Washington State University

MAJOR CURRICULAR CHANGE FORM - NEW/RESTORE COURSE

☐ Please attach rationale for your request, a complete syllabus, and explain how this impacts other units in Pullman and other campuses (if applicable).

☐ Obtain all required signatures with dates.

☐ Provide original stapled packet of signed form/rationale statement/syllabus PLUS 10 stapled copies of complete packet to the Registrar's Office, campus mail code 1035.

☐ Submit one electronic copy of complete packet to wsu.curriculum@wsu.edu.

Requested Future Effective Date: **Spring, 2015** (term/year) Course Typically Offered: **Spring, annually**

DEADLINES: For fall term effective date: October 1st; for spring or summer term effective date: March 1st. See instructions.

NOTE: Items received after deadlines may be put to the back of the line or forwarded to the following year. Please submit on time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Course</th>
<th>Temporary Course</th>
<th>Restore Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLP</th>
<th>597</th>
<th>Writing and Rhetoric for Scientists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
<td></td>
<td>title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate standing</th>
<th>prerequisite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Credit hrs**: 3
- **Lecture hrs per week**: 2
- **Lab or studio hrs per week**: 0

Description for catalog: The role of academic authorship in science; writing and rhetorical skills for producing manuscripts for scientific journals and/or a dissertation; rhetorical analysis and review of manuscripts.

**Additional Attributes: Check all that apply.**

- ☐ Crosslisting (between WSU departments)*
- ☐ Conjoint listing (400/500):
- ☐ Repeat credit (cum. max. hrs):

- ☐ Variable credit: ____________
- ☐ Other (please list request): ____________

Special Grading: ☐ S, F; ☐ A, S, F (PEACT only); ☐ S, M, F (VET MED only); ☐ H, S, F (PHARMACY, PHARDSCI only)

- ☐ Cooperative with UI
- ☐ Other (please list request): ____________

The following items require prior submission to other committees/depts. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS.)

- ☐ Request to meet Writing in the Major [M] requirement (Must have All-University Writing Committee Approval.)
- ☐ Request to meet UCORE in ____________ (Must have UCORE Committee Approval >> See instructions.)
- ☐ Special Course Fee ____________ (Must submit request to University Receivables.)

**Contact:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean Glawe</th>
<th>Phone number: (509) 335-0619</th>
<th>Campus mail code: 6430</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:glawe@wsu.edu">glawe@wsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor, if different:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chair/date**: 9/26/14

**Dean/date**: 9/26/14

**All-University Writing Com Date**:

**Chair (if crosslisted/interdisciplinary)***

**Dean (if crosslisted/interdisciplinary)***

**UCORE Committee Approval Date**

**Catalog Subcommittee Approval Date**

**GSC or AAC Approval Date**

**Faculty Senate Approval Date**

*If the proposed change impacts or involves collaboration with other units, use the additional signature lines provided for each impacted unit and college.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 26, 2014

FROM: Dean Glawe, Professor, Department of Plant Pathology
Lisa Johnson-Shull, Writing Center Coordinator
Victor Villanueva, Regents Professor and Director of the Writing Program

SUBJECT: Rationale for new course “PLP 597 Writing and Rhetoric for Scientists”

We propose to initiate a new course named “Writing and Rhetoric for Scientists,” listed as PLP PLP 597. It will be a 3-credit course, with two hours of lecture and one two-hour studio per week. It will be taught in Pullman. It is designed to be an elective course for graduate students in the sciences at WSU. It will incorporate lectures and writing studio work aimed at preparing graduate students to prepare manuscripts for submission to scientific journals, as well as to prepare them to serve as effective peer-reviewers, and will also help prepare them to write a thesis or dissertation. The course is supported by Dr. Scott Hulbert, Chair of the Department of Plant Pathology. Rationale for the new course follows, in format used in CAHNRS.

1. Justification of how the proposed course or degree program aligns with the intentions of the academic program for the department in which it is housed, and how it aligns with the strategic plan for CAHNRS.

The course aligns with the following goal of the CAHNRS strategic plan:

“Goal 4
Provide world-class graduate student education and training that includes strong research experiences and enhanced disciplinary and multidisciplinary skills.”

There is no other course at WSU that duplicates the goals or content of the course we propose. It will provide graduate students with unique and much-needed support for developing as writers and in making the transition from being students to becoming professionals. By drawing students from across the sciences, it will foster interactions and collaborations among students representing diverse disciplines. The course is also consistent with the Department of Plant Pathology’s efforts to increase its impact in graduate education.

