replaced; changes will be noted in class and/or on Canvas. It is your responsibility to check Canvas regularly for updates.
Readings in Writing Analytically (WA)
Readings in Speak Up, Speak Out (SUSO)
Readings on Canvas (C)

August
Week 1 (8/22-8/24): Outside the Law: Sanctuary, Rhetoric, and Rebellion

Week 2 (8/27-8/31): Rhetoric: A System for Thinking and Doing
Reading/Watching: Wed 8/29 Essential Guide to Rhetoric, Chapter 3 [C]; Trump and Obama’s Inauguration Speeches [C]
Reading: Fri 8/31 Chapter 19, “Speaking Confidently: Your First Speech” (SUSO)
Due: Wed 8/27 Re-Writing the Reading (Canvas Post/Wed Workshop)

September
Week 3 (9/5-9/7): To Rebel or Not to Rebel Speech Week
No Monday Class
Due: Wed/Fri (depending on assigned speech day): Final Speech and Outline for Speech 1: To Re(BE)l or Not to Re(BE)l

Week 4 (9/10-9/14): Why Do We Obey? Part 1
Reading: Wed 9/12 Chapter 2, selection (p. 38-56) (WA)
Due: Wed 9/12 Re-Writing the Reading (Canvas Post/Wed Workshop)

Week 5 (9/17-9/21): Why Do We Obey? Part II
Reading: Mon 9/17 Michel Foucault, “Discipline and Punish (excerpts)” [C]
Watching: Fri 9/21 “The Breakfast Club” [C]
Due: Wed 9/19 Re-Writing the Reading (Canvas Post/Wed Workshop)

Week 6 (9/24-9/28): Revising and Rethinking
Reading: Mon 9/24 Chapter 4: Responding More Analytically (WA); NY Times Book Review [C]
Reading: Wed 9/26 Chapter 6: Reasoning from Evidence to Claims (excerpt p. 148-153) [WA]
Reading: Fri 9/28 James Lopach and Jean Luckowski, “Uncivil Disobedience: Violating the Rules for Breaking the Law” [C]
Due: Mon 9/25: Draft Thesis Statement
Due: Wed 9/26: Draft Paragraph
Due: Fri 9/28: Final Writing Assignment 1: He Said, She Said: Critical Comparison [due at midnight]

October:
Week 7 (10/1-10/5): Rhetorics of Rebellion
Reading and Listening: Mon 10/1 Campus Activism in the 20th Century: An Overview; Maggie Astor, “7 Times in History When Students Turned to
Activism,” *New York Times*, March 5, 2018 [C]; Excerpts from the Backstory Podcast, [https://www.backstoryradio.org/shows/teen-activists](https://www.backstoryradio.org/shows/teen-activists) [C]

**Watching:** Wed 10/3 Protest speeches: Emma Gonzalez, Mario Savio, Alcatraz Occupation [C].

**Reading:** Fri 10/5 Mohsin Hamid, *Exit West* [C]

**Due:** Wed 10/3 *Re-Writing the Reading (Canvas Post/Wed Workshop)*

Week 8 (10/8-10/12): Archive Fever

**Reading:** Mon 10/8: Mohsin Hamid, *Exit West* [C]

**Reading:** Wed/Fri: Searching Foghorn Archives, reading select articles

**Due:** Wed 10/10 *Re-Writing the Reading (Canvas Post/Wed Workshop)*

*Note:* Mon 10/8: Pending confirmation, class meets in Gleeson Library for archive workshop; In addition, please plan to attend the Mohsin Hamid reading on Monday night

Week 9 (10/15-10/19): Consider the Text

*No Monday Class*

**Reading:** Wed 10/17 Chapter 6: “Reasoning from Evidence to Claims” (p. 160-176) (WA)

**Due:** Wed 10/17 *Re-Writing the Reading (Canvas Post/Wed Workshop)*

**Due:** Fri 10/19: *Pitch Prep (be prepared to give quick pitch of argument to group)*

Week 10 (10/22-10/26): Revising and Rethinking

**Reading:** Mon 10/22 Chapter 7: Finding and Evolving a Thesis [WA]

**Watching:** Fri 10/26 (Democracy Interlude): FilmmakingFrenzy.com entries for persuading people to vote in midterm elections [C]

**Due:** Mon 10/22: *Draft Thesis Statement*

**Due:** Wed 10/24: *Draft Paragraph*

**Due:** Fri 10/26: *Final Writing Assignment 2: Into the Archives: Intrinsic Analysis* [due at midnight]

Week 11 (10/29-11/2): Consider the Context


**Reading:** Wed 10/31 Introduction to Collaboration, [https://writingcommons.org/collaboration-introduction](https://writingcommons.org/collaboration-introduction) [C]; Independent Research

