

Rhetorical Leadership and Ethics

Spring 2021 – Communication 772, 201

Wednesdays, 3:30-6:10 p.m. via Collaborate Ultra (through CANVAS)
Student Guide to Collaborate Ultra (available even during a session): <https://kb.uwm.edu/99445>

Instructor: Kathryn Olson

Email: kolson@uwm.edu (please contact me via email; allow 72 hours for reply,
although usually it will be much sooner)

Office Hours: Email me, and we will set up a mutually convenient Teams meeting

This syllabus and all lectures and original materials are copyrighted 2021, Kathryn M. Olson.

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/>.

Required Readings

Single article and book chapter readings are available on our CANVAS site, or you can locate them yourself using the citations below. The one required book, which is not on CANVAS, is:

Lakoff, George. *The All New Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2014.

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.

Instructional Technology

This course will be taught and is accessible through an online management system called CANVAS. On the course site you will find a variety of information and class materials including announcements, lectures, readings, videos, and preparation questions/worksheets to use as you do assigned readings, and assignments for the course. You will attend synchronous class sessions via Collaborate Ultra (housed in our CANVAS site), and submit work throughout the semester using CANVAS. If you need help when you are in CANVAS, there is a Help button (with a question mark icon) on the left Navigation bar; click it, and you can be in a live chat with CANVAS Support. For how-to guides and help, please visit:

<https://community.canvaslms.com/docs/DOC-10701>. **The Student Guide for Collaborate Ultra is at <https://kb.uwm.edu/99445>.** If you have any trouble with CANVAS, please consult the student help files or contact Canvas directly for support 24/7:

<https://uwm.edu/canvas/students/> or by using the Help button on the Navigation bar, described above. If you need technological help unrelated to CANVAS, please contact the UWM Help Desk by calling 414-229-4040, emailing helpdesk@uwm.edu, or visiting uwm.edu/help. Also visit <https://uwm.edu/technology/student-resources/> to learn more about UWM's technical resources for students.

Course Standards and Policies

1. *Supportive Instructional Climate Expectations.* I am committed to having a supportive instructional climate in all online encounters including in Collaborate Ultra class sessions, Discussions, emails, and Teams meetings. Achieving such a climate means that both students and instructor:
 - attack arguments, not people, and in a civil manner
 - are individually responsible for the accuracy, quality, and complete citations of all evidence and the 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, race, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and physical challenges
2. *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, giving or receiving help

regarding, or otherwise cheating on an exam or quiz; turning in an assignment for which you have received or will receive credit in another course; representing an analysis that you learned from another professor or student in this or another course or presentation of any kind as your own; 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 their own or who allows others to use their work as if it is the other's own or helps people cheat in other ways 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/>

Reusing work. All your work for this course should be original work and turned in **only** to this course. *You are not allowed to re-use work that you created, submitted, or presented for grading in any other university class.* If you are repeating the course or if you started this course in a previous semester and did not complete it, you must create new work. “Double dipping” will be treated as academic dishonesty.

3. *Accessibility.* If you have a health condition or disability that may interfere with your ability to complete course requirements, you should take the following steps as soon as possible. First, if you have not done so already, you should contact the Accessibility Resource Center (ARC) at <http://uwm.edu/arc/> and undertake the process of ARC assessing whether your condition qualifies you for accommodations and what kind(s); if you are eligible, ARC will provide you with a “Notification of Accommodation.” Second, you should email the instructor with the “Notification of Accommodation” so we can consult (collaborating with an ARC staff member, if needed) to develop acceptable accommodations for this course. 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 ARC at <http://uwm.edu/arc/>
4. *Communicating with the Instructor.* Please email the instructor at kolson@uwm.edu and allow 72 hours for a response, although usually I respond much faster. I encourage you to request a Teams meeting with me for complicated questions or if you would like to talk. Send me an email, and we'll schedule a mutually convenient time.
5. *Late Work Policy and CANVAS Deadlines.* For written assignments, you will lose 10% of the assignment's maximum value for each day or portion thereof that your submission is late. After three days (30%), I can no longer accept the work for credit.

Please note that the deadlines listed in the Syllabus indicate when a CANVAS submission portal or discussion CLOSES OR WORK BEGINS TO BE ASSESSED AS LATE, so you need to have your work uploaded **PRIOR TO (not “at”) THAT TIME.**

Build your work plan knowing that technology is inherently unreliable (frequently our computers malfunction, our Internet connection slows down or goes out, one's preferred browser isn't a good match for CANVAS, etc., and replacement technology or choices need to be sought to complete and submit something electronically, which takes time). These are not "CANVAS problems;" actual CANVAS problems are rare, and the Central CANVAS Team researches and verifies whether or not there was an actual "CANVAS problem or disruption" at a particular time, which might justify accommodation. Therefore, don't risk waiting until the night before or the day of to complete or upload your work because these technical difficulties do not excuse missing the deadline. The system publicizes planned CANVAS outages for routine maintenance so be alert to such announcements and plan your work accordingly. CANVAS Assignments provides you with a **receipt** when something is successfully submitted, so always look for and save those until your final grade is posted in PAWS.

