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Overview

The Rhetoric Department is charged with the serious responsibility of ensuring that all first-year students are taught the basic academic skills of logical argument, creativity and composition, and clarity of expression. Key concepts that they need to acquire and develop include: analysis of audiences, forms of argumentation, structure of argument, types of presentation, and ability to assess arguments, whether these are ones they accept or contest.

Whatever their future course of life, students will need these skills. Scientists, humanists, artists, and every informed citizen needs to know the ways to create, critique and analyze arguments, evaluate evidence, and organize responses, whether in written or spoken form. Whether they are being successful students or arguing in a local community, everyone needs these skills [including academic teachers who seek to publish in learned journals].

We therefore put controversy at the center of our program. This helps us to show students that Rhetoric needs to be understood in their own current living social contexts and that good Rhetoric takes those contexts into account. We will lead students through a sequence that begins in analysis and ends in advocacy. This means that students must learn (and we must teach them) to analyze controversies in society thoroughly. These may be controversies in the arts or sciences or social life in general and must be analyzed in terms of multiple perspectives that advocate positions responsibly. But not all positions in a controversy are responsible ones — that’s part of the quest — to discover which ones are and which ones aren’t and why.

A controversy is not just a single yes/no issue. There are always complex issues to evaluate and our job is to teach students how to do this. We begin by helping students understand how a rhetorical text such as a speech, an editorial, an argument by a friend, a course choice, a musical preference, an advertisement, or anything else which involves personal opinion, takes a stand on an issue. We need to show them how each of these things makes claims, supports them with arguments and evidence, appeals to an audience’s beliefs and emotions, and so on. This is the give-and-take of the controversial exchange, with writers, TV commentators, friends, audiences, speakers, opinion givers, advocates, all partaking in a larger conversation. Then we invite students to assume the role of advocate by inquiring into a controversial issue and thoughtfully articulating a position in relation to the interests and concerns of others.
Your job as a Rhetoric Instructor is to secure that all students "get" this. Rhetoric at the UI is not focused on poetry, social activism, or literature. Every engineer will at some time need to convince the City Board of Supervisors about the merits of one proposal as compared to another. Every biologist will confront issues of creationism versus evolution. All historians must discuss whether Andrew Jackson should be celebrated on the $20 bill or regarded as the first American President responsible for genocide. Even physicists argue about the nature of energy, heat, and time.

So, communicative and experiential [especially political or civic] life involves argument – though this too is a position subject to argumentative critique; there are good reasons to believe that some facts are not subject to argument and your classes should help the students to make the distinction. Remember the famous prayer: “Give me the courage to face the things I cannot change, the dedication to alter those that I can change, and the wisdom to know the difference”. Your students from all disciplines must be taught and encouraged to learn this approach first and foremost. Rhetoric is not about grandstanding, but about persuasion.

Having "got" that idea the students must know how to argue persuasively for their values and beliefs with logic, passion and respect avoiding obvious logical errors, and in ways that persuade others [the audience]. Your job is not to convince your students to accept your way of thinking nor to focus only on literature or the humanities but to examine controversies in all walks of life that will help their eventual success as student in their chosen major. That is the raison d'être for the students’ exposure to Rhetoric in the very first year of their university life: they must be taught advanced thinking and presentation skills, both in writing and speaking.

In taking this view of your centrality to University life, you are accepting the large responsibility of teaching students how to think. It's not illegal (yet), so we must teach them well, without ourselves falling into the traps that we teach them to avoid. Rhetoric is not about convincing all your students to be pro-or anti-abortion, pro-or anti-vegetarianism, pro-or anti-liberal views, pro-or anti-science, or pro-or anti-anything. It is about teaching them to dissect, analyze, and judge the arguments of each position. The Rhetoric course is not a podium for your own personal views. You are teaching students to be both judges and advocates: judges of the arguments made by either side of a particular contentious issue; intelligent advocates for a position in which they believe. If each of them could get involved with another TA, another student, a parent, a professor, a journal editor, CEO, a Dean or a Provost in an intelligent argument that neatly dissects the opposition and proposes a well-structured argument against them, then we have done well. We have taught them how to think in ways which will further their education during the rest of their time of the University of Iowa.
Against this background, we have other responsibilities. Rhetoric is a key general education requirement and it is necessary that no student is passed into the second year of studies without succeeding in 10:03 Rhetoric or, having pre-qualified in part of the speech and composition requirements elsewhere to pass through the other courses as represented by 10:004 and 10:006. Our joint responsibility as instructors is to ensure that students have the necessary skills to be functioning members of the University. We must differentiate the excellent from the merely competent students but strive to enable all students to become at least competent. Not every student who passes Rhetoric will do so at the Excellent (A grade) level. A competent (C grade) pass is sufficient to get them moved along into the rest of their education. Policies on grading will be discussed below, but the Department does not regard the granting of large numbers of high grades as a simple measure of an instructor’s skills.