**Reading:** Fri 11/3: Chapter 8: Supporting Ideas (SUSO)

**Due:** Wed 10/31: *Individual Canvas Post (Draft Mind-Map)*

**November**

Week 12 (11/5-11/9): Power in Numbers: Making Groups Work

**Reading:** Mon 11/5: Chapter 12: “Outlining” (SUSO)

**Reading:** Fri 11/9: Chapter 9 and 11: “Intros and Conclusions” (SUSO)
Due: Wed 11/7 Group Canvas Post (Draft Outline)

Week 13 (11/12-11/16): Flashback Speech Week, Part I
Due: Wed, Fri Final Outline and Speech Assignment 3: Flashback (Group Informative Speech)

Week 14 (11/19-11/21) Flashback Speech Week, Part II
Due: Mon, Wed Final Outline and Speech Assignment 3: Flashback (Group Informative Speech)
No Class on Friday (11/23)

Week 15 (11/26-11/30) Putting it All Together
Reading: Fri 11/30 Chapter 11: Choosing Words, Shaping Sentences
Due: Wed 11/28 Focused freewrite on revisions for final rhetorical analysis (Canvas Post)

December
Week 16 (12/3-12/5) Ending and Beginnings
Due: Mon 12/3: Find an article in a contemporary issue (past 5 years) of the Foghorn to compare/contrast with your historical article. What has changed? What’s remained the same?

Finals Week (12/6-12/14)
Due: Thurs 12/14 Final Writing Assignment 3: Rhetorical Analysis
Welcome to the second semester of Written and Oral Comm! In the first semester, we focused on analysis. In exploring theories of obedience, we learned how to identify and compare key arguments in complex texts. In researching and presenting on past activist movements, we learned how to uncover and make meaning from historical events. In analyzing Foghorn editorials, we practiced closely reading and evaluating the merits of specific rhetorical strategies. And in our final project, we put our close reading in conversation with our contextual analysis. This final effort helped us learn how paying attention to audience and historical context can reshape our evaluation of specific arguments and strategies – and vis versa.

This semester we’ll take our analytical skills and turn them towards making our own arguments. More specifically, we’ll work towards realizing the USF motto - creating arguments to make the changes we want to see in the world. We’ll consider the merits and problems of “academic discourse” in the service of advocacy and learn how to join thorough research and critical reasoning with personal and historical storytelling. Through exploring these various ways of writing, speaking, thinking, and knowing, we’ll connect WHAT we want to change, with WHO can make that change, and HOW to convince them to do it.

**Course Description:**
Written and Oral Communication (130/131) is a two-semester course that meets the university Core requirements for writing and public speaking. In the first semester, students learn the basic practices of oral and written argument, writing 5000 to 6000 words of revised prose and delivering 2-3 graded speeches totaling 15-20 minutes of speaking time. In the second semester, students learn more elaborate approaches to argument, rhetoric, and analysis, writing 6000 to 7000 words of revised prose and delivering at least two presentations, totaling at least 15 minutes of speaking time.

In the second semester, having mastered basic public speaking skills, students prepare oral presentations for more complex contexts, which may include more detailed argumentative speeches, debates, research reports, facilitation of class discussion, or other appropriate assignments. In both written and oral contexts, they learn to make arguments in an ethical manner, balancing emotion and reason, while fairly and accurately representing (and responding to) opposing views. Additionally, they analyze more complex cultural texts and learn to adapt arguments to audience and occasion, studying the rhetorical use of style and diction.

**Learning Outcomes:**
By the end of this 2-semester course, you should have mastered Core A1 and Core A2 skills and knowledge. Take a look at the assignment descriptions below to see how each
assignment will help you develop and assess progress towards mastery (Learning Objectives abbreviated as LOA1/LOA2 respectively).

**Core A1 Outcomes:**
2. Present well-reasoned and appropriately supported oral arguments that are responsive to topic, purpose, audience, and occasion.
3. Deliver speeches using an audience-centered, extemporaneous approach.
4. Use rhetorical concepts and principles to evaluate the effectiveness of their own and others' communication in both academic and civic contexts.
5. Use rhetorical concepts and principles to practice ethical and socially responsible public speaking, and to identify and evaluate ethical problems in public address.

