RHETORICAL LEADERSHIP AND ETHICS

Communication 772, 001
Fridays, 9:00-11:40 a.m., Merrill G48

Instructor:  Kathryn M. Olson
Office:   Johnston 225
Office Hours:   W - 2:15-2:45 p.m., F – Noon-12:30 p.m.
and other times by appt.
Email: kolson@uwm.edu

Course Description

This course is designed to explore rhetorical perspectives and practices of leadership, critical followership, and ethics. By the course’s end, you should be able to: 1) understand, analyze, and evaluate rhetoric’s potential relationships to experiences and practices of contemporary leadership and 2) demonstrate fluency with a range of rhetorical choices for effectively and ethically exercising and critiquing rhetorical leadership.

In keeping with its mission as the anchor course in the Rhetorical Leadership Certificate, the class focuses less on discovering and generating new insights than on understanding, finding, and elaborating creative, practical uses for many rhetorical insights in the existing literature; learning to harness, creatively and logically re-combine, and apply existing knowledge to difficult practical problems is no less valuable than pioneering new theoretical knowledge. As Polanyi (1962) put it:

   The mathematical theories of physics are formal systems which are applied to experience by symbolic operations. . . . [Re-casting a formal system into more manageable terms] adds to the beauty and power of the system without enlarging its theoretical scope; it can tell more fluently what it says about nature, but cannot say more than it could say before. So we can achieve greater economy and simplicity in our interpretive framework, and keenly enjoy this as the display of intellectual elegance, without saying anything substantially new. (p. 145)

This course is required for the 15-credit post-baccalaureate Rhetorical Leadership Graduate Certificate (stand-alone credential) or Concentration (as part of a Communication graduate degree), though you need not be pursuing this credential to benefit from the course. For details, talk to the instructor or visit http://www4.uwm.edu/letsci/rhetlead/ or the department website.

Required Readings

Single article and book chapter readings are available on our D2L site, or you can locate them yourself using the citations below. The one required book is:

Time Investment

Students should expect to spend a minimum of 38 hours in class meetings, 50 hours reading and preparing for class, and 56 hours researching and preparing papers and oral assignments.

Course Standards and Policies

1. Participation. In a graduate seminar, full preparation and weekly participation are not only expected, but required. Attendance, including being ready on time and staying through the entire class period, is necessary but not at all sufficient for participation. It is assumed that you will not miss more than one week of class and that only for a pressing reason (e.g., presenting a scholarly paper at an academic conference or being ill).

Asking questions of information or rhetorical questions or being able to summarize aspects of the reading are also necessary but not sufficient to participation. You must regularly take and defend--with good reasons and appropriate evidence--sustained, well-reasoned positions with respect to, but other than, those argued by the readings to test the ideas raised by, assumptions behind, implications and uses of, and alternatives to the positions presented by those authors and other class participants. Thoughtful, detailed interaction with the readings and other students’ comments, not just with the professor, is expected.

2. Provisional Personal Technology Policy. Use of portable technological devices other than tablets or computers (e.g., phones, pagers) is prohibited any time that class is in session. All such devices are to be turned off and stowed away in a backpack, purse, etc.; they cannot be out on the desk or in your lap or hand during instructional time. Of course, you may check messages and make calls at breaks, but otherwise these 2 hours and 40 minutes are for interacting f2f and publicly with all other class members and only with them. If you have a condition that qualifies you for accommodation to use a particular device during classtime, please follow the steps outlined in 9 below.

Provisionally, we will begin the semester with the understanding that students may use tablets or laptop computers during class for note-taking and referring to electronic copies of 772 readings IF they follow etiquette that keeps their use from distracting others (e.g., answering email, checking Facebook or messages, surfing the Internet) and IF they bring their computers with enough BATTERY CHARGE or a portable power source to last throughout class period so that we can easily and efficiently move into groups because no one is tethered to a wall by a cord or has to sit in a particular location because they need an outlet. If everyone cannot abide by these provisions, we will move to a totally electronics-free policy.

