

WRTG 1150 (Baker RAP): Environmental Justice

2018 Fall Semester

Section #430R MWF 9:00-9:50am BKER E212	Section #431R MWF 10:00-10:50am BKER E212
-----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

Dr. Levente Szentkirályi (pronounced sĕnt-kĕ-rō-yĕ or “sent-key-rah-yee”)

Email: szentkiralyi@colorado.edu

Phone: 720-636-5041

Office hours: Tuesdays, 10:30am-12:30pm or by appointment (or via personal Zoom meeting space)

Office: 09 TB-1 (Temporary Building 1)—directly east of Sewall Hall

Mailbox: hallway on main level in TB-1

Course Overview

This interdisciplinary course teaches principles of academic writing by examining a host of contemporary problems of environmental justice, which challenges students to engage difficult scholarship at the intersection of normative political theory and environmental public policy. Designed specifically to complement the curriculum of the Baker Natural Sciences and the Environment RAP, students will explore domestic and global ethical dimensions of a host of contemporary issue areas. Topics will include the distribution and management of scarce natural resources; sustainable development; environmental discrimination of vulnerable populations; food security, food safety, and food justice; public perceptions of risk and the role and limits of science in shaping environmental policy; and ecological consumerism.

Through course readings, independent research, and various writing assignments, students will critically evaluate diverse moral arguments in these different issue-areas, they will critique the ways in which different normative theories frame our understanding of these complex policy problems, and they will appraise proposed solutions to the prevailing social injustices they explore. In having students apply lessons of rhetorical analysis learned in the classroom to real world states of affairs and complex ethical problems, this course strives to motivate students to think beyond themselves and their own interests, and to consider their civic responsibility to help to solve the social and environmental problems we face.

Writing Objectives

This writing course meets two sets of requirements here on the CU-Boulder campus. The first set consists in the requirements established by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) for all second-level “Communication General Education ‘Guaranteed Transfer’” (CO-2) courses in the state. These CO-2 courses are designed to ensure that students “learn how to summarize, analyze, and synthesize the ideas of others” (par. 3) by emphasizing “rhetorical knowledge,” “writing processes,” “writing conventions,” and “comprehension of content knowledge at the intermediate level” (par. 6).

The second set consists in the requirements established by the Program for Writing and Rhetoric (PWR), which is the home program for this course. These include your capacities to:

- *develop rhetorical knowledge*—analyzing and making informed choices about purposes, audiences, and context as you read and compose texts.
- *analyze texts in a variety of genres*—understanding how content, style, structure and format vary across a range of reading and writing situations.
- *refine and reflect on your writing process*—using multiple strategies to generate ideas, draft, revise, and edit your writing across a variety of genres.
- *develop information literacy*—making critical choices as you identify a specific research need, locate and evaluate information and sources, and draw connections among your own and others' ideas in your writing.
- *construct effective arguments*—using appropriate reasons and evidence to support your positions while responding to multiple points of view.
- *understand and apply language conventions rhetorically*—including grammar, spelling, punctuation and format. (PWR First Year Committee)

In light of these requirements, our writing course this semester will ask you to:

1. develop rhetorical knowledge by reading and writing diverse academic arguments—which will attend to a variety of rhetorical considerations, like context, audience, purpose, rhetorical appeals, genre- and discipline-specific conventions of writing and research, etc.—while using effective evidence and providing appropriate analysis.
2. develop a working understanding of writing processes and information literacy by drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading your own work; by reading and critiquing the work of others; and by engaging in a number of formative writing assignments using primary and secondary source materials.
3. understand and employ general and discipline-specific conventions and principles of academic writing and clear prose style in your writing, while exploring the potential social benefits and costs of doing so, as well as our obligations to our communities as educated students and writers.
4. reflect on your educational goals and values, and those of others.

To accomplish these goals, you will spend extensive time this semester working alone and in small groups. You will also be required to meet with me one-on-one to discuss your paper assignments.

Required Textbooks

There are three required texts for this course:

- Gottlieb, Robert and Anupama Joshi. *Food Justice* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010).
- University of Colorado Program for Writing and Rhetoric. *Knowing Words: A Guide to First-Year Writing and Rhetoric*, 13th ed. (Southlake: Fountainhead Press, 2018).
- Weston, Anthony. *A Rulebook for Arguments*, 4th ed. (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2009).

All other required readings will be made available on Canvas (<http://canvas.colorado.edu>).

University and Course Policies

Attendance: Since we will have several writing and peer-review workshops and other in-class activities, as detailed in the course requirements below, there is a formal attendance policy for this class. Students are permitted (3) unexcused absences without penalty, after which each subsequent unexcused absence will result in a 2% deduction in their attendance grade.

- Note on excessive absences: having 9 absences (missing 20% of the semester)—*even when your absences are excused*—will result in an F for the course. Students cannot learn the material and develop the skills necessary to succeed in this course when missing this much class.

Canvas and Class Emails: You should regularly check your CU email account for class announcements and information, as well as regularly check our Canvas course webpage to access reading assignments, to view paper assignments, to view syllabus updates, and to keep track of your course grade.

