

CHAMINADE UNIVERSITY OF HONOLULU
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES & FINE ARTS
DIVISION OF ACCELERATED PROGRAMS
Course Outline and Syllabus

EN101²⁰ Intro. Expos. Writing
Semesters 10E q
Location:
Instructor: Robert A. Rogers
H#: 524-3012

REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS:

1. Writing with a Thesis (Seventh Edition), Skwire and Skwire
2. The Holt Handbook (Fourth Edition), Kirsznier and Mandrell
3. Any standard dictionary, desk size or larger, for reference

MEETING/DATE MATERIALS TO BE COVERED

ASSIGNMENT FOR NEXT CLASS MEETING

- | | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| 1, T-1/12: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course Introduction. 2. Reading: "Even on Death Row, Good Writing Is a Plus" 3. CUH General Catalog (p. 49)1 "Academic Honesty," "Plagiarism" and "Attendance" 4. In-class writing sample. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overview of the texts. 2. <u>Writing</u>, v-vi, 1-16, 23-33, 103-05. 3. Holt, 2-9, 99-106. |
| 2, Th-1/14: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Practical applications of the persuasive principle. 2. Importance of details and specific examples. 3. Discussion: "What Is Intelligence, Anyway?" and "Darkness at Noon" | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Writing</u>, 63-68, 72-78, 92-96. 2. Holt, 9-22; AI-A6, G1-G19. 3. Description Paper topic selecti n. 4. Handout: Sample Description Pap r. |
| 3, T-1/19: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Description Paper writing technique. 2. Holt: "Planning an Essay," intros and conclusions. 3. In-class writing: Thesis statement approval and topic sentence outline for Description Paper. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Writing</u>, 136-37, 172, 239-41. 2. Holt, 25-36, 64-65, 539 (#33C), 698-99, A10-A20, G20-G34. 3. Rough draft for Description Pap r. |
| 4, Th-1/21: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proofreading techniques for quality control. 2. Appropriate format and vocabulary for final copy. 3. Discussion: "Be Scared for Your Kids" and "Hush, Timmy--This Is Like a Church" 4. In-class writing: Description Paper revised rough draf t. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DESCRIPTION PAPER. 2. <u>Writing</u>, 247-55. |
| 5, T-1/26: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appreciative reading of Description Papers. 2. Definition Paper writing technique. 3. Discussions "Growing Up" and "The Workaholic" 4. Holt: "Shaping Your Material." | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Writing</u>, 258-61. 2. Holt, 41-69. 3. Prepared Definition Paper thesis statement. |
| 6, Th-1/28: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussions "The Handicap of Definition" 2. Holt: "Writing and Revising" 3. In-class writings Definition Paper thesis statement approval and topic sentence outline. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Writing</u>, 215-20, 222-25, 241-46. 2. Definition Paper rough draft. 3. Handouts Sample Definition Pape |
| 7, T-2/2: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student critique of Description Papers. 2. Classification Paper writing technique. 03 and #4: Continued on next page.) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DEFINITION PAPER. 2. <u>Writing</u>, 226-34, 241-43. |

MEETING/DATE	MATERIALS TO BE COVERED	ASSIGNMENT FOR NEXT CLASS MEETING
	3. Discussion: "How Fit Are You?" and "Three Kinds of Discipline"	
	4. Holt: "Writing and Revising" (Part 2).	
8, Th-2/4:	1. Appreciative reading of Definition Papers. 2. Discussion: "Mother-in-Law," "The Plot Against People"	1. Prepared Classification thesis statement. 2. Holt, 70-76.
9, T-2/9:	1. Student critique for Definition Papers. 2. <u>Holt</u> : "Writing Paragraphs" (Part 1). 3. In-class writing: Thesis statement approval and topic sentence outline for Classification Paper.	1. <u>Writing</u> , 1_51-61, 164-68. 2. <u>Holt</u> § 77-86. 3. Classification Paper rough draft.
10, Th-2/11:	1. Comparison/Contrast writing technique. 2. Discussion: "That Lean and Hungry Look" 3. Holt : "Writing Paragraphs" (Part 2).	1. CLASSIFICATION PAPER. 2. <u>Writing</u> , 172-86. 3. Prepared Com/Con thesis statement.
11, "r-2/16:	1. Appreciative reading of Classification Papers. 2. Discussion: "The Lowest Animal" and "The Prisoner's Dilemma" 3. Comparison/Contrast thesis statement approval.	1. <u>Writing</u> , 168-72. 2. <u>Holt</u> , 87-98. 3. Comparison/Contrast sentence outline.
12, Th-2/18:	1. Student critique of Classification Papers. 2. Discussions "Conversational Ballgames" 3. <u>Holt</u> § "Writing Paragraphs" (Part 3). 4. In-class writings Rough draft of Comparison/Contrast.	1. Holt, 99-107. 2. Handout: Sample Com/Con Paper. 3. Comparison/Contrast revised rough draft.
13, T-2/23:	1. Holt : "Writing Paragraphs" (Part 4). 2. In-class writing: Comparison/Contrast final revisions.	1. COMPARISON/ CONTRAST PAPER. 2. <u>Writing</u> , 187-95. 3. Holt , 110-24. 4. Prepared C&E thesis statement.
14, Th-2/25:	1. Appreciative reading of Comparison/Contrast Papers. 2. Cause and Effect writing technique. 3. Discussion: "A Few Short Words," "The Decisive Arrest" 4. Cause and Effect thesis statement approval. 5. Holt : "Reading Critically and Writing Critical Responses"	1. <u>Writing</u> , 200-06. 2. Cause and Effect sentence outline. 3. Handout: Sample Cause and Effect Paper.
15, T-3/2:	1. Student critique of Comparison/Contrast Papers. 2. Discussion: "The Best Years of My Life" 3. In-class writing: Cause and Effect rough draft.	1. <u>Writing</u> , 195-200. 2. Cause and Effect revised rough draft. 3. Tentative social issue topic for A.P.
16, Th-3/4:	1. Discussion: "Why We Crave Horror Movies" 2. <u>Holt</u> : "Thinking Logically" 3. Appropriate alternatives for Argumentation topic choice.	1. CAUSE AND EFFECT PAPER. 2. <u>Writing</u> , 271-80, 284-86. 3. Prepared Argumentation thesis statement.
17, T-3/9:	1. Appreciative reading of Cause and Effect Papers. 2. Argumentation Paper writing technique. 03 and #4 continued on next page)	1. <u>Writing</u> , 286-93. 2. Argumentation Paper sentence outline 02 and #3 continued on next page)