3. I am committed to having a supportive instructional climate. Achieving such a climate means that both students and professor:
   - attack arguments, not people, and in a civil manner
   - are individually responsible for the accuracy, quality, and complete citations of
all evidence or reasons that they use to support oral or written claims
- speak for themselves, not for others
- support equality of access to opportunities in the course
- show respect for differences including but not limited to, gender, culture, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and physical challenges

4. Assignments due to the D2L Dropbox must be submitted as Word documents, unless otherwise specified (i.e., texts for your assignment(s) may be pdfs), and by the specified time to count for credit. For pedagogical purposes, I may provide feedback on late submissions, even when they are not eligible for credit. All deadlines are published in this syllabus, so late assignments are unacceptable. If you have an emergency situation, you must provide acceptable documentation and contact the instructor immediately (preferably before you miss the deadline) to see if an exception can be made and to define the terms of any arrangement.

5. Please consistently and rigorously use the endnote style (not author-date or footnotes) from the 16th edition of the Chicago Manual of Style for all documentation; start with the examples at 14.23 in the manual. The complete, easy-to-use version of the Chicago manual is available to you remotely, electronically, and free of charge via the UWM Libraries site under Databases A-Z. Please note that Chicago note reference formats differ from the bibliography entries in the Course Schedule (which may include some additional information to facilitate other documentation styles that you might use in the future but that you might not need for Chicago style). So do not just cut and paste from the syllabus when citing a class reading; verify all citation format details and use only what is minimally needed, according to Chicago style. It is a matter not only of accuracy and ethics, but of ethos as a scholar.

6. Academic dishonesty is strictly prohibited. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to: turning in as your own any individual graded work that you did not produce entirely on your own; looking at another's work during, or otherwise cheating on, an exam or quiz; turning in an assignment for which you have received or will receive credit in another course; failure to document references completely and properly (including appropriate use of quotation marks, presenting full citations, etc.). Any student who uses, without proper acknowledgment, all or part of another's work as if it is his or her own or who allows others to use his or her work as if it is their own will face severe penalties (e.g., grade reduction; course failure; being reported for college disciplinary action). Cheating on exams or plagiarism are violations of the academic honor code and carry severe sanctions such as failing a course, suspension, or dismissal from the University; see http://uwm.edu/academicaffairs/facultystaff/policies/academic-misconduct/

7. If you must be absent due to the call-up of reserves to active military duty, please see the policies at http://uwm.edu/active-duty-military/

8. If religious observances will prevent you from completing work on an assigned date(s), please discuss this with the instructor WITHIN THE FIRST THREE WEEKS OF CLASS to make arrangements. See the accommodations policy at http://www4.uwm.edu/secu/docs/other/S1.5.htm
9. If you have a health condition or disability that may interfere with your attendance or your ability to complete course requirements, you should take the following steps. First, if you have not done so already, you should contact the Accessibility Resource Center (ARC) to and undertake the process of ARC determining whether your condition qualifies you for accommodations and what kind(s); if you are eligible, ARC will provide you with a “Notification of Accommodation” document. Second, you should initiate by email a face-to-face meeting with the instructor, and attach that “Notification of Accommodation” document. At the meeting we will consult to develop acceptable accommodations for this course, collaborating with an ARC counselor if needed. To arrange for needed accommodations in a timely manner, students are expected to complete these steps within the first three weeks of class or as soon as possible after incurring or recognizing the need for accommodation, unless legitimate circumstances prevent one from doing so. If you have questions about this process or need to initiate an accommodations request, please contact an ARC counselor or initiate the accommodation request at http://uwm.edu/arc/

10. For university policies regarding issues such as incompletes, discriminatory conduct, complaint procedures, grade appeal procedures, visit https://uwm.edu/secu/wp-content/uploads/sites/122/2016/12/Syllabus-Links.pdf

11. Information on departmental, Graduate School, and university policies on topics including drop procedures, retaking courses, safety, graduate requirements, and certificate requirements are available in the Graduate Bulletin, the Communication Department's main office, and on the university, the Graduate School, and the department's websites.

12. Bad weather? Check website or call 414-229-4444 to see if UWM has canceled classes.

Final Grading Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1000 - 925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>924 - 895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>894 - 875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>874 - 825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>824 - 795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>794 - 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>774 - 725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>724 - 695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>694 - 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>674 - 625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>624 - 595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>594 - 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignment Weightings

- Uploading to D2L a Completed Course Policies Agreement: 5 points
- First Position Paper: 150 points
- Participation Self-Analysis (or Analyses) - total: 20 points
- Second Position Paper: 175 points
- Graded Oral Loci Assignment: 75 points
- Blind Peer Review of a Final Paper Draft: 100 points
- Final Project: 325 points
- Weekly Participation (see Course Standards 1 & 3): **150 points**
- Total: 1000 points
Grading Criteria

