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1. School/Division: Liberal Arts
2. Academic Subject Code: ENG
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4. Instructor: Lovejoy

5. Course Title: Advanced Writing in the Arts and Sciences
   Recommended Abbreviation (Optional): Adv. Writing in the Arts & Sciences
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6. First time this course is to be offered (Semester/Year): Spring 2009

7. Credit Hours: Fixed at 3 or Variable from ______ to ________

8. Is this course to be graded S-F (only)? Yes [✓] No [ ]

9. Is variable title approval being requested? Yes [ ] No [✓]

10. Course description (not to exceed 50 words) for Bulletin publication:
    Features semi-regular readings on various interdisciplinary topics and examines how writers in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences define problems, investigate their problems, and report their findings. Focuses on the study and practice of knowledge-making in different discourse communities with particular attention to the student's major discipline.

11. Lecture Contact Hours: Fixed at 3 or Variable from ______ to ________

12. Non-Lecture Contact Hours: Fixed at ________ or Variable from ________ to ________

13. Estimated enrollment: 25 of which ______ percent are expected to be graduate students.

14. Frequency of scheduling: Annually Will this course be required for majors?

15. Justification for new course: Needed for a 3rd-year offering in academic writing

16. Are the necessary reading materials currently available in the appropriate library? Yes

17. Please append a complete outline of the proposed course, and indicate instructor (if known), textbooks, and other materials.

18. If this course overlaps with existing courses, please explain with which courses it overlaps and whether this overlap is necessary, desirable, or unimportant.

19. A copy of every new course proposal must be submitted to departments, schools, or divisions in which there may be overlap of the new course with existing courses or areas of strong concern, with instructions that they send comments directly to the originating Curriculum Committee. Please append a list of departments, schools, or divisions thus consulted.

Submitted by: ________________________ Date: 3/31/08

Dean of Graduate School (when required) Date: ____________

Approved by: ________________________ Date: 4/10/08

Chancellor/Vice-President Date: ____________

University Enrollment Services Date: ____________

After School/Division approval, forward the last copy (without attachments) to University Enrollment Services for initial processing, and the remaining four copies and attachments to the Campus Chancellor or Vice-President.
March 27, 2008

Candice,

I submitted a course request to change W290 Writing in the Arts and Sciences to a 300-level course (the new course number is W320), and the SLA Curriculum and Standards Committee approved the change. However, when the course went through the remonstrance process, Professor Virginia Anderson, at IUS, expressed concerns about making it a 300-level offering because in their program W290 functions as our W132 (see attached e-mail).

I am therefore submitting a new course request for Advanced Writing in the Arts and Sciences, which will be a 300-level course offering using the W320 course number.

Attached is a New Course Request form along with the W320 course syllabus. Please let me know if I need to supply any additional information (274-2120).

Kim Brian Lovejoy
Dear Dr. Lovejoy,

Thank you for your response to our concerns about W290. The 300-level course you envision sounds like a wonderful course, and we support your creation of it. However, we feel that your plan to convert W290 into a 300-level course to serve this purpose adversely affects our ability to use W290 as a sophomore-level introduction to research writing. Although we in the writing program have always supported a second 100-level introductory course, our campus has not chosen that route, and, as we stated in our previous message, W290 serves the function that W132 serves for your students in a number of disciplines. Moreover, it has been selected as a second general education writing course for many programs on our campus, and as such, needs to continue to approach interdisciplinary writing more generally, as an introduction. Leaving it as a 200-level course allows us to use it for this purpose.

We would gladly support your creation of a new 300-level course to provide the more advanced interdisciplinary writing experience that you describe. We suggest that you create W320 as this new course as an upper-level follow-up to the current sophomore-level W290.

Sincerely,

Virginia Anderson
Associate Professor of English, on behalf of the writing faculty at IUS.
We decided to offer W290 as a 300-level course because we didn’t have an upper-level course in academic writing and we believed the cross-disciplinary focus better suited juniors and seniors, who are at a point in their careers when the disciplinary knowledge and methods of writing in the arts and sciences are more important and relevant to their learning. We thought it made better sense as a 300-level offering because of its focus on scholarly reading and writing in the disciplines. Using as a course text Janet Giltrow’s *Academic Reading: Reading and Writing Across the Disciplines* (Orchard Park, CA: Broadview Press, 1995), the course features various interdisciplinary topics (e.g., race and ethnicity, gender, health) and examines how writers in different disciplines define problems, how they investigate these problems, and how they report their findings.