Classroom Etiquette: Be respectful of and considerate toward your classmates. I am committed to establishing an atmosphere that fosters open, civil, and constructive lines of communication, and inappropriate or offensive conduct will not be tolerated. *If you feel uncomfortable at any time with any aspect of the class environment, I strongly encourage you to come discuss your concerns with me.*

Disability Accommodations: If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit a letter to me from Disability Support Services (DSS) in a timely manner so I can accommodate your needs. DSS requires that disabilities be documented. Visit dsinfo@colorado.edu for details; call 303-492-8671 with questions. If you have a temporary medical condition or injury, review Disability Services' details about *Temporary Injuries* at <http://disabilityservices.colorado.edu/>, and discuss your needs with me.

Discrimination: No discrimination or harassment will be tolerated in this class. If you believe you have been discriminated against, you are strongly encouraged to speak with me and/or contact the Office of Discrimination and Harassment at 303-492-2127, or the Office of Student Conduct at 303-492-5550. Information about University policies and resources can be found at <http://hr.colorado.edu/dh/>.

Electronics: Students are expected to turn **OFF** all electronic devices when entering the classroom, with the exception of personal computers—which are to be used only for course-related purposes.

- You must bring either paper or electronic copies of each course reading with you to each class—you **will not be permitted to use cell phones to access course material**.
- Students who must be reminded not to use personal electronics for non-course-related purposes will be prohibited from using electronics in class, and their participation grade will be penalized.

Honor Code: Students are responsible for knowing and adhering to the academic integrity policy of this institution. Violations may include cheating, plagiarism, aiding others in academic dishonesty, deception, fabrication, and etc. All incidents of academic misconduct will be reported to the Honor Code Council (honor@colorado.edu; 303-735-2273). Students found to be in violation of the academic integrity policy will be subject to both academic sanctions from the faculty member and non-academic sanctions (including, but not limited to, university probation, suspension, or expulsion). Further details can be found at <http://colorado.edu/policies/honor.html>, and at <http://honorcode.colorado.edu>.

Plagiarism: If students have *any* doubt about what constitutes plagiarism, it is their responsibility to ask *before* submitting work as their own. Plagiarism is the act of using others' words and/or ideas without proper attribution, either intentionally or unintentionally. The *MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing* (Gibaldi 1999) requires that

[s]cholarly authors generously acknowledge their debts to predecessors by carefully giving credit to each source. Whenever you draw on another's work, you must specify what you borrowed—whether facts, opinions, or quotations—and where you borrowed it from. Using another person's ideas without acknowledging the source constitutes plagiarism (Gibaldi 151).

Intentional plagiarism will be strictly punished: a proven first offense will result in an automatic F for the final assignment grade, while a proven second offense will result in an automatic F for the course. Moreover, depending on the nature of the offense, engaging in plagiarism may result in further disciplinary action by the University. Consult the PWR or Campus Honor Code websites for more info.

Further resources are available on our Canvas course page, under "Additional Student Resources," or at https://levszentkiralyi.com/teaching/student_resources/.

Punctuality: persistent tardiness is unacceptable. With students who consistently arrive to class late, I reserve the right to count two late arrivals to class as one absence.

Religious Observances: Campus policy requires that faculty make every effort to reasonably and fairly accommodate students who have scheduling conflicts because of religious observances. Students who need to reschedule exams or assignments should inform me as soon as possible.

Writing Center: Students are strongly encouraged to utilize the Writing Center—a free campus service offering one-on-one sessions with professionally-trained writing consultants—as a supplement to their learning in this course. Visit <https://colorado.edu/pwr/writing-center> for details. Appointments are available at the Norlin Writing Center, which is located in Norlin E111 (visit <http://ucb.mywconline.com>). Drop-in hours are also available Monday-Thursday evenings, and Sunday afternoons and evenings, at select residence halls and the C4C. Bring a working draft of your paper and assignment guidelines. Call or email the Norlin Writing Center with questions at 303-735-6906 or wrtghelp@colorado.edu.

Written Work and Due Dates: Students must type all writing assignments using single spacing, 1-inch margins, and a consistent citation style (MLA, APA, or Chicago), and they must upload all assignments to our Canvas course dropbox by the assigned dates and times.

- Late work will be penalized one full letter grade (10%) for each day that it is late. Technology problems with computers, printers, etc., will **not** excuse you from completing assigned work on time.
- If you require an extension, you must contact me 48 hours before the deadline to request one and your request must explain why your circumstance warrants extra time to finish the assignment.
- A timely request for an extension does not guarantee that one will be provided: any decision to grant an extension will be made solely at my discretion.

Course Requirements

The individual graded assignments are as follows. Specific information about each assignment will be provided as we move through the semester.

- **Paper 1: Conventions of Research and Writing Executive Summary** (5% of final course grade):
 - Students will explore scholarship in their majors—identifying what counts as evidence within their respective fields of study, as well as some universal and discipline-specific conventions of research, analysis, and writing.
 - 1-2 pages in length—single-spaced
 - Only a final draft will be collected (no rough draft will be peer-reviewed)
 - This is a collaborative (co-authored) project

- **Paper 2: Comparative Argumentative Essay** (20% of final course grade)
 - Students analyze the opposing arguments of two authors on a particular issue of their choice, and they construct an argument that defends the position they disagree with against objections.
 - 2-3 pages in length—single-spaced
 - Students must submit a rough draft and substantively revised final draft
 - Rough draft will be peer-reviewed and conferencing with me to discuss rough draft is mandatory

- **Paper 3: Research Paper** (30% of final course grade)
 - Students write a brief research paper that develops an academic argument in defense of a thesis statement related to a subject of their choice—though, preferably a subject in their respective majors—successfully applying principles of good writing, discipline-specific conventions of research and analysis, and general conventions of rhetorical analysis and information literacy
 - 5-6 pages in length—single-spaced
 - Students must submit a rough draft and substantively revised final draft
 - Rough draft will be peer-reviewed and conferencing with me to discuss rough draft is mandatory

- **Reading Comprehension Quizzes** (20% of final course grade):
 - There will be 10 unannounced quizzes during the semester that will test students on specifics from the assigned readings and will ask students to apply course material learned earlier in the week.
 - Quizzes will be completed in class and will consist in short answer questions.