- Demonstrated ability to make and support an argument (see “Top Eleven Tips”)
- Demonstrated attempts to understand and apply a range of course material
- Demonstrated ability to unite theory and practice
- Use and proper citation of appropriate evidence for your claims
- Clarity of expression and ability to develop and support an idea persuasively
- Degree of thoughtfulness and originality in using concepts
- Completeness of arguments and assignment
- Ability to justify the importance of and defend your arguments orally
- Fulfilment of assignment instructions
- Proper and consistent use of Chicago style (Reminder: The citations below are NOT in a particular style, so don’t just cut and paste them into your work; check the proper format for citing the kind of resource in the complete, electronic version of the Chicago manual via UWM’s library website, not a shortcut, like Purdue Owl or automatic citation formatting software, to learn the particulars of creating endnote citations in this major academic style.)

Assignments

Directions for the Oral Assignments, Position Papers, and Self-Analysis of Participation
Appear below in the Course Schedule; Blind Peer Review and Final Project Instructions are:

Blind Peer Review of Final Paper Draft

Offering constructive feedback to help others do their best work is an important part of scholarship. Each student should do a thorough peer review of another student’s draft of the final paper with the intent of helping the original author best meet the requirements for the assignment and potential of the project. This will be a single-blind review; the reviewer will know who the paper author is, but the paper author will not know the identity of the reviewer. Please honor this professional code and do not discuss with anyone whose paper you are peer reviewing. Reviewers will be assigned and papers distributed after noon on Monday, November 26; blind peer reviews are due to the Dropbox by 9:00 a.m. on Friday, November 30.

Below is the assignment with the key aspects highlighted and color-coded so that you, as a peer reviewer, can verify that all are present and developed and evaluate their quality relative to the grading criteria above. Please use it to thoroughly assess and offer comments on your peer’s paper. You should turn in to the Dropbox (without your name or other identifying information) two documents: 1) a marked-up copy of the peer’s paper with specific comments, corrections, ideas, locations of what should be where or what is missing, etc., and 2) a separate overall evaluation (1-2 single-spaced, typed pages) in which you address how well your peer’s paper is performing on the highlighted aspects of the assignment description below, in light of the grading criteria, and offer both compliments and suggestions for performing even better on the final draft.
There is a sample of the two documents from a good blind peer review of a previous 772 paper on D2L under “Blind Peer Review Sample and Materials. Review it with a focus on how the reviewer approached the two-part task.

**To make your comment bubbles in Word (Review Tab, Track Changes) anonymous, you have to click the box for Track Changes Options, then click Change User Name in the user information, and remove or alter to “Critic 1” or something untraceable to you (no last name/first name/initials/nickname) BEFORE you make any comments on the paper. Be careful not include any self-identifying information in your independent review or comments on the paper. For methods to remove any self-identifying information from any document, see the additional materials on D2L under “Blind Peer Review Sample and Materials” and, most timely, the support documentation for the word processing program that you are using.

Final Project Information

Overview

Research and write a case analysis of an actual instance involving an unresolved rhetorical leadership problem. Your project should explain, define, and support with evidence the nature of a particular leader’s rhetorical situation, as you see it. Then it should propose two good, complete strategies for successfully handling the challenge by securing shared action through rhetoric. Each of your two alternative rhetorical strategies must be fully developed with specific action steps/sample discourse/speech outlines, etc., must rely on an analysis of the pros and cons and likely developments if this route is followed, and must be defended as an effective, ethical route using the materials we have studied this semester. Finally, make a recommendation of which of your two rhetorical routes you think is preferable and why. Each graduate student will present and defend a 10-minute oral version of the essay’s argument on December 7 or possibly December 17—read on. The exact amount of initial presentation time that each person will have depends on the number of students enrolled in the class, so I can be more specific closer to the presentations. If there are too many students enrolled to do the presentations justice in one class period, we will also use the scheduled final exam period (Dec. 17, 12:30-2:30 p.m.) for presentations. Decisions on whether we need the final exam period and whether presentations can be any longer than 10 minutes will be announced in November, so please be sure to hold open the university-scheduled final exam period for 772, as attendance is expected, even if you present your paper on December 7. (16-19 pages, exclusive of endnotes, due to the D2L Dropbox by noon on December 14)

