



digital rhetoric

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
 English 846, Section 001, #22020
 Meeting: Tuesdays, 2:30-5, HSS B03
 Dr. Matt Vetter; Office: HSS 505M
 Office Hours: Tuesday & Thursday, 12:30-
 2:00pm; Wednesday, 1-3pm
 & by appointment;
 Email: mvetter@iup.edu
mattavetter@gmail.com

Course Introduction

This advanced seminar in literacy focuses on digital rhetoric - the application of rhetorical theory to digital texts and technologies. As an emerging field of inquiry, digital rhetoric encompasses the study of rhetorical techniques for production and analysis; new media function, design, and capability; digital identity; community formation; ideology, epistemology, and culture in digital interfaces and texts, among other topics (Eyman, 2015). Through two informal projects and four major projects, we will write, create, analyze, and research while exploring issues related to identity, literacy, technology, social media, pedagogy, and knowledge equity while attending to classical, modern, and postmodern theories of rhetoric. Whatever your understanding or prior experience with rhetoric, welcome! I look forward to learning with you and reading your work.

Course Texts & Resources

- Ball, Cheryl E, et al. *Writer/Designer : A Guide to Making Multimodal Projects*. Second ed., Bedford/St. Martins, 2018. *Recommended*.
- Hidalgo, Alexandra, editor. *Pixelating the Self: Digital Feminist Memoirs*. Enculturation Intermezzo, 2018, intermezzo.enculturation.net/08-hidalgo-et-al.htm
- Eyman, Douglas. *Digital Rhetoric: Theory, Method, Practice*. University of Michigan Press, 2015, www.fulcrum.org/concern/monographs/qn59q490d
- Hess, Aaron, and Amber Davisson, editors. *Theorizing digital rhetoric*. Routledge, 2017, ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/indianauniv-ebooks/detail.action?docID=4921758.
- Reagle, Joseph, and Jackie Koerner, editors. *Wikipedia @ 20*. University of Chicago Press, 2019, wikipedia20.pubpub.org/.
- Vie, Stephanie, and Douglas M. Walls, editors. *Social Writing/Social Media: Publics, Presentations, and Pedagogies*. WAC Clearinghouse, 2017, wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/social/.
- Comer, Kathryn, Michael Harker, and Ben McCorkle, editors. *The Archive as Classroom: Pedagogical Approaches to the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives*. Computers and Composition Digital Press/Utah State University Press, 2019, ccdigitalpress.org/book/archive-as-classroom.

Medina, Cruz, and Octavio Pimentel, editors. *Racial Shorthand: Coded Discrimination Contested in Social Media*. Computers and Composition Digital Press /Utah State University Press, 2018, ccdigitalpress.org/shorthand.

Rhodes, Jacqueline, and Jonathan Alexander. *Techne: Queer Meditations on Writing the Self*. Computers and Composition Digital Press/Utah State University Press, 2015, ccdigitalpress.org/book/techne.

Gonzales, Laura. *Sites of Translation: What Multilinguals Can Teach Us About Digital Writing and Rhetoric*. University of Michigan Press, 2018, <https://www.fulcrum.org/concern/monographs/0z708x360>.

Wiki Education Course Dashboard:

[https://dashboard.wikiedu.org/courses/Indiana University of Pennsylvania/Digital Rhetoric \(Spring\)?enroll=vymslfqp](https://dashboard.wikiedu.org/courses/Indiana_University_of_Pennsylvania/Digital_Rhetoric_(Spring)?enroll=vymslfqp)

Course Goals

Goals for this course include but are not limited to the following:

- to practice digital literacy skills related to multimodal composition, arrangement, and digital publishing
- to reflect on technology's relationship to identity and experience
- to build your understanding and knowledge of a body of scholarship in digital rhetoric and multimodal composition
- to become familiar with rhetorical criticism as a form of qualitative inquiry
- to practice rhetorical analysis of a digital text, artifact, or application
- to help you understand technology's relation to writing, literacy, and rhetoric
- to provide training and practice in composing technology-mediated texts
- to think critically about the cultural and social ramifications of technology and multimodal composition
- to gain experience planning and facilitating a campus-wide digital campaign/event
- to practice professional research and writing on course topics
- to practice sustained revision and development of a course project
- to become exposed to/familiar with digital pedagogies for rhetoric, research, and writing