MEETING/DATE	MATERIALS TO BE COVERED	ASSIGNMENT FOR NEXT CLASS MEETING
	3. Discussion: "E-Mail Is Not-for-Me Mail" and "Sis Boom Bah Humbu g" 4. In-class writing : Argumentation Paper thesis statement.	and rough draft, 3. Handout: Sample Argumentation Paper.
18, Th-3/11:	1. Discussions "What's Wrong with Black English?" and "The Smiley-Face Approach" 2. <u>Holt</u> : "Recognizing Logical Fallacies"	1. <u>Writing</u> , 293-97. 2. <u>Holt</u> , 163-82. 3. Revised rough draft of Argumentation.
19, T-3/16:	1. Student critique of Cause and Effect Papers. 2. Discussions "The Case for Torture" 3. In-class writing : Final revisions of Argumentation.	1. ARGUMENTATION PAPER (optional). 2. Bring a large, self-addressed, stamped envelope to class.
20, Th-3/18:	1. Final Exam : Appreciative reading of Argumentation Papers. 2. Course evaluations.	End of course -- Enjoy the break!

NOTE #1: A UNIVERSITY **PERFORMANCE** STANDARD - Students are expected to make a very serious academic commitment to their success in this course. This is demonstrated by maintaining the syllabus schedule with respect to all readings and by- submitting all papers on time as indicated above without fail. Major written assignments are indicated on the syllabus in capital letters. It is recommended that students work slightly ahead of the syllabus whenever possible to compensate for the unexpected. Students on verified deployment or medical or emergency leave will receive consideration and full credit for work mailed and postmarked by the due date to the following address: 1137 Wilder Ave # 803, Honolulu, HI 96822-2757.

NOTE #2: A UNIVERSITY WRITING STANDARD - Successful completion of this course requires that all papers must meet commonly accepted university standards of grammar, punctuation, spelling, style and substance as stated on the Master Syllabus, The Holt Handbook is an invaluable source of information, and students with weakness in the above basics of the language need to make extensive use of this reference beyond the assignments. Successful students must be willing to measure up to these university writing standards.

NOTE #3: ATTENDANCE POLICY - It is the students' responsibility to be in class on time as much as humanly possible. Students are not allowed to sign in for a particular class meeting unless they are present for the entire instructional **period** or unless they have the instructor's permission at least 24 hours before the class meeting in question. Students are requested not to forget this. Because of the critical importance of class discussions and in-class writing, excessive absences would have a significant negative impact on the course grade,

NOTE A : GRADING POLICY - Course grades are based on the format accuracy and the substantive quality of the five major written **assignments** and the optional Argumentation Paper. Also, consideration will be given for students' consistently active class participation as well as for the completeness and accuracy of the final exam.

NOTE #5: CONCLUSION OF THE COURSE - Students are expected to submit a stamped, self-addressed envelope together with their Argumentation Paper so that it can be returned to them corrected within a reasonably short time. Included also will be the course grade.

MASTER SYLLABUS FOR EN 101

Description

EN 101 (3) Practice in composing, revising, and editing the personal essay addressed to a general audience; course is structured by rhetorical modes of description, definition., analysis, comparison-contrast, cause and effect, and argument; emphasis on organization, clear expression, and correct use of standard English.