6. *Attendance and Participation Expectations.* This class works well when every class member is well prepared and actively contributes during class sessions. Attendance--including being on Collaborate Ultra and ready to begin promptly at 3:30, returning on time from our 10-minute breaks, and staying through the entire session--is expected. When it is impossible for you attend in person, be sure to watch the recording of the class session in Collaborate Ultra prior to the next class session because the sessions build on each other.

Attendance/watching sessions you missed is necessary, but not sufficient for participation. Participation depends on being fully prepared by completing the week's assigned readings or viewings and making notes using the week's preparation questions or worksheet, when provided. Your notes should help you formulate your thoughts to participate during class discussion orally or by putting comments in the chat box. Participating actively in in-class exercises, offering examples or thoughts in response to discussion questions or prompts and to other students' contributions, and being able to identify in the readings exactly where you are drawing an idea or support for a point from are all important to participation.

7. *Reading and Materials Responsibility Policy.* DOWNLOAD FROM CANVAS AND HAVE OPEN DURING CLASS TIME ALL THE READINGS AND HANDOUTS FOR THE WEEK BECAUSE WE WILL OFTEN REFER DIRECTLY TO THEM AND YOU WILL NEED TO SPECIFY PAGE NUMBERS WHERE YOU FOUND AN IDEA OR DO SOME CLOSE TEXTUAL ANALYSIS THAT REQUIRES HAVING YOUR OWN COPY HANDY. Sometimes there will be questions posted on CANVAS to guide your reading and prepare you for productive class discussions. Complete all readings and viewings due for each class session, and make your preparation notes with respect to guiding questions (hint: if you type these, you can easily share some of your briefer thoughts in the chat box by cutting and pasting), submit any graded work due that day **BEFORE 3:00 P.M.** (NOT 3:30 p.m., 3:00), and have open/accessible all of the week's readings, your preparation materials, and a blank Word document to take notes for your break-out group, if we use them. Please, we need everyone organized, attentive, and signed in on time to Collaborate Ultra so we can start promptly at 3:30.

8. *Required Citation Style for Assignments.* Please consistently and rigorously use the

endnote style (not author-date or bibliography) from the 17th edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* for all documentation (look at section 14 under Part III), including shortened subsequent citations. Please note that “Ibid.” is discouraged (14.34), as of 17th ed., so never use it. 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 needed, according to Chicago 17th ed.

In consideration of those with whom you are working, when citing readings we read in this class in your written submissions for this class, cite from that version, NOT from another translation or a reprint published in, say, a collection that you may have read for another class (e.g., Bitzer, Vatz, Aristotle). The page numbers, publication date, and wording (if a translation) will be different, so stick to the version that we all should have read together for my and your peer reviewers and peer accountability buddies’ ease of working with you.

9. *Religious Observances*. 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 <https://apps.uwm.edu/secu-policies/storage/other/SAAP%201-2.%20Accommodation%20of%20Religious%20Beliefs.pdf>
10. *Other University, College, and Department Policies*. For university policies regarding incompletes, discriminatory conduct, complaint procedures, active military duty, etc., see <https://uwm.edu/secu/wp-content/uploads/sites/122/2016/12/Syllabus-Links.pdf> and, regarding COVID-19, see <https://uwm.edu/cetl/covid-19-syllabus-statements/>

For grade appeal procedures, see the departmental procedure, which complies with the College of Letters and Science’s implementation of the university policy, at https://uwm.edu/communication/wp-content/uploads/sites/150/2014/11/grievance_policy.pdf.

Information on departmental, college, Graduate School, and university policies on topics including drop procedures, retaking courses, safety, and degree requirements are available in the Undergraduate Bulletin, the Communication Department’s main office, and on the university, the college, the Graduate School and the department websites.

Final Grading Scale

1000 - 925	A	824 – 795	B-	694 - 675	D+
924 - 895	A-	794 – 775	C+	674 - 625	D
894 - 875	B+	774 – 725	C	624 - 595	D-
874 - 825	B	724 – 695	C-	594 - 0	F

Assignment Weightings

Completed Course Policies Agreement	10 points
CANVAS Discussion Introductions	40 points
Analysis Paper	150 points
Oral Analysis 1	75 points
Speaking Manuscript & Text Ex. with Citation for Oral Analysis 2	75 points
Preliminary Final Project Rhetorical Situation Analysis	50 points
Completeness of Final Paper Draft Submitted for Peer Review	50 points
Blind Peer Review of a Completed Final Paper Draft	125 points
Final Project (25 pts cr/no cr for presentation, 300 paper)	325 points
Peer Accountability	<u>100 points</u>
	1000 points*

*There is no planned extra credit for this course, so please plan accordingly.