2. A management plan, including name of the program manager, must be provided for degree programs. Not Applicable

3. Course delivery schedule: Identify who will teach the course, how often the course be offered and what delivery cycle (semester, odd year/even year) the course will be offered
in. PLP 597 will be alternate spring semesters starting in 2015. Dr. Dean Glawe is the instructor. Facilitators from the Writing Program will lead the writing studios.

4. **A marketing plan for the course/program, including target audience, programs of study it will support, expected student numbers, and methods of advertising the course must be provided.** The course is designed to be relevant to students in a wide range of majors representing the agricultural, biological, and physical sciences. Based on information available to the Writing Program, we believe that the course enrollment will be 300-400 students each time it is offered. We propose to teach it as a smaller class, involving 38 students, for the first time during spring semester 2015, and to scale it for larger enrollments following the first offering. Advertising will include sending information to Major Professors in the sciences, by publicizing it at the Writing Center, and by flyers. Information about the course will also be provided on the websites of the Writing Center and the Department of Plant Pathology.

5. **Will the new course/program require redeployment of existing resources? If so, what will be the impact on existing courses and/or programs, teaching loads, research productivity, and service and outreach?** Teaching loads in the Department of Plant Pathology are under continuous review and adjustment; the current teaching FTE assignment to the Department should be adequate for this course to be offered. Writing studio facilitators will be provided by the Writing Center.

6. **Describe the funding model for the course if an instructor on permanent budget is not assigned to the course.** Addressed in item 6.
PL P 597: \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Writing and Rhetoric for Scientists}
3 credits
Lecture: [MW 1:10-2:00 PM, Johnson Hall 343]
Writing studio: [F 1:10-3:00 PM, Johnson Hall 343]

\textbf{Instructor:} \hspace{1cm} Dr. Dean Gliwe
Johnson Hall 351
509-335-0619 (gliwe@wsu.edu)

\textbf{Writing Center Coordinator:} \hspace{1cm} Ms. Lisa Johnson-Shull
Smith CUE 303
509-335-7695 (lisaj@wsu.edu)

\textbf{Office Hours:} \hspace{1cm} M-F, 11:00 AM-12:00 PM

\textbf{Catalogue Description of course:}
The role of academic authorship in science; writing and rhetorical skills for producing manuscripts for scientific journals and/or a dissertation; rhetorical analysis and review of manuscripts.

\textbf{Prerequisite:}
Graduate standing.

\textbf{Required Texts:}
(Available from Amazon.com)

\textbf{Recommended Text:}
(Available from Amazon.com)

\textbf{Other Readings:}

Objectives:
The course addresses issues fundamental to the professional development of scientists, including: the centrality of publication to the scientific method; strategies for doing research and preparing manuscripts for publication in scientific journals; the rhetorical basis for preparing persuasive narratives; the craft and professional obligations of manuscript reviewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Course Topics/Dates</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outcome: This outcome will be evaluated primarily by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the end of this course, students will:</td>
<td>The following topic(s)/dates(s) will address this outcome:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appreciate and understand the centrality of publication to the scientific method.</td>
<td>All sessions</td>
<td>Graded writing assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use effective strategies for preparing manuscripts for publication in scientific journals.</td>
<td>All sessions</td>
<td>Graded writing assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Construct effective arguments based on an understanding of published literature and their own research findings.</td>
<td>All sessions</td>
<td>Graded writing assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Review scientific manuscripts submitted to journals in a professional manner</td>
<td>All sessions</td>
<td>Graded writing assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods of Instruction: Lecture and writing studio

Grading
Course outcomes will be assessed by performance on short writing assignment, two rhetorical analyses of published papers, preparation of a journal manuscript, and a final portfolio. There will be no final examination given in this course. No late assignments are accepted except in the case of a documented emergency, a documented university sponsored event or a documented observance of a religious holiday. Attending lectures and studios is expected but not required. Students should note that short writing assignments are made, and collected, during each class meeting; absent students will not be able to complete such assignments (and thus will not be able to accumulate points from these assignments that will be used to compute final grades).
Points used in assigning grades are awarded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short writing assignments (30 @ 5 points each)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical analyses (2 @100 points each)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal manuscript (1 @ 300 points)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio (1 @150 points)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total points possible</strong></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Grade</th>
<th>% Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&gt;93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90.0 – 92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87.0 – 89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>83.0 – 86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80.0 – 82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77.0 – 79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>73.0 – 76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70.0 – 72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>67.0 – 69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60.0 – 66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt;59.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Incompletes** will be granted only under unusual circumstances, and only if 500 of the possible 800 course points have been earned.