Objectives

This course is designed to improve the clarity, correctness, and organization of student writing, to give practice in the basic rhetorical modes, and to develop the student's understanding of writing as a process in composing, revising, and editing.

Minimum Requirements

Each student will complete five revised and edited papers in different modes and of 400-500 words each (or the equivalent in papers of varying length) as well as a somewhat longer argument paper. Instructors will add exercises, in-class writing assignments, and examinations as individual need or class level requires. All courses at Chaminade require a final examination.

Grading Policies

Chaminade University grading policies cover all courses in the writing program except EN 100. The following comes from the current catalog:

- A Outstanding scholarship and an unusual degree of intellectual initiative.
- B Superior work done *in* a consistent and intellectual manner.
- C Average grade indicating a competent grasp of subject matter.
- D Inferior work of the lowest passing grade, the student having learned the bare minimum of subject matter.
- F Failed to grasp even the minimum subject matter, no credit given.
- W Withdrew before published deadline.'
- I Did not complete a portion of the work or examinations, due to circumstances beyond the student's control.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR GRADING STUDENT PAPERS (written out OF class)

The following guidelines are ones your instructor will use in grading the formal papers you write for this class. Remember that content, organization, and style work together to create a successful paper. It is not enough for your paper to be organized and free from error. You must have something worth saying. On the other hand, significant and creative ideas will be lost if they are poorly presented. Appropriate structure, grammar, usage, and documentation are necessary for effective communication.

A--Excellent

This paper has a clearly stated position (thesis) with sharp focus consistently maintained. It is well organized into a coherent structure. The evidence used clearly supports the position with details arranged logically. Such evidence is specific and convincing. If outside sources have been used, they are carefully documented with all quotations and paraphrases incorporated smoothly into the text. Sentences also are smooth and carefully constructed, containing virtually no errors in punctuation, spelling, grammar, or usage. The diction is clear, accurate, and precise. The paper avoids triteness and unsupported generalizations. The substance indicates some originality of thought and the style is suited to both audience and subject. The paper reflects critical thinking and comes to logical conclusions. Finally, the paper holds the reader's interest.

B--Good

This paper also has a clearly stated position with sharp focus maintained. It is generally well organized, but an occasional detail may be out of place or transitions between points may be missing. However, nothing detracts seriously from the coherence of the presentation. Supporting evidence is provided, but may not be specific enough or completely convincing. Outside sources are carefully documented but their use may not be incorporated smoothly. Some sentences may be awkwardly phrased with some errors in mechanics. The diction may be too general or abstract; it may lack precision. Although the substance may not be as original as that of the A paper, the response indicates a thoughtful handling of the assignment. None of its weaknesses are glaring or distracting to the reader.

C--Adequate

This paper has a position, but lacks sharp focus. The work is basically well organized though individual paragraphs may be disunified or misplaced. Some evidence may not support the thesis or details may be loosely related. Often this evidence is insufficient, overly general or unconvincing. Outside sources are documented but they are awkwardly incorporated, poorly summarized, or relied upon too heavily. The writing is competent but often wordy, general, imprecise, or trite. Sentences may be awkward but their meaning is clear; mechanics will have some errors but these are not highly distracting. The writer demonstrates little original thinking. Substance is weak. The paper may not come to logical conclusions or conclusions may be omitted altogether. The ideas, though understandable, are usually self-evident and do not demonstrate much critical thought.

D--Acceptable

This paper may have a recognizable thesis, but poor organization obscures it. Supporting **evidence is** extremely limited and **unconvincing**. Perhaps the paper is a mosaic of quotations and paraphrases **from outside** sources. The writing is general, vague, or irrelevant; **some sentences** may be confusing. Words may be imprecise, **misused**, or trite. In general, however, the paper is **understandable even** though content is weak and poorly developed. The reader suspects **this** is a first draft rather *than* a revised and edited paper.

F--Unacceptable

This paper lacks a clear thesis. Even if one is stated, the presentation is generally disorganized. Supporting **evidence is extremely** limited, vague, or unrelated. Sentence structure is weak or overly simplified; errors in mechanics are highly distracting. The language is unclear; diction is inaccurate or imprecise. The *content* lacks originality or significance. Or the paper says very little. Occasionally, the unacceptable paper does not **conform** to the **assignment's** requirements such as length, format, or subject.

Some instructors **allow** students to revise unacceptable papers.

F--Plagiarized

This paper has used outside sources--quotations, **paraphrase**, or summary--without properly **documenting** the source. Whether plagiarism was intentional or **unintentional**, *the paper may not* be revised. As the **Chaminade** catalog states, "The usual penalty for an overt act of **academic** dishonesty is failure in the course for the first offense and disciplinary action, **not** to **exclude suspension** from the University, for the second offense."