Grading Criteria for Written and Oral Analyses (UNLESS there is a separate rubric provided)

- 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 develop and defend your arguments orally
- Fulfilment of assignment instructions
- Proper and consistent use of 17th ed. Chicago endnote citation style (*Reminder: The citations below are NOT in Chicago endnote style, so don't just cut and paste them into your work, if you cite these sources; 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

Course Policies Agreement (10 points)

The Syllabus for Communication 772 and other important course information are available on our CANVAS site in the Basic Course Information module; please read everything carefully. You must complete everything in the module, including this agreement (structured using the Quiz function on our CANVAS site), to view and proceed into Unit 1. The syllabus includes the course objectives, complete assignment directions and grading criteria, assignment values, the course schedule, and course policies as well as other information. Please review the syllabus and

all other materials in the Basic Course Information module carefully, including the various policies, expectations, and deadlines. If you have questions or concerns about what is written, please contact your instructor and understand the answers BEFORE completing and submitting the Course Policies Agreement, because submission attests to your understanding and acceptance of these terms. (**Note: Don't use the CANVAS Student app for completing the agreement, because it relies on the "quiz" feature of CANVAS. If you use your mobile device for quizzes, you need to use your browser in your mobile device rather than the CANVAS Student app.**)

Introductions Discussion on CANVAS (40 points)

Because we are a large class and have work to do at our first class, we'll use a CANVAS Discussion to have a more satisfactory introduction to each other than unilateral introductions during the first class session. Please follow these directions in a timely way

Original Post (DUE BEFORE 3:00 p.m. on Friday, January 29): Write a brief (about 150 words) original post introducing yourself to the class and telling us something unique or interesting about yourself. You might include your hobbies or interests, what you did during the break, what series you are currently watching or re-watching on Netflix, a book you recently enjoyed, your hometown, or other details that might help you make a connection with us.

Reply (DUE BEFORE 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, Feb. 2): Review all other students' posts in this Discussion to find one or more students with whom you have something in common and reply to at least one person, briefly (about 100 words) elaborating your connection and possibly asking them a follow-up question. Of course, replying to students who replied to your introduction is nice, although not required for credit.

Grading Criteria for this Discussion: (See Rubric on CANVAS)

Timeliness of original post - 10
Original post completed - 20
Reply completed - 10

Peer Accountability (100 points)

During the second week of class, each student will be assigned one to three peer writing buddies who can serve as a semester-long connection point and accountability partners. (We'll see whether we have an odd or even number of class participants and chat on the first day of class about what course is preferable.) The purpose is to get feedback on your work prior to formally submitting it, so you would be wise to share copies of your work with your buddies PRIOR TO your meetings so that they are not "cold" commenting at your meetings. You will establish at least 3 mutually agreed-upon virtual check-in meetings to share and discuss, using the assignment directions and grading criteria, your work on upcoming assignments with each other. Students will be assessed on a credit/no credit basis, based on whether they have completed the required meetings. You will each report the dates and times of your meetings to me at the end of the semester, so please keep a record of that information for when I request it.

Analysis Paper (150 points)

After Martin Luther King, Jr.'s assassination, many African-American communities reacted in grief, despair, and violence. Robert Kennedy, who was on a presidential primary campaign visit to a predominantly black community, replaced his planned speech with the statement you are asked to read:

Kennedy, Robert F. "Statement on the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., Indianapolis, Indiana, April 4, 1968." In Stephen E. Lucas and Martin J. Medhurst, *Words of a Century: The Top 100 American Speeches 1900-1999*, 480-82. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

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. The handout on CANVAS, written by Dr. Leah Ceccarelli and used with her permission, gives further insight into the speech's historical context and evidence of its success with the immediate audience.

Write a double-spaced, 4-6-page paper (excluding your Chicago 17th ed. endnotes) that first presents a coherent interpretation of Kennedy's rhetorical situation. The text includes an historical headnote with sufficient information for you to use in assessing and proving your interpretation of the three parts of the immediate RHETORICAL SITUATION that Kennedy faced. You are not required or encouraged to do outside historical research beyond that provided by Ceccarelli and Lucas and Medhurst, as we are focused on practicing basic analysis skills here, such as explicitly and tightly formulating a well-considered, single-sentence statement of the primary exigence, establishing its relationship to a rhetorical audience (which meets both criteria for a rhetorical audience), and identifying obvious constraints (from the headnote and possibly implied by the text) for this rhetor and justifying each. Second, analyze how Kennedy's particular textual choices may have productively managed meaning **in the rhetorical situation for his immediate audience, as you have analyzed it** (i.e., do the follow-up textual criticism with evidence from the speech text). About half of your paper should be devoted to each task.