Course Work

Course work will be comprised of two informal projects and four major projects. Informal projects include weekly reading responses to a collaborative digital commonplace book (IP#1), which you will contribute to in pairs of 2-3, and which will help provide a place for you to begin making realizations about the texts we're reading. These commonplace books will serve as a starting place for your future research, thinking, and writing. In addition to this weekly assignment, you will also be responsible for leading an in-class discussion (with your commonplace book partner) of our weekly readings (IP#2) using questions, notes, and ideas from your commonplace books. You will be responsible for leading one of these in-class discussions throughout the semester. In addition to these informal projects, you will also complete four major projects: (MP#1) a multimodal essay; (MP#2) rhetorical analysis of a digital

artifact or application; (MP#3) a Wikipedia Edit and Wikipedia Edit-a-thon, to be held April 21 2020; and (MP#4) a revision/development of one of your previous projects. Each project is described in more detail in the following sections, and can be discussed and negotiated further in class.

Course Projects

Informal Project 1 (IP#1): Collaborative Digital Commonplace Book

Informal Project 2 (IP#2): Discussion Lead

Major Project 1 (MP#1): Multimodal Essay (Literacy Narrative or Academic Memoir)

Major Project 2 (MP#2): Rhetorical Analysis of Digital Media

Major Project 3 (MP#3): Wikipedia Edit and Edit-a-thon Planning

Major Project 4 (MP#4): Revision / Development of a Previous Project

Informal Project #1: Collaborative Digital Commonplace Book

You will keep a digital commonplace book in small groups of two or three using Google docs to record and write out summaries, responses, and useful notes and quotes from our weekly reading assignments. I may ask you to do a more focused writing occasionally, but for the most part, your entries should be motivated by your own reading engagement and research interest. Use this assignment as an opportunity to begin a dialogue with the ideas in our readings and with the summary and response offered by your commonplace book partner. I would also like you to engage and explore the multimodal affordances of Google docs by integrating video/image/color for every entry. Finally, I will also ask you to develop at least one discussion question for every commonplace book entry, to be addressed during class discussions. Discussion leaders may pull from your questions to create their handouts. For each commonplace entry, be sure to include identifying information about the source and give each entry a title that identifies the entry number, reading, and your name: e.g. "Week 1 Entry, Digital Rhetoric Ch. 1, Matt Vetter." Links to each of your Commonplace Books will be created in D2L. Each Commonplace Book entry should be about 300-500 words in length/or 1 to 1 ½ pages of content (including multimodal content such as screenshots, videos, other resources, etc.) Note: Digital Commonplace Book Groups will be assigned the first week of class

Informal Project #2: Discussion Lead

Each commonplace book group (listed below) will also be responsible for leading 1 in-class discussion, as noted on our schedule. I don't want to prescribe a specific format for this except to say that you should use notes and questions from your commonplace book entry to lead in-class discussion on the texts assigned. You should also prepare a 1-page handout that summarizes major ideas and 2-3 discussion questions to jump-start our in-class conversations. In this way, we will attempt to bridge your reflections and notes from the commonplace books and our in-class discussions and interactions. Plan for a discussion about 30-40 minutes in length, but do not feel like you are "on" or presenting that entire time. The idea is to give an overview of the readings, your reaction/response, make connections to course assignments or other texts, and prompt discussion through questions and/or activities.

Major Project #1: Multimodal Essay

For this assignment, you will produce a multimodal essay in the genre of either (1) a digital literacy narrative or (2) an academic memoir.

