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English 5007 – Composition Theories and Pedagogies

Instructor: Dr. Terri Fredrick  
Office: Coleman Hall 3070  
Phone: (217) 714-6028  
Email: Use D2L email when possible; if sending a large file or sharing a document via GoogleDrive, use tfredrickwork@gmail.com  
Office hours: T 1:00–3:00 pm; Th 1:00–3:00 pm and 5:00–6:00 pm; other times by appointment

Objectives and Overview
This seminar introduces graduate students to the theories and pedagogies that shape our understanding of how to teach writing at the college level. We will explore the foundational pedagogies, history, and theory of the discipline of Composition. The course will explore how knowledge gets made in Composition/Rhetoric. As part of the course, students will write analytical responses to readings. Students will also complete a seminar paper based on secondary and/or primary sources.

By the end of the semester, you should be able to do the following:
- Demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge about the history, theories, and movements within Composition Studies.
- Analyze and synthesize diverse composition theories
- Demonstrate preparation to apply composition theories and pedagogies to one’s own teaching
- Demonstrate effective oral and written communication
- Demonstrate the ability to produce research and/or pedagogical materials that could lead to presentation/publication or classroom teaching

Success in this course includes (1) finding your own ways to make readings, topics, and assignments personally interesting—especially if your first instinct is to label them “boring” or “too hard,” (2) believing that you have something worthwhile to say, and (3) expressing it after you’ve analyzed beyond the surface.

Texts for this Class
- Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader, 3rd edition, Victor Villanueva (ed.)
- Guide to Composition Pedagogies, 2nd edition, Gary Tate, Amy Rupiper, Kurt Schick, and H. Brooke Hessler (eds.)
- Articles on D2L

Course Components
Eight Article Responses (30% of semester grade):
Eight times during the semester, you will write a response to one or more of the readings from that week.
For seven of those responses, you will select an important issue from the readings and briefly summarize how that issue is discussed in the articles you have read. You will then write an analysis by doing one or more of the following:

- Take a position in support of or opposition to the arguments presented in the articles
- Compare/contrast the relative strengths and weaknesses among the three articles’ presentations of that issue (i.e., which is more credible, reliable, persuasive on this issue?)
- Discuss the issue in terms of concepts or articles from earlier in the course
- Apply the issue to your own experiences evaluating or being evaluated

For one of the eight responses (your choice which one), you will focus on the “form” of an article rather than the content. You will analyze the structure, genre, and methodology of the article to uncover the author’s rhetorical moves and the research methodology employed.

Article responses will be evaluated on evidence of accuracy of reading, depth of engagement with the articles, critical thinking, and clarity of prose. Length is not a focus of the evaluation.

Note: There are eleven dates (between weeks 2–14 on the syllabus with the assignment indicator “article response.” You may choose the eight responses you will write from this list of dates. (You must complete the article response for Oct 06, which will be written collaboratively.) If you choose to write more than eight responses, you may drop the lowest article response scores at the end of the semester.

Discussion Leader (DL) Responsibilities (10% of semester grade):
While active class discussion stemming from close and reflective reading is expected of all members of this seminar, you will be assigned to be a discussion leader for an article one time during the semester. In this position, you will lead discussion through thoughtful questions that are text-specific in order for you and the rest of us to make connections to other authors and ideas.

Keep in mind that a discussion leader does not lecture. Instead, you are facilitating discussion. Your role is to get us talking about the article in a fruitful and responsible way. You’re not “filling people’s heads” (the “banking” model of education) via lecture, so you need to direct an engaging discussion through careful planning. You should plan to use 20–30 minutes for directing discussion and activities related to the article you’re assigned.

Composition Theories Synthesis/Analysis (20% of semester grade):
You will write an in-depth synthesis/analysis in which you bring together 3–5 theories for comparison and analysis. As part of the assignment, you will address what theories you might incorporate into your own writing courses/instruction.

Seminar project (30% of semester grade):
At the end of the semester, you will create a seminar project on the composition topic of your choice. The project can be based in secondary sources, interviews with teachers or students, analysis of student writing or course materials, etc. The topic and scope are at your discretion; you will, however, submit an informal 2–5 page proposal and reading list midway through the semester. Specific evaluation criteria for the major project will be provided at a later date.