YOU MAY WATCH THE SPEECH AT THE LINK PROVIDED ON CANVAS, BUT DON'T USE PRECIOUS PAPER SPACE TO TALK ABOUT KENNEDY'S DELIVERY; FOCUS IN THE PAPER'S SECOND HALF ON SPECIFIC TEXTUAL CHOICES AND HOW THEY OPERATED TOGETHER TO MOVE YOUR IDENTIFIED RHETORICAL AUDIENCE TO COOPERATE IN HELPING THE RHETOR RESOLVE THE EXIGENCE IDENTIFIED IN YOUR RHETORICAL SITUATION ANALYSIS.

Be sure to properly cite, in Chicago 17th ed. style endnotes, the headnote and the assigned version of the speech. Each goes onto two pages. You may cite the entire speech once, with inclusive pages, at the first mention, then refer in-text to specific passages with the paragraph number in which they appear, i.e. (para. 3). For your convenience, I have put a one-page copy of just the speech with the paragraphs numbered on CANVAS, following the full scan.

Please cite Kennedy's speech itself as a chapter in an edited book. Please cite the Lucas and Medhurst headnote using the below Chicago 17th ed. format for introductions (including the page numbers, following a comma, after the publication info in parentheses and before the final period). Since it is a headnote to a chapter in their edited book, not to a book written or edited by

someone else, you will need to adapt to show the information on the book that you used in the Kennedy speech citation. Here are the relevant passages from Chicago 17th ed. (available in full on the Golda Meir Library website) to get you started:

[14: Notes and Bibliography](#)

14.23: Notes and bibliography—examples and variations

[Chapter in an Edited Book](#)

When citing a chapter or similar part of an edited book, include the chapter author; the chapter title, in quotation marks; and the editor. Precede the title of the book with *in*. Note the location of the page range for the chapter in the bibliography entry. See also [14.106–12](#).

1. Glenn Gould, “Streisand as Schwarzkopf,” *in The Glenn Gould Reader*, ed. Tim Page (New York: Vintage Books, 1984), 310.
2. Gould, “Streisand as Schwarzkopf,” 309.

14.110: Introductions, prefaces, afterwords, and the like

[Chapter Contents / Books / Chapters or Other Parts of a Book](#)

If the reference is to a generic title such as *introduction*, *preface*, or *afterword*, that term (lowercased unless following a period) is added before the title of the book. See also [8.179](#).

1. Toni Morrison, foreword to *Song of Solomon* (New York: Vintage International, 2004).

If the author of the introduction or other part is someone other than the main author of a book, that author comes first, and the author of the book follows the title. In a bibliography entry, include the page number range for the part cited, as shown in the second example below.

2. Christopher Hitchens, introduction to *Civilization and Its Discontents*, by Sigmund Freud, trans. and ed. James Strachey (New York: W. W. Norton, 2010).

Oral Analysis 1 (75 points) (4 minutes, max, all-inclusive of explaining any necessary context for the text, highlighting any passages, and analyzing and evaluating the ethicality according to one of the three ethics)

Locate an assignment-appropriate public text presented by a leader. Prepare an oral presentation that systematically analyzes and evaluates this text using ONE AND ONLY ONE of the three process ethics argued by Booth, Johnstone, or Brockriede. *Your focus is strictly on very 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 primarily on explaining how the rhetorical*

choices in your example text support your evaluation of that text's ETHICALITY on your chosen ethic. (Remember ETHICALITY is not necessarily the same as EFFECTIVENESS with an audience or ELOQUENCE, though the three certainly may interact in the same text.) **All of your evidence supporting your evaluation will be from the public text itself.**

Make and, before 3:00 p.m. on February 17, upload to your “Share Tray” in Collaborate Ultra one Powerpoint slide to show as a presenter during class that contains the brief entire text or a representative portion of the text that you are analyzing.

Speaking Manuscript and Text for Oral Analysis 2 (75 points) (3 minutes, max)

DUE TO CANVAS ASSIGNMENTS BEFORE 3:00 P.M. ON MONDAY, MARCH 1: YOUR SPEAKING MANUSCRIPT (YOU WILL NEED IT TO DO AN EFFECTIVE JOB DURING CLASS IN JUST 3 MINUTES) AND A COPY OF YOUR TEXT WITH FULL CHICAGO 17TH ED. ENDNOTE CITATION. SEE THE DETAILS BELOW ON WHAT KIND OF A TEXT YOU NEED. ALSO PUT UP BY MONDAY, MARCH 1 BEFORE 3:00 P.M. A DISCUSSION POST WITH THE FULL CHICAGO 17th ED. CITATION AND ATTACH A COPY OF THE TEXT FOR YOUR CLASSMATES TO CONSULT. THEN, BEFORE 3:00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3: Make and upload to your “Share Tray” in Collaborate Ultra one or two PowerPoint slides showing a textual example 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 aware that the “reveal bullet” function does not operate in Collaborate Ultra, so your entire slide will appear at once.) In your manuscript and presentation of it, **argue exclusively for why one specific locus is DOMINANT in this passage**. **All your supporting evidence will be from the text itself that you are showing us.** Examples of previous students’ speaking manuscripts and texts are on CANVAS. See the rubric for this assignment.