As part of this responsibility to advance first-year students through to second year as capable logicians, arbiters, constructors, and analyzers of argument, we represent a two thousand year tradition of education centered on "rhetoric," variously assumed to be the ability to contrive, invent, deconstruct, analyze, and present arguments in public. Nowadays we’d be less likely to put this in terms of the art of civic discourse by which Rhetoric challenges students to consider what it means to speak and write as a member of a community – indeed, of many communities, but especially the academic community, whether poetic, social, scientific, business focused.

All of these elements and the conduct of civil interpersonal life need the skills and values that the Rhetoric Department is uniquely positioned to deploy. Do not confuse Rhetoric with 1) something the Ancient Greeks and Romans did and we should all forget; 2) “empty words” as opposed to substance. Although the term is used in this latter sense non-technically in everyday life, part of our job in the Rhetoric Department is to dispel the absurdity that this is all that it represents. Indeed students need to be shown how the very use of the term “mere rhetoric” to dismiss a point of view expressed by another person is itself a rhetorical trick.

Undergraduates at the University of Iowa fulfill the Rhetoric requirement of the general education with 10:003 Rhetoric, divided into two major speaking assignments, two major writing assignments, and a cluster of related assignments and activities. These are non-overlapping and non-substitutable. The student must complete two speaking assignments and two separate writing assignments. You may not allow students to read a written assignment as a speech nor present the text of the speech as a written assignment. Be sure you understand that this means that your duty, represented in your contract, is that you present the students with four separate requirements: two speeches, and two written assignments.

As noted above, the Rhetoric Department also offers courses 10:004 Writing and Reading and 10:006 Speaking and Reading for students who
have been approved by the Department as having fulfilled part of their general education requirement at the previous institution. If you are assigned to these two courses you should talk with your teaching advisor about the differences between these courses and 10:003.

Goals

All your assignments and activities should help students develop the following three sets of abilities:

1. To use flexible, appropriate PROCESSES for writing, speaking, and reading. Rhetoric classes use a workshop approach to writing and speaking: that is to say, we focus on development of a finished product by repeated editing and development over which you take major supervisory oversight. Your job is to help students develop a repertoire of techniques for:

   - invention as a social as well as individual process (e.g., exploratory writing and speaking, brainstorming, drafting, researching);
   - arrangement (organization);
   - revision, based on both self-criticism and audience response;
   - editing for style, usage, grammar, and mechanics; and
   - rehearsing for oral presentations.

Your course should help students see reading as an active, productive way of participating in a rhetorical transaction and see interpretation as an individual and collective process, involving feedback from you and from other students. To read rhetorically means especially:

   - to select interpretive strategies appropriate to particular purposes, which include both reading “with the grain” and against it (to comprehend and to critique);
   - to analyze texts in terms not just of what they say but of how they work (e.g., organizational strategies, stylistic features, underlying values and assumptions), evaluating their effectiveness for particular audiences, occasions, and purposes;
   - to compare texts in a nuanced, systematic way (explaining a text’s position on an issue in relation to other texts with different positions, synthesizing texts with one another, etc.).

2. To understand basic rhetorical CONCEPTS and use them in composing, presenting, and interpreting texts. Ideas that must be emphasized include:

   - the appeal—to logic, to emotion, to the credibility of the author;
   - the audience, occasion, and purpose;
   - the content, organization, style, and mechanics/delivery;
   - the issue and the claim;
   - the varieties of evidence; and
active listening.

3. To write and speak analytically about the rhetorical aspects of CONTROVERSIES past and present—
   evaluating persuasive strategies (forms of argument, types of appeals, self-presentation) in the context of a controversial exchange;
   describing a controversy in terms of a complex variety of perspectives, not limited to pro/con oppositions; and
   analyzing perspectives in terms of the values, assumptions, and interests that inform them.

Students must be given many opportunities to develop the abilities required to meet this goal, such as
   stating and supporting a claim about a text, strategy, or controversy;
   explaining a position in relation to other positions and synthesizing texts with one another, strategically integrating source material;
   analyzing the terms of a controversy, with special attention to how meanings shift in various contexts;
   evaluating the credibility of an authority for a particular audience; and putting their own values, assumptions, and interests in conversation with those of other people.

Research

An essential part of involvement in controversies is learning how to work with supporting evidence and information [research, source credibility, analysis of alternative claims]. We teach students how to locate relevant sources, evaluate their credibility and reliability in the context of a specific controversy, and integrate the results effectively into their own discourses. There is no single set of sources or techniques that every student should learn; students must be taught how to explore and evaluate a variety of sources.

Research is not merely an exercise in creating footnotes or doing scavenger hunts. Research should be purposeful and directed at the evaluation of sources and arguments. This key aspect of rhetorical work should be evident in all of the assignments and exercises that you set your students. Keep reminding students of the connection of this activity to their work in their majors and their lives as informed citizens. Research, research, research. We must teach the students not to make wild unsubstantiated claims: we must show them how to gather the research facts necessary to back up a position. You might spend some time having them research the arguments and the bases of claims that they find most disagreeable, for
example. This will help them to understand the opposite position to the one they hold and why other people might believe it.