**Core A2 Outcomes:**
1. Critical analysis of academic discourse: Students critically analyze linguistic and rhetorical strategies used in long and complex texts from a variety of genres, subjects, and fields.
2. Integrating multiple academic sources: Students incorporate multiple texts of length and complexity within a unified argumentative essay, addressing connections and differences among them.
3. Academic research: Students develop sophisticated research questions and compose substantial arguments in response to those questions, incorporating extensive independent library research and demonstrating mastery of documentation in MLA and APA modes.
4. Style: Students edit their own prose to achieve a clear and mature writing style in keeping with the conventions of academic and/or professional discourse.
5. Revision: Students develop their own revision strategies for extending and enriching early drafts and for producing polished advanced academic writing.

**Assignments:** Because this class is designed to develop your speaking AND writing skills, speaking and writing assignments are designed to work together, complementing and expanding on similar topics or skill-sets. **In addition, your major writing and speaking assignments this semester will work as “building blocks” to help you complete your final advocacy project. In other words, like last semester, most major assignments will help you draft a component of your final project, so that your final project will not be started “from scratch” near the end of the semester but rather reflect both skills and content you have developed, rethought, and revised throughout the semester.**

Writing and speaking assignments will increase in value and complexity throughout the semester as they build toward your final Advocacy Article. With this in mind, all of your written assignments will be related to a single controversial issue you select at the beginning of the semester. Building-block assignments are also designed to emphasize how “story” perspectives and narrative organizational styles join with traditional argumentation and advocacy. Final grades for each assignment will often incorporate grades for “process” elements, such as proposals, drafts, peer reviews, and final reflections (helping you fulfill Learning Objectives A2.4 and A2.5). **All writing**
assignments will be submitted on Canvas; drafts and proposals are often a component of
the final grade for these assignments.

- **Storytelling to Raise Awareness (Speech):** Expanding your “hook” techniques
  from last semester into an entire speech, tell a story that reflects why your
  controversial issue matters to you, and therefore why your particular audience
  should care. This speech will help you practice organized, audience-centered
  speeches pertinent to A1.1 and A1.3. 3-4 mins. 40 pts. Due Week 4.

- **Backstory: Digital Timeline and Historical Reflection (Writing):** Using
  scholarly sources as practiced for your contextual analysis speech assignments
  last semester, you’ll identify and summarize the history and context of your issue
  in a digital visual timeline. You’ll also make a This builds towards A2.2 and A2.3
  in requiring you to identify, integrate, and cite numerous scholarly sources while
  deepening your understanding of the “backstory” of your chosen issue. ~ 4-5 pgs.
  40 pts. Due Week 7.

- **The Great Debates (Speech):** In this group speech, you and your team will
  prepare and rebut arguments surrounding controversial and community-centric
  issues. This assignment will develop your reasoning and critical-thinking skills
  and help you prepare for the argumentation elements of your own advocacy issue.
  Skills are particularly pertinent to A1.4 and A1.5. 10-15 mins per person. 60 pts.
  Due Week 11.

- **Rough Draft Advocacy Article (Writing):** Submit a complete rough draft of your
  final advocacy article. Skills are relevant to all A2 learning objectives. 5-7 pgs. 40
  pts. Due Week 13.

- **Restyle It! (Speech):** We’ll spend some class time experimenting with expressing
  your core argument in other genres (poems, dialogues, etc). In this informal
  speech, you’ll share your favorite “restyle” with the class and explain how it helps
  you rethink or otherwise differently approach a problem in your advocacy article.
  This speech builds style, revision and audience-centered skills (A1.3-5, A2.4-5).
  2-3 mins. 20 pts. Due Week 15.

**Final Advocacy Article:** In this final essay designed for a public audience, you will
develop a substantial and well-researched argument advocating a position on your issue.
This article should incorporate components from each of your previous assignments,
including how your life experience has shaped your opinion about the issue, context and
history of the issue, and evaluation of current arguments about the issue. How you
combine these elements will be shaped by your identification and audience analysis of a
particular publication context. Taken together, it will educate your reader on the history
of your controversy, identify the major positions relevant to your controversy, and offer
your unique perspective on what we (your audience) should think, feel, or do about your
issue. **Your final submission will also include a cover letter identifying and reflecting
on the revisions you made since the initial rough draft version. As such, it should
reflect skills relevant to all A2 learning objectives.** 5-7 pgs. 80 pts. Due Week 17
(Finals Week)

**Weekly Writing and Speaking Assignments.**
Canvas Project Workshops and Rhetorical Reflections. You will be asked to respond to prompts that help you develop upcoming assignments (Project Workshops) or to reflect on lessons-learned from previous assignments (Rhetorical Reflections) in weekly posts on Canvas. You’ll also be using these posts to revise your Problem Proposal – your articulation of what it is you want to change in the world and how you want to change it. These posts will be graded on a complete/incomplete basis. Posts should be submitted before class the day they are due. NOTE HOW MANY POINTS THESE ARE CUMMULATIVELY WORTH! 80 pts (the same as your final paper!!)