Quality of failure / Wallowing in Ambiguity (10% of semester grade):
The knowledge of every discipline is based on a process that includes regular failure, reflection on that failure, and then adjustment made accordingly. The development of an effective teaching
pedagogy and practice requires teachers to stake claims and then rethink those claims in light of new information and experience. Unfortunately, the nature of our educational system often makes the risk of failure and contradiction seem too high for students; as a result, students may not develop risk-taking habits in their education and, subsequently, their careers. For most of you, this class introduces you to a new discipline, a situation ripe with opportunities to fail. I encourage you to make high-quality mistakes: try out a new idea or approach in a reading response, share a partially formed idea, change your mind. And when you do, I will reward you for that in the currency of the university: your grade. At the end of the semester, I will ask you to submit a memo to me detailing the ways in which you embraced failure and ambiguity this semester. (Want to learn more about “teaching to fail”? Check out this essay: http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2012/08/21/essay-importance-teaching-failure)

Attendance and Late Work
Prompt, regular attendance, as well as active, informed engagement in class discussion and activities, is expected. Students who do not attend regularly or who do not participate in class discussions and activities can expect that their final grade will be lowered.

Reading responses must be turned in at the beginning of class to receive credit. Drafts of research synthesis and final project must be submitted by deadline, or points will be deducted from the final grade.

Plagiarism/Academic Integrity
Since this is a class on teaching writing, we’ll have opportunities to discuss how you might handle student work that has been plagiarized or that you suspect might have been plagiarized. It should go without saying (but unfortunately, these things usually don’t) that we will model the behaviors of academic integrity that we would expect from our students.

To that end, plagiarism of any kind will not be tolerated. The English Department states, "Any teacher who discovers an act of plagiarism -- 'The appropriation or imitation of the language, ideas, and/or thoughts of another author, and representation of them as one's original work' -- has the right and the responsibility to impose upon the guilty student an appropriate penalty, up to and including immediate assignment of a grade of "F" in the course."

The Student Success Center:
Students who are having difficulty achieving their academic goals are encouraged to contact the Student Success Center (www.eiu.edu/~success) for assistance with time management, test taking, note taking, avoiding procrastination, setting goals, and other skills to support academic achievement. The Student Success Center provides individualized consultations. To make an appointment, call 217-581-6696, or go to 9th Street Hall, Room 1302.

Information for students with disabilities:
If you are a student with a documented disability in need of accommodations to fully participate in this class, please contact the Office of Student Disability Services (OSDS). All accommodations must be approved through OSDS. Please stop by Ninth Street Hall, Room 2006, or call 217-581-6583 to make an appointment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Write:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anson, “Process Pedagogy” (GCP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Murray, “Teach Writing as a Process Not Product” (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emig, “Writing as a Mode of Learning” (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 01</td>
<td><strong>TOPICS: (1) AUDIENCE AND (2) COGNITIVE PEDAGOGY</strong></td>
<td>Ede &amp; Lunsford, “Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked” (CT)</td>
<td>Article response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flower &amp; Hayes, “A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing” (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bizzell, “Cognition, Convention, and Certainty” (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hart and Parmeter, “Writing in the Margins” (D2L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 08</td>
<td><strong>TOPIC: EXPRESSIVIST PEDAGOGY</strong></td>
<td>Burnham and Powell, “Expressive Pedagogy” (GCP)</td>
<td>Article response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Murray, “Writing before Writing” (D2L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones Royster, “When the First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own” (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 15</td>
<td><strong>TOPICS: (1) RHETORICAL PEDAGOGY AND (2) GENRE STUDIES</strong></td>
<td>Fleming, “Rhetoric and Argumentation Pedagogy” (GCP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Devitt, “Genre” (GCP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kinneavy, “The Basic Aims of Discourse” (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bartholomae, “Inventing the University” (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 22</td>
<td><strong>TOPIC: CRITICAL PEDAGOGY</strong></td>
<td>George, “Critical Pedagogy” (GCP)</td>
<td>Article response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hairston, “Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing” (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shor, “Why Teach about Social Class?” (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shor, “Critical Pedagogy is Too Big to Fail”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENG 5007 – Weekly Schedule

GCP = Tate, Rupiper, and Shick, *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*
CT = Villanueva, Cross-Talk in *Comp Theory: A Reader*
E = E-reserves for ENG 5007