Assignments

10:003 classes include four major assignments: two for writing, two for speaking [as noted above, these must be different from one another. You may not permit your students to read a written assignment as a speech nor present the text of a speech as a written assignment. It is a contractual obligation that you observe this distinction and the College holds the Department responsible for ensuring that everyone observes this rule.]. As the word *major* suggests, these should be substantial and challenging. Every major assignment must meet three criteria:

1. Students receive a written assignment sheet (paper or electronic).
2. Whether for writing or speaking, performances go through more than one version or draft. The final version is not impromptu but has been prepared in advance over a period of weeks.
3. At the earliest opportunity, the student receives a written response from the teacher, as well as peer responses. Some form of response is usually helpful for each version or draft of the performance.

Although the students’ portfolios suffice for supervisory functions of checking your responses, some instructors prefer to keep a copy of these responses in their teaching portfolio. You may be asked to show your student portfolios to your advisor periodically and new TAs will be required to present these portfolios at midterm and before finals week.

Whereas contributing substantially to a panel presentation with prepared speeches can count as a major speaking assignment; participating in a class discussion does not. You should add this point of clarification to your syllabus so that students are very clear about the difference between desirable active class participation and the completion of required class assignments.

Of course, you will also use other formal assignments and activities: reading responses, brainstorming, impromptu speeches, class discussion, etc. These usually have the following characteristics:

1. The student’s performance is exploratory and improvised rather than fully revised and polished.
2. Response focuses on content, on discovery and criticism of ideas rather than on formal perfection.
These less formal performances are valuable in their own right and, when carefully sequenced, prepare students for success on the major assignments by developing necessary abilities and exploring possible topics and strategies.

A well-designed assignment not only promotes learning and respect for opposite positions, but incidentally reduces the likelihood of plagiarism. It is harder to cheat on a distinctive assignment connected closely to your particular class than on a generic one. Breaking down an assignment into stages makes it more manageable for students, helps you teach specific abilities more effectively, and allows you to examine work in progress and therefore to particularize your guidance and supervision of the work-in-progress. Have students provide copies of sources. This allows you to monitor how students use them. Teaching students to avoid plagiarism is a point of emphasis in every Rhetoric class.

**Folders**

Have your students keep a folder of all their completed work for the course. All new TAs are expected to present a sample of these folders to the faculty teaching advisor at midterm and before Finals week, and advisors of experienced TAs may ask to see them from time to time.

**Books**

Every class uses approved reading texts, whether a textbook anthology ("reader"), regular trade books, or a course pack. Other books are optional. All assigned books must be approved by your faculty advisor.

All TAs have these three options:

1. A reader from the approved textbook list.
2. A reader and trade book from the list.
3. Two (or at most three) trade books from the list.

After your first semester, you gain two additional options:

4. An equivalent set of alternative textbooks and/or trade books, approved by petition (a reader; a reader and trade book; 2-3 trade books).
5. A course pack approved in advance by your faculty teaching advisor.

For option #4, ask your teaching advisor to approve an "Alternative Textbook Application."

**Honors**

The Chair [DEO] may designate a 10:003 section as “Honors,” which limits enrollment to students in the Honors Program. Qualified students may
receive Honors credit in any section if the teacher is willing to supervise a special project. Further information is available from the DEO [Steve Duck].
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Syllabus

Rhetoric is a mainstay of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and is governed by their policies. CLAS requires teachers to present and discuss a syllabus on the first day of class [this may be presented electronically, but you must still discuss the syllabus with the class on the first meeting]. Hard copies of the syllabus are no longer required as long as your syllabus is posted on ICON (the UI electronic teaching resource). Your syllabus (also called a course policy statement) has two parts and must be based on the Department syllabus template, as noted in your contract letter. It is available from the Dept. website (http://clas.uiowa.edu/rhetoric/) for downloading and personalization.

Information specific to your section needs to appear on the personalized syllabus based on the template:

Course and section number, with meeting times and location
Your name, office hours and office location: at least 3 full hours (180 minutes) per week “and by appointment” [this latter is a CLAS requirement, and is in addition to the required 3 hours]

Required texts and materials

Grading policies, including absence and late work

As noted, the required template for your syllabus is available on the department website and consists of two elements, one required and unchangeable and the other customizable according to your preferences. Every syllabus must include the Department’s statement of goals and purposes of the course. 10:003, for example, has a clear purpose agreed by faculty and this is a uniform statement that clarifies and declares the mission of the Rhetoric Department. You may not modify, adjust, edit or replace this statement. However, you may add other personalized information if you desire (e.g., a statement of welcome, course overview, expectations of student behavior, assignment schedule), but none of this is required. After you have designed your syllabus it requires the approval of your faculty advisor before
it may be released to students or published on the University teaching website, ICON (which we encourage you to use and explore).

