

Introduction to Rhetoric : A Course Collaborative

(28322/ENGL 286-01) T/Th, 2:00 pm -3:15 pm
Healy 106

Professor	Matthew Pavesich, PhD mpp44@georgetown.edu	Office & Studio Hours	NN 419 // Tues 3:15 - 5 EthicsLab // Studio time EthicsLab, TBD
Course Fellow	Eamon Johnston ehj9@georgetown.edu		

Texts

- Bang, Molly. *Picture This*.
- Crowley, Sharon and Debra Hawhee. *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*, 5th ed.
- Kennedy, George, ed. *Aristotle's On Rhetoric*, 2nd ed.
- Lanham, Richard. *The Economics of Attention*.
- -- . *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*.
- Other texts shared through Blackboard.

Course Description

This course will introduce students to rhetorical methods and practice in an innovative, studio-based forum. By linking their courses, Matthew Pavesich, faculty in English and Associate Director of the University Writing Program, Maggie Little, Director of the Kennedy Institute of Ethics, and Francis Slakey, Upjohn Lecturer on Physics and Public Policy, will lead students through a semester that combines traditional approaches with design-based methods. Created as an experiment in design itself (pedagogical), these linked courses will offer students the chance to work with each other on authentic problems involving public policy, ethics, science, and rhetoric, and to act as the ancients did: by taking public action on important civic issues.

Assignments will include traditional rhetorical work (written analyses), but also work in a variety of digital formats. Students will produce individual projects and contribute to collaborative projects. No background in rhetoric or design methods required or assumed.

[For a description of the collaborative facet of this course, go [here](#).
See below, for a description of our course-specific assignments.]

Course Commons

Make sure to go [here](#) for our course commons site. This is the major portal for all things Engl 286 and Course Collaborative, including your access to the course material for all three classes.

Grading and Grade Distribution

A (100-93); A- (92-90); B+ (89-87); B (86-83); B- (82-80), C+ (79-77), C (76-73), C- (72-70), and so on.

Course Collaborative Projects (40%), Commonplace Book and Analyses (20%), Tuesday Response/s (10%), Thursday Contribution/s (10%), Participation (10%), Interdisciplinary Collaboration (10%)

Attendance

I don't like having an attendance policy, but because this course takes an experimental approach that absolutely depends on your presence, attendance is mandatory. If something serious/extreme comes up, please come to talk to me (beforehand not afterwards), but otherwise know that missing meetings will affect your grade.

Academic Integrity

Plagiarism is an act of the hopeful and the hopeless--please talk to me if you're struggling in class enough that you find yourself considering plagiarism. No matter what we're often told, however, plagiarism rarely represents a black and white reality; muddying these waters is the fact that navigating the expectations of a community you are new to can be difficult. See me if you have any doubts about what constitutes appropriate writing and citation in my class.

Academic integrity at Georgetown is defined by the Georgetown Honor System, which you can view at <http://gervaseprograms.georgetown.edu/honor/system>.

p.s., our assignments are weird enough that I doubt people could plagiarize in this class even if they wanted to. Which you don't, of course. :)

Our Assignments

Because I want to be mindful of the amount of work that will emerge from our course collaborative, I'm going easy on the reading/writing I assign for our group alone. I hope you'll come to see our meetings as lively, rigorous, free-wheeling sessions that provide value on their terms but that also contribute to your studio work.

Course Collaborative Project/s -- 40%

See a description of this work [here](#).

Technical Tuesdays Samples -- 10%

Tuesdays' readings will generally be less theoretical and more pragmatic than Thursdays'; these are chosen to help us think about the actual tools of rhetoric. To help us ground our technical considerations, one of you will find for each Tuesday meeting a rhetorical artifact of some sort. We will consider these in the context of the day's reading in terms of both critique and translation. This might be a speech, a comic strip, a video, a pamphlet, a website, a uniform,

etc. Be creative in your selection, but also try to find something that connects to the reading for the day. Please email the document or a link to view to Eamon by Monday at noon so he can post it to the course site.

Big Idea Thursday Responses -- 10%

Each of you will write a 1-page response to the readings for one Thursday. This is your basic reading response. Make sure to specifically cite a point of interest from one of the readings (this is more important than trying to summarize everything). Furthermore, ask a genuine question about this point of interest, and relate it to our class conversations. Feel free to ask questions that support and take further the arguments of a text, or ones that reverse and/or confront the terms of the text (think: dissoi logoi). Each week's writer/s will email their text to Eamon by Wednesday at noon so he can post it to the course site. I expect that everyone will read these before class.