### Sep 29
**TOPICS:** (1) CULTURAL STUDIES PEDAGOGY AND (2) FEMINIST PEDAGOGY
**READ:**
George & Trimbur, “Cultural Studies and Composition” (GCP)
France, “Assigning Places” (E)
Micciche, “Feminist Pedagogy” (GCP)
Flynn, “Composing as a Woman” (CT)

**WRITE:**
Article response

### Oct 06
**TOPICS:** (1) COLLABORATIVE PEDAGOGY AND (2) COMMUNITY-ENGAGED/SERVICE-LEARNING PEDAGOGY
**READ:**
Kennedy and Moore Howard, “Collaborative Writing, Print to Digital” (GCP)
Julier, Livingston, and Goldblatt, “Community Engaged” (GCP)
Cushman, “The Public Intellectual, Service Learning, and Activist Research” (CT)
Bruffee, “Collaborative Learning and the ‘Conversation of Mankind’” (CT)

**WRITE:**
Article response (written collaboratively) [required]

### Oct 13
**TOPICS:** (1) WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM (WAC)/WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES (WID) AND (2) COMPOSITION AND LITERATURE
**READ:**
Thaiss and McLeod, “Writing in the Disciplines and Across the Curriculum” (GCP)
Knoblauch & Brannon, “Writing as Learning through the Curriculum” (E)
Melzer, “Writing Assignments across the Curriculum: A National Study of College Writing”
Farris, “Literature and Composition” (GCP)

**WRITE:**
Article response

### Oct 20
**TOPICS:** (1) NEW MEDIA PEDAGOGY AND (2) TEACHING WRITING ONLINE
ENG 5007 – Weekly Schedule

GCP = Tate, Rupiper, and Shick, *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*
CT = Villanueva, Cross-Talk in *Comp Theory: A Reader*
E = E-reserves for ENG 5007

**READ:**
- Gifford Brooke, “New Media” (GCP)
- Hewett, “Online and Hybrid” (GCP)
- Blake Yancey, “Made Not Only in Words: Composition in a New Key (CT)
- Wysocki and Johnson-Eilola, “Blinded by the Letter: Why Are We Using Literacy as a Metaphor for Everything Else?”

**WRITE:**
- Article response

---

**Oct 27 TOPIC: TEACHING FOR TRANSFER**

**READ:**
- Sommers and Saltz, “The Novice as Expert: Writing the Freshman Year”
- Beaufort, “New Directions for University Writing Instruction”
- Addison and James McGee, “Writing in High School / Writing in College: Research Trends and Future Directions”
- Wardle, “Creative Repurposing for Expansive Learning: Considering “Problem-Exploring” and “Answer-Getting” Dispositions in Individuals and Fields” (online)

**WRITE:**
- Article response

---

**Nov 03 TOPIC: TEACHING RESEARCHED WRITING**

**READ:**
- Moore Howard and Jamieson, “Researched Writing”
- Kantz, “Helping Students Use Textual Sources Persuasively”

**WRITE:**
- Theory synthesis/analysis

---

**Nov 10 TOPIC: TEACHING GRAMMAR, STYLE, AND “CORRECTNESS”**

**READ:**
- Hartwell, “Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar” (CT)
- Braddock, “The Frequency and Placement of Topic Sentences” (CT)
- Rodgers, “A Discourse-Centered Rhetoric of the Paragraph” (CT)
- Lu, “Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone (CT)

[or cut Braddock, Lu, or Rodgers in favor of elbow?]

**WRITE:**
- Paper proposal and proposed reading list
**ENG 5007 – Weekly Schedule**

GCP = Tate, Rupiper, and Shick, *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*
CT = Villanueva, Cross-Talk in *Comp Theory: A Reader*
E = E-reserves for ENG 5007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic: Basic Writing / Developmental Composition READ: Mutnick and Lamos, “Basic Writing Pedagogy” (GCP) Shaughnessy, “Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing” (CT) Rose, “The Language of Exclusion” (E) Adler-Kassner, “Just Writing, Basically: Basic Writers on Basic Writing” (online) WRITE: Article response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 17</td>
<td>TOPIC: BASIC WRITING / DEVELOPMENTAL COMPOSITION READ: Mutnick and Lamos, “Basic Writing Pedagogy” (GCP) Shaughnessy, “Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing” (CT) Rose, “The Language of Exclusion” (E) Adler-Kassner, “Just Writing, Basically: Basic Writers on Basic Writing” (online) WRITE: Article response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 15</td>
<td>WRITE: Final paper due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>