TAs must give a draft of their syllabus to their faculty teaching advisor before the Friday before the start of semester, and an approved final copy should be sent electronically to the advisor and to the Administrative Assistant. Faculty must submit their syllabi to the DEO for review by the Friday before semester starts, with final copies sent electronically to the DEO and Administrative Assistant.

**Registration**

Never sign an add/drop slip for Rhetoric. Students need the DEO’s signature, not yours. If a student shows you a slip signed by the DEO, add the student to the class list. Anyone else not on the roster should be told to leave class immediately and to enroll at the Department Office as soon as possible.

**Midterm and Final Grades**

Some teachers grade individual assignments throughout the semester. Others use a portfolio or holistic approach, periodically evaluating overall performance. Regardless of your system, no student should ever have reason to be surprised by the final grade. At midterm, you must give every student a written grade and must report grades below C- to the Registrar via OSIRIS, the Registrar’s master record of student grades. You will receive a notice about this from the Registrar at the appropriate time. You must first report the grade list to your advisor for approval before submitting your grades to the Registrar.

Be careful when designing your syllabus. It is all too easy to create small assignments with, say, 5 points for each of several little elements, and then to find that you have inevitably inflated your grades at the end of semester because you only ever give people a 4 or 5 on each assignment. If you do assign points in this way then you must be prepared to use all six data points from 0-5. Your syllabus requires the approval of your advisor before it is released to students, and advisors will be looking out for this simple problem in new teachers’ syllabi. They can offer guidance if you are confused. Please ask.

Midterm and final grades are based primarily on the major assignments (at least 60% of the grade if you use percentages). The rest depends on other assignments and activities. If you count active participation in discussion, the course policy statement must define it and specify criteria for evaluation, and it should receive much less weight than major assignments (typically 10%, never more than 20%). Again, be aware of the risks of assigning small point grades for active participation and other activities, as noted earlier. Always use the full scale for any assignment.
The Rhetoric Department does not mandate a grade distribution or curve. However, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences does set guidelines, noting that “Fairness to students...implies reasonably consistent grading among courses of the same level, other things being equal.” For introductory courses, the College recommends this distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The guidelines go on to say that “Adjustments should be made for sections and classes of different levels of ability, some calling for a larger proportion of high grades and some for a larger proportion of low grades.” For more information, see [http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/teaching/grading/grade_distributions.shtml](http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/teaching/grading/grade_distributions.shtml)

*It is not a mark of a great teacher that all grades for a class come in at A. Teachers with experience must learn to discriminate and to use the full scale, recognizing important differences between levels of skill.* All grades must be reviewed with your advisor both at midterm and at Finals and although everyone wants their classes to be wonderful, it is just as well to check with other TAs and with your advisor to assess whether your expectations are realistic and justified relative to the experience of others. Do not leave this till the last week of semester. It is important that you do not paint yourself into a corner at the last minute. Faculty advisors are here to help you learn the appropriate standards within CLAS at university level and to differentiate between popularity and proper assessment of student abilities.

**Attendance**

You may not reward a student because of mere attendance. Attendance at class discussions is expected and therefore unremarkable. Failure to attend, however, is a cause for concern. You can lower a grade on account of missing work, including low active participation in discussion and other class activities. If a student is repeatedly absent (say, two weeks in a row) then you are encouraged to discuss the situation with your advisor and/or the DEO. They can arrange for inquiries to be made to support the student if he or she is having personal difficulties that warrant the deployment of university support systems.

“No late work” is not an acceptable policy. The College recommends that instructors accommodate excused absences, which in Rhetoric generally means allowing students to make up a reasonable amount of work without penalty if circumstances allow. Likewise, class participation should not be evaluated in a way that counts against students with excused absences.
Excused absences are allowed by such unavoidable circumstances as illness, family emergencies, mandatory religious obligations, or “authorized University activities” which include “participation in athletic teams, marching band and pep band, debate teams, and other recognized University groups, as well as participation in University field trips, service with the National Guard, and jury duty.” Absences for University activities should be officially documented in advance. For medical and personal excuses, teachers may ask students to complete the “Explanatory Statement for Absence from Class” form available from Student Health Services, the Registration Center, or http://www.registrar.uiowa.edu/forms/absence.pdf For further information, including advice from Student Health Services, see http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/teaching/classroom_p&p/classlists_attendance.shtml

The University also directs teachers to excuse another sort of absence: “While students remain responsible for learning class material and completion of course requirements, faculty should respect reasonable decisions by students, based on their exercise of their own intellectual freedom, to not attend part or all of a particular class session” (UI Operations Manual III.15.2f). If a student decides to be absent for such reasons, the teacher may (but need not) require an alternative assignment or activity.

Students sometimes skip an evening Rhetoric class to take an examination in another course. Such absences are not excused. Scheduled classes always take precedence over exams given outside of class time, so the other teacher is required to offer your students “reasonable options without penalty.” For details, see http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/deomailing/2005/03/30/night_exams.shtml

Incomplete and Second-Grade-Only

You must submit a departmental form for every I (Incomplete) you award. The unfinished portion of the student’s work should be small, the rest of the work satisfactory, and the reason for not finishing legitimate (e.g., illness). TAs should consult their advisor before assigning an I.