The formal papers in the course are all based on students’ analyses of texts, ranging from literary to non-literary texts, from published discourse to the student’s own disciplinary writing. They write a biology lab report (natural sciences), a text analysis (humanities), and an experimental study (social sciences). The Analysis of a Scholarly Article assignment requires students to choose a scholarly article from their own discipline and to analyze the way meaning is constructed for readers of the discourse community. Students apply critical tools from the course readings to show how the article communicates knowledge in the field in ways that are similar and different from others they have read in class or from other papers they have written. They learn to evaluate the logic, validity, and relevance of data, among other things, as they begin to uncover the important differences in knowledge-making in the discourse community. Evaluating data is an important and necessary component of the assignment. Students evaluate the theoretical approach of the author(s) (deductive or inductive), the nature of the evidence or “proof,” and the methods used to produce it. A culminating assignment is a synthesis and evaluative paper that looks back at the students’ study of disciplinary texts and then forward to a rapidly changing technological world and its impact on scholarly discourse. The course is intense in its reading and writing requirements.

Another reason we decided to change the level of the course has to do with our particular school’s requirements. When we offered W290 once annually, it enrolled 10-12 students only, in part because our school requirements favor 300-400 level courses. So a 300-level offering seemed to fit better with our school requirements, not only the 300-level integrator course requirement (and W290 is a natural fit, here) but also the Area III requirement, which stipulates that students take five courses at the 300-400 level in at least three areas other than the major.

I hope this rationale is a good one. I would be happy to answer any further questions you have about W290 or our research courses. If your W290 course works effectively for your students, and the emphasis is on the study of writing in the major areas of the academy, I see no reason why you should have to change what you’re doing. However, we may need to agree to have two similar courses with different numbers and slightly different titles. Let me know what you think. I’m open to your suggestions. KBL.

Kim Brian Lovejoy, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English
Associate Editor, *Journal of Teaching Writing*
Indiana University School of Liberal Arts, IUPUI
Department of English, CA 501M
425 University Blvd.
Indianapolis, IN 46202
317-274-2129 (O)
317-278-1287 (FAX)
klovejoy@iupui.edu

From: Anderson, Virginia S.
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2008 4:53 PM
To: Rebein, Robert; Harrington, Susanmarie; May, Thomas A
Cc: Jackman, Michael; O’neal, James; Ramey, John Wilson; Reynolds, C. Teresa; Russell, Diane Mae; Sweigart, William E.; Wyandotte, Annette M
Subject: W290 Remonstrance: Concerns
Dear Drs. Rebein and Harrington:

We are responding to the request submitted by Professor Lovejoy and approved by you to change the course number of W290, Writing in the Arts and Sciences, to W320, effectively changing the course from a lower-level to an upper-level course. This change would affect our use of the course at Indiana University Southeast, since it is now taken by students on our campus as an introduction to research writing, usually in the sophomore year. Most students taking the course have only taken W131 prior to W290.

We noticed that in the remonstrance as submitted there is no rationale for your wish to make this change. Could you please supply us with your reasons for requesting the course number change? We will be back in touch once we have considered these arguments in relation to our program.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Virginia Anderson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English
Indiana University Southeast
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
IU School of Liberal Arts
Department of English

Advanced Writing in the Arts and Sciences
ENG W320

Instructor and Contact Information

Kim Brian Lovejoy, Ph.D., Department of English, CA 501M
274-2120 (Office), 278-1287 (FAX), klovejoy@iupui.edu
Office Hours: MWF 1:00 – 2:00 P.M. and other times by appointment

Course Description

Writing in the Arts and Sciences is for students of any major interested in developing their abilities as academic writers and readers. The course introduces students to scholarly reading and writing in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences, focusing on the similarities and differences in the ways academic writers share knowledge in their respective fields. Using as a course text Janet Giltrow’s Academic Reading: Reading and Writing Across the Disciplines (Orchard Park, CA: Broadview Press, 1995), the course features various interdisciplinary topics (e.g., race and ethnicity, gender, health, technology) and examines how writers in different disciplines define problems, how they investigate these problems, and how they report their findings. Students will engage in writing projects as one way of learning about disciplinary practices, and they will use genre analysis as a critical tool in their investigation of scholarly writing in their major. A culminating assignment is a synthesis and evaluative paper that looks back at the students’ study of disciplinary texts and then forward to an examination of technological advancements and their impact on scholarly discourse. Like other writing courses at IUPUI, the course emphasizes writing and reading as a process. Class time is devoted to discussions of course readings, small-group activities, and workshops on students’ writing projects. The course also features invited guests from each of the major divisions of the university who talk about their scholarly writing and the evidence, forms, and conventions valued in their community.