Attendance + Participation: Attendance and participation are a significant part of your grade; they can make the difference between a B+ or A-. So be prepared to speak every day in class. Group speeches, reading discussions, delivery and performance practice, and peer critiques will also be a component of this grade. Attendance policies are listed below, but obviously if you aren’t in class, you can’t get attendance/participation points for that day. 40 pts

Grade Breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Writing (2)</td>
<td>80 pts (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Speeches (3)</td>
<td>120 pts (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Advocacy Article</td>
<td>80 pts (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvas Workshops</td>
<td>80 pts (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/Participation</td>
<td>40 pts (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>400 pts (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details, guidelines, and internal grade breakdowns (point values of proposals, drafts, etc) will be posted on Canvas and discussed in class.

Required Textbooks:
- Writing Analytically, 8th ed, by David Rosenwatter and Jill Stephen.
- Stand Up, Speak Out: The Practice and Ethics of Public Speaking (Saylor Academy, 2012). This text is available for free at: https://saylordotorg.github.io/text_stand-up-speak-out-the-practice-and-ethics-of-public-speaking/index.html (link is also posted on Canvas)

Note that these are the texts required for last semester, so they haven’t been ordered at the campus bookstore for this semester. In fact, we won’t really be reading much from these texts this semester; instead we’ll be focusing on other readings and audio/video materials (which will be posted on Canvas – labelled on the syllabus below with a (C). Please follow the reading guidelines (posted on Canvas) for all days in which you have assigned readings and no Canvas post.

Course Schedule:
* Note: Readings may be supplemented or replaced; changes to readings, assignments, and other schedule issues will be noted in class and on Canvas.
January
Week 1: Welcome Back and Agenda-Setting:
  • For Fri - Read: Booth, “How Many Rhetorics”? [C]

Week 2: “Academic Discourse”: Definitions, Discontents, and Alternatives.
  • For Mon - Read: Elbow, “Reflection on Academic Discourse” (C)
  • For Fri – Read: Forna, “Your Nationalism Can’t Contain Me” [C]
  • Due (Mon): Canvas Workshop #1: What issue has impacted your life and why?

February
Week 3: Stories as Arguments/Arguing About Stories
  • For Mon – Read: Simmons, “The Art of the Story,” “How to Tell a Story” [C]
  Tues night: Aminatta Forna lecture, 6:30pm in the Berman Room (Fromm Hall)
    • For Wed – Read another Forna article (https://aminattafornea.com/articles-and-essays.html); bring in questions for Ms. Forna (class visit from Ms. Forna)
    • Due (Mon): Canvas Workshop #2: Draft Storytelling Speech Outline and storytelling strategy justification
    • Due (Fri): Canvas Workshop #3: Video Draft for Storytelling Speech

Week 4: Tell YOUR Story
  • Due (Mon - Fri) Speech 1: Storytelling to Raise Awareness Speeches and Outlines

Week 5: Hi(stories) as Arguments
No class on Monday for President’s Day
Tuesday night – Rhetoric Week Speaker Showcase: 6:30-7:30 Fromm Hall 120 - Xavier Auditorium
  • For Wed – Watch: Silberman, “The Forgotten History of Autism” [C]
Wednesday night – Rhetoric Week Debate Team Showcase: 7-8 pm McLaren Complex 250
  • For Fri – Read: SF Chronicle, “Is Desegregation Dead?” [C] (https://www.sfchronicle.com/schools-desegregation/)
  • Due (Wed): Canvas Rhetorical Reflection and Problem Proposal #1

Week 6: History Matters
  • For Mon – Research Day
  • For Wed - Citation Workshop (Bring in list of sources)
  • Due (Fri): Canvas Workshop #4: Hi(stories) as Arguments: draft paragraph about how the history you uncovered should reshape our understanding of your issue’s problem or solution
March
Week 7: Introducing Dissoi Logoi:
- For Wed – Read: Booth, “Judging Rhetoric”; Bring in debate topics
- For Fri – Read: Zarefsky, “Types of Evidence”
- **Due (Mon): Writing 1: Backstory Digital Timelines**

