Appearing on the following pages are best versions of the major documents distributed to students in my three sections of ENGL 1213: Composition II—Sections 015, 023, and 040— during the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Oklahoma. They appear much as they were distributed to students; minor adjustments and corrections have been made without comment.

In order, the documents are
- Syllabus and Course Calendar, Revision 2
- Diagnostic Exercise
- Strategic Reading Assignment Sheet*
- Developing a Topic and Locating Sources Assignment Sheet*
- Developing a Topic and Locating Sources Update Assignment Sheet
- Infographic Portfolio Assignment Sheet*
- Student's Own Question Assignment Sheet*
- Special Exercise Assignment Sheet
- Special Exercise Form
- Final Exam Assignment Sheet*
- Final Exam Prompt*

Owing to overlap with a similar class taught at Northern Oklahoma College, some materials may be duplicated or closely parallel.

Major assignments' materials are indicated by *.

Office	411 Morrill Hall	**Office Phone**	405-744-2084
	Oklahoma State University	**Office Email**	geoffrey.b.elliott@okstate.edu
	Stillwater, OK 74078	**Office Hours**	MWF 0930-1020
			F 1230-1400

Note that information in this document is subject to change. Reasonable efforts will be made to inform students of any such changes that occur.

Course Description

Per Oklahoma State University, ENGL 1213: Composition II treats "Expository composition with emphasis on technique and style through intensive and extensive readings."

Course Objectives

Per policies of the First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University, the primary goal for ENGL 1213 is that "Students will develop and extend their proficiency with writing processes by developing research questions, conducting sustained and focused primary/secondary research, critically analyzing source materials, developing research projects, and reflecting upon their own research processes." This is reflected in a programmatic statement of desired outcomes, to wit:

In addition to building upon the outcomes from English 1113, in English 1213, all students will:
- Identify conversations surrounding a particular subject through research and inquiry, and enter those conversations by crafting research questions, synthesizing outside sources, and identifying potential avenues for further inquiry.
- Explore a research subject deeply by identifying important source material about that subject, and engage with that material by analyzing and abstracting the material in the form of an annotated bibliography.
- Develop an awareness of their own research and writing processes through reflection and self-assessment.
- Develop and explore their own research questions into a thesis-driven, researched essay that builds an original argument in which they make rhetorical decisions about issues including—but not limited to—style, tone, organization, and evidence.
- Demonstrate proficiency with conventions of academic style by consistently and accurately summarizing, paraphrasing, and quoting source materials, by clearly citing and distinguishing their own prose from source materials, and by correctly utilizing both in-text and bibliographic citation according to a chosen style guide (such as MLA, APA, or Chicago).
- Revise and edit multiple drafts to produce writing that is well organized, mechanically and grammatically sound, and mostly error free.

Textbook

Per program policy, ENGL 1213 requires two textbooks:
- Richard Bullock, Maureen Daly Goggin, and Francine Weinberg's *The Norton Field Guide to Writing with Readings and Handbook*, 3rd edition (ISBN 978-0-393-91959-2) and
- *Guide to Writing and Research at Oklahoma State University and Beyond*, edited by Ron Brooks, Jessica Fokken, and Benjamin Smith.

Be sure to get the correct editions, as the class will make use of materials and will reference pagination and chapters in them and not in others.

The textbooks may be available in an electronic edition as well as in print. Students who opt to use electronic textbooks should note that they, and they alone, are responsible for securing access to the text during class time and for any hardware or software problems attendant upon their doing so.

Other Resources

In addition to the required textbook, the following resources will be helpful or vital in carrying out the tasks of the course:

- OSU Writing Center, Student Union 440, http://osuwritingcenter.okstate.edu, 405-744-6671
- *ElliottRWI*, www.elliottrwi.com
- *Purdue University Online Writing Lab,* http://owl.english.purdue.edu
- Major English-language dictionary, such as those from Oxford University (preferred) and Merriam-Webster
- Gerald Graff, Cathy Birkenstein, and Russel Durst's *They Say, I Say*, 3rd edition (ISBN 978-0-393-93751-0)
- Access to campus email and D2L
- Pen/pencil and paper every class meeting

Evaluation

Student grades in the class will be determined according to the distribution in Table 1, below.

Table 1: Grading Distribution

Assignment or Category	Percent of Grade
Strategic Reading (StratRdg)*	20
Developing a Topic and Locating Sources (T&S)*	10
Infographic Portfolio (Infog)*	20
Student's Own Question (SOQ)*	30
Final Exam (FinEx)*	5
Minor Assignments (i.e., quizzes, homework, Special Exercise [SpEx], etc.)	10
Student Professionalism (Prof., see below)	5
Total	**100**

* Indicates a major assignment.

Major and some minor assignments will be assessed in terms of their demonstrated performance in several categories (these will be discussed in more detail on the individual assignment materials). Individual categories on such assignments will be assigned a number of "steps," individual motions through the grading scale indicated on Table 2, below; the total number of steps, positive or negative, will indicate the final assignment score.

Some minor assignments will only be offered an overall score. Such scores also conform to Table 2, below.

Table 2: Grading Scale

Score	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F	0
Steps	+7	+6	+5	+4	+3	+2	+1	+/-0	-1	-2	-3 or more	N/A*
Numerical Equivalent	98	95	92	88	85	82	78	75	72	65	55	0

*Grades of zero (0) result from non-submission of assignments or from academic integrity violations.

Final grades for the term will be reported according to the standard grading scale in force at Oklahoma State University, which unfortunately eschews -plus and -minus grades (i.e., A+, A, and A- are all reported as A).

Each of the major written assignments (with the exception of the FinEx) is expected to be submitted as a work of polished prose. "Polished prose" refers to work that has been written and revised more than once; much time in class will be given over to reading and critique of the work we do in the class. We shall take the short works of polished prose through a cycle of invention, drafting, and revision. As part of this, you will need to be ready to read and comment appropriately on the work of your classmates, as well as to have them do the same to your work. **Peer review is a vital component of this class, and is to be conducted respectfully and only within the context of the classroom**.

Please note that you may be asked to read your work aloud for the class to critique; sometimes talking through a piece is just what is needed. As with peer review, **presentations will be conducted respectfully and only within the classroom context.**

Please note that most major and many minor assignments will be submitted through D2L and that the originality-checking software included in D2L will be applied to the materials submitted through it.

I generally grade fairly holistically. This does not mean that I shall not mark or penalize your errors, but I shall do my best to give you better and more useful feedback on the work you do than simply "fixing" your punctuation and spelling and slapping a grade on the work. Mechanical "correctness" is important, but organization, depth, and originality of thought are more so.

In this class, the fact that you or somebody else paid for you to have a seat does not entitle you to any specific grade; by registering and meeting the requirements for this class, you have earned the right to have access to higher learning and the **opportunity to earn** credit, much as you have to pay to take a martial arts class but are not assured of earning any specific belt. I do not **give** you a grade, you **earn** a grade; I report to you on the quality of the work you turn in to me, as measured against standards expressed for each assignment.

Discussion of Grades and Progress

I am always happy to discuss your progress and grades with you. I am not going to discuss your grades with your parents, your siblings, your roommates, your spouses, your children, or anyone else except as required by my superiors and the law. I am also not going to discuss your grades over the phone or through email; if you want to know your grades, come see me during office hours or set up an appointment, and we can go over how you are doing, what you have done well, and what you can improve upon.

Attendance

Ideally, every student will attend every class meeting. Things happen that ought not to happen, however, and so some allowance for absence is made. Per program policy, students enrolled in

Monday/Wednesday/Friday sections of ENGL 1213 may miss up to six classes without penalty to the final grade. Penalties apply afterward as follows:

- The seventh absence incurs a five percent reduction from the final grade (i.e., a grade of 92% is reduced to 87%).
- The eighth incurs a ten percent grade penalty (i.e., a grade of 92% is reduced to 82%).
- The ninth incurs a fifteen percent grade penalty (i.e., a grade of 92% is reduced to 78%).
- The tenth absence results in automatic failure of the class.

Program policy additionally makes the following statement, with the original emphasis retained:

> You are expected to be present every day your class meets, but we do allow a specific number of absences without penalty for unavoidable circumstances that may occur. Absences beyond the limit are considered excessive and result in grade reductions. The only absences that do not count toward the total allowed are those taken for mandatory military service and activities required for classes or scholarships. **No other absences will be considered excused, including absences due to illnesses, doctor's appointments, and emergencies.** Reductions will be taken on a percentage basis from the total number of points possible in the course. Students are expected to arrive in class on time in order to be counted present. Requests for exemption from this policy must be made in writing to the Program Director. However, exemptions are extremely rare and have been granted only for the most extraordinary circumstances.

The First-Year Composition Program Director is Prof. Lynn C. Lewis (309C Morrill Hall, 405-744-6267, lynn.lewis@okstate.edu).

Tardiness and Early Departure

Students are encouraged to note the above statement from program policy, repeated here for convenience: "Students are expected to arrive in class on time in order to be counted present." Students are additionally subject to being counted absent if they leave before a class meeting is dismissed, or if they are out of the room for protracted periods during class (usually more than five minutes), or multiple times in a given class period.

Late Work

Program policy makes the following statements regarding missed and late work:

> **Missed in-class work**
> Students absent for university-sponsored activities (which do not include social or Greek-sponsored activities, clubs, or intramural athletics) or mandatory military service may make up work missed due to such absence. Other policies regarding missed in-class work are at the discretion of the instructor.
>
> **Late work**
> Grades of work defined as "late" (coming in after established due date and time) will be reduced by 5% of the total points possible for the assignment each day it is late. Instructors may determine if this policy includes drafts and how weekends will be counted toward the grade reduction. Instructors may reduce the grade on a paper by up to 5% if a conference or peer editing session is missed.
>
> **Missing work**
> You must complete all required drafts and all final copies of the four major papers in order to receive credit for the course.

Clarifications to program statements applicable to this class are as follows:

- Minor assignments may not be made up and will not be accepted late. Students who miss minor assignments due to University-sponsored activities or documented legal obligation will be excused from the minor assignments missed.
- Major assignments submitted late begin to accrue late submission penalties as soon as they are late. Because major assignments are submitted online, non-attendance is not regarded as a valid reason for non-submission. Consequently, weekends count as days late for the purpose of applying late submission penalties.

Student Professionalism

Please treat the classroom with the same degree of attention and consideration as any professional space. Please show up to class prepared and on time; **this means having necessary materials, having completed the assigned readings, and having prepared any assignments upon entry into the classroom**. Silence or deactivate electronics during class time, and refrain from private conversations outside of group/class discussion. If you are late, please be respectful of the instructor and others in the classroom by quietly and quickly finding a seat without gratuitous comment, questioning, or other obtrusive behavior (this includes interrupting lecture or discussion to explain your tardiness, ask what the class is doing, or make other comments). The same requests also apply to those who need to leave early. If you feel the need to discuss late arrival or early departure, please do so via email, during office hours, or before or after class.

Please note that excessive tardiness or early departure will negatively impact your professionalism in addition to other penalties noted above. Please note also that egregious violations of professional conduct will result in your being asked to leave; if you are asked to leave, you will be counted absent from the class.

Special Needs Students

This class follows the Program's statement regarding students with special needs, presented below:

If you think you have a qualified disability and need special accommodations for this course, you should notify your instructor and request verification of eligibility for accommodations from the Office of Student Disability Services (315 Student Union) as soon as possible. Accommodations for disabilities cannot be made until the instructor receives a verification letter from the SDS office, and accommodations cannot be made retroactively for assignments already completed or absences already accrued. For more information, call 405-744-7116 or go to **http://sds.okstate.edu//**.

Academic Integrity

This course follows the Program's statement regarding academic integrity, reproduced below:

According to University Policy, plagiarism is "presenting the written, published or creative work of another as the student's own work. Whenever the student uses wording, arguments, data, design, etc., belonging to someone else in a paper, report, oral presentation, or other assignment, the student must make this fact explicitly clear by correctly citing the appropriate references or sources. The student must fully indicate the extent to which any part or parts of the project are attributed to others. The student must also provide citations for paraphrased materials." Plagiarism can result in failure of the course or suspension from the University. For more information, see the policies listed at **http://academicintegrity.okstate.edu/.**

Contact Policy

Email is my preferred mode of contact outside of class time; I check my email at least once (and usually more often) each day I am scheduled to teach, usually in the morning. As a note, I do not sit up all night waiting for my email inbox to chime, and I may not have time to read and answer all emails before class.

Agreements

Students who remain enrolled in the class past the Nonrestrictive Drop/Add Deadline signal their understanding of, and agreement to, the policies and procedures outlined in this syllabus.

A form will be distributed allowing students to opt into or out of the use of their work in the course for study and professional development purposes. Opting in or out will make no difference to grading.

Course Calendar

Readings and minor assignments not already on the course calendar (Table 3, below) may be announced in class. When they are, they are to be treated as appearing on the calendar at the correct time. Also, readings may not always be discussed in class. You are still responsible for knowing the material; the readings form the bases for discussions and are likely to undergird any necessary quizzes and/or homework.

"Readings Due" indicates that the readings listed are assigned **to be completed before the beginning of class** on the day listed, unless otherwise noted. "*Norton*" refers to readings in the *Norton Field Guide* and "*Guide*" refers to readings in the *Guide to Writing and Research at Oklahoma State University and Beyond*. "Assignment Due" indicates that the activities listed are to be completed and submitted at the time and in the manner indicated. Due dates for major assignments, including the FinEx, and their significant components are already noted.

In the event that a given class day has neither reading nor activity listed, class will still meet normally. The only times class does not meet as scheduled will be announced in advance (if possible) or posted on the door to the classroom.

Table 3: Course Calendar

Week	Date	Readings Due	Assignment Due
1	11 Jan	Syllabus (in class)	
	13 Jan		Diagnostic Exercise (in class)
	15 Jan	StratRdg Assignment Sheet (in class)	
2	20 Jan	*Norton* Chs. 39 and 41; *Guide* Ch. 5; Rose, "Language of Exclusion"	StratRdg Txt (in print as class begins)
	22 Jan	*Norton* Ch. 27, *Guide* Ch. 20	
3	25 Jan		StratRdg PV (in print as class begins)
	27 Jan	*Norton* Chs. 47 and 48	
	29 Jan	*Norton* Ch. 28, Handbook	StratRdg RV (via D2L before class begins)
4	1 Feb	T&S Assignment Sheet (in class), *Guide* Chs. 8 and 18 (before class begins)	
	3 Feb	**All sections should meet in Edmon Low Library, Room 206.**	
	5 Feb	*Norton* Ch. 12, *Guide* Chs. 14 and 15	StratRdg FV (via D2L before class begins)

Week	Date	Readings Due	Assignment Due
5	8 Feb	*Norton* Chs. 43 through 45, *Guide* Ch. 13	
	10 Feb	*Norton* Chs. 49 and 50	
	12 Feb	*Norton* Ch. 27	
6	15 Feb		T&S PV (in print as class begins)
	17 Feb	*Guide* Chs. 12 and 16	
	19 Feb		T&S RV (via D2L before class begins)
7	22 Feb	Infog Assignment Sheet (in class); *Norton* Ch. 28, Handbook (before class begins)	
	24 Feb	****All sections should meet in Edmon Low Library, Room 206.****	
	26 Feb	*Norton* Chs. 52-54	T&S FV (via D2L before class begins)
8	29 Feb		
	2 Mar		
	4 Mar	*Norton* Ch. 27	
9	7 Mar		Infog PV (in print as class begins)
	9 Mar		
	11 Mar		Infog RV (via D2L before class begins)
10	21 Mar	*Norton* Ch. 43 (before class), SOQ Assignment Sheet (in class)	
	23 Mar	*Norton* Ch. 28, Handbook	T&S Update (in print as class begins)
	25 Mar	SpEx Assignment Sheet (in class)	Infog FV (via D2L before class begins)
11	28 Mar	*Norton* Chs. 6 and 24, Guide Ch. 7	
	30 Mar	*Norton* Chs. 10 and 33, *Guide* Chs. 10 and 11	
	1 Apr		SpEx (in class)
12	4 Apr	*Norton* Ch. 46	
	6 Apr	*Norton* Ch. 27	
	8 Apr		SOQ PV (in print as class begins)
13	11 Apr		
	13 Apr		
	15 Apr		SOQ RV (via D2L before class begins)
14	18 Apr		
	20 Apr		
	22 Apr		SOQ Update (via D2L before class begins)
15	25 Apr		
	27 Apr	*Norton* Ch. 28, Handbook	
	29 Apr	*Norton* Ch. 42, *Guide* Ch. 21	SOQ FV (via D2L before class begins)
16	Varies	**FinEx, by section:** • **Section 015, 2 May 2016, 1000-1150, meet in the Electronic Classroom, Morrill 106** • **Section 023, 4 May 2016, 1000-1150, meet in the Electronic Classroom, Morrill 106** • **Section 040, 4 May 2016, 0800-0950, meet in the Electronic Classroom, Morrill 106**	

Dates to Remember

The following notes derive from program and University calendars.