**Academic Integrity**
WSU expects all students to behave in a manner consistent with its high standards of scholarship and conduct. Students are expected to uphold these standards both on and off campus and acknowledge the university's authority to take disciplinary action. The purpose of these standards and processes is to educate students and protect the welfare of the community. The standards of Conduct for Students can be found at [http://conduct.wsu.edu](http://conduct.wsu.edu). University instructors have the authority to intervene in all situations where students are suspected of academic dishonesty. In such instances, responsible instructors retain the authority to assign grades to students considering, from an academic standpoint, the nature of the student action. More information regarding responding to academic integrity violations can be found at: [http://academicintegrity.wsu.edu/](http://academicintegrity.wsu.edu/). Feel free to contact the Office of Student Standards and Accountability (335-4532) if you would like more specific information about the process.

**WSU Safety Statement**
Washington State University is committed to maintaining a safe environment for its faculty, staff, and students. Safety is the responsibility of every member of the campus community and individuals should know the appropriate actions to take when an emergency arises. In support
of our commitment to the safety of the campus community the University has developed a Campus Safety Plan, http://safetyplan.wsu.edu. It is highly recommended that you visit this web site as well as the University emergency management web site at http://oem.wsu.edu/ to become familiar with the information provided.

Students with Disabilities:
Reasonable accommodations are available for students with a documented disability. If you have a disability and need accommodations to fully participate in this class, please either visit or call the Access Center (Washington Building 217; 509-335-3417) to schedule an appointment with an Access Advisor. All accommodations MUST be approved through the Access Center.

Tentative Topic Outline
Class will meet twice each week for one-hour lectures in addition to a two-hour writing studio. The dates of class coverage of specific topics are subject to change. The instructors will keep you apprised of such changes if they are made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Lecture 1</th>
<th>Lecture 2</th>
<th>Studio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introductions; aims and methods of the course; some basic ideas about</td>
<td>Genres of scientific writing; the journal article; continued discussion of rhetoric and writing</td>
<td>Orientation to the role of the writing studio in the course; some basic writing exercises and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>writing, rhetoric, and the art of persuasion in science</td>
<td>in the development of science</td>
<td>experience in reviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discussion of the rhetorical triangle, stasis theory, and how these</td>
<td>Rhetorical choices that broaden audiences and increase impact of scientific papers</td>
<td>Writing exercises focused on developing clear, persuasive narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concepts translate to developing persuasive narratives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continued discussion of narrative development and rhetoric</td>
<td>Conventions used to organize scientific papers; rhetorical analysis</td>
<td>Begin Exercise 2.2 in Schimel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rhetorical analysis continued. [Writing Project 1: Rhetorical Analysis</td>
<td>Rhetorical analysis continued; examples drawn from some notable scientific papers</td>
<td>Discussion and exercises related to writing project 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of a Scientific Text discussed and assigned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How to read Latour; socially-situated research writing</td>
<td>Socially-situated research writing continued. Discussion of exercises from Schimel.</td>
<td>Discussion of writing project 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Scientific journals: a brief history and future trends</td>
<td>Journal articles: origins, purposes, and styles</td>
<td>Discussion and critiques of writing project 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Writing Project 1 due; the modern research article reconsidered; parts,</td>
<td>From abstracts to review articles; [Writing Project 2: Rhetorical Analysis of a Scientific</td>
<td>Discussion and critiques of writing project 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conventions, and purposes</td>
<td>Text assigned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Creating research questions and methodological strategies</td>
<td>Creating research questions and methodological strategies (continued); introduction to journal article writing assignment</td>
<td>Discussion of writing project 2; review of data and supporting information (provided by major professor) for journal article writing assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Writing Project 2 due; Working with Visuals—Visuals as Rhetoric; Visuals as Writing: graphs, illustrations, figures</td>
<td>Working with Visuals—Visuals as Rhetoric; Visuals as Writing: graphs, illustrations, figures (continued)</td>
<td>Discussion and critiques of writing project 2; Writing workshop—the Materials and Methods section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Journal articles: the results section</td>
<td>Journal articles: the discussion section</td>
<td>Writing workshop—the Results section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Journal articles: the introduction</td>
<td>Abstracts for journal articles, presentations, and posters</td>
<td>Writing workshop—the Discussion section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Authorship—where ethics, money, and credit (can, if you’re not careful) collide</td>
<td>Journal policies—instructions to authors, scope of papers accepted, review processes</td>
<td>Writing workshop—the Introduction and abstract section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Peer review—from the reviewer’s point of view</td>
<td>Peer review—from the author’s point of view</td>
<td>Journal article due; instructions to peer reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Posters—the newest genre</td>
<td>Scientific writing and electronic media</td>
<td>Peer review practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>How to write a lot (your career will depend on it)</td>
<td>Writing and strategies for career management</td>
<td>Reviewing your reviews; portfolios due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading List
Students should complete the readings listed below BEFORE class meeting as lectures will explore information from these readings.