Requirements

1. You may write with either the rhetor him/herself or an aide to that rhetor as your audience. You must have an individual SPECIFIC RHETOR or potential rhetor in mind IN A SPECIFIC TIME AND PLACE and take into account all the opportunities and constraints provided by that individual and their history/position. The situation may be from a time past, present, or pending now, but it must be “real” (in the sense of historical). You need to be able to produce evidence that this rhetor already wants this end and any policy proposal in your project and has indicated willingness to engage in public advocacy.
Since you are honorable and agreed to advise this rhetor, assume that you both desire the same rhetorical audience action outcome already, so you don’t have to defend the value of the campaign’s final outcome to your audience (e.g., if your rhetor is using rhetoric to get people to participate in having cleaner air in Milwaukee, you don’t have to defend the value of cleaner air but can just show you both already agree that that is a worthy objective). Instead you are undertaking the task of focusing your willing rhetor sharply on the demands of the rhetorical problem they face in achieving that worthy ultimate objective, then offering and developing and evaluating for them two good, well-thought-out rhetorical courses to meet the situational demands and ethically and effectively move the rhetor’s audience to action.

2. The goal within your case must be to advise the rhetor on how to move their rhetorical audience members to take part in some shared meaning that they do not currently embrace and to engage in some sort of shared action course to solve the exigence as a result (so NOT just re-align their beliefs and impressions with the rhetor’s, but follow a specific COURSE OF ACTION as a result of the rhetor’s presentation; NOT just do something individually for their OWN perceived benefit, like buy a product, but do something about an issue with PUBLIC OR SHARED STAKES BASED ON THE SHARED UNDERSTANDING ENCOURAGED BY YOUR RHETOR; NOT just do something that will primarily benefit the rhetor, like image rehabilitation or election to office, BUT DO something with particular public consequences beyond leader selection or belief and attitude reinforcement, which are only indirect means to diffuse subsequent ends).

3. In analyzing the rhetor’s rhetorical situation for him or her, defend with reasoning and evidence your interpretation of how the rhetor faces a PROBLEM THAT CAN LIKELY BE AMELIORATED OR SOLVED BY RHETORIC (i.e., a rhetorical exigence)—AND PARTICULARLY BY RHETORIC THAT IS ETHICAL AS WELL AS EFFECTIVE. (Whether the problem now faced was caused or aggravated by rhetoric in the first place, let alone by this rhetor’s own rhetoric, is immaterial EXCEPT as a possible constraint on the rhetor’s options now. Remember, you are looking forward and prescribing, like a doctor; knowing the history may help you realize how the patient got to this point and may point toward possible remedies, but it is only a tool and not the end point, as it might be with a forensic scientist examining a body. You want to elaborate on how we got to where we are now only to the extent that it helps you show how to make things better using rhetoric from this point forward.)

4. You must defend with evidence the existence of an ACTUAL RHETORICAL AUDIENCE (faced by the rhetor) that meets both essential criteria of constitution a rhetorical audience (i.e., capable of being influenced and able to act to significantly ameliorate or solve the rhetorical exigence, to move the community closer to the ultimate shared objective with public stakes, e.g. cleaner air in Milwaukee).

5. Once you have concisely argued your interpretation of the rhetorical situation that your rhetor faces, use the MAIN portion of the paper to propose and develop two different rhetorical courses and why each is ethical and likely to be effective in this situation; this request requires you to articulate your standards of judgment. You will need to use both theory and application to this situation to defend your two recommended rhetorical courses on the likeliness of both effectiveness and ethicality.

6. You need to offer two good, self-contained rhetorical courses for the rhetor to move from where we are now to the rhetorical audience acting to fix the situation. So, don’t make one option a straw person argument to blow away in the conclusion, and make sure your two options are each complete plans of action, not just random collections of unrelated tactics or a set that might get us part way to success.
Each course of action may require executing multiple rhetorical concepts or tactics working together in an internally consistent way to succeed.

7. In the conclusion, recommend one of your two good rhetorical courses of action as the rhetor’s better one, and defend that relative recommendation, defining your criteria for the judgment in the process.

Suggestions for Success

1. Review “Top Eleven Tips for Writing a Focused Argumentative Essay,” the Grading Criteria in the syllabus, the details in this assignment, and the sample final papers on D2L before you begin writing. Revisit them often during the writing process.

2. Remember, you are NOT looking for a text to analyze, but for a public, rhetorical problem with defensible shared stakes that is yet to be solved by a specific rhetorical leader moving a specific rhetorical audience into action.