Week 8: Spring Break, no class

Week 9: Good Arguments/Bad Arguments
Tues night – Tennis Star Billie Jean King speaks about being a women’s rights and LGBTQ activist; 6 pm McClaren Center
- For Wed – Read: Constructing an Argument [C]; Watch: IntelligenceSquared Debate (C)
- For Fri – Read: Constructing a Rebuttal [C]; Watch: IntelligenceSquared Debate [C]
- **Due (Mon): Canvas Workshop #5: 1-2 Arguments and Counter-Arguments for Debate Team**

Week 10: Debate Prep.
No class on Friday for Easter Holiday
- **Due (Mon): Canvas Workshop #6: Group Rough Draft Debate Prep Sheet**

April
Week 11: The Great Debates!
- **Due (Mon-Fri): Speech 2: Great Debates and Group Debate Prep Sheets**

Week 12: Putting it All Together
- For Mon – Read: Sample student Advocacy Article [C]
- For Wed – Bring in top reasons, evidence for group critique
- For Fri – Consider Context (explore various publication contexts)
- **Due (Mon) Canvas Rhetorical Reflection and Project Proposal #3. What did you learn from the debates that you will apply to your individual argument? What’s your draft thesis statement?**

Week 13: Drafting Your Advocacy Article
- **Due (Mon): Canvas Workshop # 7: Rough Draft Advocacy Article (Intro/Thesis/Paragraph)**
- **Due (Thurs): Writing 3: Draft Advocacy Article**
No class on Friday for Easter Holiday

Week 14: Restyling as Revision
- For Fri – Bring in best Restyle for peer workshop
- **Due (Mon): Canvas Rhetorical Reflection: What issue can you identify with your completed draft? What should you continue to work on?**

May
Week 15: Restyle and Workshopping
- For Fri – Bring in Draft Advocacy Article for Workshops/Conferences
- Due (Mon-Wed): Speech 3: Restyle It! (and posted revised restyles)

Week 16: Workshopping and Wrap-Ups
- For Mon/Wed – Bring in Draft Advocacy Article to workshop
No Friday class for Finals Week

Week 17: Finals Week
- Due (5/14): Final Advocacy Article

Policies and Expectations:
Grading Policy:
Letter grades will be calculated according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>84-86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>74-76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70-73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87-89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77-79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60-69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>less than 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grading Rubrics:
The following grading rubric will be applied to all writing assignments in addition to grading parameters specific to individual assignments:

A: In addition to the requirement for B papers, A papers are well written, generally free of errors, demonstrate thoughtful engagement, and clearly present an argument supported by sound evidence. A papers move well from one topic to another, are responsive to audience, employ precise language and more complex syntax and grammar, and display the author’s voice; they are exemplary performances.

B: B papers are strong and carefully attentive to assignment requirements, but have some errors in the elements outlined above. They show accurate (but less nuanced) use of the readings, have a solid (but less complex) thesis that organizes topics, uses correct (but less sophisticated) grammar with appropriate choice of language. They also show some evidence of audience awareness, and demonstrate some attention to editing, revision, and proofreading.

C: C papers follow the requirements of the assignment. They demonstrate competent but not exceptional control of language, syntax, grammar, and mechanics, and little attempt at editing, revising, and proofreading.

D and F: D and F papers are deficient in several ways. They may not follow the requirements of the assignment, or may be so carelessly written that errors interfere with reading the paper’s argument.

The following grading rubric will be applied to all speeches in addition to grading parameters specific to individual assignments:

A: In addition to the requirement for B speeches, A speeches goes beyond merely providing information on a generic topic; it adopts interesting, audience-aware angles of vision; they are well supported with sound reasoning and a variety of well-researched
evidence, are delivered extemporaneously and in an audience-centered manner, with clear and astute organization revealed through main points, signposts, and transitions. 

**B:** B speeches attend all the basic assignment requirements, and provide well-reasoned arguments in an audience-centered manner. They use transitional elements effectively, and possess an adequate amount of internal coherence and consistency strong and carefully attentive to assignment requirements.

**C:** C speeches follow the basic requirements of the assignment, but may be significantly deficient in one or more ways in the areas described above. (e.g., a speech with well-researched content but no discernible main points may get a "C" grade; a well-crafted speech that otherwise may be an "A" or "B" speech will probably get a "C" if it is delivered from a manuscript rather than extemporaneously).

**D and F:** D and F speeches are deficient in several ways. They are usually deficient in meeting one or more basic requirements of the assignment (e.g., an organized, interesting speech may receive a D or F grade if it seriously violates time restraints).