Week 1
Introductions
Have read before the next class session the preface to *Writing Science* and to *The Rhetoric of Science*. What does each suggest about the other—how is writing rhetorical or vice-versa.

Week 2
Rhetoric and Rhetorical Analysis
Have read Chapter 1 of Gross for this week and Chapters 1 & 2 of Schimel
Discussion on rhetorical triangle, stasis theory, and how these translate to storytelling.
Read

Week 3
Discussion on Halloran and on Moore as story, rhetoric, analysis. Bring Exercise 2.1 in Schimel to class. Begin all of Exercise 2.2 in Schimel (Note: Step 3 of Exercise 2.2 to be conducted in the Writing Center)

Week 4
Writing Project #1 assigned. Project #1 can use one of the articles chosen for Schimel’s Exercise 2.1. Continued discussion.
Read Schimel Chapters 3 and 4

Week 5

Week 6
Workshop Project #1 paper.

Week 7
Writing Project #1 due. Writing Project #2 assigned.

Week 8
Workshop creating research questions and methodological strategies

Week 9
Writing Project #2 due. Working with Visuals—Visuals as Rhetoric; Visuals as Writing: graphs, illustrations, and figures.

Week 10
Journal articles, results and discussions sections. Finish reading Schimel.
Week 11
Journal articles, the introduction. Abstracts and their uses. Data coding as Rhetoric; Data coding as Writing, i.e., Data do not speak for themselves.

Week 12
Issues surrounding authorship. Policies and practices of scientific journals.

Week 13
Peer review; differing roles and responsibilities of reviewers and authors.

Week 14
Authoring posters; electronic media and scientific publication.

Week 15
Strategies for managing your writing and developing your career.

Assignments
Writing Projects 1 and 2: Rhetorical Analysis of a Scientific Text
Papers: Writing Project 1, due week 7; writing project 2, due week 9.
Length (each): 6-8 double-spaced pages.

Purpose
Analyze a professional scientific text using one of the rhetorical theories discussed in class and taking into consideration the concept of storytelling. You may use Aristotle's framework (e.g., logos, ethos, pathos) as described by Gross or the framework described in Schimel's, Writing Science. Halloran's essay is a good model for this assignment. You may apply your analysis to the text as well as the graphical elements of your sample.

Your Method
Start by choosing a sample professional scientific text of some kind. The sample may be a research article, a poster, grant, or any other form of professional writing (that means, no student papers for this project). You may start by using one of the samples you or your found in Exercise 2 of Schimel.

Read the text carefully. If your sample is long, you will want to focus on just one small portion of that text.

Using no more than 4 rhetorical concepts, go through the text, looking for and listing all examples of each concept. For instance, if you were looking for ethos, you would make a list of all the places where you think the authors are positioning their ethos in the text.

Then classify each of those "moves"—e.g., moves to enhance ethos vs. places where ethos seems irrelevant.
The next step is for you to decide/discover the impact that unit has on the meaning and effect or affect of the whole text. Consider why you think the writers thought it was necessary to make such moves in their writing. Consider what effect those moves might have on the reader.

*How that Translates into a Paper*

- A good approach is to start your paper by framing your analysis around a research question: what did you set out to do and why?
- Then offer a brief explanation of the article. Who are the authors? Where was it published? Which discipline?
- Follow this brief explanation with an audience analysis: Who are the intended readers? On what evidence can you make that claim? Is that audience a receptive or hostile audience? How do you know?
- Then provide a summary or paraphrase of the article. What is its thesis and what are its major claims made?
- Then lead readers through your analysis. Develop your argument about the rhetorical moves that the writer is making in your sample. Explain those moves as well as suggesting what effect or affect those moves might have on readers. Make sure that you link your discussion to specific quotes from your sample.
- After offering your analysis, evaluate the author's overall argument and explain your critique.
- Finally, turn your analytical skills on your own analysis. What does it provide or explain? What does it lack or not explain? What other possibilities might there be to analyze your article?