- **Attendance** (10% of final course grade)
 - This is a discussion-based course in which students are expected to be actively involved in class discussions, workshops, and in-class assignments—making attendance a prerequisite.
 - Students are permitted 3 unexcused absences without penalty. Each further unexcused absence will result in a 2% deduction to your attendance grade.
 - **Excessive Absences:** having 9 absences (missing 20% of the semester)—*even when your absences are excused*—will result in an F for the course. Students cannot learn the material and develop the skills necessary to succeed in this course when missing this much class.

- **Course Participation** (15% of final course grade)
 - This is a writing seminar in which students engage in extensive collaboration with each other—co-authoring a paper together, peer-reviewing draft papers, and helping each other work through difficult course readings. Students are expected to be actively involved in our class discussions, workshops, and in-class assignments; and since this is a highly interdisciplinary class, students are expected to contribute to our collective learning by drawing on content knowledge in their majors.
 - Arriving to class late, failing to substantively annotate our course readings before arriving to class, arriving to class unprepared to discuss the readings, neglecting to contribute substantively to our class discussions, demonstrating a lack of engagement, or failing to complete in-class assignments will all result in deductions in your course participation grade.

- **Examples of behavior that indicates to me your lack of engagement:** not taking notes; using cell phones during class; being generally disengaged (staring off into space, chatting with others, falling asleep, etc.); failing to make an effort to answer questions asked of you.
- **Examples of behavior that indicates to me you are actively engagement:** taking detailed notes (not just writing down what's provided on the slides); being generally engaged (active listening, making eye contact, responding to comments other students may make, etc.); making an effort to answer questions directly asked of you.
- **Annotations.** Part of your required participation consists in collaboratively annotating our course readings. Each assigned reading posted on Canvas is hyperlinked to a pdf file in Google Drive, which allows you to annotate the reading. For each assigned reading, students must add at least two comments—clicking on the “Add a comment” icon  in the top-right corner of the webpage.

With your annotations, please note the following.

1. Only the assigned readings posted on Canvas require annotation (our two required texts do not).
2. Each comment must consist in 2-3 *complete* sentences—no sentence fragments will count toward your participation. You must invest time and thought into your annotations.
3. Comments can take the form of statements or questions, and they can be new comments or replies to existing comments your classmates have made on the reading.
4. Comments must focus on constructively critiquing the substance of the author's argument: that is, they must critique the author's thesis or hypothesis, conceptual reasons, descriptive and empirical evidence, logical analysis, research methodology, and/or possible objections, etc..
5. Keep in mind that the overarching purpose of annotating course readings is to practice your critical reading and critical thinking skills—which means that your comments must demonstrate that you have carefully read each assigned reading, that you understand the argument the author is trying to defend, and that you have thought about possible weaknesses of the argument.
6. Superficial comments that give no impression that the student has invested time and energy into trying to understand and critique our readings will receive no credit.

Final class grades will be based on the following scale:

≥ 93% = A	87 – 89% = B+	77 – 79% = C+	67 – 69% = D+	< 60% = F
90 – 92% = A-	83 – 86% = B	73 – 76% = C	63 – 66% = D	
	80 – 82% = B-	70 – 72% = C-	60 – 62% = D-	

General Grading Guidelines

Building on these general grading criteria, specific rubrics will be provided for each assignment.

An essay in the “A” Range will feature

- a strong thesis with a clear claim, reasons and evidence, and underlying warrant
- relevant and specific examples drawn from appropriate sources
- consistently clear analysis of reasons and evidence
- consistently appropriate and correct use of citation
- consistently clear and correct use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- careful attention to issues of grammar and style (satisfying the rules of grammar discussed in class)
- meeting the minimum page requirements

An essay in the “B” Range will feature

- a generally good thesis with a clear claim, reasons and evidence, and underlying warrant
- relevant and specific examples drawn from appropriate sources
- generally clear analysis of reasons and evidence
- generally appropriate and correct use of citation
- generally clear and correct use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- generally strong attention to issues of grammar and style
- meeting the minimum page requirements

An essay in the “C” Range will feature

- a thesis lacking a clear claim, reasons, evidence, and/or underlying warrant
- poorly chosen and poorly explained examples
- little specific analysis of reasons and evidence (often as a result of a poor thesis)
- minimally appropriate and correct use of appropriate citation styles
- minimally clear and correct use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- minimal attention to issues of grammar and style
- failure to meet the minimum page requirements

An essay in the “D” Range will feature

- no real thesis
- weak or no examples
- little or no analysis of reasons and evidence
- generally inappropriate or incorrect use of citation (but without lapsing into plagiarism)
- generally unclear or incorrect use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- significant problems with grammar and style
- failure to meet the minimum page requirements

An essay in the “F” Range will feature

- no real thesis
- weak or no examples
- little or no analysis of reasons and evidence
- generally unclear and incorrect use of citation styles (often in ways that lapse into plagiarism)
- generally inappropriate or incorrect use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- significant problems with grammar and style
- failure to meet the minimum page requirements

Reading, Assignment, and Exam Schedule

Note: the assigned readings that follow are subject to revision.