The second-grade-only option allows students to repeat a course with only the second registration used to calculate grade-point average and credit hours. (Both grades remain on the permanent record.) Students register as usual and then file a form in the Office of Academic Programs and Services, 120 SH.

Course Evaluations

You may give students an opportunity to write an evaluation at midterm using your own prompts. The College says you “should assure
students that these evaluations are optional and develop ways to preserve the anonymity of the responses.”

Near the end of the semester, all classes must be evaluated. Set aside twenty minutes for students to complete the required and standardized ACE forms provided by the Department.

Research Studies

A researcher must receive permission from the Department before approaching teachers about using a class in a study. The DEO reviews initial requests to ascertain that the project is relevant to the Rhetoric curriculum, does not demand excessive time, and allows students to give informed consent.

The researcher is responsible for securing the cooperation of instructors and students and must inform the DEO about it. Participation is voluntary: teachers, individual students, and whole classes are free to decline. The teacher, as well as the researcher, is responsible for impressing this fact upon students.

Sale of Materials

University policy forbids teachers to collect money from students for any purpose, including the sale of educational materials (e.g., photocopies, videotapes).

FERPA

The Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) grants students certain rights while placing various obligations on the University. The most important thing to remember is that student records are highly confidential. Never post grades, even with names removed. Never leave student work in halls, the mailroom, or the department office. Never discuss a student’s performance (grades, attendance, etc.) with anyone: parent, classmate, roommate, etc. The key exception is that you may share confidential information with a University official who needs it to perform his or her job (e.g., your faculty teaching advisor or Department Executive Officer [DEO] of Rhetoric or the College Dean or Associate Dean). If a parent contacts you then please alert the Rhetoric DEO immediately, politely declining to respond or discuss the matter with the parent whether over the phone or on email. For further information, see http://www.registrar.uiowa.edu/ferpa/

Student folders are also confidential. If you do not return student folders at the end of the semester, the College requires you to keep them for the next full semester and maintain your grade records for five years.

Equal Opportunity and Diversity

You are responsible for being familiar with a wide range of policies and procedures promulgated by the College and University. Since it is far
beyond the scope of this Handbook to reproduce most of them here, they are built into the syllabus template that you use for your course. However some extremely important policies are to be found at
http://www.uiowa.edu/~eod/policies/index.html
http://www.uiowa.edu/~eod/policies/pol-on-human-rights.html
http://www.uiowa.edu/~eod/policies/statemt-on-diversity.html
http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/ii/04.htm

Policy on Consensual Relationships Involving Students

Romantic and/or sexual relationships where one member of the University community has evaluative responsibility for the other create conflicts of interest and perceptions of undue advantage. Sexual and/or romantic relationship between individuals in inherently unequal positions of power (such as teacher and student) may undermine the real or perceived integrity of the supervision and evaluation provided, and the trust inherent particularly in the student-faculty relationship. They may, moreover, be less consensual than the individual whose position confers power believes. To review the complete Policy on Consensual Relationships Involving Students in full, please see

http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/ii/05.htm

Policy Resources at uiowa.edu

Department of Rhetoric site
http://clas.uiowa.edu/rhetoric/

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences “For Faculty”
http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/index.shtml

UI Policies and Regulations Affecting Students
http://dos.uiowa.edu/

Teaching Resources
http://www.uiowa.edu/homepage/fac-staff/teaching-resources.html

Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity
http://www.uiowa.edu/~eod/
http://www.uiowa.edu/~eod/education/publications/index.html

UI Faculty Handbook
http://provost.uiowa.edu/faculty/fachandbk/index.html

UI Operations Manual
http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual
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PDP

Rhetoric’s Professional Development Program (PDP) has the specific goal of supporting all TAs and faculty members during their first semester, along with the general goal (as its name suggests) of contributing to your long-term growth as an educator. It is not a “training” program but a forum for dialogue among novice and experienced teachers learning from one another.

PDP starts with a three-day workshop the week before classes begin. Advisory Groups of 10-12 new teachers are team-taught by experienced TAs and faculty. During this workshop, you begin developing a general plan for the semester and a detailed plan of the opening weeks, all in the context of discussions of larger issues, from rhetorical concepts to teaching strategies.

These discussions begin a conversation about teaching that continues through Fall Semester in the required PDP colloquium, 3:30-5:20 Thursdays. All new TAs must enroll in their assigned section of 10:350 Colloquium: Teaching Rhetoric (usually for 2 s.h.), graded S/U. Attendance and satisfactory performance in the August Workshop and Thursday colloquium are conditions of employment, part of every new TA and new faculty member’s contract.

Participants must not register for courses that conflict with the 3:30-5:20 Thursday period, including 2:30-3:45 classes. If you schedule such a conflict, you will be required to drop the other course.