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 they tried to manage meaning for an audience.

Preliminary Final Project Rhetorical Situation Oral Analysis (50 points) (3 minutes max)

Be prepared to describe and justify the three parts of the rhetorical situation that you will use for your final project: rhetorical exigence, rhetorical audience, and constraints. Please be sure these focused and integrated into an internally consistent situation that you could support from the **historical (not textual) evidence**, even though you cannot present all the evidence in this presentation. Keep in mind that the same item cannot be both an exigence and a constraint; you sometimes need to make a judgment that you can defend and pursue consistently. 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. This exercise is intended as a scaffolding and “early warning” opportunity to prepare you for succeeding at your final project. Thus, you may change your final project rhetorical situation choice after this presentation, if you choose.

Completeness of Final Paper Draft Submitted for Peer Review (50 points)

It is only fair to your peer reviewer for you to give them a completed paper (including all proper Chicago 17th ed. endnotes) to review, since they are being graded on their review. It is also most productive for you to give them a completed paper to get the best feedback from them and then me as I respond to their feedback and your paper. Thus, this score is based on relative completeness judged according to the final assignment directions: 50 (All Aspects Complete), 40 (Nearly Complete), 30 (More than Halfway Complete), 20 (Less than Halfway Complete, but beyond Beginning Stages), 10 (Beginning Stages), or 0 points.

Blind Peer Review of Final Paper Draft (125 points)

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 shortly after a Wave deadline for the Completed Final Paper Drafts.

Below is the assignment with the key aspects highlighted and color-coded so that you, as a writer and peer reviewer, can verify that all are present, developed, and sound, and can evaluate the paper's quality, strengths, and weaknesses relative to the requirements and grading criteria. Please use them to thoroughly assess and offer comments on your peer's paper. You should submit to CANVAS Assignments (without your name or other identifying information) two documents: 1) a marked-up copy of the peer's paper with specific comments, corrections, ideas, indications 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 version.

There is a sample of the two documents from a good blind peer review of a previous 772 paper and an additional sample that was not done for 772 on CANVAS under "Blind Peer Review Sample and Materials." Review them with a focus on how the reviewers 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 change to "Critic 1" (or some other name untraceable to you, so no last name/first name/initials/nickname) BEFORE you make ANY comments on the paper. Also, 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 CANVAS under "Blind Peer Review Sample and Materials" or locate on the Internet the most up-to-date support documentation for the word processing program that you are using.

Final Project (325 points, 25 pts “credit/no credit” for presentation, 300 for written paper)

Overview

Research and write a project based on an actual case 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 can best defend it. Then it should propose two good, complete strategies for successfully handling the challenge by securing, through this rhetoric, the needed shared action by the rhetorical audience that will effectively mitigate the exigence. 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. The paper will be 16-19 double-spaced pages, exclusive of endnotes, due on your Wave's assigned date. Each graduate student will present and defend a 10-12-minute (we'll verify that in class as we near presentations) oral version of the essay's central argument on their Wave's assigned date. The oral presentation is worth 25 points, graded credit/no credit. The final written project is worth a maximum of 300 points. See examples of previous students' final projects (sometimes with slightly different page limits or citation style requirements) on CANVAS.

Requirements

1. You may write to either the rhetor him/herself or an aide to that rhetor as *your* audience. You must have an actual, individual, SPECIFIC RHETOR (or a potential, appropriately positioned rhetor whom you can prove has the interest and inclination to be the point person in public for the exigence in question) 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 and the willing rhetor may be from a time past (this option is tricky) or present, but they must be “real” (i.e., historical and documentable). You need to be able to produce evidence that this rhetor already wants the goal and the policy assumed by your project and has indicated willingness to engage in public advocacy on their behalf.

Since you are honorable and have agreed to advise this rhetor, assume that you both desire the same rhetorical audience action, policy, and outcome already, so you don't have to defend the value of the campaign's policy or desired outcome to *your* audience (e.g., if your rhetor is using rhetoric to get people to participate in a policy resulting in significantly cleaner air in Milwaukee, you don't have to defend the value of cleaner air but do demonstrate with evidence about the rhetor that 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 that they face in getting the right rhetorical audience to help them achieve that worthy objective, then offering, developing, and evaluating for them two good, well-thought-out rhetorical courses to meet the situational demands in order to ethically and effectively move the rhetor's rhetorical audience to shared action.