Texts and Supplies

A college-level handbook (e.g., Bonnie Carter's *The Rinehart Guide to Grammar and Usage* or Andrea Lunsford and Robert Connors' *The Everyday Writer*)

Selected articles and book chapters available through library reserves

Notebook, typing paper, paper clips, several manila folders or pocket folders, iupui e-mail account

**Course Goals**

- To enable students to identify similarities and differences in the form, style, and strategies used in academic writing in the disciplines.

- To provide opportunities for students to practice the procedures and conventions of academic writing in various disciplines.

- To enhance students' critical thinking and reading skills.

- To recognize the different ways disciplines value research and present it to their peers.

- To develop students' ability to write from research and to document their sources appropriately.

- To enable students to consider the impact of technology on scholarly discourse.

- To increase students' understanding of their own writing processes and further develop their planning, drafting, and revising skills.

**Principles of Undergraduate Learning**

The course provides students with reading, writing, and interactive experiences that link directly with three of the six Principles of Undergraduate Learning: Core Communication and Quantitative Skills, Critical Thinking, and Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness. The particular abilities that students can expect to achieve, or show progress toward achieving, are the following:

- Express ideas and facts to others effectively in a variety of written formats;
- Comprehend, interpret, and analyze texts;
- Communicate orally in one-on-one and group settings;
- Solve problems that are quantitative in nature, and
- Make efficient use of information resources and technology for personal and professional needs.
- Analyze complex issues and make informed decisions;
• synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions;
• evaluate the logic, validity, and relevance of data;
• use knowledge and understanding in order to generate and explore new questions.
• Intellectual depth describes the demonstration of substantial knowledge and understanding of at least one field of study.
• Intellectual breadth is demonstrated by the ability to compare and contrast approaches to knowledge in different disciplines.
• Adaptiveness is demonstrated by the ability to modify one’s approach to an issue or problem based on the contexts and requirements of particular situations.

Course Requirements

Overview:
The formal papers in the course are all based on students’ analyses of texts, ranging from literary to non-literary texts, from published discourse to the student’s own disciplinary writing. The Analysis of a Scholarly Article assignment, in the latter half of the semester, requires students to choose a scholarly article from their own discipline and to analyze the way meaning is constructed for readers of the discourse community. Students write their papers for students new to the discourse community and for the purpose of informing them about reading and writing in the field. This assignment focuses on the students’ major field of study. Students apply critical tools from the course readings to show how the article communicates knowledge in the field in ways that are similar and different from others they have read in class or from other papers they have written. They learn to evaluate the “logic, validity, and relevance of data,” among other things, as they begin to uncover the important differences in knowledge-making in the discourse community. Evaluating data is an important and necessary component of the Analysis of a Scholarly Article assignment. Students evaluate the theoretical approach of the author(s) (deductive or inductive), the nature of the evidence or “proof,” and the methods used to produce it. Their analysis of the article leads them not only to a better understanding of scholarly writing in the discourse community but also to new research questions about academic writing, or the ways knowledge is constructed and shared in disciplinary communities. As students learn about the internal workings of a scholarly article in their particular field, they are left with many questions to explore about knowledge-making practices, the kinds of evidence valued in the discipline, as well as their own methods of analysis and the generalizability of their findings. The culminating assignment asks students to synthesize their learning in the context of technological advancements and their impact on scholarly discourse.

Course Assignments:
1. Three Formal Papers focusing on writing in the disciplines (each 750-1250 words)
   • Biology Lab Report (natural sciences; 15% of course grade)
1. Text Analysis (humanities; 15%)
2. Experimental Study (social sciences; 15%)
3. An Analysis of Scholarly Writing in the student’s major (1250-2000 words; 20%)
4. Synthesis and Evaluation Paper, a culminating assignment that looks back at the student’s reading and writing in the disciplines, and forward to the ways in which technology changes the way we interact with disciplinary information (1500-2500 words; 25%)
5. Participation (10%)

**Evaluation:** Final papers (excluding process work) must be typed, double-spaced, on 8 1/2 x 11 white paper. Guidelines for preparing the final papers will be given in class. Papers will be collected on the due dates published in the course syllabus and evaluated with a letter grade, according to the scale below. Opportunities for peer and instructor feedback will be provided in class and in conference. All process work is required when submitting finished assignments for evaluation. Save everything—all prewriting, drafts, peer responses, etc. Any paper submitted without the supporting material will not be read.