Details about how course readings and assignments satisfy CCHE guidelines are provided below.

Note the shorthand for CCHE goals:

1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

- Black bullet points refer to assigned readings or podcasts—which we will discuss on the specified date.
 - White bullet points refer to in-class assignments and/or assignment deadlines.

^[a] This bracketed superscript denotes course readings that must be annotated (see course requirements above)

WEEK 1: WRITING PROCESS AND PROBLEMS OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Guiding Questions: What is writing and rhetoric? What is environmental justice? What can we learn about principles of good writing from the study of issues of environmental justice?

Objectives: Understand what the writing process consists in, what the aims of writing are, how to structure academic papers, what the study of environmental justice consists in (e.g., the difference between environmental politics, environmental policy, and environmental political theory), and how exploring normative issues of justice can improve student writing.

Monday, 27 August: Course Introduction

- *New York Times*, “A Question of Environmental Racism in Flint” (21 Jan. 2016)¹
- **Students receive directions for Paper 1**²

¹ Purpose: preview course and outline expectations

² Purpose: understand requirements of first major writing assignment; CCHE Goal 2

Wednesday, 29 August: Writing Workshop 1

- No readings assigned
- Class activity (bring computers to class): students explore the research background of a CU faculty member in their home department and begin to answer questions in parts 1 and 2 of the paper directions¹

¹ Purpose: make progress on Paper 1; CCHE Goals: 2, 3, 4

Friday, 31 August: Writing Workshop 2

- No readings assigned
- Class activity (bring computers to class): students select and summarize (3) publications of the CU faculty member they have chosen and begin to answer questions in parts 2 and 3 of the paper directions¹

¹ Purpose: make progress on Paper 1; CCHE Goals: 2, 3, 4

WEEK 2: ACADEMIC AND NORMATIVE ARGUMENTS

Guiding Questions: What are components of academic arguments? What are ‘academic’ and ‘normative’ arguments? Are normative arguments simply expressions of our opinions (subjective value judgments)?

Objectives: Recognize that there are various types of arguments, that strong academic arguments have certain key features, that arguments of environmental justice are grounded in value-laden claims of normative truth or value judgments. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary debates over access to and management of natural resources.

Monday, 3 September: No Class—Labor Day

- No readings assigned

Wednesday, 5 September: Introduction to Argumentation ▪ Introduction to Environmental Justice

- *Knowing Words*, Chapter 5¹
- ^[a] Brown, *World On the Edge*, Chapter 1: On The Edge (2011)²

¹ Purpose: review components of academic arguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: understand interdisciplinary nature of the study of environmental justice; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Goals:
1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

WEEK 2 CONTINUED

Friday, 7 September: Types of Arguments ▪ Environmental Justice as Normative Ethics

- Review full course syllabus—bring what questions you have to class¹
- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Chapters 1 and 5²
- [a] Shrader-Frechette, “Lives at Risk,” in *Taking Action, Saving Lives* (2007)—only pp.3-15

¹ Purpose: review course expectations

² Purpose: review types of arguments and their purposes; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

³ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

WEEK 3: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS AND NATURAL RESOURCE SCARCITY

Guiding Questions: How does context in writing matter? What are some foundational arguments in contemporary debates over access to and management of natural resources? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these normative arguments?

Objectives: Recognize that writing is context-dependent: authors have specific objectives, types of arguments have specific purposes, target audiences have specific expectations, and understanding any given ‘rhetorical situation’ is necessary for successful writing. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary debates over access to and management of natural resources. Refine our ability to identify and correct problem areas in our writing.

Monday, 10 September: Generalizations ▪ Natural Resource Scarcity and Management

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Chapter 2¹
- [a] Ophuls and Boyan, *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity Revisited*, Chapter 3 (1992)—only pp. 175-85²
- [a] Arrow et al., “Economic Growth, Carrying Capacity, and the Environment” (1995)²
- **Paper 1 final draft due—upload to Canvas before class³**
- Class activity: groups prepare list of one-line descriptions of conventions of good academic writing⁴

¹ Purpose: review components of academic arguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze readings; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

³ Purpose: complete first major writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

⁴ Purpose: reflect on first major writing assignment and conventions of academic writing; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Wednesday, 12 September: Rhetorical Analysis ▪ Natural Resource Scarcity and Management

- *Knowing Words*, Chapter 3, only pp. 29-40¹
- [a] Hardin, “The Tragedy of the Commons” (1968)²

¹ Purpose: review the rhetorical situation and types of rhetorical appeals; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze reading with focus on significance of the counterargument; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Friday, 14 September: Rhetorical Analysis ▪ Natural Resource Scarcity and Management

- *Knowing Words*, Chapter 3, only pp. 29-40 continued
- [a] Ostrum et al., “Revisiting the Commons” (1998)¹
- **Students receive directions for extra credit internship/scholarship application assignment²**
- Class activity: reflective writing assignment³

² Purpose: critically analyze reading with focus on significance of the counterargument; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: understand requirements of extra credit writing assignment; CCHE Goal: 2

³ Purpose: have students explore the purpose of their college education; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

WEEK 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNICAL WRITING

Guiding Questions: What are the central reasons why students are earning an undergraduate education, how will a degree from CU help them achieve professional success after graduation, and how does this professional success relate to their broader life ambitions? What are some common attributes of résumés and cover letters and how can a well-articulated and well-organized dossier help students on the job market?