3. Avoid past successful cases. (Of course you can look at these for ideas on how to solve your problem; they just shouldn’t be the focus of your project.)

4. Avoid cases where someone already tried what you are suggesting and it failed—unless you can use that episode to help you show how your redux is fundamentally different and how your change fixes what was substantially wrong with the first try and you deal explicitly with how this rhetorical attempt being a second try might complicate or ease things with the particular rhetorical audience.

Suggested Paper Layout

Introduction
The introduction doesn’t need to be fancy as you are writing to someone whose goals you have already researched and with which you agree. So, briefly recap any needed historical context that connects you to the rhetor you are addressing and orients readers to your relationship with that rhetor and why you are “on the same page” with their goals (e.g., perhaps some uncontested, unproblematic, shared concerns that bring you to writing this proposal for them). Review the goals at which you together aim and how the success of your suggestions might be judged incrementally, short of accomplishing the final goal.

Current Rhetorical Situation Analysis and Diagnosis
- Identify and establish with reasoning and evidence the rhetor’s rhetorical exigence
  - Not just a goal, but a problem marked by urgency that could be fixed through the right rhetoric moving other people cooperatively to take action
  - Systematically rule out alternative explanations or contingencies that make the problem NOT primarily rhetorical; if you find your rhetor’s problem is not able to be substantially ameliorated through the right public rhetoric, pick a different case.
  - Identifiable and measurable indications of success need to be presented—how will we “know” if the rhetoric succeeded? What would happen and how? What indicators or observable actions could we get evidence of that would show that this rhetor’s rhetoric (and not something else) made this difference?
- Identify and establish with reasoning and evidence who the rhetorical audience is
  o Capable of being influenced by this rhetor’s rhetoric
  o Capable of taking action that ameliorates the rhetorical exigence featured

- Identify and establish with reasoning and evidence any important constraints (possibly including failed or partial past efforts/rhetoric directed at solving this exigence)
  o Be careful of confusing constraints and the exigence
  o Constraints may be positive or negative or two-sided

In light of your rhetorical situation analysis, conclude this section with your pointed diagnosis of why, in spite of their previous efforts, the rhetor has not been able to overcome the exigence with rhetoric so far and what is essential to success now (Tip: these become your standards for the likely effectiveness of your recommendations in getting the rhetorical audience to act).

Two Alternative Recommendations for Rhetorical Routes that are Ethical and Effective

- Develop and justify with reasoning and evidence two different rhetorical strategy plans (i.e., an internally consistent set of tactics, knit together and guided by one central strategy designed to work interactively as well as sufficient to reach the goal set by your analysis of the rhetorical situation) to get the rhetor from where s/he is now, in light of your rhetorical situation analysis, to successfully motivate the rhetorical audience to ameliorate the exigence.

- Be sure to defend why each strategy is likely to be effective as you suggest it be executed in this rhetorical situation and why what you have proposed is sufficient or “enough in itself” (not just one necessary step among many others that are not effected by your proposal) to get the community to the goal of significantly ameliorating the exigence by motivating the rhetorical audience to act.

Conclusion/Preferred Choice between Your Two Good, Recommended Rhetorical Routes

- Develop and justify with reasoning and evidence your criteria for promoting one of your recommended routes over the other (e.g., likelihood of success, relative ethicality, viability of switching courses later, etc.).

- Develop and justify your recommendation of one of your proposals over the other one in light of the ethicality and effectiveness criteria you have developed.
COURSE SCHEDULE

(Do all assigned readings prior to attending that day’s class)

Sept. 7  Foundations - Course Introduction

Cicero. *Ad Herennium*, Book Li-ii (“Cicero on Studying Rhetoric”)


Sept. 14  Foundations - Rhetorical Ethics in Practice

*Completed Course Policies Agreement Due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.*
Download the Course Policies Agreement from Basic Course Information on D2L, review and complete it, and upload that version to the Dropbox.

*Participation Oral Assignment Due in Class: (4 minutes max) Bring to class to share a brief example from public discourse by a leader, and be prepared to analyze and evaluate that text orally using ONE of the three ethical positions argued by Booth, Johnstone, or Brockriede. All of your evaluation evidence will be from the text itself. Remember ETHICALITY is not necessarily the same as EFFECTIVENESS with an audience or ELOQUENCE, though the three certainly may interact in the same text. Your focus is strictly on briefly recapping your understanding of ONE (and only one) of the three process ethics (either Booth’s or Johnstone’s or Brockriede’s) and then explaining how the rhetorical choices in your example text support your evaluation of that text’s ETHICALITY on your chosen ethic.*

Entire Syllabus
Olson, Kathryn. “Top Eleven Tips for Writing a Focused Argumentative Essay.”