- 18 January- University holiday; classes do not meet
- 19 January- Add/drop date
- 14-19 March- University holiday; classes do not meet
- 8 April- Withdrawal date

Other dates may be announced.

Student Name	Student ID

Read the prompt below. On the pages that follow, write a well-developed essay that addresses it, paying attention to presenting a clear thesis, solid structure, clear transitions, sufficient evidence to support points made, ample explanation of that evidence, and adherence to the conventions of edited academic American English. The results will be used to account for the day's attendance; they may also influence assessment of professionalism. They *will* be used to help determine the level and intensity of instruction, so do be sure to give an honest and sincere effort on the exercise.

Please confine your remarks to the space provided for the response on the following pages.

The Prompt
What does it mean to do research? What basis do you have for your answer, both in terms of direct experience and instruction?

The Response

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Strategic Reading assignment (StratRdg) posted online at http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii-strategic-reading/. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the StratRdg.

The First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University describes the StratRdg as enabling students to "Describe and apply genre-specific reading strategies"; "Differentiate and explain approaches to reading and critical analysis of scholarly or popular alphabetic texts and figures (charts, graphs, tables)"; "Analyze and contrast the rhetorical contexts for a variety of texts (including purpose, audience, stance, exigency, genre, and media/design)"; and "Define and write a traditional summary of a selected text." Doing so will take the form of two individual exercises, per Program standards: a 300- to 500-word summary of an 8-12 page academic or professional text and a 700- to 1,000-word reading strategy description of that text, directed towards a first-year student in the relevant field of study. The two are weighted equally, and their average score will be entered as the overall StratRdg grade.

Students in Prof. Elliott's sections of ENGL 1213 in the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University will need to perform several tasks to successfully complete the exercises:
- Find and secure a copy of an appropriate text;
- Read the text, taking notes about content and strategies used;
- Compose an effective summary of the text and an effective description of the strategies used to read the text (StratRdg PV), bringing it to class for review and comment by peers;
- Revise the StratRdg PV in light of comments made and submit the resulting version (StratRdg RV) electronically for instructor review; and
- Revise the StratRdg RV in light of comments made by the instructor and submit the resulting version (StratRdg FV) electronically for instructor assessment for 20% of the total course grade.

Information about each follows, along with a copy of the relevant grading rubric and notes.

Find an Appropriate Text

Informing the StratRdg in Prof. Elliott's sections is the idea of helping students to better understand their majors. Accordingly, students are asked to find texts written for people in their fields of study; that is, students should identify texts directly relevant to their majors or to the professions they hope to enter after graduation. The texts should be relatively brief, some eight to twelve pages in length as published.

Academic journals, conference and working papers, white papers, and articles in trade magazines suggest themselves as useful places to look for appropriate texts. The Oklahoma State University library offers information that should help narrow searches, as well as offering points of contact for more detailed and systemic inquiry; look at the following URL: http://www.library.okstate.edu/research-guides/subject-lists/.

After looking over a variety of sources, each student should select a single text of interest, printing out a copy for instructor review to ensure that the text is of sufficient heft to be amenable to the StratRdg. The copy should be submitted to the instructor in print at the beginning of class time on 20 January 2016; submission will be accepted as a completion-grade minor assignment, and comments regarding the text's utility will be returned to the student.

Read and Annotate the Text

After selecting an appropriate text, each student should read the text multiple times. The first reading should be a simple read-through, meant to offer a sense of what the text is saying. Subsequent readings should attend to specific features of content and form, looking for the key components of the text and making note of them in the interest of completing the StratRdg.

In addition to annotating the text, students should keep a log of how they go about doing their annotations. Recording thoughts about how what is important is found will make far easier the task of completing the StratRdg later on, as it will provide basic information from which to compose the reading strategy description component of the text.

Compose the StratRdg PV

After reading and annotating the selected text, each student should independently draft a two-part paper, which will be brought to class as the StratRdg PV. The two parts, summary and reading strategy description, are described below, and expectations for them explicated.

The Summary

Program requirements ask for a 300- to 500-word traditional summary of the selected text. Composing one can be done reasonably easily, as noted in some earlier teaching materials. (Find them at the following URL: https://sites.google.com/site/gelliottteaching/welcome/tci/eng-099–basic-communication/summaries.) To reiterate from those materials, the summary component of the StratRdg in Prof. Elliott's classes should include the following, in the order noted below:

- A single sentence identifying the piece being summarized. The sentence should note the author/s of the text, the title of the text, the source of the text, and the date of the text's publication.
- A single sentence iterating the thesis or central idea of the text being summarized.
- Several sentences outlining the major points made by the text. These sentences should note the major points in the order the text presents them. They should also note significant patterns of argumentation and evidence, if any appear.

The summary should read as one or two cohesive paragraphs that present the information requested above. As it evolves through future versions of the StratRdg assignment, it will account for half of the grade assigned to the project.

A number of sample summaries appear on the "Abstracts" page on *ElliottRWI*, which can be found at the following URL: http://elliottrwi.com/research/abstracts/. Not all are of a length appropriate to the current assignment, however; look to them for form and style rather than as subjects of explicit mimicry.

The Reading Strategy Description
Program requirements also ask for a 700- to 1,000-word description of the reading strategies used in interpreting the selected text, one directed as a letter or (for Prof. Elliott's classes, preferably) a short paper to a first-year student in the relevant field of study. That is, the StratRdg assignment should, in addition to providing a summary, lay out the best way in which a new student in a given major should approach texts likely to present themselves to students in that major, using the selected text as a model of how to do so. It should do so in a way likely to be read and understood as a useful guide by a new student in the field in terms of reading level, formality, and other audience-centric concerns.

The reading strategy description should open with a short (four- to six-sentence) paragraph transitioning from the summary, offering context for the kind of reading being modeled (i.e., in what circumstances is such reading likely to occur), and indicating the central thrust of the description. The following paragraphs, organized chronologically, should describe the strategies through which such texts can best be approached, illustrating from the selected text and explaining why the strategies named are desirable. The final paragraph of the reading strategy description should indicate implications of the strategies related. That is, it should speak to what readers should be able to do now that they are provided with the information given them in the description.

Some useful parallels might be found in the Literacy Narrative required of students in Prof. Elliott's ENGL 1113 classes during the Fall 2015 instructional term at Oklahoma State University. Information can be found at the following URL: http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1113-composition-i/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1113-composition-i-literacy-narrative/. Examples appearing or linked on that page may not be of a length or kind appropriate to the current assignment; look to them for form and style rather than as subjects of explicit mimicry.

Submission Expectations
The StratRdg PV is due in print (as a typed, stapled copy) **at the beginning of class on 25 January 2016**. It should be formatted as a single document, with the summary preceding the reading description, and it should be at least the minimum acceptable length for the final submission (300 words for the summary, 700 words for the reading description, plus four-line heading—student name, instructor name, course and section, date of composition—and title). The text of the StratRdg PV should be double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides. It should be in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type. Page numbers should appear in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; page numbers and surnames should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document.

A quiz grade will be taken from the presence and quality of the StratRdg PV during class on the due date. The grade will be largely holistic in nature, with more complete and on-target student work receiving higher grades. Students who arrive in class without drafts will receive a zero for the minor assignment grade, as will those who fail to attend class that day (excepting those covered under class attendance policies expressed in the syllabus and detailed during class

discussions). Detailed reading will not be conducted by the instructor at that point, although comments regarding overall adherence to assignment standards may well be made.

Students should keep in mind that the StratRdg PV is a work in progress. A more complete draft is more desirable than a less complete one, largely in that it eases the later work that must be done and offers more opportunity for concrete improvement to the writing that is done. Please note that the text composed for the StratRdg PV may well need to change; keep in mind that it cannot get better without changing, and that all writing can be improved.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the StratRdg PV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Revise the StratRdg PV into the StratRdg RV

Following the in-class workshopping of the StratRdg PV, students are **strongly** encouraged to revise their papers in light of the comments made by peer reviewer/s. They should work from global issues—such as clarifying and condensing the summary, detailing more accurately and more accessibly to the audience the reading strategies described, and reconsidering the implications of the description for readers—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The paper resulting from the process of revision, the StratRdg RV, should still open with a summary that identifies the selected text, notes its main idea, and describes its major features in order. The StratRdg RV should still follow the summary with a description of the reading strategies used to read the article. The description should still transition smoothly out of the summary into a chronological account of the reading that illustrates its methods and explains their utility before noting further use of the description.

The StratRdg RV is due via D2L before the beginning of class time on 29 January 2016. It must be submitted in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format. (No other file types will be accepted; submissions in another file type will be treated as though not submitted.) The text should be presented according to the same standards as that of the StratRdg PV, and it should be within the acceptable length indicated (300 to 500 words for the summary, 700 to 1,000 words for the reading strategies description, plus heading and title). Usage should conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time.

The StratRdg RV will be assessed via the grading rubric below as a minor assignment. The text and comments made about it will be returned to students via the email function on D2L. Those comments should be used to improve the text further in advance of its final submission; the StratRdg RV is a work in progress, although one nearing completion.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the StratRdg RV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Revise the StratRdg RV into the StratRdg FV

Following the return of instructor comments on the StratRdg RV, students are **strongly** encouraged to revise their papers in light of the comments. They should work from global issues—such as clarifying and condensing the summary, detailing more accurately and more accessibly to the audience the reading strategies described, and reconsidering the implications of the description for readers—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The paper resulting from the process of revision, the StratRdg FV, should still open with a summary that identifies the selected text, notes its main idea, and describes its major features in order. The StratRdg FV should still follow the summary with a description of the reading strategies used to read the article. The description should still transition smoothly out of the summary into a chronological account of the reading that illustrates its methods and explains their utility before noting further use of the description.

The StratRdg FV is due via D2L before the beginning of class time on 5 February 2016. It must be submitted in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format. (No other file types will be accepted; submissions in another file type will be treated as though not submitted.) The text should be presented according to the same standards as that of the StratRdg PV, and it should be within the acceptable length indicated (300 to 500 words for the summary, 700 to 1,000 words for the reading strategies description, plus heading and title). Usage should conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time.

The StratRdg FV will be assessed via the grading rubric below as a major assignment, worth 20% of the total course grade. The text and comments made about it will be returned to students via the email function on D2L. Those comments should be used to stimulate still better performance on future writing; although the StratRdg will be done, there is other writing to be done in the class and in life beyond the classroom, and it needs to be the best it can possibly be.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the StratRdg RV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the forms below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

Per course policy, assessment of the assignment is done according to performance in several categories, named and described below. Each category is weighted with a number of steps' change to the basic grade of C. To accord with Program policy, the summary and reading descriptions are assessed as specific units; the average of their scores will be the StratRdg score.

Summary		
Category	**Comments**	**Steps Yes/No**
Assignment Guidelines Met	●	+0/-3
Text Appropriately Identified	●	+2/-1
Thesis/Central Thrust Presented	●	+2/-1
Major Points Presented	●	+2/-1
Formatting Correct	●	+0/-1
Mechanics Correct	●	+1/-1
Summary Score		
Reading Strategies Description		
Category	**Comments**	**Steps Yes/No**
Assignment Guidelines Met	●	+0/-3
Strategies Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Explanations Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Organization Effective	●	+2/-1
Formatting Correct	●	+0/-1
Mechanics Correct	●	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	●	+1/+0
Reading Description Score		
Overall Score (average of Summary and Reading Description Scores)		
Overall Comments		

Summary
- Assignment Guidelines Met—Is the summary within the assigned range of word count (300 to 500 words)?
- Text Appropriately Identified—Is the text being summarized appropriately identified? That is, does the summary open with a sentence noting the text's author, title, source, and date of publication?

- Thesis/Central Thrust Presented—Does the summary present an appropriate statement of the summarized text's thesis or central thrust?
- Major Points Presented—Does the summary offer appropriate statements of the major points made by the summarized text in the order of their appearance in the text? Are other major features appropriately noted?
- Formatting Correct—Is the text of the summary double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides; in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type; with page numbers in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; and with page numbers and surnames in the same typeface as the rest of the document?
- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?

Reading Strategy Description
- Assignment Guidelines Met—Is the description within the assigned range of word length (700 to 1,000 words)?
- Strategies Clear and Appropriate—Are the strategies described clearly, given the intended audience? Is enough information about them provided that a first-year student could deploy the strategies?
- Explanations Clear and Appropriate—Are indications of the validity of the strategies described provided? Are they sufficiently clear and detailed to allow a first-year student to understand the strategies' utility?
- Organization Effective—Does the description move smoothly and appropriately from the summary? Are there clear and appropriate transitions among its various paragraphs and components, indicating both that new ideas are being treated and the relationships among those ideas? Does the description follow chronological order?
- Formatting Correct—Is the text of the description double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides; in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type; with page numbers in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; and with page numbers and surnames in the same typeface as the rest of the document?
- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?
- Engagement Developed—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the description offer some particularly engaging or poignant element unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it avoid cliché and trite phrasing? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

Notes

Owing to the restructuring of ENGL 1213 for the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University, only one example of the StratRdg is available: "Bringing Forward a Way the Past Is Brought Forward." It can be accessed online at the following URL:

- http://elliottrwi.com/2016/01/15/sample-stratrdg-bringing-forward-a-way-the-past-is-brought-forward/

Aside from the piece read, no outside information should be deployed in completing the StratRdg. Since there will be no need to reference outside information other than the piece read, informal citation will suffice for it—although that informal citation must still be sufficient for a readership that does not share the authorial/narrative background, experience, and expertise to clearly understand the piece being referenced. **Failure to provide appropriate informal citation may be treated as an academic integrity violation.**

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Developing a Topic and Locating Sources assignment (T&S) posted online at http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii-developing-a-topic-and-locating-sources/. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the T&S.

The First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University describes the T&S as enabling students to "Develop and refine a research topic, along with keywords to search that topic"; "Apply keyword knowledge to search for appropriate scholarly sources"; "Analyze a topic in order to determine possible inquiry questions"; and "Describe and be able to apply a system for searching and organizing sources." Doing so will take the form of two individual exercises, per Program standards: a topic proposal and an annotated bibliography. The two are weighted equally, and their average score will be entered as the overall T&S grade.

Students in Prof. Elliott's sections of ENGL 1213 in the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University will need to perform several tasks to successfully complete the exercise/s:

- Select a subject of inquiry;
- Develop a rationale for approaching the subject;
- Identify useful questions for research into that subject, briefly explaining their validity;
- Explore secondary sources immediately and otherwise relevant to answering those questions;
- Compose as a single document a brief (325- to 650-word) topic proposal and brief (minimum four-source) annotated bibliography (T&S PV), bringing it to class for review and comment by peers;
- Revise the T&S PV in light of comments made and submit the resulting version (T&S RV) electronically for instructor review; and
- Revise the T&S RV in light of comments made by the instructor and submit the resulting version (T&S FV) electronically for instructor assessment for 10% of the total course grade.

Information about each follows, along with a copy of the relevant grading rubric and notes.

Select a Subject of Inquiry

As noted in a similar assignment, offered to students in Prof. Elliott's Spring 2016 section of ENGL 1213 at Northern Oklahoma College, one of the goals of first-year courses is "to help students orient themselves in their disciplines." Accordingly, for students in Prof. Elliott's sections of ENGL 1213 in the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University, the T&S (as well as the more extended project to which it contributes: the SOQ), will focus on curricular issues relevant to the student's own course of study.