Objectives: Reflect on and be able to articulate the central reasons why the sacrifices are being made to earn an undergraduate degree and how this time at CU speaks to your broader life goals. Identify some of the key conventions of these genres of technical writing, apply this understanding by developing a purposefully-tailored, clearly-articulated, and well-organized résumé and cover letter for a specific audience.

Monday, 17 September: College Debt, Future Job Prospects, and Purpose of College Studies

- ^[a] *Newsweek*, “Millennial College Graduates: Young, Educated, and Jobless” (27 May 2015)¹
- ^[a] *U.S. News and World Report*, “There Is Value in Liberal Arts Education, Employers Say” (22 Sep 2014)¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Wednesday, 19 September: Professional Development—Résumé Workshop¹

- Independent reading on internship or scholarship opportunities that you are qualified for
- Optional reading: Tebeaux and Dragga, *The Essentials of Technical Writing*, Chapter 12 (2017)¹
- **Résumé draft due—bring 1 hard copy of résumé and of internship or scholarship announcement to class**
- Class activity: peer-review workshop résumé draft²

¹ Purpose: understand conventions of this genre of technical writing; CCHE Goal: 1, 3

² Purpose: engage in peer-review; CCHE Goal: 2

Friday, 21 September: Professional Development—Cover Letter & Statement of Purpose Workshop¹

- Independent reading on internship or scholarship opportunities that you are qualified for
- **Cover letter draft due—bring 1 hard copy of draft and of internship or scholarship announcement to class**
- Class activity: peer-review workshop cover letter draft²

¹ Purpose: understand conventions of this genre of technical writing; CCHE Goal: 1, 3

² Purpose: engage in peer-review; CCHE Goal: 2

WEEK 5: THE COUNTERARGUMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Guiding Questions: What does it mean to engage possible objections to our arguments, how can we take the alternative perspectives of others seriously without conceding that our argument is wrong, and why is refuting possible counterarguments important—*both* for the substance of our argument and also to the strength of our writing? What are some foundational arguments for and against sustainable economic development? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these arguments?

Objectives: Recognize that the persuasiveness of one’s academic argument and one’s credibility as a writer depend on acknowledging the limitations of her argument and thoroughly engaging alternative perspectives. Develop a working understanding of how to identify, explain, and refute reasonable objections to different aspects of one’s argument. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary debates over environmental sustainability.

Monday, 24 September: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Context on Development and Sustainability

- “U.N. Secretary-General Announces New Sustainable Development Initiative,” U.N. (29 Aug. 2012)¹
- ^[a] Carruthers “From Opposition to Orthodoxy” (2001)¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze readings and podcasts; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Goals:
1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

WEEK 5 CONTINUED

Wednesday, 26 September: Academic Argumentation ▪ The Possibility of Sustainable Growth

- *Knowing Words*, Chapter 3, only pp. 44-47¹
- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Chapter 8¹
- [a] Pearce and Warford, *World Without End*, Chapter 1 (1993)—only pp. 3-18, 28-37²
- **Students receive directions for Paper 2**³

¹ Purpose: review principles of argumentation and sections of the academic essay; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze reading with focus on counterarguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

³ Purpose: understand requirements of second major writing assignment; CCHE Goal: 2

Friday, 28 September: Engaging Counterarguments ▪ The Contradiction of Sustainable Growth

- Review *Knowing Words*, Chapter 5, only pp. 67-68¹
- [a] Daly and Townsend, “Sustainable Growth: An Impossibility Theorem” (1993)²

¹ Purpose: review how to engage counterarguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3

² Purpose: critically analyze reading with focus on counterarguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

WEEK 6: COUNTERARGUMENTS, RULES OF CITATION, AND SUSTAINABILITY AND POVERTY

Guiding Questions: Why does academic argumentation require that we take possible counterarguments seriously? Why is it important to properly cite our sources—*both* for the strength of our arguments and our credibility as writers? Are environmental sustainability and poverty reduction mutually exclusive—can we make distributions of wealth and resources more equitable and still be proponents of sustainability?

Objectives: Understand that the strength of an argument depends on considering plausible alternative accounts and thoughtfully explaining why they are wrong. Develop working knowledge of different citation styles and how to properly cite one’s sources, as well as the difference between quotes, paraphrases, and summaries, and the significance of citing one’s sources. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary debates over distributive justice.