Around midterm, TAs in PDP will give their faculty advisor a sample of student folders and schedule a conference to review them and discuss midterm grade distributions as noted above.

Advising

Every TA has a faculty teaching advisor. TAs are encouraged to talk with the advisor about any sort of pedagogical issue, from planning assignments to managing difficult classroom situations. TAs give their advisor certain materials that provide a context for such discussions:

1. Before the semester begins, TAs provide a draft of the syllabus (course policy statement). TAs send a final copy to the advisor and to the Administrative Assistant.

2. By the end of the first week of class, all TAs, whether in PDP or not, provide a course plan that includes a schedule of all major assignments and
indicates the role of other planned activities. TAs also send an approved final copy to the Administrative Assistant.

Advisors may recommend improvements, and TAs may not distribute syllabi or assignments to their students until these have been approved by the advisor.

Teaching advisors routinely request additional materials, which TAs are required to provide: e.g., sample folders of student work, midterm and final grade distributions. The department does not require classroom observations, but advisors are available for class visits as well as individual conferences, and TAs will likewise make themselves available if the advisor requests a meeting or asks to visit class.

TAs and faculty advisors are encouraged to work out any problems or conflicts that may arise between them. When that does not succeed, problems should be reported to the DEO of Rhetoric.

**Absences from Teaching**

Teachers must “meet classes as scheduled and, when circumstances prevent this, to arrange equivalent alternate instruction” ([Operations Manual III.15.2b](#)). “As scheduled” means at the assigned time and place for every session. Exceptions may be made once or twice for work in a library, museum, etc. Classes cannot be cancelled to confer with students. As University policy, the above applies to all classes in the department.

TAs who anticipate missing class must notify the Department Office, the DEO and their teaching advisor and try to arrange for a substitute teacher. For unplanned absences, notify the office (335-0178) and then inform the DEO and advisor. This is a contractual requirement. Unreported TA absences may result in financial or other penalties, up to and including withholding of pay and loss of position.

**TA Hiring**

Reappointment should never be taken for granted. To be eligible, first-year instructors must make adequate progress toward a degree and satisfactorily fulfill their teaching obligations as explained in the letter of appointment (e.g., attending the August workshop), in this Handbook (e.g., providing timely course materials to teaching advisors), and in occasional memoranda (e.g., turning in grades when they are due). Appointments beyond the second year are less common but may occur, depending on the needs of the Department of Rhetoric.

Only 1/2-time assistantships (three sections per year) are generally available. The department avoids split appointments but occasionally allows them after the first year.
When extra teaching (say, in Summer Session) becomes available, the DEO ordinarily gives preference to graduate students who have progressed satisfactorily toward their degree, demonstrated excellence in teaching, taught more semesters of Rhetoric, served the department beyond the usual expectations, and received no extra assignments in the past. For Summer Session, strong preference is given to candidates scheduled to teach Rhetoric the following year.

4 Handling Problems

- Resources • Plagiarism • Disruptive Behavior • Student Complaints • TA Dismissal

Resources

The Department offers you several resources to deal with problems or concerns. As noted earlier your first point of contact is always your teaching advisor. Additional resources depend on the nature of the issue. The Department has a Designated Reference Officer/DRO [Mary Trachsel mary-trachsel@uiowa.edu] who deals specifically with issues of suspected plagiarism, and a TA Officer [Carol Severino carol-severino@uiowa.edu] who deals with other complaints. Ultimately the Department Executive Officer [DEO Steve Duck steve-duck@uiowa.edu] will have unresolved cases referred to him.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism poses special problems for Rhetoric teachers. While learning to use sources properly, students often misuse them: paraphrasing too closely, borrowing ideas without acknowledging the debt, etc. Plagiarism should never be ignored, but if unintentional it can be dealt with through criticism and revision rather than disciplinary action. Intentional plagiarism is a different matter, covered by College and University policies regarding academic misconduct.

Any TA who suspects intentional plagiarism should consult with his or her teaching advisor or with the Mary Trachsel, the designated reference officer, before contacting the student or responding to the performance. This is meant to insure that graduate students have the backing of the Department before making a serious accusation.

If you cannot adequately document plagiarism, grade the performance according to its success in responding to the demands of the assignment, including proper documentation. Concerns about proper use of sources may be addressed in conference with the student, but never accuse anyone of plagiarism unless you have adequate documentation to support the charge.
TAs or faculty members who can document plagiarism and who judge it to be deliberate should consult with the Designated Reference Officer [DRO] about reporting the incident. The teacher provides three key documents:

1. a copy of the student’s essay, speech outline, etc., marked to indicate the relevant passages;
2. a copy of the sources, also marked;
3. a draft of his or her email letter to the student describing the case and indicating the intended penalty. (See "The Email Letter" below.)

With the approval of the DRO, the teacher sends the letter to the student, who is given time to respond before the DRO sends the documents (along with a cover letter) to the Dean’s office.