**Attendance:** My attendance policy is simple and designed to reward you for coming to class. I take the number of class sessions (40) and divide that into the number of participation points (40). You get that point amount (1) for every class you attend in which you fully participate. Being more than 5 mins. late to class counts as ½ of an absence. Why not try for 100% of these 40 easy points? More than just the points, though, we work as a whole class community and in small groups nearly every day in this class; your fellow classmates are depending on your attendance and participation. If you miss a class, please check with your fellow students (email, text, and/or call them) and Canvas for materials and assignments. Please do not send me a “What did I miss?” email.

However, conflicts and emergencies arise – written documentation from a doctor or CASA coach will count as an “excused” absence. **You MUST attend all your scheduled speech days; if an emergency arises, you must provide written documentation from above sources of a conflict such as illness, family emergency, jury duty, religious observance, etc.**. If you are late to class and arrive when a speech is underway, please wait to take your seat until the speaker is finished. Attendance is updated on Canvas ~2-3 weeks, so check there to keep up-to-date.

**Exception:** When representing the University of San Francisco in intercollegiate competition (e.g., athletics, debate), students shall be excused from classes on the hours or days such competition takes them away from classes. However, such students shall be responsible for advising their professors regarding anticipated absences and for arranging to complete course work for classes, laboratories, and/or examinations missed.

**Grades and Adjustments:** You must complete all major graded speeches and writing assignments to pass the course. While weekly Canvas Posts typically can’t be submitted late (because we use them as the basis for class workshops), I do usually accept major written assignments late, albeit for a potentially reduced grade. Late speeches will not be accepted because it affects the schedule for everyone. I’m happy to address concerns
about speech and assignment grades **within a week** after you were notified of that grade. All final grades (for the entire course) are just that—final.

**Technology:** All cell phones, tablets, and other noise-producing and communication devices must be turned off and put away during class. Laptops should not be used in class unless I approve them for presentation or group work (otherwise it disrupts the discussion dynamic). This is primarily a discussion, not lecture-based class, so pen and paper should suffice for note-taking.

**University Policies**

**Time Management and Planning:** Students are expected to spend 2 hours outside of class in study and preparation of assignments for each hour in class. In a 4 unit class, assignments have been created with the expectation that students will engage in approximately 8 hours of out-of-class work per week.

**Students with Disabilities:**
If you are a student with a disability or disabling condition, or if you think you may have a disability, please contact [USF Student Disability Services (SDS)](http://www.usfca.edu/studentdisabilityservices) for information about accommodations.

**Behavioral Expectations:**
All students are expected to behave in accordance with the [Student Conduct Code](http://www.usfca.edu/studentconduct) and other University policies.

**Academic Integrity:**
USF upholds the standards of honesty and integrity from all members of the academic community. All students are expected to know and adhere to the University's [Honor Code](http://www.usfca.edu/honor).

**Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS):**
CAPS provides confidential, free counseling to student members of our community.

**Confidentiality, Mandatory Reporting, and Sexual Assault:**
For information and resources regarding sexual misconduct or assault visit the [Title IX coordinator or USFs Callisto website](http://www.usfca.edu/callisto).

**Student Resources**
The Learning, Writing, and Speaking Centers at USF provide individualized support to assist you in better understanding course material and to aid you on your path to success. Services are free and include one-on-one tutoring, group tutoring, and one-on-one Academic Skills Coaching appointments to discuss effective study strategies. The Learning Center supports over 80 courses each semester. The Writing Center helps students develop writing skills in rhetoric, organization, style, and structure, through one-on-one interactive conferences. The Speaking Center helps students prepare for public speaking - including speeches, oral presentations, team presentations, and visual aid.
demonstrations. International students may also contact the Centers to learn more about communicating with professors and general academic study skills.

The Learning, Writing, and Speaking Centers are located on the Lower Level of Gleeson Library. Please contact them at (415) 422-6713 for further assistance or visit: https://myusf.usfca.edu/lwsc to make an appointment.
Appendix E: Faculty Technology Survey
2. Are you full-time or part-time?

Part-time

Yes

5. What teaching with technology training have you done?

I took the USF Canvas workshop, which was extremely helpful.

I would like to do more training on how to use lecture capture effectively.

Canvas, some online teaching workshops, various others over the years

I'd like to have a workshop tools students can use to read actively on line.

Mostly Canvas, presentation software and equip., google docs, etc.

Blackboard, Canvas workshops

Audacity; iMovie; Windows Moviemaker

More on Echo 360

18 years online instruction and instructional design. Moodle, Blackboard, and Canvas, Wordpress, web video, Flash, HTML 5.

No

Updates in canvas

The school offers excellent support. I don't know if the students use it.

Part-time

I orient them to Canvas, but other than that they're on their own.