Students should begin their search for a subject of inquiry for the T&S with their prescribed courses of study, either at their current undergraduate level or, for those who anticipate transitioning into graduate or professional school—veterinary school, pharmacy school, medical

school, an MBA program, an Ed.S. program, or a similar program—in the near future, the curriculum required for their desired program. Each will have no small number of requirements, including but not limited to prerequisite courses, general education courses, in-major courses, examinations, internship or practical requirements, interviews, and capstone projects. No curriculum can anticipate all needs or all possible approaches, however, so there will be gaps in the coverage offered by any degree plan, even if that gap seems a thing that would fit well with the prescribed course of study. Students should focus their attention on **one** such item, either a curricular requirement or a conspicuous gap in the curricular requirements, preferably at the upper-division level or higher. Catalog descriptions and published course syllabi, which will count as primary sources for the project, may be of help in determining what avenue of inquiry to follow, what topic to select.

Develop a Rationale for Approaching the Subject

Topics of inquiry are not arrived upon *ex nihilo*; they instead emerge from the interests and needs of those who pursue them. How personal and professional interests and needs lead to the determination of what subjects receive inquiry is worth investigating, worth explicating to readers. Doing so allows for assertion of situated ethos, as personal investment tends to lend itself to direct experience and thus credibility, as well as a tacit pathos appeal, as personal involvement is personal and therefore elicits sympathetic reading.

Thus, as students select a topic of inquiry, they will do well to log their thoughts and feelings as they make their decisions, making notes from which they will later work to lead the reader along through their process of selection. Factors to consider include what involvement with the general topic the student has and what attracts attention to the specific topic.

Determine Potential Research Questions

After selecting a topic and developing an explanation, it is necessary to narrow the subject of inquiry yet further. If delving into a topic is following an avenue, it is needful to pick a lane in which to drive. To facilitate doing so, it is often useful to generate questions that research might answer. Such questions will be more helpful in promoting inquiry if they are causal or projective rather than declarative or procedural, as such questions will admit of both detailed investigation and answers that lead to the generation of **new** knowledge rather than only the recitation of already-developed knowledge. That is, asking **why** leads to answers not already found and demonstrated, making them more useful to ask at the collegiate level.

Students should expect to develop at least three pertinent research questions. Focusing on curricular issues, such questions could easily take such forms as
- Why is the subject of inquiry included in the given curriculum?
- Why is the subject of inquiry **not** included in the given curriculum?
- Why is the subject of inquiry positioned where it is in the curriculum?
- Why is the subject of inquiry approached as it is in the curriculum?

Other questions could easily be generated. Many of them potentially lead to the kind of research that discovers or develops new knowledge and understanding of how systems of education can and do function—something in which students can be expected to have some interest, given their own positions within such systems.

Investigate Secondary Source Materials

The generation of new knowledge has to begin from already-uncovered knowledge. Students will therefore need to work from materials already developed, both primary sources (as noted above) and secondary sources: reports of research conducted into curricular matters, commentaries from interested parties, and the like. Finding such materials presents little trouble; finding which materials among them are useful is perhaps more challenging. To be useful, secondary source materials must be both reliable (i.e., the information presented in them and the conclusions made by them must be trustworthy) and relevant (i.e., they must discuss the subject of inquiry or something reasonably proximal to it). Academic journal articles and scholarly books (or chapters therefrom) are the most likely sources for such materials, although it is possible that other secondary sources—such as reports of research sponsored by major disciplinary organizations and reputable bodies that treat teaching—will be useful.

Matt Upson, Director of Undergraduate Research at Oklahoma State University's Edmon Low Library, offers several videos that may be of assistance in negotiating a search for appropriate secondary sources:
- "What Is a Database?": http://screencast.com/t/DMhi2wmJHVji
- "Choosing a Database": http://screencast.com/t/ESjMtsAQO0In
- "Searching a Database": http://screencast.com/t/jtXhWSae
- "Examining an Article": http://screencast.com/t/uAqdL8Quc67N
- "RefME": http://screencast.com/t/zTJk1V7elu
- "Evaluating Sources": https://www.lib.ncsu.edu/tutorials/evaluating-sources/

Review of the materials is encouraged. They are meant to serve collectively as an introductory guide, not to foreclose possibilities.

Additionally, the Program recommends the use of Zotero (https://www.zotero.org/) as a means of tracking secondary sources reviewed. Ostensibly, the program will facilitate the development of a bibliography later on. However the sources are sorted and logged, however, they need to be reviewed for their potential utility to the T&S and to the later work of the course.

Compose the T&S PV

After completing the tasks above, which collectively constitute a sequence of prewriting, each student should independently draft a two-part paper, which will be brought to class in printed hard copy as the T&S PV. The two parts, topic proposal and annotated bibliography, are described below, and expectations for them explicated.

To be noted for both components is the audience to be addressed. Topic proposals of the kind requested by the T&S are often written by academics to other academics, often in the pursuit of presentation or publication activities. Annotated bibliographies are generally written as scholarly aids, helping researchers and critics to access the work done by those who precede them. For the T&S, the primary audience whose needs are to be met consists of instructors of ENGL 1213. The secondary audience to keep in mind consists of students in succeeding years, whose courses of study might be influenced by the work done in the ongoing research project to which the T&S contributes.

Topic Proposal

Per Program dicta, the topic proposal "will ask students to write a one to two-page proposal [clarified by Prof. Elliott as 325-650 words, exclusive of heading and title] in which they explain the topic they have selected, their rationale for the topic, and three or more questions they have developed as a consequence of their first inquiries into the topic." This can be done reasonably easily; a three-paragraph structure suggests itself, with one paragraph addressing each of the points Program dicta request. That is,

- One paragraph could explain what the subject of inquiry is, situating it in its appropriate context.
- Another could explain the rationale for selecting the topic, noting why it is of interest and worth investigating.
- A third could present the research questions, offering them and giving some indication why they are appropriate questions to ask.

Other organizational patterns could be deployed that address all the required points, of course, although that laid out above has the advantage of being clear, evident, and systematic.

Another view of topic proposals is available in a similar assignment, offered to students in Prof. Elliott's Spring 2016 section of ENGL 1213 at Northern Oklahoma College; information about it can be found at the following URL:

- http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/northern-oklahoma-college/northern-oklahoma-college-engl-1213-composition-ii/northern-oklahoma-college-engl-1213-composition-ii-topic-proposal/

Additionally, a sample topic proposal written for that course can be found at the following URL:

- http://elliottrwi.com/2016/01/14/sample-topic-proposal-why-not-have-a-rhetoric-requirement-among-ul-lafayette-phd-students-in-english/

Look to the sample as a model of form and style rather than as a subject of explicit mimicry.

Annotated Bibliography

Per Program dicta, the annotated bibliography "asks students to locate four sources that represent crucial scholarly voices on their topic. Each annotation should summarize the source's argument and purpose and explain the rationale for selecting this source as a crucial scholarly voice. (Rationale may include such things as expertise of the writer as evidenced by publication records and scholarly awards, etc..) [*sic*]" Like the topic proposal, the annotated bibliography should be easy to accomplish.

The annotated bibliography should open with a brief paragraph outlining the methodology used to select the sources it treats. That is, readers need to know what thought processes undergird the bibliography so that they can more authentically evaluate it for their own purposes. A few sentences—no more than seven—should suffice to account for how the works were selected from the many that are available.

After the opening paragraph, the annotated bibliography should present no fewer than four three-part entries, each treating an individual secondary source. (Each source should be generally reliable, as noted in "Investigate Secondary Source Materials," above.) The three parts of each entry are, in order, an MLA -style Works Cited citation, a paragraph summarizing the source, and a brief paragraph accounting for the potential utility of the source in answering one or more

of the research questions listed in the topic proposal. The entries should be presented in alphabetical order by their citations. Entries should be separated from one another and from the introductory paragraph by an extra blank line.

The summary paragraph in each entry will be similar to that written for the summary component of the StratRdg (http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii-strategic-reading/). The first sentence of the StratRdg summary is not needed, as the citation provided in each entry suffices to identify the source. As such, the summary paragraphs in the annotated bibliography should begin with a statement of the source's thesis, with following sentences noting major points and tendencies among the argument made in the source.

The evaluation paragraph in each entry will express in a few sentences—no more than five—the potential for use of the source in answering one or more of the questions advanced in the topic proposal. Such concerns as the reliability of the source; the relevance of the source to the subject of inquiry; and what pertinent information it contributes to framing, offering, counter-arguing, or rebutting for the answer to one or more of the research questions are worth treating.

An ongoing annotated bibliography, albeit one that displaces its evaluative comments, is available at the following URL:
- http://elliottrwi.com/research/hobb-bibliography/

Another, older annotated bibliography, one perhaps more in keeping with what is expected from that in the T&S, is available at the following URL:
- http://gelliottteaching.blogspot.com/2013/06/sample-annotated-bibliography-for.html

Look to them as models of form and style rather than as subjects of explicit mimicry.

Submission Expectations
The T&S PV is due in print (as a typed, stapled copy) **at the beginning of class on 15 February 2016**. It should be formatted as a single document composed of the topic proposal and annotated bibliography, in that order, and it should be at least the minimum acceptable length for the final submission (325 words for the proposal, an introductory paragraph for the annotated bibliography, four three-part annotation entries, plus a four-line heading—student name, instructor name, course and section, date of composition—and title).

The text of the T&S PV should be double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides. It should be in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type. Page numbers should appear in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; page numbers and surnames should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document. The four-line heading should be left-aligned, the title centered horizontally; both should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document. The primary text should be left-aligned; citations in the annotated bibliography should be aligned as prescribed by MLA standards. Entries in the annotated bibliography should be alphabetized by their citations, and entries should be separated from one another and from the introductory paragraph by extra blank lines.

A quiz grade will be taken from the presence and quality of the T&S PV during class on the due date. The grade will be largely holistic in nature, with more complete and on-target student work receiving higher grades. Students who arrive in class without drafts will receive a zero for the minor assignment grade, as will those who fail to attend class that day (excepting those covered under class attendance policies expressed in the syllabus and detailed during class discussions). Detailed reading will not be conducted by the instructor at that point, although comments regarding overall adherence to assignment standards may well be made.

Students should keep in mind that the T&S PV is a work in progress. A more complete draft is more desirable than a less complete one, largely in that it eases the later work that must be done and offers more opportunity for concrete improvement to the writing that is done. Please note that the text composed for the T&S PV may well need to change; keep in mind that it cannot get better without changing, and that all writing can be improved.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the T&S PV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Revise the T&S PV into the T&S RV

Following the in-class workshopping of the T&S PV, students are **strongly** encouraged to revise their papers in light of the comments made by peer reviewer/s. They should work from global issues—whether the subject of inquiry is clear and appropriate, whether the rationale for approaching it is, whether the questions asked about it are, whether the annotated bibliography is introduced with appropriate methodology, and whether its entries are complete and appropriate—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The paper resulting from the process of revision, the T&S RV, should still open with an expression of the subject of inquiry, the rationale for selecting it, and at least three research questions to ask about it. The T&S RV should still follow with an annotated bibliography that outlines its methodology before offering four three-part entries (citation, summary, and explanation) in alphabetical order.

The T&S RV is due via D2L before the beginning of class time on 19 February 2016. It must be submitted in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format. (No other file types will be accepted; submissions in another file type will be treated as though not submitted.) The text should be presented according to the same standards as that of the T&S PV, and it should be within the acceptable length indicated (325 to 650 words of topic proposal; annotated bibliography consisting of an introductory paragraph and four three-part annotation entries; and heading and title). Usage should conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time.

The T&S RV will be assessed via the grading rubric below as a minor assignment according to the rubric below. The text and comments made about it will be returned to students via the email function on D2L. Those comments should be used to improve the text further in advance of its final submission; the T&S RV is a work in progress, although one nearing completion.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the T&S RV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Revise the T&S RV into the T&S FV

Following the return of instructor comments on the T&S RV, students are **strongly** encouraged to revise their papers in light of the comments. They should work from global issues—whether the subject of inquiry is clear and appropriate, whether the rationale for approaching it is, whether the questions asked about it are, whether the annotated bibliography is introduced with appropriate methodology, and whether its entries are complete and appropriate—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The paper resulting from the process of revision, the T&S FV, should still open with an expression of the subject of inquiry, the rationale for selecting it, and at least three research questions to ask about it. The T&S FV should still follow with an annotated bibliography that outlines its methodology before offering four three-part entries (citation, summary, and explanation) in alphabetical order.

The T&S FV is due via D2L before the beginning of class time on 26 February 2016. It must be submitted in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format. (No other file types will be accepted; submissions in another file type will be treated as though not submitted.) The text should be presented according to the same standards as that of the T&S PV, and it should be within the acceptable length indicated (325 to 650 words of topic proposal; annotated bibliography consisting of an introductory paragraph and four three-part annotation entries; and heading and title). Usage should conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time.

The T&S FV will be assessed via the grading rubric below as a major assignment, worth 10% of the total course grade. The text and comments made about it will be returned to students via the email function on D2L. Those comments should be used to stimulate still better performance on future writing; the T&S will return in an updated version as a later minor assignment (yet to be discussed), and it will directly inform later assignments in the class. Additionally, there is other writing to be done in the class and in life beyond the classroom, and it needs to be the best it can possibly be; comments on the T&S should help with that writing.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the T&S FV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for

doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Grading Rubric

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the forms below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

Per course policy, assessment of the assignment is done according to performance in several categories, named and described below. Each category is weighted with a number of steps' change to the basic grade of C. To accord with Program policy, the topic proposal and annotated bibliography are assessed as specific units; the average of their scores will be the T&S score.

Topic Proposal		
Category	**Comments**	**Steps Yes/No**
Assignment Guidelines Met	●	+0/-3
Topic Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Rationale Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Questions Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Formatting Correct	●	+0/-1
Mechanics Correct	●	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	●	+1/+0
Topic Proposal Score		
Annotated Bibliography		
Category	**Comments**	**Steps Yes/No**
Assignment Guidelines Met	●	+0/-3
Introductory Paragraph Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Sources Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Citations Correct	●	+1/-1
Summaries Appropriate	●	+1/-1
Evaluations Appropriate	●	+1/-1
Formatting Correct	●	+0/-1
Mechanics Correct	●	+0/-1
Annotated Bibliography Score		
Overall Score (average of Topic Proposal and Annotated Bibliography Scores)		
Overall Comments		

Topic Proposal
- Assignment Guidelines Met—Is the topic proposal within the assigned range of word count (325 to 650 words)?
- Topic Clear and Appropriate—Is the subject of inquiry proposed one that conforms to the guidelines expressed in the assignment sheet? Is it sufficiently narrow to admit of focused treatment? Is it of sufficient heft to sustain focused treatment?
- Rationale Clear and Appropriate—Is the reasoning leading to the treatment of the subject of inquiry reasonable? Is the explanation thereof sufficient? Does the writer express sufficient connection to the subject to justify treatment thereof?
- Questions Clear and Appropriate—Are the potential research questions clearly indicated? Are they likely to stimulate appropriate knowledge-development? Are they framed in a way that suggests open-minded investigation of their answers?
- Formatting Correct—Is the text of the proposal double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides; in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type; with page numbers in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; with page numbers and surnames in the same typeface as the rest of the document; with heading and title placed appropriately; and with text aligned fittingly?
- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?
- Engagement Developed—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the proposal offer some particularly engaging or poignant element unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it avoid cliché and trite phrasing? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

Annotated Bibliography
- Assignment Guidelines Met—Does the bibliography consist of an introductory paragraph and at least four entries, each of which consists of a citation, a paragraph-length summary, and a commentary paragraph?
- Introductory Paragraph Appropriate—Does the introductory paragraph transition smoothly and appropriately transition into the annotated bibliography from the topic proposal? Does it express the method for searching out the materials to be annotated in a manner suggestive of appropriate deliberation and consideration?
- Sources Appropriate—Are the sources treated secondary sources? Are they likely to be reliable, given their provenance?
- Citations Correct—Do the citations in the bibliography conform to MLA standards in terms of content and presentation? Do they account for information appropriately?
- Summaries Appropriate—Does each entry's summary paragraph provide the information appropriate to a summary (thesis of the piece annotated, overview of major points of discussion)? Does it provide enough information for a reader to get an accurate sense of the summarized piece's content and form?