Monday, 1 October: Flipped Classroom ▪ Sustainable Development and Example of Brazil

- [a] NPR, “Rio Environment Meeting Focuses On ‘Energy For All’” podcast (19 Jun. 2012)¹
- [a] NPR, “Hungry For Energy, Brazil Builds Monster Dams In the Amazon” podcast (13 Feb. 2013)¹
- Brazilian Ministry of Planning, Development and Management, “Sustainable Development Goals” excerpt (2017)¹
- Class activity (bring computers to class): students write a short, impromptu collaborative policy brief²

² Purpose: critically analyze podcasts and reading with a focus on counterarguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: understand conventions of decision-driven technical writing; CCHE Goal: 1, 3

Wednesday, 3 October: Avoiding Plagiarism ▪ Environmental Sustainability Global Poverty

- *Knowing Words*, Chapter 2, only pp. 20-26¹
- [a] United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, “End Extreme Poverty, Increase Environmental Sustainability” (n.d.—accessed 4 Sep 2018)²
- [a] *The Guardian*, “To End Poverty We Also Need to Ensure Equality and Sustainability” (5 Dec 2013)²

¹ Purpose: review summary, paraphrase, quotation, citation, and source information; CCHE Goals: 1, 3

² Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Friday, 5 October: Engaging Counterarguments ▪ Critiquing Sample Student Writing

- Sample Student Writing¹
- Class activity (bring computers to class): collective critique student sample of Paper 2²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading, review expectations of second writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: clarify expectations of second major writing assignment, engage in peer-review; CCHE Goal: 2

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Goals:
1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

WEEK 7: PEER-REVIEW AND REVISION PROCESSES

Guiding Questions: How can we make the most of the peer-review process to improve our writing? How can we give peers constructive feedback that enables them to successfully and substantively revise their drafts? What does the revision process consist in, and what is the significance of revising on the writing process?

Objectives: Develop a working understanding of how to provide constructive, helpful feedback to others on their working drafts—a precursor to being able to objectively critique one’s own writing. Recognize that writing requires substantive revisions to earlier drafts, that successful revision requires critical reflection on the content and purpose of one’s writing as well as the rhetorical situation, and that revision is part of a cyclical writing process.

Monday, 8 October: The Peer-Review Process

- [a] Sommers, “Responding to Student Writing” (1982)¹
- Paper 2 rough draft due—upload to Canvas before class (*both to our drop-box and your discussion group*)

¹ Purpose: review how to provide helpful and constructive peer-review feedback; CCHE Goal: 4

Wednesday, 10 October: Collaborative Peer-Review Workshop

- [a] Classmates’ rough drafts in respective discussion groups¹
- Class activity (bring computers to class): small-group peer-review workshop of Paper 2 rough draft²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading, review expectations of second writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: engage in peer-review; CCHE Goal: 2

Friday, 12 October: The Revision Process ▪ Individual Peer-Review Workshop

- [a] Sommers, “Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers” (1980)¹
- *Revised Paper 2 rough draft due—bring one hard copy to class (no upload to Canvas is required)*
- Class activity: peer-review workshop of Paper 2 rough draft²

¹ Purpose: discuss writing as a process and common difficulties novice writers have; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: engage in peer-review; CCHE Goal: 2

WEEK 8: INFORMATION LITERACY

Guiding Questions: How do we locate and evaluate scholarly sources for accuracy and credibility, and how do we make the best use of our sources in our writing? What is the difference between peer-reviewed scholarly sources and popular and non-peer-reviewed sources, and why does academic writing generally prioritize and require the former? And how do we enter and advance the scholarly discourse on a given topic?

Objectives: Recognize that the strength of an argument depends on finding and effectively utilizing external sources, and that sources serve diverse purposes in our writing. Develop the ability to discriminate peer-reviewed from non-peer-reviewed sources, and credible from unreliable non-peer-reviewed sources, and understand that improving our information literacy also involves joining and contributing scholarly debates.

Monday, 15 October: Information Literacy

- *Knowing Words*, Chapter 2, only pp. 11-19¹
- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Chapter 4¹
- RIOT module ##1-2 (on Canvas) must be completed before class²

¹ Purpose: understand how to effectively locate, evaluate, and use sources; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: understand library resource and research processes; CCHE Goals: 1, 2

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Goals:
1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

WEEK 8 CONTINUED

Wednesday, 17 October: Utilizing Library Resources—Norlin Library Seminar

- No readings assigned
- Paper 2 final draft due—upload to Canvas before class¹
- RIOT module ##3-4 (on Canvas) must be completed before class²
- Attend seminar at Norlin Library (tentative)—ATTENDANCE IS REQUIRED²

¹ Purpose: complete second major writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

² Purpose: understand library resource and research processes; CCHE Goals: 1, 2

Friday, 19 October: Information Literacy in an Era of Alternative Facts and Subjective Truths

- University Press of Colorado, “Seeking Truth among “Alternative Facts” (2017)¹
- *Mother Jones*, “Yes, the Mainstream Media Does Publish Fake News” (5 Jul 2017)¹
- [a] Lazer et al., “Science of Fake News: Addressing Fake News Requires a Multidisciplinary Effort” (2018)¹
- Optional reading: Shrader-Frechette, “Private Science, Public Inquiry,” in *Taking Action, Saving Lives* (2007)

¹ Purpose: understand how to effectively locate, evaluate, and use sources; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

WEEK 9: CONVENTIONS OF ACADEMIC WRITING AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Guiding Questions: What are some universal conventions of academic writing, and how do we define good academic writing? What are some likely effects of and key concerns with climate change?

Objectives: Understand that in addition to discipline-specific conventions of academic research and writing, there are key features of academic scholarship that academic audiences will expect and which we must satisfy if we are to be successful writers. Begin to critique the merit of these conventions of academic writing. Explore the widespread and complex scientific, policy, and ethical problems climate change begets.