I think they have it in their DNA.

Yes--they can ask instructor or IT is very helpful as well.

Canvas, Google Drive (laptops/smart phones)

Working with iPads I the classroom.

I don't know what is available to them outside of class, but I give tutorials on Canvas and MS Word.

InDesign for layouts; audiofiles on Hoopla to complement some readings; plus Canvas-enabled discussion boards, wikis

Canvas system, creating digital stories ??

Not all have all the things I use, so I need tech support--laptops, headphones--Sometimes this is hard to organize unless I am in a computer lab, so I have extra issues almost every semester

Mainly have learned by hands-on practice and consultations with colleagues in our department and others.

Canvas, Word, Google Docs, Google Slides, Power Point, iMovie, audacity, tumblr, iBooksAuthor, Adobe Spark, Wikipedia editing tools

more on avoiding plagiarism

I would like to learn more about virtual reality and augmented reality. And, honestly, I need to take a workshop on Excel.

Canvas, Google, UDL

Flipped classroom, advanced UDL

Web

No

No

Canvas, laptops, applications available online, library resources used remotely.

I've taken the iPad, and flipped classroom workshops

Canvas, Google, UDL

not sure what you mean by adequate support for students

Summer intensive

Yes

It seems to figure it out or move on to another option

Part-time

Part-time

Part-time

The school offers excellent support.  I don't know if the students use it.
9. Would you like more access to active learning classrooms?
   No
   Sometimes I get tired of looking at screens. While recognizing that tech. is amazing, I am a bit of a luddite.

10. Any open comments about technology:
    I'm thinking about a hybrid public speaking course
    I'm not sure
    Having the podiums in each classroom with the computer and projector already connected makes life as a teacher SO much easier. Thank you!
    The security demands are getting heavier every year!!!
    Since students have laptops, computer classrooms aren't necessary. They make facetime difficult, but are better for one on one during class. Swivel computers would be better than fixed
    Yes
    Yes
    Are students given courses in computer skills and paperless technologies or can they go somewhere for tutoring? Is there ... the university to switch to OER texts? Many of the books students are required to purchase are cost prohibitive.
    I'm not sure
    Yes
    I'm not sure
    What is an active learning classroom?  computers?  I think the technology at USF is excellent as is the support.
    Yes
    Yes
    I'm not sure
    The branch campuses should have access to the same technology resources as main campus in my opinion.
    The Tech Intensive really showed me the range of technologies available. I think more RHET faculty would benefit from such training.
    I'm not sure
    Yes
    I'm not sure
    Yes
    I'm not sure
    Yes
    I have long appreciated the swift and professional tech support from the folks in ITS; they seem avid to help students (and profs) with projects that require technology...
Appendix F: History of AEM Program to 2012
The University of San Francisco has a long history of educating students from around the world, and over the years, international students have contributed much to the University. The 1970s and 1980s were decades of growth in the number of international students in the United States, and like other U.S. universities, the University of San Francisco sought ways to better serve these students, prepare them for academic work in an English medium environment, and integrate them into the academic community. Throughout its history, the basic goals and mission of the ESL program have remained constant. The ESL program is focused on developing English academic literacy and oracy skills, on academic preparation for U.S. universities, introduction to U.S. culture and life, and a focus on developing an understanding and appreciation for other peoples and cultures.

Beginnings

In the early 1970s, the University of San Francisco decided to examine how they could best serve the international student population, so a group of professionals, through a program offered by the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA) and the Association of International Educators, came for a site visit and offered advice. One suggestion from the NAFSA consultants was that USF establish an intensive English program. USF asked Professor Shigeo Imamura, professor of English and the director of the English Language Center at Michigan State University and one of the NAFSA consultants who visited USF, to come to USF to do just that. Professor Imamura took a leave of absence from MSU and came to USF to found the English Language Center (ELC), as it was named then. He stayed for two years. The director of the English Language Center reported directly to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The first year, 1974-1975, there were six full-time faculty members with lecturer contracts and numerous adjunct faculty. Enrollment was good, with slightly over 100 in the fall semester and over 160 in the spring. For the 1975-1976 academic year, Professor Imamura successfully negotiated an increase in the number of full-time faculty to eight and a change in the full-time positions to tenure-track. Students were both non-matriculated, those who studied English 20 – 25 hours a week, and matriculated students, who were admitted to degree programs and took one or two ESL courses in addition to other USF courses. The ESL courses did not carry credit. A score of 520 or higher on the pbt TOEFL test was required for full admission to a degree program.