- Evaluations Appropriate—Does each entry's evaluative paragraph justify its potential use as a secondary source in answering one or more of the research questions expressed in the topic proposal?
- Formatting Correct—Is the text of the annotated bibliography double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides; in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type; with page numbers in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; with page numbers and surnames in the same typeface as the rest of the document; and with text aligned and separated fittingly, as noted above?
- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?

Notes

Although the T&S is a relatively small assignment, it directly contributes to the large project with which the semester concludes: the SOQ, worth 30% of the total course grade. Diligence with the T&S is likely to improve performance on the SOQ.

Owing to the restructuring of ENGL 1213 for the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University, only one targeted example of the T&S is available: "Sample Developing a Topic and Locating Sources Assignment: Questions about the Comprehensive Exams for UL Lafayette PhD Students in English," here: https://elliottrwi.com/2016/02/06/sample-developing-a-topic-and-locating-sources-assignment-questions-about-the-comprehensive-exams-for-ul-lafayette-phd-students-in-english/.

The T&S is in large measure an exercise in formal citation and identification of useful source materials. More than in many other assignments, attention to the details of the work done to account for the provenance of information is obligatory. **Failure to provide appropriate citation may be treated as an academic integrity violation.**

Geoffrey B. Elliott
Spring 2016
ENGL 1213: Composition II—Developing a Topic and Locating Sources Update
        Assignment Sheet

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Developing a Topic and Locating Sources Update (T&S Update) assignment, which are integrated into the online version of the Developing a Topic and Locating Sources (T&S) assignment. Discussion of the assignment remains available online at http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii-developing-a-topic-and-locating-sources/. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the T&S and its components.

Because the T&S feeds into the SOQ, and because there is substantial class time between those assignments, keeping the work of finding and evaluating resources in students' minds seems an appropriate and helpful thing to do. Because experience indicates that students will focus their attention on things that affect their grades, making the continuation of finding and evaluating resources in students' minds a graded assignment seems appropriate, as well. The T&S Update proceeds from those causes, asking students to further refine the work done for the T&S so that it remains in their minds and they therefore retain or increase their momentum towards the SOQ.

Students in Prof. Elliott's sections of ENGL 1213 in the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University will need to perform several tasks to successfully complete the exercise:

- Refine and articulate more clearly and concisely the subject of inquiry, rationale for approaching the subject, and *single* question to be addressed moving forward in the assignment;
- Explore additional secondary (and possibly tertiary) sources immediately and otherwise relevant to answering those questions;
- Refine and articulate more clearly and concisely the methodology used to identify and select the sources; and
- Compose as a single document a three-paragraph refined topic proposal, a one-paragraph statement of methodologies, and two annotative entries, submitting it in typed hard copy for a minor assignment grade.

Information about each follows, along with a copy of the relevant grading rubric and notes.

Refine the Topic Proposal
Students will have received commentary on their earlier submissions of the T&S (the RV and FV), including the identification of a single question to address as they move forward to the SOQ. For the T&S Update, they will need to consolidate, condense, and refine the Topic Proposal component of the T&S FV, clarifying issues of content and usage; in effect, students will do more of what they have already been asked to do on the project. Part of doing so will consist of focusing more narrowly on the question identified as the focus of the SOQ; because it will receive specific attention, more detail about its validity as a question to answer will need to be provided than in the T&S FV.

Explore More Secondary (and Maybe Tertiary) Sources

Because more than four sources are likely to be helpful in completing the SOQ, the T&S Update asks students to identify more outside materials to use in framing and supporting their arguments. Consequently, more secondary and, optionally, tertiary sources will need to be found, following the same ideas expressed for the selection of materials in support of earlier versions of the T&S.

Refine the Methodologies Statement

Because the current course follows the tradition of having second-semester composition courses serve as bridges into more formal types of researched writing, as evidenced by the SOQ, having students reflect on the ways in which they gather and sort information is appropriate. Consequently, earlier versions of the T&S ask for students to outline the ways in which they seek out, identify, and assess the validity of the information they use to support their research projects. The T&S Update asks for a refinement of that outline, presenting in one paragraph the means used to find information and the rubrics through which that information is assessed. Again, it is asking for an improved version of what has already been done.

Compose the T&S Update

After completing the tasks above, which collectively constitute a sequence of prewriting, each student should independently draft a two-part paper, which will be brought to class in printed hard copy as the T&S Update. The two parts, topic proposal and annotated bibliography, are described below, and expectations for them explicated.

To be noted for both components is the audience to be addressed. Topic proposals of the kind requested by the T&S are often written by academics to other academics, often in the pursuit of presentation or publication activities. Annotated bibliographies are generally written as scholarly aids, helping researchers and critics to access the work done by those who precede them. For the T&S Update, the primary audience whose needs are to be met consists of instructors of ENGL 1213. The secondary audience to keep in mind consists of students in succeeding years, whose courses of study might be influenced by the work done in the ongoing research project to which the T&S contributes.

Topic Proposal Refinement

As noted above, the T&S Update should refine and focus more narrowly on its materials than earlier versions of the T&S. This can be done reasonably easily in a three-paragraph structure, with one paragraph addressing each of the points the assignment requests. That is,

- One paragraph could explain what the subject of inquiry is, situating it in its appropriate context.
- Another could explain the rationale for selecting the topic, noting why it is of interest and worth investigating.
- A third could present the research question, offering it and giving some indication why it is an appropriate question.

While other organizational patterns could be deployed that address all the required points, the T&S Update is meant as a progress check and should be kept reasonably simple. It is meant to facilitate ongoing work, not distract from it.

Annotated Bibliography Extension
In its revised and updated form, the annotated bibliography should open with a brief paragraph outlining the methodology used to select the sources it treats. That is, readers need to know what thought processes undergird the bibliography so that they can more authentically evaluate it for their own purposes. A few sentences—no more than seven—should suffice to account for how the works were selected from the many that are available.

After the opening paragraph, the annotated bibliography should present at least two three-part entries, each treating an individual secondary source. (Each source should be generally reliable, as discussed during the term and in comments on earlier assignments.) The three parts of each entry are, in order, an MLA-style Works Cited citation, a paragraph summarizing the source, and a brief paragraph accounting for the utility of the source in answering the question selected for the SOQ. The entries should be presented in alphabetical order by their citations. Entries should be separated from one another and from the introductory paragraph by an extra blank line.

The summary paragraph in each entry will still be similar to that written for the summary component of the StratRdg (http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii-strategic-reading/). The first sentence of the StratRdg summary is not needed, as the citation provided in each entry suffices to identify the source. As such, the summary paragraphs in the annotated bibliography should begin with a statement of the source's thesis, with following sentences noting major points and tendencies among the argument made in the source.

The evaluation paragraph in each entry will still express in a few sentences—no more than five—the potential for use of the source in answering one or more of the questions advanced in the topic proposal. Such concerns as the reliability of the source; the relevance of the source to the subject of inquiry; and what pertinent information it contributes to framing, offering, counter-arguing, or rebutting for the answer to one or more of the research questions are worth treating.

Submission Expectations
The T&S Update is due in print (as a typed, stapled copy) **at the beginning of class on 23 March 2016**. It should be formatted as a single document composed of the topic proposal and annotated bibliography, in that order, and it should be an appropriate length for final submission (three adequate paragraphs for the proposal, an introductory methodological paragraph for the annotated bibliography, two three-part annotation entries, plus a four-line heading—student name, instructor name, course and section, date of composition—and title).

The text of the T&S Update should be double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides. It should be in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type. Page numbers should appear in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; page numbers and surnames should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document. The four-line heading should be left-aligned, the title centered horizontally; both should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document. The primary text should be left-aligned; citations in the annotated bibliography should be aligned as prescribed by MLA standards. Entries in the annotated bibliography should be alphabetized by their citations, and

entries should be separated from one another and from the introductory paragraph by extra blank lines.

The T&S Update will be assessed as a minor assignment using the grading rubric below. Comments will be emailed to students via D2L. Given the brevity of the assignment, comments are not likely to be extensive; they should still be considered as work on the SOQ progresses, and they are made to that end.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the T&S Update. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Grading Rubric

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the forms below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

Following earlier treatments of version of the T&S, assessment of the T&S Update is done according to performance in several categories, named and described below. Each category is weighted with a number of steps' change to the basic grade of C. To align with earlier constructions, the refined topic proposal and annotated bibliography are assessed as specific units; the average of their scores will be the T&S Update score.

Topic Proposal		
Category	**Comments**	**Steps Yes/No**
Assignment Guidelines Met	●	+0/-3
Topic Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Rationale Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Questions Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Formatting Correct	●	+0/-1
Mechanics Correct	●	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	●	+1/+0
Topic Proposal Score		
Annotated Bibliography		
Category	**Comments**	**Steps Yes/No**
Assignment Guidelines Met	●	+0/-3
Introductory Paragraph Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Sources Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Citations Correct	●	+1/-1
Summaries Appropriate	●	+1/-1
Evaluations Appropriate	●	+1/-1
Formatting Correct	●	+0/-1
Mechanics Correct	●	+0/-1
Annotated Bibliography Score		
Overall Score (average of Topic Proposal and Annotated Bibliography Scores)		
Overall Comments		

Topic Proposal
- Assignment Guidelines Met—Is the topic proposal within the assigned range of word count (three paragraphs)?

- Topic Clear and Appropriate—Is the subject of inquiry proposed one that conforms to the guidelines expressed in the assignment sheet? Is it sufficiently narrow to admit of focused treatment? Is it of sufficient heft to sustain focused treatment?
- Rationale Clear and Appropriate—Is the reasoning leading to the treatment of the subject of inquiry reasonable? Is the explanation thereof sufficient? Does the writer express sufficient connection to the subject to justify treatment thereof?
- Question Clear and Appropriate—Is the question to be addressed clearly indicated? Is it likely to stimulate appropriate knowledge-development? Is it framed in a way that suggests open-minded investigation of their answers?
- Formatting Correct—Is the text of the proposal double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides; in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type; with page numbers in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; with page numbers and surnames in the same typeface as the rest of the document; with heading and title placed appropriately; and with text aligned fittingly?
- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?
- Engagement Developed—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the proposal offer some particularly engaging or poignant element unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it avoid cliché and trite phrasing? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

Annotated Bibliography
- Assignment Guidelines Met—Does the bibliography consist of an introductory paragraph and at least two entries, each of which consists of a citation, a paragraph-length summary, and a commentary paragraph?
- Introductory Paragraph Appropriate—Does the introductory paragraph transition smoothly and appropriately transition into the annotated bibliography from the topic proposal? Does it express the method for searching out the materials to be annotated in a manner suggestive of appropriate deliberation and consideration?
- Sources Appropriate—Are the sources treated secondary sources (with an option of one tertiary)? Are they likely to be reliable, given their provenance?
- Citations Correct—Do the citations in the bibliography conform to MLA standards in terms of content and presentation? Do they account for information appropriately?
- Summaries Appropriate—Does each entry's summary paragraph provide the information appropriate to a summary (thesis of the piece annotated, overview of major points of discussion)? Does it provide enough information for a reader to get an accurate sense of the summarized piece's content and form?
- Evaluations Appropriate—Does each entry's evaluative paragraph justify its potential use as a secondary source in answering the question selected for the SOQ?
- Formatting Correct—Is the text of the annotated bibliography double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides; in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type; with page numbers in the upper right corner of the page,

with the student's surname preceding the number; with page numbers and surnames in the same typeface as the rest of the document; and with text aligned and separated fittingly, as noted above?

- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?

Notes

Although the T&S Update is a small assignment, it directly contributes to the large project with which the semester concludes: the SOQ, worth 30% of the total course grade. Diligence with the T&S Update is likely to improve performance on the SOQ.

Because the T&S Update is a minor assignment, one working from the same guidelines as the T&S PV, RV, and FV, no additional sample will be provided.

The T&S Update is in large measure an exercise in formal citation and identification of useful source materials. More than in many other assignments, attention to the details of the work done to account for the provenance of information is obligatory. **Failure to provide appropriate citation may be treated as an academic integrity violation.**

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Infographic Portfolio assignment (Infog) posted online at http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii-infographic-portfolio/. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the Infog.

The First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University describes the Infog as enabling students to "Research their topic and describe, summarize, and visually represent various points of view on the topic"; "Identify, analyze, and describe the rhetorical purpose of various types of infographics"; "Draft an infographic by hand and then use that draft to design a digital version using software"; "Reflect upon and describe the rhetorical moves made in their infographic"; and "[Research] and evaluate sources for varying contexts, including but not limited to the scholarly researched argument." Doing so will take the form of two individual exercises, per Program standards: a 500-word (approximate) statement of goals and purposes and an infographic in raw and finished form. The two are weighted unevenly, with the statement comprising 15% of the assignment score and the two-version infographic comprising the remaining 85%. The weight-adjusted combination of the two scores will be entered as the grade for the Infog.

Students in Prof. Elliott's sections of ENGL 1213 in the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University will need to perform several tasks to successfully complete the exercise/s:
- Clarify a central question regarding the context of ongoing research in the class;
- Assemble and process relevant primary source materials;
- Clarify purposes to be addressed by the infographic;
- Plan and sketch initial versions of the infographic;
- Compose as a single document a brief (500-, +/- 25-word) statement of goals and purposes and a hand-drawn infographic (Infog PV), bringing it to class for review and comment by peers;
- Revise the Infog PV in light of comments made and submit the resulting version (Infog RV) electronically for instructor review; and
- Revise the Infog RV in light of comments made by the instructor and submit the resulting version (Infog FV) electronically for instructor assessment for 20% of the total course grade.

Information about each follows, along with a copy of the relevant grading rubric and notes.

Clarify the Focal Question to Address
Because experience demonstrates that linking assignments together aids their completion and improves their quality, the Infog in Prof. Elliott's classes will focus on much the same topic as was addressed in the earlier T&S and as will be addressed in the forthcoming SOQ. That is, the Infog will continue to focus on curricular issues relevant to the student composing it. Specifically, it will work to address questions about prevailing tendencies in the student's field of study.

To explain: The T&S presented questions about one particular aspect of a student's current or anticipated course of study. The SOQ will ultimately work to answer one of those questions. That answer will benefit from having context in which to exist, and the Infog will treat at least part of that context. That is, the Infog will address the question of what the general tendency regarding the student's topic is. It will answer the question of "What do treatments of the subject generally look like?" Individual students will need to refine the question to their specific projects, looking at how courses of study generally approach their specific subjects of inquiry or those things that are most nearly akin thereto.

Gather and Analyze Primary Sources

To answer the focal question, students will need to assemble a number of sources. Since the focal question should look into common treatments of the students' subjects, those sources should be published curricula and course descriptions. That is, students should look at programs similar to their own at other institutions (no fewer than six, per Program dicta) and examine how those programs treat their subject or something similar. For one example, a student looking at why X State University's undergraduate English major requires enrolled students to take an introductory graphic design course would need to look at English degree requirements at schools similar to X State University, scanning specifically for introductory graphic design or similar courses. Attention might also be paid to other out-of-discipline course requirements.

Information from the other curricula should be collated and distilled. Replication of the entirety of a stated curriculum is not likely to be helpful to readers; determination of overall tendencies will be. Accordingly, the information in the other curricula will need to be sorted and, for the purposes of the infographic, rendered numerically for ease of interpretation.

It will be helpful for students to keep notes about how they go about finding the statements of curricula they employ (something analogous to the reading log discussed as part of the StratRdg prewriting activities). The information is likely to be of use later in the project.

An analog to the process students will need to carry out can be found in the ENGL 1113: Composition I Evaluation Essay as taught in the Fall 2015 term at Oklahoma State University. Information about it is available here: http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1113-composition-i/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1113-composition-i-evaluation/. (The section labeled "Develop Criteria for Inclusion in the (Sub-) Genre" is the most relevant.)