**Grading Scale:**
- A+ (98-100)
- A (93-97)
- A- (90-92)
- B+ (88-89)
- B (83-87)
- B- (80-82)
- C+ (78-79)
- C (73-77)
- C- (70-72)
- D+ (68-69)
- D (63-67)
- D- (60-62)
- F (below 60)

**Participation Grade:** Students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss the day’s readings and to contribute to group and class discussions. Each week short written responses (150-250 words) to the readings will be posted on Oncourse for discussion and response. Each student will be required to write at least four responses to the course readings and four responses to their peers’ postings. Responses should reflect the student’s critical reading by addressing the content and rhetorical strategies found in the reading—e.g. raising an important question about the author’s rhetorical or stylistic choices, offering a reasoned interpretation, uncovering the meanings of a critical passage, drawing purposeful comparisons or contrasts with other readings. When responding to others’ views, students are expected to control the tone of their response.

Responses will count for 10% of the course grade. Students who submit 7-8 responses, each at least 150-250 words, will automatically receive a B for participation, which may be upgraded to an A if the quality of the responses as a whole conforms to the expectations described above. Fewer than seven responses will result in an automatic C, which may be upgraded to a B if the quality of the responses is high.

**Course Policies**

**Late Work:** You are expected to complete reading and writing assignments on the due dates shown in the syllabus. If you request an extension on a paper and have a legitimate reason for needing one, I will do my best to accommodate you. However, if you miss due dates without contacting me and are frequently absent from class, you will be cautioned the first time and penalized the second time. The penalty for late submissions will be one letter grade.
Attendance: Your attendance at every class meeting is essential to your success in the class. In a process-oriented class, absences affect the learning experience of all students. If you must be away from class, please contact me immediately. Absences invariably affect the quality of work submitted for grade evaluations.

Academic Integrity

Students are responsible for knowing the university’s regulations concerning attendance, cheating, personal misconduct, and plagiarism that appear under the heading “Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct” in the Indiana University Purdue Indianapolis Campus Bulletin. See http://life.iupui.edu/help/docs/Part_3all.html for an online copy of the student code.

Plagiarism is the term generally applied to all violations of academic expectations about citing sources. Plagiarism can take several forms; all these forms will draw some type of teacher or institutional response. The Indiana University Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities (available in CA 401) provides a fuller explanation of the various institutional penalties.

Cheating or Fraud. If you turn in work written by someone else—work which was bought, borrowed, stolen, or downloaded from the Internet—and pass it off as your own work, you are cheating. Penalties for this form of plagiarism may range from a lowered grade on the assignment to an F for the course, or, in extreme cases, expulsion from IUPUI.

Failing to Cite Sources. If you have written an essay that includes passages, specific information, or striking language from another source, and fail to include appropriate documentation, you are violating academic expectations. Information that is summarized, paraphrased, or quoted from others’ work (including electronic texts, web sites, classmates’ work, lectures, interviews, or written sources) should be correctly attributed in the text. While there are many different systems for documenting sources in written work, in most liberal arts courses, students use MLA-style citation (with parenthetical page references and a works cited list at the end of the essay). You are expected to know the conventions of MLA documentation. If you have questions, contact me or search the information available via the English Department and Writing Center websites.

Diversity

The Department of English values diversity in its faculty, students, and staff, and in the work it does to advance the goals of its discipline. As a result, it seeks opportunities to enhance and extend the diverse and inclusive elements of its teaching, research, and service, and their impact on university and community lives.

The Department of English defines diversity as accepting, respecting, and recognizing individual differences. These can be along the dimensions of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, age, physical abilities, religious beliefs, political views, languages, or ideologies. Exploring these differences in a safe, positive,
and nurturing environment creates understanding beyond simple tolerance, honoring and celebrating the varying aspects of diversity within individual identities (definition adapted from the University of Oregon's "Definition of Diversity").

**Adaptive Educational Services**

Students with learning differences who require special accommodations in class must register with Adaptive Educational Services (AES), located in Cavanaugh Hall Suite 001E. The office phone number is 274-3241; the email address is aes@iu.edu.

- AES coordinates support services and academic accommodations for students with documented disabilities.
- AES ensures students with documented disabilities have equal opportunities to pursue a college education, while also ensuring a high level of academic integrity is maintained.
- AES understands students with disabilities face unique challenges in college and our services are designed to maximize potential and minimize disability.

**University Writing Center**

The University Writing Center is a place, sponsored by the English department and the School of Liberal Arts, where undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff can go for free help with writing assignments and projects. The UWC offers opportunities to work one-on-one with experienced readers and writers.