2. VERY IMPORTANT—READ THIS POINT TWICE. 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 a PUBLIC problem 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 that solves 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 them, 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, when judged by a process, not an ends, ethic, 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 (or for a rhetorical critic examining a past text to explain it and offer lessons for future rhetors, but not for THAT rhetor). You want to elaborate on how we got to where we are now *only* to the extent that it is essential for you show in this paper how to make things better on this very exigence for this rhetor from this point forward; remember, the doctor usually does not explain all of how they diagnosed you because the focus is on forward-going program options (and their relative pros and cons) to fix the problem.
4. You must defend, with evidence, the existence of an ACTUAL RHETORICAL AUDIENCE (available to the rhetor) that meets both essential criteria to be 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).
5. Once you have concisely argued and supported 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 argue why each is ethical and likely to be effective in this situation; this request requires you to explicitly detail your standard(s) of judgment (e.g., what is the ethic? What proves sufficient effectiveness in this case?). 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 the rhetorical audience from where things currently stand to them actually cooperating to fix the exigence. So, don't make one option a straw person argument to blow away in the conclusion, and make sure that your two options are each *complete, internally consistent, coherent, explicitly justified* plans of rhetorical action, not just random collections of unrelated tactics or a set of "tips" or partial ideas that might get us only part way to success. Each course of action will require executing multiple rhetorical concepts or tactics working together in an internally consistent way to succeed. You may use rhetorical concepts in addition to those that we learn in this class.

7. In the conclusion, recommend one of your two good rhetorical courses of action as the rhetor's superior option and/or the better one with which to begin, 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 CANVAS before you begin writing. Revisit them often during the writing process.
2. Remember, you are NOT looking for an existing text to analyze, but for a public, rhetorical problem with defensible shared stakes that is *yet to be solved* through your rhetorical leader moving a specific rhetorical audience into shared 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* unless you deal explicitly with how this rhetorical attempt being a second try of a prior approach might complicate or ease things with the particular rhetorical audience (i.e., function as a constraint that the rhetor overcomes or uses).

Suggested Paper Layout

Introduction

The introduction doesn't need to be fancy as you are writing to someone whose goals and policy preferences you have already researched and with which you agree. (Remember, you are not changing their minds about what policy or what goal is best; this is just about the rhetorical approach to advocate for a proposed policy that has already been developed and that your rhetor already embraces. If you would need to change the paper addressee's mind or if they have not shown willingness to be the public spokesperson for this policy, then this is NOT the appropriate rhetor to select for this assignment.) 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, and the as-yet-unrealized policy that is the means to those goals, on which you agree, and explain how the success of your suggestions might be measured. Here you are setting the standard for effectiveness; what will the audience do, specifically, if your recommendations are successful?

Current Rhetorical Situation Analysis and Diagnosis

- Identify and establish with reasoning and evidence the rhetor's rhetorical exigence
 - o 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
 - Capable of being influenced by this rhetor's rhetoric
 - 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)
 - Be careful of confusing constraints and the exigence
 - 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 they are initially, 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 SCHEUDLE**

With the exception of the Lakoff book, which you need to secure access to during the period that we will use it, all readings, videos, and preparation questions/worksheets are on CANVAS. Class will meet through CANVAS using the Collaborate Ultra tool (on the left Navigation Bar in our CANVAS site; please review the instructions prior to our first session). Please be logged in and ready to start each session promptly at 3:30 p.m. Complete the materials assigned for each session (including readings, videos, preparation que) BEFORE 3:00 p.m. on that class date. Submission deadlines for materials that will be graded are specified below.

Complete the Basic Course Information unit on CANVAS before beginning the weekly modules.

Jan. 27 Foundations - Introduction to Rhetorical Leadership

DUE to CANVAS BEFORE 3:00 p.m.: Completed Course Policies Agreement

Cicero. *Ad Herennium*, Book I.i-ii

Cicero. *On the Orator*, Book I.xxxii.144-147

Gouran, Dennis S. “Problematic Constraints on the Successful Exercise of Leadership, Their Negative Impact, Palliative Measures, and Argument as a More Effective Remedy,” 229-33. In *Recovering Argument*, edited by Randall A. Lake. New York: Routledge, 2018.

Roy, Jody M. “The Power of Outreach: Using Communication Research to Help At-Risk Youth.” *Spectra*, March 2011, 2-6.

LaDuke, Winona. “Introduction.” In *Grassroots: A Field Guide for Feminist Activism*, by Jennifer Baumgardner and Amy Richards, xi-xv. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

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

Olson, Kathryn M. “Educating Rhetorical Leaders.” In *Engaging Argument*, edited by Patricia Riley, 532-38. Washington, D.C.: National Communication Association, 2006.

AFTER completing the above readings, view the entire documentary *9500 Liberty* (1 hr., 17 min.) and complete the Viewing Notes Worksheet on CANVAS with respect to specific parts of the video to prepare for effective discussion at our first session. Here is the link: <https://vimeo.com/191337455>

Jan. 29 & Feb. 2 DUE to CANVAS BEFORE 3:00 p.m. each day: Introductions Discussion – Two Posts; see the instructions above under Assignments

Feb. 3

Foundations - Rhetorical Situations and Rhetorical Leadership

Review the final project assignment details, read all of the Sample 772 Final Papers on CANVAS, and make notes on the Discussion Preparation Questions as you read

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1(1), (Winter 1968): 1-14.