Identify Specific Goals for the Infographic

After gathering and processing information from other curricula, students need to consider what they want to do with it. Information is not neutral; it is of no moment unless acted upon in an interpretive act, and how the interpretation is presented can do much to aid—or hinder—its reception and acceptance by the audiences that encounter it. Accordingly, students need to consider their overall purposes, reflecting on what it is they hope to have their infographics do (other than the obvious "get me a good grade in the class"). A series of questions might help to focus students' thinking on the matter:

- How complex is the response to that treatment?

- How complicated is the subject being treated?
- Is it something to recommend? To condemn?
- Is the subject a positive or negative thing?
- What are the best ways to convey that information quickly?
- What should the infographic convey about its composer?
- What should the infographic convey about the subject?
- What type of information does the infographic need to present?
- Who will benefit from having the information? What do they expect? What do they like? What do they dislike?
- With what colors and images is it associated?

The questions are not meant to restrict answers, but to stimulate thinking. Any, all, or none may be answered in an individual student's work.

Having a list of such purposes will be of benefit not only in drafting the infographic, but later on in the assignment, as well. The kind of thinking that goes into developing such a list is also broadly applicable to any productive or creative endeavor.

Lay out and Compile Initial Sketches of the Infographic
With information and goals for the infographic in mind, drafting it becomes the task to accomplish. A series of sketches is recommended, annotating the desired dimensions of the infographic, laying out information to be presented and placing it appropriately, determining color palettes and iconographic schema to apply, considering typeface choices, and the like. Class lectures will attend to such concerns, and the series of sketches that students produce should work from the broad and general to the specific and deliberate—all acknowledging that the work is in progress and provisional, as well as later to be converted to digital format.

Individual methods may vary, but grid paper and tracing paper seem useful materials to have at hand during the process. Pencils also seem to be preferred to inks, at least in earlier versions.

Compose the Infog PV
After completing the tasks above, which collectively constitute a sequence of prewriting, each student should independently draft a two-part paper, which will be brought to class in printed hard copy as the Infog PV. The two parts, statement of goals and purposes and raw-form infographic, are described below, and expectations for them explicated.

To be noted for both components is the audience to be addressed. Infographics are generally drafted to be presented to broad public audiences, non-specialists who may have only a passing interest in the topic being treated. For the Infog, the primary audience whose needs are to be met consists of instructors of ENGL 1213. The secondary audience to keep in mind consists of the broad, general public; assume a completion of high school but no attendance at college as yet, as well as a middle-class multiethnic background.

Statement of Goals and Purposes
Per program dicta, the statement of goals and purposes should be a short paper, approximately 500 words, in which students demonstrate having reflected on their choices of sources and

methods in composing the infographic. This can be done reasonably easily; a three-paragraph structure suggests itself:

- One paragraph could explain what the subject of inquiry is, situating it in its appropriate context.
- Another could explain the rationale for selecting the sources used, explaining the rubric for determining what programs to examine.
- A third could explain the significance of the choices made in the infographic itself. Such things as document dimensions, typeface, color choice, image form and style, and citation choice all influence how the information presented will be accepted; all need to be deliberate decisions made by the composer.

Other organizational patterns could be deployed that address all the required points, of course, although that laid out above has the advantage of being clear, evident, and systematic.

Raw-form Infographic
Per Program dicta, the raw form of the infographic moves towards students "tell[ing] a story about [their] research topic[s] using a variety of modes, including—but not limited to—words, image, color, and number." Like the statement of goals and purposes, the raw-form infographic should be easy to do; it is, in essence, a colored drawing with spaces for words and shapes blocked out, perhaps with the shapes and colors detailed and addenda indicating the words that go in various places.

Even in its raw form, the infographic needs to adhere to design principles articulated and discussed during class time (alignment, balance, consistency, contrast, and grouping), as well as in a number of supplemental sources, indicated below:

- Natalija S., "8 Types of Infographics: Which Is Right for You?": http://piktochart.com/blog/8-types-of-infographics-which-right-for-you/
- See Mei Chow, "Layout Cheat Sheet: Making the Best out of Visual Arrangement": http://piktochart.com/blog/layout-cheat-sheet-making-the-best-out-of-visual-arrangement/
- "Winners: Kantar Information is Beautiful Awards 2015," *Information is Beautiful*: http://www.informationisbeautiful.net/2015/information-is-beautiful-awards-winners-2015/
- Amy Balliett, "The Do's and Don'ts of Infographic Design," *Smashing Magazine*: https://www.smashingmagazine.com/2011/10/the-dos-and-donts-of-infographic-design/
- Nathan Yau, "The Do's and Don'ts of Infographic Design: Revisited," *Smashing Magazine*: https://www.smashingmagazine.com/2011/10/the-dos-and-donts-of-infographic-design-revisited/
- Megan McArdle, "Ending the Infographic Plague," *The Atlantic*: http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2011/12/ending-the-infographic-plague/250474/
- Rebecca J. Rosen, "Yes, Google, Do What You Can and Save Us from Wretched Infographics," *The Atlantic*: http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/07/yes-google-do-what-you-can-and-save-us-from-wretched-infographics/260271/

- Kristen Hohenadel, "How Doodles and Sketches Become Gorgeous Infographics," *Slate*: http://www.slate.com/blogs/the_eye/2014/09/26/infographic_designers_sketchbooks_by_steven_heller_and_rick_landers_reveals.html
- Ed Roberts, "A Deep Dive into Infographic Design: Q&A with Steven Heller and Rick Landers," *The Creative Group*: https://www.roberthalf.com/creativegroup/blog/a-deep-dive-into-infographic-design-qa-with-steven-heller-and-rick-landers

Other sources are, without doubt, available; consultation with them is likely to be helpful.

Submission Expectations

The Infog PV is due in print (as a typed and hand-drawn, stapled copy) **at the beginning of class on 7 March 2016**. It should be presented as a single document composed of the statement of goals and purposes and raw-form infographic, in that order, and it should be at least the minimum acceptable length for the final submission (500 words, +/- 25, for the statement, one or more hand-drawn preliminary versions of the infographic, plus a four-line heading—student name, instructor name, course and section, date of composition—and title).

The text of the statement of goals and purposes for the Infog PV should be double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides. It should be in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type. Page numbers should appear in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; page numbers and surnames should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document. The four-line heading should be left-aligned, the title centered horizontally; both should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document. The primary text should be left-aligned; formatting of the raw-form infographic needs to be easily read and taken in, adherent to the principles of design articulated in assigned readings and during class discussion.

A quiz grade will be taken from the presence and quality of the Infog PV during class on the due date. The grade will be largely holistic in nature, with more complete and on-target student work receiving higher grades. Students who arrive in class without drafts will receive a zero for the minor assignment grade, as will those who fail to attend class that day (excepting those covered under class attendance policies expressed in the syllabus and detailed during class discussions). Detailed reading will not be conducted by the instructor at that point, although comments regarding overall adherence to assignment standards may well be made.

Students should keep in mind that the Infog PV is a work in progress. A more complete draft is more desirable than a less complete one, largely in that it eases the later work that must be done and offers more opportunity for concrete improvement to the composition that *is* done. Please note that the materials composed for the Infog PV may well need to change; keep in mind that they cannot get better without changing, and that all creative work can be improved.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the Infog PV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Revise the Infog PV into the Infog RV

Following the in-class workshopping of the Infog PV, students are **strongly** encouraged to revise their papers in light of the comments made by peer reviewer/s. They should work from global issues—whether the statement of goals and purposes presents all information requested, whether the information on the infographic is accurate, and whether it is presented accessibly and effectively—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The paper resulting from the process of revision, the Infog RV, should still open with a statement of goals and purposes that identifies the subject and situates it in context, indicates sourcing methods, and explains design choices. The Infog RV should follow with a clear, digital version of the revised raw-form infographic that presents its information accurately and accessibly. Information and materials to assist with the processes of digital rendering are available at the following URLs, provided in Program dicta:

- Infographic Maker: http://piktochart.com/
- Piktochart Tutorial: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GIa0v_inDOM
- Piktochart Tutorial 2: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-wOIcf5lcdo
- Creating Infographics with *PowerPoint*, Tutorial 1: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HexiBkfmkFc
- Creating Infographics with *PowerPoint*, Tutorial 2: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rmuqp1HiPgM

The Infog RV is due via D2L before the beginning of class time on 11 March 2016. It must be submitted in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format. (No other file types will be accepted; submissions in another file type will be treated as though not submitted.) It should be presented as a single document consisting of multiple sections: the statement of goals and purposes, a scanned-in version of the raw-form infographic, and an improved digital-original version of the infographic.

- The text of the statement should be presented according to the standards expressed for the Infog PV, and it should be within the acceptable length indicated (500 words, +/- 25, for the statement, one or more hand-drawn preliminary versions of the infographic, plus a four-line heading—student name, instructor name, course and section, date of composition—and title).
- The digitized raw-form infographic should be scanned into an image file (preferably .jpg format) and inserted into the .doc, .docx, or .rtf file submitted; page sizing, margins, and numbers should proceed from the statement text.
- The digital-original version of the infographic should also be inserted as an image file into the .doc, .docx, or .rtf file submitted. Page numbers and margins should proceed from the digitized raw-form infographic; page size should be the smallest standard sized page that allows the infographic to be read clearly and easily.

Usage throughout should conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time.

The Infog RV will be assessed via the grading rubric below as a minor assignment according to the rubric below. The text and comments made about it will be returned to students via the email function on D2L. Those comments should be used to improve the text further in advance of its final submission; the Infog RV is a work in progress, although one nearing completion.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the Infog RV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Revise the Infog RV into the Infog FV

Following the return of instructor comments on the Infog RV, students are **strongly** encouraged to revise their papers in light of the comments. They should work from global issues— whether the statement of goals and purposes presents all information requested, whether the information on the infographic is accurate, and whether it is presented accessibly and effectively —to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The paper resulting from the process of revision, the Infog FV, should still open with a statement of goals and purposes that identifies the subject and situates it in context, indicates sourcing methods, and explains design choices. The Infog RV should follow with a clear, digital version of the revised raw-form infographic that presents its information accurately and accessibly.

The Infog FV is due via D2L before the beginning of class time on 25 March 2016. It must be submitted in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format. (No other file types will be accepted; submissions in another file type will be treated as though not submitted.) The text should be presented as a single document consisting of multiple sections: the statement of goals and purposes, a scanned-in version of the raw-form infographic, and a further-improved digital-original version of the infographic.

- The text of the statement should be presented according to the standards expressed for the Infog PV, and it should be within the acceptable length indicated (500 words, +/- 25, for the statement, one or more hand-drawn preliminary versions of the infographic, plus a four-line heading—student name, instructor name, course and section, date of composition—and title).
- The digitized raw-form infographic should be scanned into an image file (preferably .jpg format) and inserted into the .doc, .docx, or .rtf file submitted; page sizing, margins, and numbers should proceed from the statement text.
- The improved version of the infographic should also be inserted as an image file into the .doc, .docx, or .rtf file submitted. Page numbers and margins should proceed from the digitized raw-form infographic; page size should be the smallest standard sized page that allows the infographic to be read clearly and easily.

Usage throughout should conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time.

The Infog FV will be assessed via the grading rubric below as a major assignment, worth 20% of the total course grade. The text and comments made about it will be returned to students via the email function on D2L. Those comments should be used to stimulate still better performance on future writing; comments on the Infog should help with that writing.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the Infog FV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Grading Rubric

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the forms below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

Per course policy, assessment of the assignment is done according to performance in several categories, named and described below. Each category is weighted with a number of steps' change to the basic grade of C. To accord with Program policy, the statement of purpose and goals are assessed as specific units. The Infog score will be calculated with 15% of its weight coming from the statement; the remaining 85% derives from the actual infographic.

Statement of Goals and Purposes		
Category	**Comments**	**Steps Yes/No**
Assignment Guidelines Met	●	+0/-3
Subject and Context Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Source Selection Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Infographic Choices Clear and Appropriate	●	+2/-1
Formatting Correct	●	+0/-1
Mechanics Correct	●	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	●	+1/+0
Statement Score		
Infographic		
Category	**Comments**	**Steps Yes/No**
Assignment Guidelines Met	●	+0/-3
Alignment Appropriate	●	+1/+0
Balance Appropriate	●	+1/-1
Consistency Maintained	●	+1/-1
Contrast Appropriate	●	+1/-1
Grouping Appropriate	●	+1/-1
Information Appropriate	●	+1/-2
Mechanics Correct	●	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	●	+1/+0
Infographic Score		
Overall Score (15% Statement, 85% Infographic)		
Overall Comments		

Statement of Goals and Purposes
- Assignment Guidelines Met—Is the statement within the assigned range of word count (500 words, +/- 25)?
- Subject and Context Clear and Appropriate—Is the subject being treated by the project made clear to the identified primary readership?
- Source Selection Clear and Appropriate—Is the methodology leading to the selection of the sources deployed in the infographic expressed clearly and in a way accessible to the primary identified readership? Is it a reasonably responsible method of sourcing?
- Infographic Choices Clear and Appropriate—Is the explanation of the decisions made about the infographic expressed clearly and in a way accessible to the primary identified readership? Is it a sensible explanation?
- Formatting Correct—Is the text of the statement double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides; in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type; with page numbers in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; with page numbers and surnames in the same typeface as the rest

of the document; with heading and title placed appropriately; and with text aligned fittingly?
- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?
- Engagement Developed—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the statement offer some particularly engaging or poignant element unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it avoid cliché and trite phrasing? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

Infographic
- Assignment Guidelines Met—Are a scanned copy of the raw-form infographic and a current, improved version thereof provided, and in the order listed?
- Alignment Appropriate—Does the infographic align related information to itself? Does it place items on the page in a manner that eases reading and encourages authentic interpretation thereof? Is a title clear and fittingly prominent?
- Balance Appropriate—Does the infographic display a balanced presentation? Is the page weighted to call attention to all parts in tandem with one another?
- Consistency Maintained—Does the infographic deploy a consistent design scheme? That is, are color choices, typeface choices, iconography, and other visual features kept in agreement across the document?
- Contrast Appropriate—Do the color choices, typeface choices, iconography, and other visual features facilitate reading? Do they allow for easy access to the presented information? Do they minimize eye strain and fatigue?
- Grouping Appropriate—Does the infographic keep similar information together? Does it separate information fittingly for ease of reading?
- Information Appropriate—Is the data presented on the infographic accurate? Is it presented authentically? Is it documented appropriately?
- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text on the infographic conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?
- Engagement Developed—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the infographic offer some particularly engaging or poignant element unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it avoid cliché and trite phrasing and visuals? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

Notes

Owing to the restructuring of ENGL 1213 for the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University, only one targeted example of the Infog is available: "Sample Infographic Portfolio Assignment: Context to Answer a Question about the Comprehensive Exams for UL Lafayette PhD Students in English," here: https://elliottrwi.com/2016/03/01/sample-infographic-portfolio-assignment-context-to-answer-a-question-about-the-comprehensive-exams-for-ul-lafayette-phd-students-in-english/.

Students whose curricula will ask them to take ENGL 3323: Technical Writing at Oklahoma State University, or something similar thereto, will find the practice in visual rhetoric offered by the Infog useful. Incorporation of images into documents is a key component of that class, as well as of the kind of work for which that class serves as training and practice.

Infographics are typically associated with online work, and online presentation has its own conventions for citation. This is not the same thing as *not* citing; although the form is different, the need to account for data is no less present. **Failure to do so appropriately (per conventions of the genre) may be treated as an academic integrity violation.**

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Student's Own Question assignment (SOQ) posted online at http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii-your-own-question/. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the SOQ.

The First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University describes the SOQ as enabling students to "research and write a ten page [*sic*] research [paper] in response to their selected inquiry questions," one that offers practice in "in-text citation, argument structure, and deep revision skills," among others. Doing so will take the form of a single exercise, per Program standards: a researched, predominantly argumentative essay of 3,100 to 3,400 words. As a single exercise, its single score will be entered as the grade for the SOQ.