Each of these two papers will be graded using the following rubric.

1. **Introduction** (10 points maximum)
   - Low score: Issue is not clear nor described adequately.
   - High score: Issue is clear and comprehensively described.

2. **Presentation of analysis** (25 points maximum)
   - Low score: Evidence from irrelevant sources and is not organized or unrelated to issue.
   - High score: Synthesis of in-depth and relevant information; information organized to reveal insightful trends or patterns related to issue.

3. **Logic, clarity, and conciseness of ideas** (25 points maximum)
   - Low score: Writing difficult to follow with unclear arguments that are not well developed or verbose.
   - High score: Writing easy to follow and understand; arguments clearly and succinctly developed.

4. **Conclusions** (30 points maximum)
   - Low score: Ambiguous, illogical, or unsupported conclusions.
   - High score: Conclusions are logical and in-depth extrapolations from findings.

5. **Mechanics and grammar** (10 points maximum)
   - Low score: Sentences and paragraphs are difficult to read and understand due to poor mechanics or grammar; number of words greatly exceeded specified assignment length.
• High score: The article does not contain obvious grammatical or mechanical errors; paper of specified length.

Short Writing Assignments

These short writing projects will be assigned and collected during each lecture period, and will consist of paragraph-long writing assignments dealing with topics relevant to that day’s lecture. Points will be awarded on each assignment according to the following rubric:

• Assignment includes correct information that is well-presented, grammatically correct and stylistically effective: 5 points
• Assignment is lacking in one or more aspects of content, grammar, or style: 3 points
• Assignment is incomplete or substantially lacking in content, grammar or style: 1 point
• No assignment turned in: 0 points

Portfolio and Portfolio Review

This project will be due at your final conference with your instructor and the writing center coordinator. Length: 500-750 words (2-3 pages double-spaced.)

At the end of the semester, you will assemble all your materials from this course into a portfolio. Assemble your notes, in-class writings, and papers into an organized folio of your work (please put in some folder and make sure the pages are not loose). Include a cover letter in which you review those materials: What can you say about how your understanding of writing and rhetoric in the sciences has changed over the semester? What questions have arisen that do not seem satisfactorily addressed? How can rhetoric (if at all) contribute to a better understanding of science? What does it miss? What else would you like to know or study? What does all of this make you thing about writing in the sciences? You are also welcome to discuss the class itself: how the class activities and projects contributed to your understanding or rhetoric and writing in and for the sciences.

The assignment will be assessed according to the following rubric:
1. Logic, clarity, completeness and conciseness of ideas (50 points maximum)
   • Low score: Writing difficult to follow with unclear arguments that are not well developed or verbose.
   • High score: Writing easy to follow and understand; arguments clearly and succinctly developed.

2. Conclusions (50 points maximum)
   • Low score: Ambiguous, illogical, or unsupportable conclusions.
   • High score: Conclusions are logical and supported clearly by presented information.

3. Mechanics and grammar (50 points maximum)
   • Low score: Sentences and paragraphs are difficult to read and understand due to poor mechanics or grammar; number of words greatly exceeded specified assignment length.
   • High score: Paper is easily understood; grammar is correct; paper is of specified length.
Journal Article Manuscript

This assignment will consist of a manuscript that is suitable for submission to a scientific journal representative of the student’s discipline. Journals that do not employ peer review, or that are published for lay instead of scientific audiences are not acceptable for the assignment. Each student should select the journal they choose, and receive approval for using this journal, by the end of the third week of the course. The manuscript must be prepared for this class—it cannot be an existing manuscript “recycled” for this course. The manuscript will be based on original data generated by the student, or on data provided by the student’s major professor.

The assignment must be accompanied by the “Instructions to Authors” and information describing the scope and audience of the journal. If this information is not provided with the paper, the assignment will receive 0 (zero) points at grading.

The assignment will be graded using the following rubric.

The manuscript follows all requirements specified in the journal’s Instructions to Authors; this will include things such as: division of the manuscript into sections appropriate to the journal; conventions of grammar and spelling; presentation of figures and data; abbreviations; margins and fonts; and any other requirements found in the Instructions to Authors. A total of 300 points are possible on the assignment.