The 1970s and early 1980s

The late 1970s and early 1980s were tumultuous years for ESL faculty and the University as a whole. This was especially true in the ESL program, with faculty workload and conditions often an area of contention. The fluctuating enrollments also made the program vulnerable to reorganization, and changes. At times, the Administration held up the threat of closing the program. In summer 1976, after Professor Imamura left, several major changes were implemented in the English Language Center: a) two full-time instructors and six adjunct faculty were dismissed with no reasons given; b) the tenure-track faculty positions were eliminated and 11 full-time faculty were given the title of ESL specialists with lower pay than the previous years, c) the name of the program was changed to the World English Center (WEC).
In 1977, the USF Faculty Association, which had been established in fall 1975, working with the ESL faculty, filed a grievance, charging that the Administration had unilaterally eliminated eight bargaining unit positions and that ESL specialists were, in fact, doing the same work in 1976-1977 that they had done as tenure-track faculty the previous year. The Administration agreed to settle this grievance. As a settlement, in spring 1978, seven tenure-track positions were reinstated, including two of the fired full-time faculty. Shortly after the settlement in spring 1978, six full-time faculty were given increased workloads in violation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. All six filed grievances; four faculty were terminated at the end of the semester. The grievances regarding workload were upheld by an arbitrator in a February 1980 ruling, and faculty received back pay for working an overload. The arbitrator’s ruling affirmed that ESL faculty were to have the same teaching load/work load as other faculty under the USFFA Collective Bargaining Agreement.

With the help of the USFFA and after filing grievances, two tenure-track faculty (Hafernik and Vandrick) were awarded tenure and promotion. A third faculty member (Carleton) was granted tenure and promotion.

The World English Center moved to a program in the College of Arts and Sciences, with the director being appointed by and reporting directly to the Dean. During these years, enrollment continued to increase with enrollments consistently well over 200, climbing to a high of 292 in 1980 and 1981. The curriculum was evaluated and improvements made throughout this time.

**The mid and late 1980s**

1983 brought several changes with a new administrative team (Rev. Edward Justen, S. J., Director, and Leila Kellow, Assistant Director) and several new tenure-track faculty.

In December 1984, faculty were informed that the World English Center was being reorganized, and all non-tenured ESL faculty received termination notices because their positions were being eliminated. The three tenured faculty kept their positions.

The name was changed to the *Intensive English Program (IEP)* in fall 1985. From fall 1985–fall 1989, only matriculated students were enrolled in ESL courses. In 1989, the IEP was reorganized so that non-matriculated students as well as matriculated students could enroll. The IEP director reported directly to the Associate Dean and Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences.

From 1985, there was a decrease in enrollment, with fall and spring semester enrollments in the mid to late 1980s under 100 and summer enrollments over 150 from 1988 – 1991, with 227 in summer 1991. This decrease was partly due to the fact that from 1985 - 1989 there were no IEP students in fall and spring semesters.

In 1985 the pbt TOEFL score requirement for full-admission was raised from 520 to 550 due to complaints from faculty and administrators that international students were not prepared for academic work at USF.

**The 1990s and early 2000s**
In summer 1990, Professor Stanley Nel became Acting Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and subsequently he became Dean. The ESL program reported directly to the dean. In 1991, Dean Nel reorganized the ESL program so that it was in line with other academic units and had a chair who oversaw the academic aspects of the program. The 1991-1992 academic year was one of transition in that there was an academic chair (Hafernik) elected by the full-time faculty and a director (Leila Kellow). In fall 1992, the ESL program became the Department of English as a Second Language in the College of Arts and Sciences with a faculty chair. The director’s position was eliminated. (Kellow moved to a new position and then left the university after one year.) ESL was its own department from 1992-1998.

In fall 1998, the ESL Department became part of the Department of Communication Studies, which included the Communication Division, with a major in Communication Studies, Rhetoric and Composition, and the ESL Program. This configuration was advantageous at the time for several reasons: (1) combining programs that deal with literacy and communication skills together, (2) providing an academic department home for the Rhetoric and Composition Program which previously had been a program under an appointed administrator who reported to the Dean’s office (College of Arts and Sciences), (3) providing a more secure academic home for the ESL Program, and (4) providing a critical mass or sufficient number of faculty in Communication Studies after faculty in media studies split off to form a separate department (Department of Media Studies). This configuration was from 1997-2009.

2009 – 2012

In 2009 the Department of Communication Studies became a separate department and the Program in Rhetoric and Composition and the ESL Program became the Department of Rhetoric and Language, composed of three areas: Composition, Public Speaking, and ESL. Each area has its own director; the area directors report to the Department Chair.