The Department strongly recommends an assignment grade of F in all proven cases of intentional plagiarism but has the option in egregious cases of assigning F for the whole course. These grades must not be given without consultation with an advisor, the DRO, and or the DEO, who have a duty to report such cases to the College and assign grades in consultation with the appropriate College office. For a first offense, a student is ordinarily placed on disciplinary probation; for a second offense, suspended for a semester; for a third offense, expelled. These procedures apply to other forms of cheating as well. For examples, see “Academic Fraud, Dishonesty, and Cheating” in the College’s Student Academic Handbook, available at http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/students/academic_handbook/ix.shtml

A point made earlier in this document, in the context of teaching research, is worth repeating here:

It is harder to cheat on a distinctive assignment connected closely to your particular class than on a generic one. Breaking down an assignment into stages makes it more manageable for students, helps you teach specific abilities more effectively, and allows you to examine work in progress. Having students provide copies of sources allows you to monitor how they use them.

**The Email Letter**

Only after consulting with the Designated Reference Officer, the instructor will inform the suspected student of the problem in an email to the uio.wa.edu account, inviting the student to discuss the situation in person. The email must...

- Describe the academic fraud that occurred and when it was discovered.
Briefly describe the documentation or proof supporting the claim that academic fraud has been committed.

Describe the penalty that will be given.

Invite the student to discuss the situation as soon as possible in person or by phone. (Contact information should be included.)

Remind the student of the seriousness of academic fraud.

Inform the student that he or she may also speak to the DRO of Rhetoric about the fraud policy or the action taken.

Inform the student that a formal report concerning the fraud must be submitted.

**Sample Letter**
The following letter may be used, with whatever changes are necessary.

*Dear [student]:*

*In evaluating your most recent major [writing/speech], I discovered that it contains substantial plagiarism, with passages taken directly from your sources without proper attribution.*

*Due to the seriousness of this academic misconduct, you will receive the grade of F for this course. [Most common alternative: ...you will receive the grade of F for this assignment, and in order to pass the course you will need to demonstrate that you can complete the assignment without plagiarizing.]*

*If you would like to discuss this situation with me in person, see me as soon as possible. I have time available during my office hours on _____ at _____ in _______. [Optional addition: If that will not fit your schedule, please call me at ____________ and we can make another appointment or we can discuss the matter by phone.]*

*The CLAS Academic Student Handbook summarizes the seriousness of academic dishonesty in the following way: "All students suffer when academic misconduct takes place. Academic fraud disturbs the mutual respect that should exist between instructors and students and among students and can poison the atmosphere of a classroom. Perhaps most seriously, those who commit academic fraud are robbed of the educational experiences that are the primary purpose of course work in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences considers all instances of academic fraud as serious academic misconduct."

*If you have further questions about the academic fraud policy or about this situation, you may also make an appointment with the Designated Reference*
Officer [Mary Trachsel mary-trachsel@uiowa.edu] to discuss the situation. I may be invited to attend this meeting as well. Please see the CLAS Academic Student Handbook for more information on student rights and responsibilities.

CLAS policy requires me to submit a report concerning this incident to the DEO of the Department of Rhetoric, who will forward the report to the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and Curriculum in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and will send you a copy. The Associate Dean will inform you of the action the College will take concerning this incident. At that time, if you would like to discuss the report, you may do so in 120 Schaeffer Hall, Academic Programs and Services, 335-2633.

**Disruptive Behavior**

You can expect to encounter minor problems of student discipline from time to time. Many incidents can be addressed during the normal conduct of class. When the problem is more serious or part of a pattern, you may need to meet individually with the student(s) involved. TAs are encouraged to discuss such problems as soon as possible with their teaching advisors. Major escalations can easily be prevented by such consultation and advisors are there to assist and support TAs in such circumstances.

If a student truly disrupts class and refuses to stop when asked, you should tell the student to leave; TAs must also report the incident to his or her teaching advisor. Taking care to ensure that unnecessary escalation is prevented, the TA does nevertheless have options available in exceptional cases of dangerous disruption or threats to the safety of the TA or to other students. If the student refuses to leave, you should call or contact the Rhetoric Department Office and have them notify the UI Department of Public Safety (335-5022) to request that an officer remove the student. *This option should not be used lightly and has very seldom been necessary.* You should report such action at once to the DEO and TA Officer of Rhetoric; TAs should report the incident to their teaching advisor as well. Such “paper trails” often turn out to be very important.

As a teacher, you do not have the authority to cancel a student’s enrollment in your section, but in the proper circumstances, some administrators do have such authority. If such action seems warranted, discuss it with your teaching advisor, the TA Officer, or the DEO.

**Student Complaints**

Your syllabus explains how students in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences are expected to address concerns about a Rhetoric class. First they should discuss the matter with the teacher if possible; then, if necessary, approach the TA’s advisor, the Department TA Officer (Carol Severino), or the DEO; and finally, as a last resort, contact the College. These steps are
important and should not be end-run, though some students and even their parents attempt to do so.

You should emphasize the first step to your students and make it as easy as possible for them to speak with you about any difficulties. Most problems are solved at this stage.