Students in Prof. Elliott's sections of ENGL 1213 in the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University will need to perform several tasks to successfully complete the exercise:

- Identify a (tentative) thesis for the paper;
- Identify points of support for that thesis, developing each through appropriate primary, secondary, and (optionally) tertiary/critical evidence, as well as systematic explanation of the same;
- Identify a reasonable counter-argument to the thesis, developing it through appropriate primary, secondary, and (optionally) tertiary/critical evidence, as well as systematic explanation of the same;
- Identify a reasonable rebuttal to the counter-argument, developing it through appropriate primary, secondary, and (optionally) tertiary/critical evidence, as well as systematic explanation of the same;
- Develop a graceful, sensible entry into and exit out of the discussion;
- Compose a predominantly argumentative paper of approximately ten pages—3,100 to 3,400 words in length—that articulates and supports a thesis and includes both counter-argument and rebuttal (SOQ PV), bringing it to class for review and comment by peers;
- Revise the SOQ PV in light of comments made and submit the resulting version (SOQ RV) electronically for instructor review;
- Revise the SOQ RV in light of comments made and submit the resulting version (SOQ Update) electronically for instructor review (this is an adjustment from information on earlier forms of the course syllabus); and
- Revise the SOQ Update in light of comments made by the instructor and submit the resulting version (SOQ FV) electronically for instructor assessment for 30% of the total course grade.

Information about each follows, along with a copy of the relevant grading rubric and notes.

Identify a (Tentative) Thesis
A note on the T&S assignment sheet indicates that the earlier assignment "directly contributes to the large project with which the semester concludes: the SOQ, worth 30% of the total course

grade." That contribution takes two forms. One is that it points to secondary (and tertiary/critical) source material likely to be useful, something detailed below. The other, and the more immediate, is that it offers questions worth answering in the SOQ. Comments returned from the instructor suggest which of the questions posed in the T&S is the most likely to have an interestingly researchable answer. That answer will serve as the thesis of the SOQ, the central point the rest of the paper exists to support and validate.

Such a thesis should present a reasonable claim in an authoritative manner, one that indicates what question is being answered without having to explicitly present a question. For example, if the T&S asked "Why does the Professional Writing concentration of the State College English degree not include a course in graphic design?" the thesis for the SOQ might be something like "The Professional Writing concentration of the State College English degree lacks a course in graphic design because of tensions between the English and Design departments." A well-written thesis makes clear what issue is being addressed without having to pose a question explicitly. It is also one that advances a position without insulting the reader, as well as being something that asks for explanation to validate it. (A self-evident thesis hardly merits discussion, reading as trite or worse.) In essence, it offers an intellectual destination, one that requires some travel to reach—travel provided by the rest of the paper.

It is important to keep in mind that the initial thesis must be regarded as tentative. During the process of developing the argument supporting it (as discussed below), it may happen that the thesis will need to be reconsidered or even discarded entirely, as evidence and the reasoning applied to that evidence may argue that a variation on the thesis, or even another thesis altogether, is a more accurate answer to the question that spurred the initial investigation. Being open to such changes is one mark of a thinking, reasoning, intelligent person, so changing theses is not something to be taken as a failure.

Identify and Develop Support for the Thesis

Theses are not necessarily valid on their own. For readers to accept them, they need to be supported by a number of argumentative points, each of which derives from carefully explained primary, secondary, and (optionally) tertiary/critical evidence. After the (tentative) thesis for the SOQ is determined, then, support for it needs to be arrayed.

Each point of support marshaled for the thesis, each reason that it is valid, needs to emerge from close examination of specific primary, secondary, and/or (optionally) tertiary/critical evidence. That is, there need to be specific words or images on a page or from the mouths of experts speaking about their areas of relevant expertise, or else directly reported authorial observations, that undergird the assertions made. That evidence needs to be clearly and explicitly presented to readers, so that they are able to understand what materials lead to the ideas presented in the paper. More importantly, *how* that evidence serves to support the ideas about it needs to be explained. Readers do not approach the materials presented from the same positions as authors of the papers wherein they are presented; they need to have the process through which the authors move from the evidence to their ideas about it explained in detail so that they can follow along with it and, if all goes as it should, come to accept that the idea is arrived at sensibly, becoming itself sensible. Additionally, how the ideas themselves serve to validate the overall thesis of the

paper needs to be made clear, and for much the same reason that the evidence informing the ideas needs to be explained in terms of how it informs the ideas.

Additionally, the points of support for the thesis cannot exist in isolation. They must be presented in relation to one another, ideally in an order that both fosters readerly comprehension and conduces to the effectiveness of the overall argument. The chronological order discussed in earlier assignments may be a useful organizing principle, depending on the question being addressed and the answer given to it. Some questions and answers will not admit of such treatment, however, so other orders may need to be deployed. Traditional rhetorical order (i.e., weakest point to strongest point) or a slight modification thereof (i.e., starting with the second-strongest point before presenting the weakest and growing progressively stronger throughout the paper) suggests itself as a useful organizing principle in such cases. In some circumstances, a simple additive order might be most helpful, although it is less likely to be so than many others. Whatever organizing principle is at work needs to be clearly indicated in the way new points are introduced—and transitioning *into* new ideas tends to work better than transitioning *out* of old ones.

It will be helpful to develop the list of Works Cited during the process of composition, rather than postponing it for creation after drafting is done. Continuous development reduces the chances of overlooking a source in later development, which is an error with potentially grave consequences. Embedding in-text citations should occur during the process of drafting, as well, and for the same reason.

Identify and Develop a Counter-Argument

The SOQ serves as something of an introduction to the kinds of formal academic writing prevalent in many disciplines, as well as types of formal writing common outside academe. Papers such as the SOQ are often referred to as conference papers, meant to be delivered in fifteen to twenty minutes to groups of peers interested in the general area of research treated by the paper. They are often also called "white papers," and they are used as support for establishing or changing policies. Both types of papers have expectations of genre, including an indication that the author 1) is familiar with the work done in the area discussed by the paper and 2) has considered other opinions before arriving at that presented in the paper. One way to do so is to present a counter-argument.

A counter-argument serves to present an opposing or divergent view to that articulated in the thesis. To follow from the example above, if a paper will argue that "The Professional Writing concentration of the State College English degree lacks a course in graphic design because of tensions between the English and Design departments," one workable counter-argument could be that "The Professional Writing concentration of the State College English degree instead lacks a course in graphic design because of an overabundance of degree hours already required," followed by a demonstration of that assertion's validity. In effect, a counter-argument serves to anticipate a possible objection to the thesis being argued, something which helps to strengthen authorial ethos in that it demonstrates superior command of relevant material and a considered approach to it.

It may seem paradoxical to include a counter-argument, and including a counter-argument does not, on its own strengthen support of a thesis. Another component is required: the rebuttal (discussed below). Further, for the counter-argument to be effective, it has to articulate a reasonable position, one that can easily be understood as being valid. A straw-man or otherwise fallacious counter-argument will not suffice; it will instead have a detrimental effect on the strength of support for the thesis, indicating that the author is insufficiently certain of materials or is insufficiently able to investigate divergent opinions to be able to handle reasonable objections. As such, the counter-argument must be presented sincerely and honestly, given as much attention as a solid point of support for the thesis. Additionally, the disjunction between the thesis and the counter-argument is such that particular attention to transitioning into the latter is needed. Readers need to be eased into the counter-argument; an abrupt introduction of it will confuse and annoy them, greatly diminishing the effectiveness of the writing, overall.

The use of secondary sources to develop the counter-argument suggests itself as a useful tactic. It is easier to report another's words (perhaps summarizing them as the StratRdg asks for its focal text) as a means of presenting alternative views of the topic than to develop counter-arguments internally. Doing so is by no means required, and there will be some projects where such a tactic is inappropriate, but it is often helpful.

Further, as with supporting the thesis, continuous development of in-text citations and the Works Cited list to which they refer during drafting of the counter-argument is recommended.

Identify and Develop a Rebuttal

The counter-argument serves to demonstrate to readers that a paper's writer has command of the material being discussed and has considered other opinions. On its own, however, it does not conduce to the support of the argument being made by the paper. For it to do so, it must be followed immediately by a rebuttal, an argumentative point that demonstrates that the counter-argument is in some way inapplicable to the situation being treated in the paper. This is not necessarily the same thing as saying that the thesis is correct—and it should not be. What it *is* is a counter-argument to the counter-argument, the provision of which facilitates return to the main line of discussion in the paper while demonstrating further the author's considered approach to the topic being discussed.

As noted, the rebuttal serves to demonstrate that the counter-argument is in some way incorrect or inapplicable to the specific situation being discussed by the thesis. To follow from the example above, if a paper will argue that "The Professional Writing concentration of the State College English degree lacks a course in graphic design because of tensions between the English and Design departments," and its counter-argument is that "The Professional Writing concentration of the State College English degree instead lacks a course in graphic design because of an overabundance of degree hours already required," a workable rebuttal could be that "There is room to include such a requirement, however," followed by an explanation of where that room is or how it could be developed. In effect, the rebuttal serves to undercut the potential objection raised in the counter-argument, clearing intellectual ground upon which to build the argument that supports the thesis.

Like the counter-argument, the rebuttal must present a reasonable argument to be effective; an extreme or untenable assault on the counter-argument will have the same effect for it that an extreme or fallacious counter-argument will have for the thesis. As such, the rebuttal must be presented sincerely and honestly, given as much attention as a solid point of support for the thesis. Additionally, the disjunction between the counter-argument and the rebuttal is such that particular attention to transitioning into the latter is needed. Readers need to be eased into the rebuttal; an abrupt introduction of it will confuse and annoy them, greatly diminishing the effectiveness of the writing, overall.

As with the counter-argument, the use of secondary sources to develop the rebuttal suggests itself as a useful tactic. It is often easier to report another's words (perhaps summarizing them as the StratRdg asks for its focal text) as a means of presenting alternative views of the topic than to develop rebuttals internally. Doing so is by no means required, and there will be some projects where such a tactic is inappropriate, but it is not seldom helpful.

Further, as with supporting the thesis and indicating the counter-argument, continuous development of in-text citations and the Works Cited list to which they refer during drafting of the rebuttal is recommended.

Develop an Introduction and a Conclusion

After having considered what the thesis will be and how to adequately support it, how to move into the thesis and its support must be determined, as must how to move out of them. The former needs to introduce the topic being discussed in the paper, identifying it clearly and providing context for the discussion to come. An indication of authorial involvement with the topic would also be useful, as it helps to situate ethos and provides an appropriate pathos appeal to motivate reading. The introduction should also articulate the thesis to be presented; readers tend to benefit from and appreciate knowing the end towards which their reading efforts will be directed. It might be useful to follow the presentation of the thesis with an essay map: a statement of the order in which points will be presented. Forecasting organization for the reader eases reading— but if an essay map is provided, it must be followed scrupulously. Doing otherwise has the effect of lying to the reader, with commensurate damage to the paper's credibility and the author's.

The conclusion should do more than simply recapitulate the thesis and supporting points. It needs to move towards some greater implication, perhaps suggesting a course of action that can be taken in light of the now-validated thesis. Indicating what value accrues to the inquiry conducted in the paper is another good strategy, something that returns the paper to the world and moves forward, addressing the relevance the paper has for future uses.

Compose the SOQ PV

After completing the tasks above, which collectively constitute a sequence of prewriting, each student should independently draft a predominantly argumentative paper of 3,100 to 3,400 words, which will be brought to class in printed hard copy as the SOQ PV. To be noted is the audience to be addressed. For the SOQ, representative of more formal academic and professional writing as noted above in "Identify and Develop a Counter-Argument," the primary audience whose needs are to be met consists of program and department administrators who are in positions that allow them to make changes to curricula. The secondary audience to keep in mind

consists of students and professors of the discipline about which the paper is written, both sets of whom will have vested interests in any changes made to the courses of study concerned therewith.

The SOQ PV will do well to open with a graceful introduction that identifies the topic being discussed and articulates a context for it before asserting a thesis and perhaps providing an essay map that forecasts the organization of the document that follows. It will do well to then present a counter-argument and rebuttal, in that order, before moving on to present a well ordered series of points that support the thesis with solid primary, secondary, and (optionally) tertiary/critical evidence that is explained in terms of how it supports each point made—as well as an explanation of how each point serves to support the thesis. The paper will do well to conclude with a paragraph that moves beyond simply repeating the thesis and the points made in support of it to some kind of recommendation or indication of what readers can do now that they are provided with the validated thesis presented in the text.

The SOQ PV is due in print (as a typed, stapled copy) **at the beginning of class on 8 April 2016**. It should be presented as a single document, and it should be at least the minimum acceptable length for the final submission (3,100 to 3,400 words **plus** a four-line heading—student name, instructor name, course and section, and date of composition—title, and appropriately MLA-formatted list of Works Cited).

The text of the SOQ PV should be double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides. It should be in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type. Page numbers should appear in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; page numbers and surnames should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document. The four-line heading should be left-aligned, the title centered horizontally; both should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document. The primary text should be left-aligned, its paragraphs indented one-half inch in their first lines and flush to the left margin thereafter. The Works Cited list should begin on a new page with a horizontally centered subject-heading; its citations should align left with the first lines flush to the left margin and subsequent lines indented half an inch. Double-spacing remains in place; no extra spaces intervene within or between citations.

A quiz grade will be taken from the presence and quality of the SOQ PV during class on the due date. The grade will be largely holistic in nature, with more complete and on-target student work receiving higher grades. Students who arrive in class without drafts will receive a zero for the minor assignment grade, as will those who fail to attend class that day (excepting those covered under class attendance policies expressed in the syllabus and detailed during class discussions). Detailed reading will not be conducted by the instructor at that point, although comments regarding overall adherence to assignment standards may well be made.

Students should keep in mind that the SOQ PV is a work in progress. A more complete draft is more desirable than a less complete one, largely in that it eases the later work that must be done and offers more opportunity for concrete improvement to the composition that *is* done. Please note that the materials composed for the SOQ PV may well need to change; keep in mind that they cannot get better without changing, and that all creative work can be improved.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the SOQ PV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Revise the SOQ PV into the SOQ RV

Following the in-class workshopping of the SOQ PV, students are **strongly** encouraged to revise their papers in light of the comments made by peer reviewer/s. They should work from global issues—such as the presence and appropriateness of a thesis, the effectiveness of counter-argument and rebuttal, the adequacy of support for the thesis, the adequacy of evidence undergirding the support, and the adequacy of explanation thereof—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The paper resulting from the process of revision, the SOQ RV, should still open with a graceful introduction that identifies the topic being discussed and articulates a context for it before asserting a thesis and perhaps providing an essay map that forecasts the organization of the document that follows. The SOQ RV should still follow with a counter-argument and rebuttal, in that order, before moving on to present a well ordered series of points that support the thesis with solid primary, secondary, and (optionally) tertiary/critical evidence that is explained in terms of how it supports each point made—as well as an explanation of how each point serves to support the thesis. It should still end with a paragraph that moves beyond simply repeating the thesis and the points made in support of it to some kind of recommendation or indication of what readers can do now that they are provided with the validated thesis presented in the text.

The SOQ RV is due via D2L before the beginning of class time on 15 April 2016. It must be submitted in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format. (No other file types will be accepted; submissions in another file type will be treated as though not submitted.) It should be presented as a single document, and it should be at least the minimum acceptable length for the final submission (3,100 to 3,400 words **plus** a four-line heading—student name, instructor name, course and section, and date of composition—title, and appropriately MLA-formatted list of Works Cited). Formatting should be the same as that for which the SOQ PV calls.

The SOQ RV will be assessed via the grading rubric below as a minor assignment. The text and comments made about it will be returned to students via the email function on D2L. Those comments should be used to improve the text further in advance of its next submission; the SOQ RV is a work in progress, so changes and improvements are expected.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the SOQ RV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Revise the SOQ RV into the SOQ Update

Following the in-class workshopping of the SOQ RV, students are **strongly** encouraged to revise their papers in light of the comments made by peer reviewer/s. They should work from global issues—such as the presence and appropriateness of a thesis, the effectiveness of counter-argument and rebuttal, the adequacy of support for the thesis, the adequacy of evidence undergirding the support, and the adequacy of explanation thereof—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The paper resulting from the process of revision, the SOQ Update, should still open with a graceful introduction that identifies the topic being discussed and articulates a context for it before asserting a thesis and perhaps providing an essay map that forecasts the organization of the document that follows. The SOQ Update should still follow with a counter-argument and rebuttal, in that order, before moving on to present a well ordered series of points that support the thesis with solid primary, secondary, and (optionally) tertiary/critical evidence that is explained in terms of how it supports each point made—as well as an explanation of how each point serves to support the thesis. It should still end with a paragraph that moves beyond simply repeating the thesis and the points made in support of it to some kind of recommendation or indication of what readers can do now that they are provided with the validated thesis presented in the text.