1. Explanation of issue, problem, or research hypothesis (60 points maximum)
   • Low score: issue, problem, or research hypothesis is not clear nor described adequately.
   • High score: issue, problem, or research hypothesis is clear and adequately described.

2. Description of materials, methods, and results (60 points maximum)
   • Low score: Information is poorly organized, is not presented properly, or is unrelated to the presentation.
   • High score: Information is well-organized and easily understood, is presented properly, and is relevant to the purpose of the paper.

3. Logic, clarity, and conciseness of discussion of results (100 points maximum)
   • Low score: Writing is difficult to follow with unclear arguments that are not well developed, or incompletely made, or verbose.
   • High score: Writing is easy to follow and understand; arguments are made clearly and succinctly.

4. Mechanics and grammar (60 points maximum)
   • Low score: journal’s “instructions to authors” not followed; sentences and paragraphs are difficult to read and understand due to poor grammar or other issues.
   • High score: all of journal’s “instructions to authors” followed; proper grammar is used.

5. References/citations (20 points maximum)
   • Low score: Fewer than ten (10) references from refereed journals, citations in text or references do not follow proscribed format.
   • High score: Minimum of ten (10) references from refereed journals, citations in text or references do not follow proscribed format.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 26, 2014

TO: Kimberlee Kidwell, Associate Dean, Academic Programs

FROM: Dean Glawe, Professor, Department of Plant Pathology
       Lisa Johnson-Shull, Writing Center Coordinator
       Victor Villanueva, Regents Professor and Director of the Writing Program

SUBJECT: PLP 597 Writing and Rhetoric for Scientists Course Request

We propose to initiate a new course named “Writing and Rhetoric for Scientists,” listed as PLP PLP 597. It will be a 3-credit course, with two hours of lecture and one two-hour studio per week. It will be taught in Pullman. It is designed to be an elective course for graduate students in the sciences at WSU. It will incorporate lectures and writing studio work aimed at preparing graduate students to prepare manuscripts for submission to scientific journals, as well as to prepare them to serve as effective peer-reviewers, and will also help prepare them to write a thesis or dissertation. The course is supported by Dr. Scott Hulbert.

Requirements for New Course/Major Program Adjustment Requests

1. Syllabus for the proposed course. Attached

2. Justification of how the proposed course or degree program aligns with the intentions of the academic program for the department in which it is housed, and how it aligns with the strategic plan for CAHNRS.

   The course aligns with the following goal of the CAHNRS strategic plan:

   “Goal 4
   Provide world-class graduate student education and training that includes strong research experiences and enhanced disciplinary and multidisciplinary skills.”

   There is no other course at WSU that duplicates the goals or content of the course we propose. It will provide graduate students with unique and much-needed support for developing as writers and in making the transition from being students to becoming professionals. By drawing students from across the sciences, it will foster interactions and collaborations among students representing diverse disciplines. The course is also consistent with the Department of Plant Pathology’s efforts to increase its impact in graduate education.
3. A management plan, including name of the program manager, must be provided for degree programs. Not Applicable

4. Course delivery schedule: Identify who will teach the course, how often the course be offered and what delivery cycle (semester, odd year/even year) the course will be offered in. PLP 597 will be alternate spring semesters starting in 2015. Dr. Dean Glawe is the instructor. Facilitators from the Writing Program will lead the writing studios.

5. A marketing plan for the course/program, including target audience, programs of study it will support, expected student numbers, and methods of advertising the course must be provided. The course is designed to be relevant to students in a wide range of majors representing the agricultural, biological, and physical sciences. Based on information available to the Writing Program, we believe that the course enrollment will be 300-400 students each time it is offered. We propose to teach it as a smaller class, involving 38 students, for the first time during spring semester 2015, and to scale it for larger enrollments following the first offering. Advertising will include sending information to Major Professors in the sciences, by publicizing it at the Writing Center, and by flyers. Information about the course will also be provided on the websites of the Writing Center and the Department of plant Pathology.

6. Will the new course/program require redeployment of existing resources? If so, what will be the impact on existing courses and/or programs, teaching loads, research productivity, and service and outreach? Teaching loads in the Department of Plant Pathology are under continuous review and adjustment; the current teaching FTE assignment to the Department should be adequate for this course to be offered. Writing studio facilitators will be provided by the Writing Center.

7. Describe the funding model for the course if an instructor on permanent budget is not assigned to the course. Addressed in item 6.