Sept. 21 Foundations – Interactions of Leadership and Rhetorical Pedagogy

*Position Paper 1 Due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.:

What are key similarities in the rhetorical ethics proposed by Booth, Johnstone, and Brockriede? What are the key differences among the three positions, and why are these important? Based on your analytical comparisons, propose and defend what you see as the best, most comprehensive process ethic that you can formulate, grounded in these readings, for guiding or critiquing rhetorical leadership, irrespective of issue content. YOU ARE NOT CHOOSING AMONG THE THREE FOR YOUR FAVORITE BUT PROPOSING AND DEFENDING YOUR OWN BEST, MOST COMPREHENSIVE (AND PRESUMABLY INTERNALLY CONSISTENT) PROCESS ETHIC STANDARD THAT IS GROUNDED IN AND MAY BORROW FROM THESE READINGS BUT ADDS AND ARGUES FOR YOUR OWN IMPROVEMENTS AND INNOVATIONS. (3-5 pages, excluding Chicago endnotes) Sample position papers are available in D2L.


Morse, Suzanne W. “Making Leadership Personal and Universal.” Innovative Higher Education 17(1), (Fall 1992), 71-77.


*Special Guests: Dr. Rachel Davidson, Assistant Professor, Hanover College, and Marnie Lawler McDonough, Fourth Year PhD Student, UWM


*Self-Analysis of Class Participation to Date Due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.: Review Course Standards 1 and 3 and reflect on your class participation to date emphasizing the “non-presentation” aspects (i.e., participation other than on the specific oral assignments that are required as part of the participation grade). Write a one-page essay in which you propose the grade you honestly deserve for class participation thus far and defend your proposed grade with evidence from the classroom. If you have trouble finding enough evidence to make a case for a good grade, acknowledge that and use your essay to describe instead the specific steps that you will take to improve. I will look at these essays and consider their persuasiveness and your follow-through in my participation assessment. We may repeat this exercise later in the semester, if that seems appropriate.


**Oct. 5**

**Rhetorical Situations and Rhetorical Leadership**

*Review the final project assignment details, all Sample 772 Final Papers on D2L, and Use the Discussion Preparation and Exercises (D2L) on the Below Readings*


Examples:


Start locating a final project case in which you can demonstrate clearly and with supporting evidence the three parts of the rhetorical situation of someone with an actual, unsolved rhetorical leadership problem that you want to see solved.

Oct. 12  Managing Meaning in Controversy – Rhetorically Defining and Redefining Situations

*Position Paper 2 Due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.:

After Martin Luther King, Jr.’s assassination, many African-American communities reacted in grief, despair, and violence. Robert Kennedy, who was on a campaign visit to a predominantly black community, replaced his planned speech with the statement we are reading for today. It was the first that many in that Indianapolis audience heard of the assassination, and Indianapolis was the only major city in which civil unrest did not break out. First outline a coherent interpretation of Kennedy’s rhetorical situation (the text includes an historical headnote with information for you to use in assessing and proving your interpretation of the three parts of the immediate RHETORICAL SITUATION that Kennedy faced, so you are not required to do outside research), then analyze how Kennedy’s particular textual choices may have productively managed meaning in that rhetorical situation for his immediate audience (i.e., do the follow-up textual criticism with evidence from the speech text). (4-6 pages excluding Chicago endnotes)


***3:00 today – Dr. Victoria Gallagher presents the annual Rhetorical Leadership Lecture focused on her “Virtual MLK” project digitally recreating Dr. King’s Durham sermon***

Oct. 19 Competing Value Hierarchies, Loci, and Rhetorical Leadership

*Participation Oral Assignment:* (3 minutes max) Be prepared to describe and justify the three parts of the rhetorical situation you will use for your final project: rhetorical exigence, rhetorical audience, and constraints. Please make these focused, yet supported from historical (not textual) evidence (even if you cannot present all the specifics in this presentation). Be sure you have timed your talk so that you don’t get cut off. We want to be cognizant of the time so that we can briefly discuss and provide feedback for each classmate on their choice and still have time for our other scheduled materials.