The SOQ Update is due via D2L before the beginning of class time on 22 April 2016. It must be submitted in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format. (No other file types will be accepted; submissions in another file type will be treated as though not submitted.) It should be presented as a single document, and it should be at least the minimum acceptable length for the final submission (3,100 to 3,400 words **plus** a four-line heading—student name, instructor name, course and section, and date of composition—title, and appropriately MLA-formatted list of Works Cited). Formatting should be the same as that for which the SOQ PV calls.

The SOQ Update will be assessed via the grading rubric below as a minor assignment. The text and comments made about it will be returned to students via the email function on D2L. Those comments should be used to improve the text further in advance of its final submission; the SOQ Update is a work in progress, albeit one nearing completion.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the SOQ Update. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Revise the SOQ Update into the SOQ FV

Following the return of instructor comments on the SOQ Update, students are **strongly** encouraged to revise their papers in light of the comments. They should work from global issues—such as the presence and appropriateness of a thesis, the effectiveness of counter-argument and rebuttal, the adequacy of support for the thesis, the adequacy of evidence undergirding the support, and the adequacy of explanation thereof—to more local issues—such

as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The paper resulting from the process of revision, the SOQ FV, should still open with a graceful introduction that identifies the topic being discussed and articulates a context for it before asserting a thesis and perhaps providing an essay map that forecasts the organization of the document that follows. The SOQ FV should still follow with a counter-argument and rebuttal, in that order, before moving on to present a well ordered series of points that support the thesis with solid primary, secondary, and (optionally) tertiary/critical evidence that is explained in terms of how it supports each point made—as well as an explanation of how each point serves to support the thesis. It should still end with a paragraph that moves beyond simply repeating the thesis and the points made in support of it to some kind of recommendation or indication of what readers can do now that they are provided with the validated thesis presented in the text.

The SOQ FV is due via D2L before the beginning of class time on 29 April 2016. It must be submitted in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format. (No other file types will be accepted; submissions in another file type will be treated as though not submitted.) It should be presented as a single document, and it should be at least the minimum acceptable length for the final submission (3,100 to 3,400 words **plus** a four-line heading—student name, instructor name, course and section, and date of composition—title, and appropriately MLA-formatted list of Works Cited). Formatting should be the same as that for which the SOQ PV calls.

The SOQ FV will be assessed via the grading rubric below as a major assignment, worth 30% of the total course grade. The text and comments made about it will be returned to students via the email function on D2L. Those comments should be used to stimulate still better performance on future writing—because it is certain that students will be asked to complete other writing tasks, not only in their future coursework, but in their professional lives after their formal coursework is completed.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the SOQ FV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

Grading Rubric

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the forms below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

Per course policy, assessment of the assignment is done according to performance in several categories, named and described below. Each category is weighted with a number of steps' change to the basic grade of C.

Category	Comments	Steps Yes/No
Assignment Guidelines Met	•	+0/-3
Introduction Effective	•	+0/-1
Thesis Clear and Appropriate	•	+1/-1
Counter-argument Clear and Appropriate	•	+1/+0
Rebuttal Clear and Appropriate	•	+1/+0
Supporting Points Clear and Appropriate	•	+1/+0
Evidence Clear and Appropriate	•	+0/-1
Explanations Clear and Appropriate	•	+1/-1
Conclusion Effective	•	+0/-1
Organization Effective	•	+1/+0
Formatting Correct	•	+0/-1
Mechanics Correct	•	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	•	+1/+0
Overall Score		
Overall Comments		

- Assignment Guidelines Met—Is the paper of an appropriate length: 3,100 to 3,400 words? Is it primarily an argumentative work?
- Introduction Effective—Does the paper begin with a clear and cogent indication of the topic to be discussed and the context in which it will be discussed?
- Thesis Clear and Appropriate—Does the paper provide a clear thesis? Is the thesis reasonably and authoritatively asserted? Is it of sufficient heft as to be able to support sustained inquiry?
- Counter-argument Clear and Appropriate—Does the paper provide a reasonably counter-argument, supporting it adequately?
- Rebuttal Clear and Appropriate—Does the paper appropriately rebut the counter-argument, demonstrating adequate intellectual space for the thesis to be investigated appropriately?
- Supporting Points Clear and Appropriate—Does the paper provide enough points and strong enough points of support for the thesis? Do they reflect adequate reflection upon and consideration of the topic and the thesis?
- Evidence Clear and Appropriate—Are all supporting points provided with sufficient primary, secondary, and (optionally) tertiary/critical source evidence to validate them? Is the evidence appropriate to the purposes to which it is directed? Is the evidence appropriately attested, both in the text and at the end of the text?

- Explanations Clear and Appropriate—Is the evidence provided sufficiently and appropriately explained in terms of how it supports the point being made? Are the points made sufficiently and appropriately explained in terms of how they support the thesis?
- Conclusion Effective—Does the paper end with an effective motion to some point beyond itself? Does it lead primary readers smoothly and appropriately to consider a course of action or some other idea, indicating what can be done in light of the validated thesis the paper presents?
- Organization Effective—Does the paper move smoothly and appropriately from the introduction through counter-argument, rebuttal, and points of support to its conclusion? Are there clear and appropriate transitions among its various paragraphs and components, indicating both that new ideas are being treated and the relationships among those ideas? Are the supporting points ordered in a manner easily read and conducive to the overall effect of the argument? Is the paper weighted appropriately towards the explanation of support for the thesis?
- Formatting Correct—Is the text of the paper double-spaced on letter-size sheets with one-inch margins on all sides; in 12-point Times New Roman, Garamond, or Georgia type; with page numbers in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; with page numbers and surnames in the same typeface as the rest of the document; with heading and title placed appropriately; and with text aligned fittingly?
- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?
- Engagement Developed—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the SOQ offer some particularly engaging or poignant element unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it avoid cliché and trite phrasing? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

Notes

Owing to the restructuring of ENGL 1213 for the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University, only one targeted example of the SOQ is available: "Sample Student's Own Question/Researched Paper: Why Not Have a Rhetoric Requirement among UL Lafayette PhD Students in English?" here: https://elliottrwi.com/2016/04/05/sample-students-own-questionresearched-paper-why-not-have-a-rhetoric-requirement-among-ul-lafayette-phd-students-in-english/.

Also, examples of responses to similar assignments are available, some of which are noted below:
- A shorter paper discussing Aikikai aikido, written as a sample for students at a two-year technical school, here: http://gelliottteaching.blogspot.com/2013/07/sample-conference-length-paper_29.html
- Another shorter paper, written primarily as a response to materials read online and discussing a comedy article, here: http://gelliottteaching.blogspot.com/2013/05/comments-on-what-might-as-well-be-paper.html

- A shorter paper discussing progressive rock, written for Composition I students at a two-year technical school, here: http://gelliottteaching.blogspot.com/2011/03/sample-longer-paper.html
- Another shorter paper, written for another semester of the same course and discussing chores, here: http://gelliottteaching.blogspot.com/2011/07/sample-longer-paper.html
- Yet another shorter paper, written for still another semester of the same course and discussing science fiction characters, here: http://gelliottteaching.blogspot.com/2012/03/sample-longer-paper.html

That the SOQ is a substantial and complex assignment is clear; the heavy weight in has in the course reflects it. An early start on the assignment is **strongly** recommended—partly because it is possible, if not likely, that responsible research will lead to reconsideration of the thesis, as indicated above. Time to adjust for such an event will be helpful—and even if it is not needed, time spent developing the paper early will minimize the time needed to do so later, and the end of the term tends to be a busy time.

Because the SOQ represents an entry into more formal academic and researched writing, it will rely in large part upon appropriate documentation of the sources used to inform it. **Failure to provide appropriate documentation may be investigated as an academic integrity violation.**

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Special Exercise assignment (SpEx) posted online at http://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii-special-exercise/. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the SpEx.

The First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University offers no description of the SpEx; it is an activity entirely restricted to Prof. Elliott's classes, and is usually used to pilot ideas about assignments and materials that may be used in future terms. During the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University, the SpEx is being used as part of a University initiative to assess instruction in critical thinking in the arts and humanities. To that end, students were asked about ideas for assessment activities; the ideas were sorted and reviewed, and a selection of them was presented to students for their selection. Of 40 responses submitted, a plurality of 14 selected the student-proposed prompt of "Would you rather fight 50 duck-sized horses or one horse-sized duck? Why?" to address on the SpEx. It is that prompt, therefore, that is to be presented.

Students in Prof. Elliott's sections of ENGL 1213 in the Spring 2016 instructional term at Oklahoma State University will need to perform several tasks to successfully complete the exercise:
- Assess their own martial abilities, preferences, and tactics;
- Assess the likely martial abilities, preferences, and tactics of 50 duck-sized horses;
- Assess the likely martial abilities, preferences, and tactics of a horse-sized duck;
- Compare the assessed abilities, student to horses and student to duck;
- Compare the resulting comparisons, determining which situation is preferable;
- Compose, as a timed, in-class exercise, a well-developed short essay that articulates the situation to be addressed, offers a thesis expressing the preferable situation, and justifies that thesis, submitting it before the end of the assigned period as a particularly emphatic minor assignment: the SpEx.

Information about each follows, along with a copy of the relevant grading rubric and notes.

Self-Assess Combat Prowess

For students to determine what they would rather fight requires that they understand how they themselves fight. Preparation for the SpEx will therefore oblige students to assess their own abilities, considering such factors as strength, perception, agility, awareness, reflexes, endurance, willpower, and training. Honest self-assessment will be welcome; despite the humorous situation presented by the SpEx, it is an exercise in critical thinking, and effective critical thinking relies upon accurate information.

Students will do well to record the results of their assessment. Having a record thereof will make composing the SpEx easier, as the process of setting down a record generally helps the thing recorded remain in the memory of the recorder. Since the SpEx will be an open-book, open-note exercise—synthesis and assessment being more "critical" thinking than simple recall, de-

emphasizing the last in favor of the other two seems appropriate—the record will be of direct benefit to the completion of the exercise.

Assess the Combat Prowess of 50 Duck-Sized Horses

For students to determine what they would rather fight also requires that they understand how their hypothetical opponents fight. Preparation for the SpEx will therefore oblige students to assess the abilities that 50 duck-sized horses might deploy, considering such factors as strength, perception, agility, awareness, reflexes, endurance, willpower, and training. Honest assessment will be welcome; despite the humorous situation presented by the SpEx, it is an exercise in critical thinking, and effective critical thinking relies upon accurate information.

Students will do well to record the results of their assessment. Having a record thereof will make composing the SpEx easier, as the process of setting down a record generally helps the thing recorded remain in the memory of the recorder. Since the SpEx will be an open-book, open-note exercise—synthesis and assessment being more "critical" thinking than simple recall, de-emphasizing the last in favor of the other two seems appropriate—the record will be of direct benefit to the completion of the exercise.

Assess the Combat Prowess of a Horse-Sized Duck

For students to determine what they would rather fight further requires that they understand how their hypothetical opponents fight. Preparation for the SpEx will therefore oblige students to assess the abilities that a single horse-sized duck might deploy, considering such factors as strength, perception, agility, awareness, reflexes, endurance, willpower, and training. Honest assessment will be welcome; despite the humorous situation presented by the SpEx, it is an exercise in critical thinking, and effective critical thinking relies upon accurate information.

Students will do well to record the results of their assessment. Having a record thereof will make composing the SpEx easier, as the process of setting down a record generally helps the thing recorded remain in the memory of the recorder. Since the SpEx will be an open-book, open-note exercise—synthesis and assessment being more "critical" thinking than simple recall, de-emphasizing the last in favor of the other two seems appropriate—the record will be of direct benefit to the completion of the exercise.

Compare Combat Prowess

For students to determine what they would rather fight yet further requires that they understand how they fight in relation to how their potential opponents fight. Preparation for the SpEx will therefore oblige students to compare their own combat prowess to that of 50 duck-sized horses. It will also oblige students to compare their own combat prowess to that of a single duck-sized horse. Honest assessment will be welcome; despite the humorous situation presented by the SpEx, it is an exercise in critical thinking, and effective critical thinking relies upon accurate information.

Students will do well to record the results of the comparisons. Having a record thereof will make composing the SpEx easier, as the process of setting down a record generally helps the thing recorded remain in the memory of the recorder. Since the SpEx will be an open-book, open-note exercise—synthesis and assessment being more "critical" thinking than simple recall, de-

emphasizing the last in favor of the other two seems appropriate—the record will be of direct benefit to the completion of the exercise.

Compare Relative Statuses

For students to determine what they would rather fight still further requires that they understand how they fight in relation to how their potential opponents fight. Preparation for the SpEx will therefore oblige students to compare how their prowess compares to that of 50 duck-sized horses to how their prowess compares to that of a single horse-sized duck. Honest assessment will be welcome; despite the humorous situation presented by the SpEx, it is an exercise in critical thinking, and effective critical thinking relies upon accurate information.

Students will do well to record the results of the comparisons. Having a record thereof will make composing the SpEx easier, as the process of setting down a record generally helps the thing recorded remain in the memory of the recorder. Since the SpEx will be an open-book, open-note exercise—synthesis and assessment being more "critical" thinking than simple recall, de-emphasizing the last in favor of the other two seems appropriate—the record will be of direct benefit to the completion of the exercise.

Compose the SpEx

The prior five sections can be taken collectively as comprising a sequence of prewriting. That is, they do not generate independent texts for assessment, but they do stimulate discussion and guide thinking along the way towards texts for assessment. For them to contribute to an effective SpEx, however, their results must be consolidated and set down in a form accessible to the expected audience; that is, they must be arranged to present a solid claim and well explained evidentiary support of that claim in relatively polished prose that can be taken in quickly and easily by readers.

Doing so will require students to draft an introduction that articulates the situation being presented and a response thereto, indicating preferences in the fight—the thesis. After indicating the preference, the justification for that preference needs to be explained in detail, demonstrating that the students have considered the situation and their response thereto. The explanation needs to provide evidence in its support and to demonstrate how that evidence serves to support and validate the thesis. Following the explanation needs to be a conclusion that motions toward some broader implication of the thesis and its explanation.

The SpEx will be composed as an in-class exercise on **1 April 2016**. The entire class meeting that day will be given over to the completion of the exercise. A form will be provided, on which students will be asked to compose their SpEx. Students are asked to confine their responses to that form, which will be scanned in for reporting to the University before being assessed as an emphatic minor assignment (one worth thrice what the other minor assignments in the class are; the score will be multiplied by three for entry into D2L).

Grading Rubric

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the forms below are general in nature. That is,

they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

Per course policy, assessment of the assignment is done according to performance in several categories, named and described below. Each category is weighted with a number of steps' change to the basic grade of C. The assessed score will be recorded in triplicate in the instructor's gradebook; it will be multiplied by three for inclusion in the D2L gradebook.

Category	Comments	Steps Yes/No
Introduction Clear and Appropriate	•	+1/-1
Thesis Clear and Appropriate	•	+0/-1
Evidence Clear and Appropriate	•	+1/-1
Explanations Clear and Appropriate	•	+2/-1
Conclusion Clear and Appropriate	•	+1/-1
Organization Effective	•	+1/-1
Mechanics Correct	•	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	•	+1/+0
Overall Score		
Overall Comments		

- Introduction Clear and Appropriate—Does the response to the SpEx prompt articulate the situation being presented and present a clear thesis?
- Thesis Clear and Appropriate—Does the response to the SpEx clearly and explicitly articulate a thesis for the paper? Is the thesis appropriate to the prompt presented?
- Evidence Clear and Appropriate—Does the response offer clear evidentiary support for the thesis? Is it of a sort likely to read as acceptable?
- Explanations Clear and Appropriate—Does the response offer clear, systematic explanation of how the provided evidence supports the thesis?
- Conclusion Clear and Appropriate—Does the response paper offer a clear conclusion (rather than simply stopping) that moves beyond repetition of points to a suggestion of broader implications of the paper's (hopefully) validated thesis?
- Organization Effective—Does the paper read smoothly and well, moving gracefully among its parts and indicating the relationships of the parts to each other with clear and explicit transitions? Are the relationships expressed conducive to the support of the thesis?
- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text conform to standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?
- Engagement Developed—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the text offer some particularly engaging or poignant element unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year

composition? Does it avoid cliché and trite phrasing? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

Notes

Owing to the *ad hoc* and specific nature of the SpEx, no targeted example thereof was available prior to the event, although one was drafted as the students composes their own: "Sample Special Exercise: No Horsing Around—I'm Fighting a Duck," here: https://elliottrwi.com/2016/04/01/sample-special-exercise-no-horsing-around-im-fighting-a-duck/. That said, the SpEx is, in essence, an essay exam, with which students are presumed to be generally familiar owing to the instructional climate of "accountability" prevailing in the United States since the early 2000s.