UWC tutors believe writing is a process. Tutors are prepared to talk with students at any stage in this process. UWC welcomes students who write in any discipline or for any purpose. They work with students to help them understand assignments and brainstorm ideas, to discover and narrow topics, to support ideas with appropriate evidence, to see ways to revise drafts, and to plan, organize, and document long or short research papers. We do not proofread or edit papers for students; instead, tutors focus on helping students learn to proofread and edit their own work.

UWC is open in two convenient locations, CA 427 and UL 2125, at the hours listed below. Undergraduates may schedule up to four 30-minute appointments a week. Graduate students and ESL/EAP students may schedule up to four 1-hour appointments a week. All students are limited to one appointment a day. Please call or come in to schedule an appointment in advance.

- **Cavanaugh 427** 274-2049
- MTWR 9:00a-7:00p
- FS 9:00a-3:00p
- Tutoring sessions by appointment
English Club Events

The English Club is an active organization of students and faculty interested in the study of language, literature, writing, and film. Information about activities is available at the English Department’s website at http://english.iupui.edu.

Student Advocate Office

The Student Advocate provides objective, impartial and confidential assistance to students, faculty and parents in situations involving students. Anyone who has a student-related question, complaint, conflict or general concern may contact the Student Advocate Office as an initial, neutral, and confidential first step toward resolution.

For Students Who…

- Need interpretation of IUPUI policies and procedures.
- Need to discuss a sensitive issue.
- Have questions about how they were treated.
- Need help in an emergency situation.
- Need assistance withdrawing from a course.
- Need information about community resources.

The Student Advocate Office is located in UC Suite 002 and can be contacted by phone at 278-7594 or email at stuadvoc@iupui.edu. For more information, see the Student Advocate website at <http://life.iupui.edu/help/advocate.asp>

Syllabus

Please Note: The syllabus is a course guide for students, not a fixed agenda. In some cases, assignments may be announced in class that will not appear on the syllabus. Occasionally, photocopied material will be distributed in class and added to the reading assignment. Students are responsible for all course assignments.

On course Postings: A schedule will be worked out in the first few weeks of the semester.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics/Activities</th>
<th>Assignments Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1—Jan. 7 &amp; 9</td>
<td>Introduction to the course</td>
<td>W, Kabeer article, pp. 18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is academic writing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing as process/product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2—Jan. 14 &amp; 16</td>
<td>Review of course description</td>
<td>M, Kabeer article, pp. 34-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Features of written products</td>
<td>W, Writing in Biol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language varieties, style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion of Kabeer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3—Jan 21 &amp; 23</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Holiday</td>
<td>W, handout on lab reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W, In-class Experiment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4—Jan. 28 &amp; 30</td>
<td>M, review of lab reports</td>
<td>M, draft due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W, Porter, “Intertextuality…”</td>
<td>W, Porter handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lab report Due</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5—Feb. 4-6</td>
<td>M, Discussion of Dasenbrook</td>
<td>M, Dasenbrook, 302-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W, Text Analysis. Discussion of readings</td>
<td>W, Samples for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6—Feb. 11-13</td>
<td>M, Readings in literature Elements of fiction</td>
<td>M, read handout material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W, review of Text Analysis draft</td>
<td>W, draft due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7—Feb. 18-20</td>
<td>M, Readings in literature cont’d.</td>
<td>M, bring written work on text analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>W, Text Analysis due</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8—Feb. 25-27</td>
<td>M, Empirical studies Discussion of Apter et al.; Counts Scientific method of inquiry</td>
<td>M, Apter et al., 324-43; Counts article, pp. 49-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W, In-class Experiment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9—Mar. 4-6</td>
<td>Review of experimental report</td>
<td>draft due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Experimental Report due</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10—Mar. 11-13</td>
<td>Spring Break—No Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11—Mar. 18-20</td>
<td>M, Theorizing a subject Discussion of Lu and McDonald Articles</td>
<td>M, Lu, 118-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W, Analyzing a Scholarly Article Genre analysis</td>
<td>MacDonald handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W, bring sample articles from major field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Week 12—Mar. 25-27  Discussion of Bazerman; Tiratsoo and Tomlinson  handout; Tiratsoo & Tomlinson, 196-218; Draft due

Week 13—Apr. 1 & 3  M, Review of analysis paper  M, draft due
W, Scholarly Analysis Due  Planning the Synthesis/Eval. paper

Week 14—Apr. 8 & 10  M, Discussion of Tech. & Scholarly Discourse  M, readings (handout)
W, discussion of readings  W, readings (handout)

Week 15—Apr. 15 & 17  M, Workshop  Draft due
W, Workshop  Draft due

Week 16—Apr. 22 & 24  M, review of drafts  W, Synthesis and Evaluative Paper due

Week 17—Apr. 29  Evaluations