If your student brings a complaint to the Department, the TA Officer usually begins by establishing that the student has spoken with you or has a valid reason for not doing so, then decides how to proceed based on the nature of the complaint. When appropriate, the student is invited to express his or her concerns in writing, after which you have an opportunity to write a response. Most formal complaints are resolved at the Departmental level; students seldom file appeals with the College and our policies of managing ourselves internally respect the many kinds of issues that arise and allow time and low-level intervention to solve most issues before escalating them.

Complaints remain confidential unless the TA Officer needs to consult a departmental, collegiate, or University officer. Documents related to complaints are seldom placed in teachers’ personnel files and never without their being informed.

**TA Dismissal**

Adapted from *UI Operations Manual III.12.4b, “Graduate Assistant Dismissal Procedure: Grounds for Dismissal.”*

(1) Loss of Student Status—An assistant may be dismissed by the Dean of his or her college during the term of appointment if the assistant’s status as a student or degree candidate at the University is suspended or terminated.

(2) Other Grounds—An assistant may be dismissed by the Dean of his or her College during the term of appointment (a) for any reason sufficient to dismiss a faculty member during the term of his or her appointment; or (b) for failure to follow or implement properly and adequately reasonable instructions of his or her supervisor when such instructions are within the proper scope of the supervisor’s duties.

5 **Writing Center & Speaking Center**

The Department’s Writing Center (110 EPB, 335-0188) and Speaking Center (151-153 EPB, 335-0205) offer free individual instruction to any UI students, including Rhetoric students, who need more help than section teachers can provide. Students may enroll to work with the same tutor every session—usually thirty minutes per week in the Speaking Center, one or two
sessions per week in the Writing Center (MW or TTh)—or may sign up for single-session tutoring. The Writing Center offers online services as well.

The Centers also serve as resources for instructors. Staff can suggest pertinent sections in textbooks, talk with an instructor about possible approaches, and (in the case of the Speaking Center) offer videos of sample speeches by professionals and students.

You should describe both Centers to the entire class on the first day of the semester. Even students who do not need them for Rhetoric may decide to use them for another course. Any student can work in a Center as long as teachers are available, with Rhetoric students receiving top priority.

You can also recommend to individual students that they attend one or both of the Centers. Teaching advisors and Center staff can provide advice about such decisions. Available places are limited, so the sooner such recommendations are made, the better. After making a referral, you may find it useful to check on a student’s progress. Your continued encouragement and support can be critical to a student’s success in the Center.

10:375 Teaching in a Writing Center is a seminar-practicum required of all WC tutors and serves to supplement PDP. This course complements what you can learn in PDP and gives extra experience working one on one with students, especially Rhetoric students, non-native speakers of English and graduate students.


READERS

Colombo, Cullen & Lisle *Rereading America* (Bedford/St. Martin's)
Feldman, McManus & Downs *In Context* (Pearson/Longman)
Graff & Birkenstein *They Say/I Say with Readings*, (W.W. Norton)
Johnson *Global Issues, Local Arguments*, (Pearson/Longman)
Lunsford & Ruszkiewicz *Everythings an Argument with Readings* (Bedford/St. Martin's)
Selzer *Conversations* (Pearson/Longman)

RHETORICS (optional supplements)

Graff & Birkenstein *They Say/I Say (without readings)* (W.W. Norton)
Harvey *The Nuts & Bolts of College Writing* (Hackett)
Heinrichs *Thank You for Arguing* (Random House)
Lunsford & Ruszkiewicz *Everythings An Argument (without readings)* (Bedford/St. Martin's)
O'Hair, Rubenstein & Stewart *A Pocket Guide to Public Speaking* (Bedford/St. Martin's)
Simonds et al: *Public Speaking: Prepare, Present, Participate* (Allyn & Bacon/Pearson)
**TRADE BOOKS**

*Experienced* TAs may petition their teaching advisors to approve other titles from this list of books, used recently with success.

- Eggers, D. *Zeitoun*
- Ehrenreich, B. *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting by in America*
- Foer, J. S. *Eating Animals*
- Gladwell, M. *Outliers: The Story of Success*
- Kaufman, M., *The Laramie Project*
- Krakauer, J., *Into the Wild*
- Levitt & Dubner *Freakonomics: A Rogue Economist Explores the Hidden Side of Everything*
- Malcolm X with Alex Haley *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*
- Mezrich, B. *The Accidental Billionaires: The Founding of Facebook*
- Quart, A. *Branded: The Buying and Selling of Teenagers*
- Satrapi, M. *Persepolis: The Story of a Childhood*
- Schlosser, E. *Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the All-American Meal*
- Singer & Mason *The Ethics of What We Eat: Why Our Food Choices Matter*
- Sperber, M. *Beer & Circus: How Big-Time College Sports Is Crippling Undergraduate Education*
- Spiegelman, A. *Maus: A Survivor’s Tale*
- Twenge, J. *Generation Me*