Monday, 22 October: The Term Paper ▪ Diverse Complexities of Global Climate Change

- [a] *National Geographic*, “World Without Ice” (Oct 2011)¹
- NPR, “When The Weather Is Extreme, Is Climate Change To Blame?” podcast (29 Jul 2018)¹
- CPR, “As Colorado’s Climate Changes, Our Collective Health Will Be Connected To It” podcast (26 Jul 2017)¹
- NPR, “High Demand, Low Supply: CO River Water Crisis Hits Across The West” podcast (30 Dec 2016)¹
- Students receive directions for Paper 3²
- Class activity: students brainstorm possible topics for Paper 3³

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading and podcast; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: understand requirements of third major writing assignment; CCHE Goal: 2

³ Purpose: make progress on Paper 3; CCHE Goals: 2, 3

Wednesday, 24 October: Revisiting Conventions of Academic Writing ▪ On Extreme Weather

- [a] Thonney, “Teaching the Conventions of Academic Discourse” (2011)¹
- [a] Greenough et al., “The Potential Impacts of Climate Variability and Change on Health Impacts of Extreme Weather Events in the United States” (2001)²

¹ Purpose: understand general and discipline-specific standards of good writing; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze reading with focus on IMRAD and descriptive evidence; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Friday, 26 October: Grammar Workshop

- No readings assigned
- Class activity: students finalize topics for Paper 3¹
- Class activity: grammar and style workshop 1²

¹ Purpose: make progress on Paper 3; CCHE Goals: 2, 3

² Purpose: rhetorical grammar, review punctuation and sentence components; CCHE Goal: 3

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Goals:
1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

WEEK 10: CONVENTIONS OF ACADEMIC WRITING, RESEARCH, AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Guiding Questions: What are some universal conventions of academic writing, and how do we define good academic writing? How can we productively begin researching a new subject without becoming overwhelmed by large bodies of unfamiliar literature? What are some likely effects of and key concerns with climate change?

Objectives: Be able to articulate what academic writing “sounds” like, and how less experienced writers can work to meet the expectations of and to be taken seriously by academic audiences. Begin to critique the merit of universal and discipline-specific conventions of academic writing. Explore the widespread and complex scientific, policy, and ethical problems climate change begets.

Monday, 29 October: “Un-Research” Writing Workshop 1 ▪ On Infectious Diseases

- [a] Hosier, “Teaching Information Literacy Through Un-Research” (2015)¹
- [a] *Mother Jones*, “Zika May Be a Threat to the Adult Brain” (21 Sep 2016)²
- Optional reading: Epstein, “Climate Change and Human Health” (2005)
- Class activity (bring computers to class): pre-research writing exercise and conferencing¹

¹ Purpose: learn value of articulating one’s argument before reviewing literature; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Wednesday, 31 October: Revisiting Conventions of Academic Writing ▪ On Infectious Diseases

- [a] Bartholomae, “Inventing the University” (1985)—only pp. 8-20¹
- [a] Jones et al., “Global Trends in Emerging Infectious Diseases” (2008)²
- Optional reading: Sollaci et al., “The IMRAD Structure: A Fifty-Year Survey” (2004)

¹ Purpose: understand some common expectations of academic audiences; CCHE Goals 1, 3, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze reading with focus on IMRAD and empirical evidence; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Friday, 2 November: “Un-Research” Writing Workshop 2 ▪ On Antibiotic Resistance

- [a] Batt et al., “Evaluating the Vulnerability of Surface Waters to Antibiotic Contamination” (2006)¹
- Class activity (bring computers to class): subsequent pre-research writing exercise and conferencing²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: make progress on Paper 3; CCHE Goals: 2, 3

WEEK 11: CONVENTIONS OF ACADEMIC WRITING AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Guiding Questions: What are some universal conventions of academic writing, and how do we define good academic writing? What are some likely effects of and key concerns with climate change?

Objectives: Understand that in addition to discipline-specific conventions of academic research and writing, there are key features of academic scholarship that academic audiences will expect and which we must satisfy if we are to be successful writers. Begin to critique the merit of these conventions of academic writing. Explore the widespread and complex scientific, policy, and ethical problems climate change begets.

Monday, 5 November: Revisiting Conventions of Academic Writing ▪ Mitigating Infectious Diseases

- [a] *BBC News*, “How We Can Stop Antibiotic Resistance” (8 Jun 2017)¹
- [a] Aginam, “International Law and Communicable Diseases” (2002)¹
- **Students should bring two hard copies of their working introduction to Paper 3 (1-2 paragraphs)**
- Class activity (bring computers to class): students work to develop an engaging introduction for Paper 3²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading with focus on introductions; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: make progress on Paper 3; CCHE Goals: 2, 3

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Goals:
1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

WEEK 11 CONTINUED

Wednesday, 7 November: Revisiting Conventions of Academic Writing and Use of Multimedia

- Gerson and Gerson, *Technical Communication: Process and Product*, Chapter 8 (2017)—skim only¹
- Ostrom et al., “Revisiting the Commons: Local Lessons, Global Challenges” (1999)—skim only²
- Class activity: sample visual or multimedia arguments that fail³

¹ Purpose: understand how to implement non-text-based media into our writing; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

² Purpose: review common conventions of academic writing; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

³ Purpose: discuss and evaluate sample visual and multimedia arguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

Friday, 9 November: Writing Workshop and Conferencing

- No readings assigned
- Class activity (bring computers to class): students will construct outlines for Paper 3¹

¹ Purpose: make progress on Paper 3; CCHE Goals: 2, 3

WEEK 12: PEER-REVIEW AND FOOD JUSTICE

Guiding Questions: How can food systems cause social injustices? What are some foundational arguments for promoting just food systems? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these normative arguments?