Vatz, Richard E. "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 6(3), (Summer 1973): 154-61.

Smircich, Linda, and Gareth Morgan. "Leadership: The Management of Meaning." *Journal of Applied Behavior Science* 18(3), (September 1982): 257-73.

Example:

Nixon, Richard. "The 'Checkers' Speech." In *Contemporary American Voices: Significant Speeches in American History, 1945-Present*, edited by James R. Andrews and David Zarefsky, 241-48. White Plains, NY: Longman, 1992.

Start in earnest to locate and research 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. YOU ARE LOOKING FOR AN UNSOLVED CASE WHERE THE MEASUREMENT OF SUCCESS WOULD BE REASONABLY STRAIGHTFORWARD AND WHERE YOU CAN IDENTIFY A SPECIFIC RHETORICAL LEADER WHOM YOU CAN ETHICALLY AND EFFECTIVELY ADVISE TO FUTURE SUCCESS, NOT A PAST TEXT TO CRITIQUE.

Feb. 10

Foundations - Public Problems and Policy (i.e., Deliberative) Stock Issues

DUE to CANVAS BEFORE 3:00 p.m.: Analysis Paper

Review Next Week's Graded Oral Assignment Directions and Rubric

Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric*, Book I:i-iv.

View: Voiceover Powerpoint explaining the three classical genres (15 min.)

Lasch, Christopher. "The Lost Art of Political Argument." *Utne Reader*, March/April 1991, 72. (Original work published in 1990)

Ziegelmüller, George W., and Jack Kay. *Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy*,

3rd ed., 169-78. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1997.

View: Voiceover Powerpoint explaining the policy stock issues.

Olson, Kathryn M. "The Practical Importance of Inherency Analysis for Public Advocates: Rhetorical Leadership in Framing a Supportive Social Climate for Education Reforms." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 36(2), (May 2008): 219-41.

Feb. 17

Foundations – Rhetorical Ethics in Practice

*** Oral Analysis 1 Due in Class (4 minutes max)**

Booth, Wayne C. "The Rhetorical Stance." In *Contemporary Rhetoric: A Reader's Coursebook*, edited by Douglas Ehninger, 218-24. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1972. (Original work published 1963)

Johnstone, Jr., Henry W. "Toward an Ethics of Rhetoric." *Communication* 6(2), (September 1981): 305-14.

Brockriede, Wayne. "Arguers as Lovers." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 5(1), (Winter, 1972): 1-11.

Feb. 24

Competing Value Hierarchies, *Loci*, and Rhetorical Leadership

Review Next Week's Assignment Directions and Rubric, NOTING THAT YOUR SPEAKING MANUSCRIPT AND TEXT ARE DUE BY MONDAY, BEFORE 3:00 P.M. Complete today's Preparation Chart as you do the below readings to prepare for class.

Perelman, Chaim, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*, translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver, 80-99. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

Cox, J. Robert. "The Die Is Cast: Topical and Ontological Dimensions of the *Locus* of the Irreparable." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68(3), (August 1982): 227-39.

Example:

Nelson, Gaylord. "Statement for The Wilderness Society"

Olson, Kathryn M. "Rethinking *Loci Communes* and Burkean Transcendence: Rhetorical Leadership While Contesting Change in the Takeover Struggle Between AirTran and Midwest Airlines." *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 23(1), (January 2009): 28-60.

****MON., Mar. 1 – DUE to CANVAS BEFORE 3:00 p.m. - Speaking Manuscript (for 3 min., max, Wed. presentation –see good examples of prior manuscripts on CANVAS) and a copy of the text you are analyzing with Full Chicago 17th ed. citation (in endnote style). Please also upload to Discussion a message with the full citation and attach the text for classmates.**

Mar. 3 **Practicing with Loci (Everyone) & Wave 1 Rhetorical Situation Oral Analyses**

***Oral Presentation of Speech Manuscript on Loci Due in Class (3 min., max)**

Wave 1 Preliminary Final Project Rhetorical Situation Oral Analysis (3 minutes max)

Mar. 10 **Framing Situations and Choices I: The Pentad & Wave 2 RS Oral Analyses**

Wave 2 Preliminary Final Project Rhetorical Situation Oral Analysis (3 minutes, max)

Fairhurst, Gail T., and Robert A. Sarr. “Framing: Seizing Leadership Moments in Everyday Conversations.” Chap. 1 in *The Art of Framing: Managing the Language of Leadership*, 1-22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969, xv-xxiii.