Review Next Week’s Graded Oral Assignment Directions (Below, Next Week) and Rubric (D2L) and Use Today’s Discussion Preparation Exercises (D2L) on the Below Readings to Prepare for Class


Example:
Nelson, Gaylord. “Statement for The Wilderness Society” (D2L)


The aspects of the Olson Bitburg essay likely most germane to our work in this rhetorical leadership class (vs., say, its additional uses for a Burke class or a rhetorical criticism class) are related to transformation and transcendence as potential means of redefinition. There are other ideas there, too, but prioritize understanding these two ideas.
Oct. 26  Practicing with Loci and Rhetorical Framing and Reframing I

*Graded Oral Loci Assignment Due at 9:00 a.m.:* (3 minutes max) Bring to class and have uploaded to D2L Discussion AND Dropbox a textual example (with full Chicago endnote citation in the body of the Discussion post and the note to me in Dropbox) from public discourse of a leader urging a shared course of action using any of the six *loci* catalogued in last week’s Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca reading. Be prepared to analyze the text orally, arguing exclusively for why one specific locus is DOMINANT in this text. All your supporting evidence will be from the text itself. Before class, please upload to the D2L Dropbox a copy of your speaking notes, in addition to the copy of your text, to help in evaluation. Good examples of speaking notes and the texts the students analyzed are on D2L.

Remember, *loci* are just places to look for or standard ways of developing an argument. The same issue or course of action could be advocated with different *loci* as justification, either within the same text or in different texts that are all on the same side of the issue. What you are looking for is a particularly good actual example of where a public leader developed an argument (thoroughly, hopefully) by *featuring* one of the six *loci* as s/he tried to manage meaning for an audience.


In Lakoff, pay close attention to Parts I and II. Those are the key parts of the book for our purposes.

The next two Parts III and IV are just cases illustrating the basic theory, so those parts can be read more superficially than Parts I and II (but with the newer cases in Part III are more likely to be referenced than the older ones in Part IV). Part V basically reiterates and fleshes out for application the theory from Part I and II and is more "political"; the main interesting problem to consider as you read this section is whether the progressive vision that Lakoff proposed to fill the gap that prompted him to write the book in the first place hangs together (which is also worth considering when reading, even superficially, the newer cases in Part III)--do they execute well the theory that he proposed? Finally, there are a few nice "review" or "definition" gems in the FAQ.


Examples:
Montini, E. J. “Why Pay for Laura’s Kids?” *Arizona Republic*, March 12, 2009,


Nov. 2 Rhetorical Framing and Reframing II – Comedy, Tragedy, and Melodrama

As you read, Use and Complete (with corresponding page numbers for your ideas/quotations) the Discussion Chart (D2L) on Comparing and Contrasting these Three Frames


Schwarze, Steven. “Environmental Melodrama.” Quarterly Journal of Speech 92(3), (August 2006): 239-61. (If you are interested someday--these are not required readings for this class--, responses to Schwarze are available in the forum of Environmental Communication 2(3), (August 2008): 78-109.)

Nov. 9 Challenges of Generating Ethos and Social Activism

Use Discussion Preparation Questions on the Below Readings (D2L)

Aristotle. The Art of Rhetoric, Book II.i.1-7 (“Aristotle on Ethos”)


**Special Guest: Dr. Robert Kraig, Executive Director, Citizen Action of Wisconsin**

Selected articles introducing Dr. Kraig and his work, plus any TBD materials he would like students to read prior to his visit (D2L):


**Nov. 16** **Rhetorical Framing and Reframing III – Strategic Ambiguity**


Ceccarelli, Leah. “Polysemy: Multiple Meanings in Rhetorical Criticism.” *Quarterly*
Nov. 23 No Class – Thanksgiving Break

MONDAY, NOV. 26, Noon - FULL COPY OF FINAL PAPER DUE TO D2L DROPBOX BY NOON; PEER REVIEWERS RECEIVE PAPERS TO BLIND REVIEW

Nov. 30 Challenges of Public Involvement

*Blind Peer Review (2 documents) due to D2L Dropbox by 9:00 a.m.


Dec. 7 Final Project Presentations Due at 9:00 a.m.

Dec. 14 Written Final Projects Due to D2L Dropbox by Noon

Dec. 17 Final Exam Period, 12:30-2:30 p.m. – Final Project Presentations Due (if needed, depends on number of students enrolled in class. A decision on whether we need to use this period for presentations will be announced, one way or the other, no later than November.)