Commonplace Book and Analyses -- 20%

Throughout the semester, you will keep a commonplace book. Read about this age-old practice and your assignment [here](#). You will make weekly entries into your commonplace book, pulling material from our work in class and studio, from your group work with the collaborative, from your other classes, from your tv watching and music listening, from the news, etc. The idea is that this sort of attention paid, helps you to synthesize the material from class and to think rhetorically. At the end of the semester, you will produce two analyses of the materials you've collected. Both will characterize what you see when you look back (analyze trends, discover interests you didn't see until they'd already developed, etc.). One will be written (5 pages) and one will be visual (digital or not). I'm intentionally leaving a wide range of choices here; let's talk together about what forms your analyses might most productively take. The idea is that their form will emerge from your analysis itself, rather than the other way around. I recommend keeping the commonplace book in Google Docs (for easy sharing), and the submission for your analyses will depend upon their form.

Participation -- 10%

Because this class embraces an experimental pedagogical design, as is no doubt clear by now, I have to lean on all of you for a unique kind of class participation -- that of both a general DIY ethos and a kairotic sensibility. We need to work together, be willing to tinker, take the initiative on our own, and be okay with not knowing exactly how everything will turn out.

Because digital media platforms and software change so fast, and because much of our work will happen in these media, providing you with step-by-step instructions on how to use a particular program is a futile process. While I will provide guidance and resources, it is ultimately your responsibility to learn the digital practices (via tutorials and exercises) needed to complete your projects. Much of this intensive learning will take place in studio, but you'll never be on your own: you'll have your team members and cohort members, of course, but I'll be there too as will experts of other sorts. Know that I'm in this with you!

I'm assigning a larger than normal percentage of your grade to participation, and I intend to grade this generously in exchange for your willingness to help me make this experiment work. Thanks in advance; I think we can do great things together.

Interdisciplinary Collaboration in Studio -- 10%

This last element of your grade will emerge from my conversations with the other faculty of the collaborative, including Profs Little and Slakey and our design faculty Arjun Dhillon and Nico Staple. We will have a more robust description of this element shortly.

Our Schedule

Week	Technical Tuesday	Big Ideas Thursday
1 Jan 8		Intros (a time you were persuasive). Use Cs posters to examine an artifact or two. Then, consider translation for another context. Look at Mark Antony's speech and Stanley Fish's list in DWCN. Syllabus, general chit-chat. Make sure to sign people up for T/Th assignments. Also, direct students to course site for cohort schedule survey.
2 Jan 13 & 15	Grabill ("The Work of Rhetoric") and Brown ("Louis C.K.")	Rice ("Rhetoric's Mechanics")
3 Jan 20 & 22	<i>Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students</i> : Chapter 1 (p. 1 - 25) Small groups -- your teams and potential topics -- and your roles	Kennedy's introduction and Frankfurt
4 Jan 27 & 29	<i>Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students</i> : Chapter 2 (p. 37 - 51) Crit prep	Aristotle's <i>Rhetoric</i> , Book I
5 Feb 3 & 5	Aristotle's <i>Rhetoric</i> , Book II [This week is the first juried crit.]	No meeting: instead email me a one-page reflection on the juried crits. See further instructions on the course website.
6 Feb 10 & 12	Ira Glass on story and the storyboarding bits? Pry Novella (touch screen only) Crit reflection	Cintron: unfixing as a persuasive strategy
7 Feb 17 & 19	<i>Picture This</i>	Dickinson ("Joe's Rhetoric" and "Old Pasadena") Include youarehere.cc

8 Feb 24 & 26	Connors (“Actio”) plus NYTimes on Baskerville and Dan Gilbert’s open letter Clip from “Helvetica”	Lanham, 1
9 Mar 3 & 5	SRM on D Brand // Lanham’s <i>Handlist</i>	Lanham, 2
Spring Break		
10 Mar 17 & 19	9 Essential Principles of Good Web Design // Color on the Web	Lanham, 3
11 Mar 24 & 26	On Audio // Setting Pace in Video Provoke! This American Life’s Mapping episode, soundscape chapter	Lanham, 4 Also: https:// blogs.commonsgorgetown.edu/ innatureswake/
12 Mar 31	Lanham, 5	No Class :: Easter Break
13 Apr 7 & 9	Studio/Tools	Lanham, 6
14 Apr 14 & 16	Studio/Tools	Lanham, 7
15 Apr 21 & 23	Studio/Tools	Lanham, 8
Exams begin May 1.	[Final juried crits and public showcase. Dates/times TBD.]	