Objectives: Practice providing our peers constructive feedback on working drafts. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary debates over preventing food deserts, promoting the human right to food, and environmentally-sustainable and socially-just food systems.

Monday, 12 November: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Food Production and Social Injustice

- *Food Justice*, Introduction and Chapter 1: Growing and Producing Food¹
- Paper 3 rough draft due—upload to Canvas before class (*both to our drop-box and your discussion group*)

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; 1, 4

Wednesday, 14 November: Collaborative Peer-Review Workshop

- Sample Student Writing¹
- Class activity (bring computers to class): collective critique of student sample of Paper 3 rough draft²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading, review expectations of third writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: engage in peer-review; CCHE Goal: 2

Friday, 16 November: Individual Peer-Review Workshop

- No readings assigned
- Students must bring one hard copy of their Paper 3 rough drafts to class
- Class activity: peer-review workshop of Paper 3 rough draft²

¹ Purpose: engage in peer-review; CCHE Goal: 2

WEEK 13

Monday, 19 November through Friday, 23 November: Fall Break—no classes

No readings assigned

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Goals:
1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

WEEK 14: FOOD JUSTICE

Guiding Questions: What are some key global dimensions of food justice? What is the relevance of food safety to food justice? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these normative arguments?

Objectives: Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing arguments in contemporary debates over global injustices of contemporary food systems and food safety regulations.

Monday, 26 November: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Food Deserts and Inequitable Accessibility

- *Food Justice*, Chapter 2: Accessing Food and Chapter 3: Consuming Food¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze readings; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Wednesday, 28 November: Writing Workshop and Conferencing

- No readings assigned
- Class activities (bring computers to class): students will identify key revisions to improve working drafts, and will scrutinize the assumptions in their arguments and improve their logical analysis¹

¹ Purpose: review revision process and importance of making logical analysis explicit; CCHE Goals: 2, 3

Friday, 30 November: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Global Food Politics

- *Food Justice*, Chapter 5: The Food System Goes Global¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

WEEK 15: RESPONDING TO FOOD INJUSTICE

Guiding Questions: How—if at all—can food injustices be overcome? What are some foundational arguments for preventing inequitable exposure to environmental health risks and harms? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these normative arguments?

Objectives: Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments about how to champion food justice and to safeguard against environmental racism and discrimination more broadly.

Monday, 3 December: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Food Safety, Precaution, and the Public Citizen

- [a] Vogel, *Politics of Precaution* excerpts from Chapter 3 (2012)¹
- [a] Bullard, “Unequal Environmental Protection” excerpt, in *Worst Things First?* (1994)¹
- [a] Shrader-Frechette, *Taking Action, Saving Lives*, Chapter 4 (2007)—only pp. 113-24, 141-8¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Wednesday, 5 December: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Cultivating Food Justice

- *Food Justice*, Chapter 6: Growing Justice and Chapter 7: Forging New Food Routes¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Friday, 7 December: Peer-Review Workshop

- No readings assigned
- **Revised Paper 3 rough draft due—bring one hard copy to class (no upload to Canvas is required)**
- Class activity: peer-review workshop of Paper 3 rough draft¹

¹ Purpose: engage in peer-review; CCHE Goal: 2

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Goals:
1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

WEEK 16: GREEN-WASHING AND ECOLOGICAL CONSUMERISM

Guiding Questions: Can we be ecologically-responsible consumers in an era of pervasive greenwashing? How do the actions of socially and environmentally irresponsible corporate actors undermine our ability and moral obligation as individuals to reduce our impact on the environment? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these arguments?

Objectives: Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing arguments in contemporary debates about how irresponsible corporations preclude ecological consumerism.

Monday, 10 December: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Empowered Consumers

- ^[a] Dauvergne, “Sustainable Beef?” and “The Brutes!” excerpts, in *Shadows of Consumption* (2008)¹
- ^[a] O’Rourke, “Citizen Consumer” (2011)¹
- Optional reading: Dobson, “Environmental Citizenship: Towards Sustainable Development” (2007)

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Wednesday, 12 December: Writing Workshop and Conferencing ▪ Greenwashing

- Vos, “Actions Speak Louder Than Words: Greenwashing in Corporate America” excerpt (2014)¹
- Pollan, “Big Organic” excerpt, in *The Omnivore’s Dilemma* (2006)¹
- **Students should bring two hard copies of their working conclusion to Paper 3 (1-2 paragraphs)**
- Class activity (bring computers to class): students work to develop a cohesive conclusion for Paper 3 (which explores the broader relevance or implications of their argument)²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: make progress on Paper 3; CCHE Goals: 2, 3

Friday, 14 December: Reading Day—No Classes

- Very best wishes on your final exams this semester!

FINALS WEEK

No final exam is scheduled—our class does not meet during finals week

Paper 3 final draft due—upload to Canvas by allotted final exam time (see below); no hard copy required¹

Section #430R (MWF 9:00am)
Wed., Dec. 19th at 1:30pm

Section #431R (MWF 10:00am)
Sat., Dec. 15th at 4:30pm

¹ Purpose: complete third writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4