Examples:

Read https://www.insider.com/the-murder-of-jamal-khashoggi-2019-10?utm_source=pocket-newtab

“Read the Full Text: Mitt Romney’s Remarks on Impeachment Vote,” transcript, *Politico*, February 5, 2020, accessed February 6, 2020,
<https://www.politico.com/news/2020/02/05/mitt-romney-impeachment-vote-speech-transcript-110849>.

Mar. 17 **Framing Situations and Choices II: Comedy, Tragedy, and Melodrama**

As you read, Use and Complete (with brief characterizations/quotations corresponding page numbers for your ideas/quotations) the Preparation Worksheet (on comparing and contrasting these three frames as you do the readings

Brummett, Barry. “Burkean Comedy and Tragedy, Illustrated in Reactions to the Arrest of John Delorean.” *Central States Speech Journal* 35(4), (Winter 1984): 217-27.

Carlson, A. Cheree. “Gandhi and the Comic Frame: ‘Ad Bellum

Purificandum.”” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 72(4), (November 1986): 446-55.

Olson, Kathryn M. “Rhetorical Leadership and Transferable Lessons for Successful Social Advocacy in Al Gore’s *An Inconvenient Truth*.” *Argumentation and Advocacy* 44(2), (Fall 2007): 90-109.

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

Mar. 24 **SPRING BREAK!!!**

Mar. 31 **Framing Situations and Choices III**

Lakoff, George. *The All New Don’t Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2014.

Reading Directions: 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, pp. B1, B5.

Kraig, Robert, and Erik Kirkstein. “Prevention: The Missing Piece in State Response to Heroin Epidemic,” opinion piece, *[Milwaukee, WI] Journal Sentinel*, April 27, 2016,
<http://archive.jsonline.com/news/opinion/prevention-the-missing-piece-in-state-response-to-heroin-epidemic-b99707575z1-377271001.html>

Apr. 7

Rhetorical Leadership through Metaphors and Condensation Symbols

Ellwood, William N. "Declaring War on the Homefront: Metaphor, Presidents, and the War on Drugs." *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 10(2), (1995): 93-114.

Graber, Doris A. *Verbal Behavior and Politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976, 289-321.

Apr. 14

Rhetorical Leadership in Action

DUE to CANVAS BEFORE 3:00 p.m.: Wave 1 Completed Final Paper Drafts

Complete, PRIOR TO READING FULKERSON, but after you have read all the other material for the week, the Discussion Preparation worksheet entitled “Rhetorical Leadership Aspects of ‘Letter’” on Canvas to make some notes about King’s speech and draw your initial conclusions.

“The White Ministers’ Law and Order Statement, January 16, 1963.” In S. Jonathan Bass, *Blessed Are the Peacemakers: Martin Luther King Jr., Eight White Religious Leaders, and “Letter from Birmingham Jail,”* 233-34. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001.

“The White Ministers’ Good Friday Statement, April 12, 1963.” In S. Jonathan Bass, *Blessed Are the Peacemakers: Martin Luther King Jr., Eight White Religious Leaders, and “Letter from Birmingham Jail,”* 235-36. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001.

Hartwick Classic Leadership Cases. *Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail,”* 1-11. Oneonta, NY: Hartwick Humanities in Management Institute, 1994.

Fulkerson, Richard P. “The Public Letter as a Rhetorical Form: Structure, Logic, and Style in King’s ‘Letter from Birmingham Jail.’” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65(2), (April 1979): 121-36.

Apr. 21

Special Guest Panel of Rhetorical Leaders/RL Educators

DUE to CANVAS BEFORE 3:00 p.m.: Wave 1 Blind Peer Reviews and Wave 2 Completed Final Paper Drafts

Readings: TBD

Guests: UWM RL Alumni Dr. Rachel Davidson, Dr. Josh Miller, Dr. Hilary

Rasmussen, Dr. Tom Salek, and Dr. Jim Vining

Apr. 28

Challenges of/to Public Involvement

DUE to CANVAS BEFORE 3:00 p.m.: Wave 2 Blind Peer Reviews

Putnam, Robert D. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy* 6(1), (January 1995): 65-78.

Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. "Individualism and the Crisis of Civic Membership." *Christian Century* 113, May 8, 1996, 510-15. (Excerpt from the new introduction to a tenth-year anniversary edition of *Habits of the Heart* published by the University of California Press, 1996.)

Eliasoph, Nina. *Avoiding Politics: How Americans Produce Apathy in Everyday Life*, 1-22, 230-68. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hart, Roderick P., and E. Johanna Hartelius. "The Political Sins of Jon Stewart." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 24(3), (August 2007): 263-72.

Baumgardner, Jennifer, and Amy Richards. "Prologue." In their *Grassroots: A Field Guide for Feminist Activism*, xvi-xxv. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

May 5

Final Project Presentations/Papers Due from Wave 1

May 12

Final Project Presentations/Papers Due from Wave 2

****HAVE A WONDERFUL SUMMER!****