As a minor assignment, albeit one receiving particular emphasis, the SpEx cannot be made up. Students absent from class on University business or in response to legal obligations will be excused from it, as normal. Other absences will be treated normally. Students who anticipate being absent from class on the assigned day need to make arrangements to sit for the SpEx early.

Students entitled to accommodations for such exercises as the SpEx must arrange for them in a timely manner and must advise the instructor as to those arrangements in a similarly timely manner so that the appropriate materials may be created and delivered where they need to go.

No outside information need be deployed in completing the SpEx. In the event that outside materials are deployed in supporting the SpEx response, they will require informal citation— although that informal citation must still be sufficient for a readership that does not share the authorial/narrative background, experience, and expertise to clearly understand the piece being referenced. **Failure to provide appropriate informal citation may be treated as an academic integrity violation.**

Student Name	Student ID

Read the prompt below. On the pages that follow, write a well-developed essay that addresses it, paying attention to presenting a clear thesis, solid structure, clear transitions, sufficient evidence to support points made, ample explanation of that evidence, and adherence to the conventions of edited academic American English. The results will be assessed in accordance with the provisions on the SpEx assignment sheet.

The exercise is open-book and open-note. It is not collaborative, however.

Please confine your remarks to the space provided for the response on the following pages.

The Prompt
Would you rather fight 50 duck-sized horses or one horse-sized duck? Why?

The Response

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Final Exam (FinEx) posted online at
https://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-
ii/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii-final-exam/. The online version is to be
considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the FinEx.

The First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University offers only minimal
description of the FinEx, noting that it will occupy some five percent of the total grade in the
course but making no comment about the form or content of the exercise. As such, in an effort to
afford students more agency in determining the shape of their studies, the form and content were
left to student vote. Of the 49 students available to vote, 43 responded to an online survey calling
for a choice from among four options. Of the 43 respondents, a plurality of 18 opted to write an
essay exam arguing that an assignment not already included in the first-year writing sequence
ought to be included in it; the audience to be addressed is one that approves of the current
sequence but is willing and able to adjust it if persuaded. Consequently, students will be asked to
argue that an assignment—whether an assignment to be done in addition to what is already
present or one that replaces something already assigned—should be incorporated into the
standard course sequence for ENGL 1113 and ENGL 1213.

Students in Prof. Elliott's sections of ENGL 1213 in the Spring 2016 instructional term at
Oklahoma State University will need to perform several tasks to successfully complete the
exercise:
- Review the purposes to which first-year writing is directed;
- Review the assignments already included in the mainstream first-year writing sequence;
- Identify a way in which the purposes of first-year writing are not being adequately
  addressed by the current assignment sequence;
- Develop a writing assignment which addresses the purposes of first-year writing more
  fully; and
- Compose an argument which explains what the assignment is and how it fulfills a
  purpose of first-year writing in a manner not already adequately addressed by the current
  sequence: the FinEx.

Information about each follows, along with a copy of the relevant grading rubric and notes.

Much of the information on this assignment sheet duplicates information for a similar
assignment in another version of ENGL 1213 being taught. It is reproduced without comment.

Review the Purposes of First-Year Writing

Despite what many profess to believe, first-year writing does have purposes in curricula for all
disciplines (as systems of higher education in the United States conceive of them, at least). What
those purposes are and are perceived as being vary across audiences; reliable treatments of those
treatments are advanced repeatedly and in detail by the National Council of Teachers of English
(www.ncte.org) in its policy statements and in its major publications, *College English* and *CCC*
(both available through the Edmon Low Library at Oklahoma State University). The First-Year
Composition Program at Oklahoma State University (www.comp.okstate.edu) also hosts some
articulation of specific Program purposes and underpinnings. Investigation of those purposes

suggests itself as an activity worth conducting, since knowing what the courses and the Program that hosts them are *supposed* to do is helpful in developing means to actually *accomplish* those purported purposes.

Review Current Assignments in the Mainstream First-Year Writing Sequence

Investigation of what assignments are currently offered seems to be worth doing, as well, since knowing what needs to be added or replaced requires knowing what is already in place. Information about the assignments is available from the First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University. Additional information about the assignments in at least one version is available on *Elliott RWI*, as noted below:

- ENGL 1113: Composition I webpage, https://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1113-composition-i/
- ENGL 1113: Composition I Reference Document from Fall 2015, https://elliottrwi.files.wordpress.com/2015/12/g-elliott-fall-2015-engl-1113-reference-document.pdf
- ENGL 1213: Composition II webpage, https://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii/

In their presentations, statements are made regarding their specific purposes, which should help in determining what course purposes are already addressed, and to what extent.

Find a Gap in Purpose Coverage

Ideally, each assignment will contribute in some way to the purposes of the class in which it appears. In total, the set of assignments should address the whole set of purposes towards which the first-year composition sequence is addressed. Ideals are not always or necessarily often realized, however, and it is possible or even likely that some of the purposes of the first-year writing sequence will not be addressed by the assignments provided within it. (Admittedly, this is more likely to be the case with purposes not explicitly articulated by the Program than for those it directly notes.) Identifying such a mismatch is helpful; the purposes of the assignments should be compared to the purposes of the course, and parts of the latter not addressed by the former should be identified and noted. It is upon one or more such parts that the FinEx should focus.

Find a Way to Fill the Gap

More challenging, perhaps, than identifying a mismatch between purposes of courses and purposes of assignments is identifying ways in which the unmet purposes can be met—yet it is needful. One way to address the identification is to think in terms of genre. That is, students can ask what style or form of writing seems suited to meeting the purpose not yet addressed. Follow-up questions can include:

- How much time is needed to compose a piece in the given style or form?
- In what context or circumstances will the given style or form be produced outside of the composition classroom?
- To what other genres does the given style or form contribute?
- What materials are likely to be necessary for the given style or form to have useful content?
- What other genres contribute to the given style or form?

- What skills are needed to carry out the given style or form of writing?
- What skills are needed to meet the given purpose being addressed?

It is not necessary that the FinEx address all or even any of the questions provided. It is certainly not the case that the FinEx should treat the questions in the order presented; alphabetical order does not make for good argumentative structure. The list is not meant to be exhaustive or restrictive, but to help guide student thinking about how to address the class's purposes by means of a specific written assignment.

The *Norton* offers an extensive—although not comprehensive—list of genres. The same is true of the *Purdue Online Writing Lab* (https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/); the "Subject-Specific Writing" and "Job Search Writing" pages usefully compile information about similar types of writing likely to be encountered.

Compose the FinEx

The prior four sections can be taken collectively as comprising a sequence of prewriting. That is, they do not generate independent texts for assessment, but they do stimulate discussion and guide thinking along the way towards producing texts for assessment. For them to contribute to an effective FinEx, however, their results must be consolidated and set down in a form accessible to the expected audience; that is, they must be arranged to present a solid claim and well explained evidentiary support of that claim in relatively polished prose that can be taken in quickly and easily by readers.

Doing so will require students to introduce the course being discussed (i.e., ENGL 1113 or ENGL 1213, depending on which course for which the new assignment is being proposed), identify the purpose for the course that is not being addressed, and articulate an assignment that will adequately address that purpose. How the purpose is not being met by current standards will need to receive some attention. So, too, will what the proposed assignment will require students to do and when it will do so (either inserted among the current assignment sequence or substituting for one of the current assignments), as well as how the assignment and its requirements will address the purpose. A conclusion that motions towards future use and effects will be a good way to end the written presentation: the FinEx.

The FinEx will be composed as an in-class exercise at the date and time prescribed by the University for scheduled classes, noted below:
- Section 015 will meet from 1000 to 1150 on 2 May 2016
- Section 023 will meet from 1000 to 1150 on 4 May 2016
- Section 040 will meet from 0800 to 0950 on 4 May 2016

All sections will meet in the Electronic Classroom, Morrill Hall Room 106. Please note that **no food or drink may be had at the computer stations in the Electronic Classroom, per Department policy; students who violate the policy may be asked to leave the room and will be counted absent.** (That this differs from usual course policy is acknowledged.) Because the FinEx will be conducted in the Electronic Classroom, student responses to the exam are expected to be **submitted via D2L as a single document in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format**, as with any major assignment in the class.

The text of the FinEx should be formatted as if to be printed on letter-sized pages with one-inch margins in 12-point Garamond, Georgia, or Times New Roman font. Page numbers should appear in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname preceding the number; page numbers and surnames should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document. The four-line heading (student name, professor name, course and section, and date of composition) should be left-aligned, the title centered horizontally; both should be in the same typeface as the rest of the document. The primary text should be left-aligned, its paragraphs indented one-half inch in their first lines and flush to the left margin thereafter.

Grading Rubric

Please note that, in the interest of facilitating timely assessment of student work and closure of the semester, comments offered through reproductions of the forms below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

Per course policy, assessment of the assignment is done according to performance in several categories, named and described below. Each category is weighted with a number of steps' change to the basic grade of C. The assessed score will be recorded as the FinEx grade.

Category	Comments	Steps Yes/No
Introduction Clear and Appropriate	●	+1/+0
Thesis Clear and Appropriate	●	+1/-1
Evidence Clear and Appropriate	●	+1/-1
Explanations Clear and Appropriate	●	+1/-1
Conclusion Clear and Appropriate	●	+1/+0
Organization Effective	●	+1/+0
Format Correct	●	+0/-1
Mechanics Correct	●	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	●	+1/+0
Overall Score		
Overall Comments		

- Introduction Clear and Appropriate—Does the response to the FinEx prompt articulate the situation being presented and present a clear thesis?
- Thesis Clear and Appropriate—Does the response to the FinEx clearly and explicitly articulate a thesis for the paper? Is the thesis appropriate to the prompt presented?
- Evidence Clear and Appropriate—Does the response offer clear evidentiary support for the thesis? Is it of a sort likely to read as acceptable?
- Explanations Clear and Appropriate—Does the response offer clear, systematic explanation of how the provided evidence supports the thesis?

- Conclusion Clear and Appropriate—Does the response paper offer a clear conclusion (rather than simply stopping) that moves beyond repetition of points to a suggestion of broader implications of the paper's (hopefully) validated thesis?
- Organization Effective—Does the paper read smoothly and well, moving gracefully among its parts and indicating the relationships of the parts to each other with clear and explicit transitions? Are the relationships expressed conducive to the support of the thesis?
- Format Correct—Is the FinEx presented as if on letter-sized paper with one-inch margins in double-spaced 12-point Garamond, Georgia, or Times New Roman type? Are a four-line heading and descriptive title provided? Are page numbers presented as has been discussed for other assignments in the class?
- Mechanics Correct—In terms of usage, does the text conform to standards promulgated by the MLA (in the seventh edition of its handbook) and discussed during class time? Does it maintain a level of diction appropriate to its authorship and its intended audience?
- Engagement Developed—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the text offer some particularly engaging or poignant element unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it avoid cliché and trite phrasing? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

Notes

Owing to the specific nature of the FinEx, no targeted example thereof is available, although it is possible that one will be generated as the students compose their own. That said, the FinEx is, in essence, an essay exam, with which students are presumed to be generally familiar owing to the instructional climate of "accountability" prevailing in the United States since the early 2000s.

The FinEx is restricted to discussion of ENGL 1113 and ENGL 1213 at the institution. There are other first-year writing courses, but those do not necessarily have prescribed assignment sequences, being offered on an *ad hoc* basis. As such, they do not present a useful framework within which to conduct the FinEx.

As the final assignment in the course, the FinEx cannot normally be made up. (Indeed, after the FinEx is assessed and final grades entered, the semester is effectively done with respect to the course.) Students absent from class on University business or in response to legal obligations will be handled on a case-by-case basis. Other absences will be treated normally. Students who anticipate being absent from class on the assigned day need to make arrangements to sit for the FinEx early.

Students entitled to accommodations for such exercises as the FinEx must arrange for them in a timely manner and must advise the instructor as to those arrangements in a similarly timely manner so that the appropriate materials may be created and delivered where they need to go.

No outside information need be deployed in completing the FinEx. In the event that outside materials are deployed in supporting the FinEx response, they will require informal citation—although that informal citation must still be sufficient for a readership that does not share the authorial/narrative background, experience, and expertise to clearly understand the piece being

referenced. **Failure to provide appropriate informal citation may be treated as an academic integrity violation.**

The FinEx itself is open-book and open-note, but it is not collaborative. Students are each expected to do their own work and to submit original responses to the prompt; the formal prompt will only be issued during the assigned examination periods, although the topic should be clear from the assignment sheet and class discussion.

It has been an enjoyable semester, overall. May you find success in your future endeavors!

As indicated on the Final Exam (FinEx) assignment sheet, of which a version appears online at
https://elliottrwi.com/instruction/osu/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-
ii/oklahoma-state-university-engl-1213-composition-ii-final-exam/, students are asked to meet in
Morrill Hall Room 106 during the examination period assigned to their section of the course by
the University:
- Section 015 will meet from 1000 to 1150 on 2 May 2016
- Section 023 will meet from 1000 to 1150 on 4 May 2016
- Section 040 will meet from 0800 to 0950 on 4 May 2016

During that time, students are asked to argue that an assignment—whether an assignment to be
done in addition to what is already present or one that replaces something already assigned—
should be incorporated into the standard course sequence for ENGL 1113 and ENGL 1213.
Successfully doing so will require
- Noting the course to be treated and its purposes,
- Identifying a purpose not currently adequately met by the standard assignment sequence,
- Describing the assignment, and
- Explicating how the assignment will successfully address the currently inadequately met
  purpose.

Please note that **no food or drink may be had at the computer stations in the Electronic
Classroom (Morrill Hall Room 106), per Department policy; students who violate the
policy may be asked to leave the room and will be counted absent.** (That this differs from
usual course policy is acknowledged.) Because the FinEx will be conducted in the Electronic
Classroom, student responses to the exam are expected to be **submitted via D2L as a single
document in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format**, as with any major assignment in the class.

As noted previously, the text of the FinEx should be formatted as if to be printed on letter-sized
pages with one-inch margins in 12-point Garamond, Georgia, or Times New Roman font. Page
numbers should appear in the upper right corner of the page, with the student's surname
preceding the number; page numbers and surnames should be in the same typeface as the rest of
the document. The four-line heading (student name, professor name, course and section, and date
of composition) should be left-aligned, the title centered horizontally; both should be in the same
typeface as the rest of the document. The primary text should be left-aligned, its paragraphs
indented one-half inch in their first lines and flush to the left margin thereafter.

Assessment of the FinEx will follow the grading rubric published on the FinEx assignment sheet.
Comments and evaluations will be returned to students via the email function on D2L. Grades
will be posted to D2L, and course grades to SIS, shortly after the FinEx is graded.

No outside information need be deployed in completing the FinEx. In the event that outside
materials are deployed in supporting the FinEx response, they will require informal citation—
although that informal citation must still be sufficient for a readership that does not share the
authorial/narrative background, experience, and expertise to clearly understand the piece being

referenced. **Failure to provide appropriate informal citation may be treated as an academic integrity violation.**

The FinEx itself is open-book and open-note, but it is not collaborative. Students are each expected to do their own work and to submit original responses to the prompt noted above.

Come and go as you need to during the exam period. If the door is locked, knock and await admission. When you are done, submit your response; you are free to go.

It has been an enjoyable semester, overall. May you find success in your future endeavors!