(1) The digital literacy narrative tells the story of how your literacy development is bound up in your use of, relationship with, and access to digital technologies. You should use narrative techniques such as sensory image, description, narrative time, memory, etc. to make your narrative accessible and compelling. Draft an essay first, then create a multimodal text by producing a website, video, audio essay, etc. using digital software or web design programs. You may (this part is optional) submit your final narrative for publication to the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (DALN), a public archive of literacy narratives, and share your work with the class.

(2) The academic memoir genre is a bit more open in that its subject isn't constrained to the topic of your literacy history or development. Rather, an academic memoir might reflect on and narrate any aspect of your experience or relationship with academic spaces, experiences, or future plans or ambitions. Like the digital literacy narrative, you should use narrative techniques such as sensory image, description, narrative time, memory, etc. to make your narrative accessible and compelling. Draft an essay first, then create a multimodal text by producing a website, video, audio essay, etc. using digital software or web design programs.

Resources and Examples

Ball, Cheryl E, et al. *Writer/Designer : A Guide to Making Multimodal Projects*. Second ed., Bedford/St. Martins, 2018. The *Writer/Designer* book is great for understanding the processes of doing multimodal work.

Hidalgo, Alexandra, editor. *Pixelating the Self: Digital Feminist Memoirs*. Enculturation Intermezzo, 2018, intermezzo.enculturation.net/08-hidalgo-et-al.htm. This collection of memoirs provides numerous examples of academic memoir.

<http://www.thedaln.org/#/home>. "The DALN is an open public resource made up of stories from people just like you about their experiences learning to read, write, and generally communicate with the world around them. If you have a compelling story to share (it can be text, video, audio, or a combination of formats), we'd love to hear it." This is a great resource for examples of literacy narratives.

Criteria and Requirements

Multimodality: Essay combines and/or engages modes beyond the alphabetic, e.g. audio, video, visual, etc.

Length: No formal length requirement for final produce as different projects will take on different content and form. Written personal essay should be no shorter than 3-4 double-spaced pages (900-1200 words).

Form: No prescribed form as you may choose to create any type of multimodal text based on your experience with digital or analog materials and applications. But the form should complement that major purpose or goals of the project.

Theme/Center of gravity: This is not an academic essay with a thesis; however, it should still forward a central theme, center of gravity or major point consistent with your topic.

Accessibility: Multimodal elements of your final text should be accessible to all readers. For example, if you choose to produce a video you will need to create captions. You will also need alt-text/captions for any images used.

Sources/Assets: Any work that is not your own should be appropriately sourced. I would recommend using Creative Commons or Wikimedia Commons for sound, video, image assets. There is no formal source requirement, but I would encourage you to look to creative scholarship in the field as a way to make connections between yours and others' experiences.

Major Project #2: Rhetorical Analysis

A more traditional assignment, this project asks you to employ a rhetorical, theoretical framework to analyze and/or interpret a digital text, artifact, or application.

This project will include the following additional elements: **an informal proposal** which you will receive feedback on (in individual conferences with Dr. Vetter); **rough draft** to be workshopped in an informal, in-class peer review with your classmates; and **a cover letter** written to Dr. Vetter explaining the project and identifying a target journal for possible publication. I will not require that you submit your article for publication, but would like you to keep this venue in mind as you are writing and conducting your research.

Resources and Examples

Present Tense: <https://www.presenttensejournal.org/>

Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy: <https://jitp.commons.gc.cuny.edu/>

Kairos PraxisWiki: <http://66.113.161.124/praxis/tiki-index.php>

Computers and Composition Online: <http://cconlinejournal.org/>

Help with rhetorical analysis/criticism

Foss, Doing Rhetorical Criticism -

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1JUrb_iS4qkeU7qMSt3nhTLIOyGJrIyn/view?usp=sharing

Rhetorical Criticism Explained (Summary of Foss by Marissa McKinley) -

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1X17z-4501nNLRc3sVPzYbdbbOW6Pc-gi>

Criteria and Requirements

Length: Essay Length: 2,000-3,000 words

Source Engagement: Essay should productively engage with a minimum of 8-10 scholarly sources related to rhetorical theory, digital rhetoric, and the digital artifact or application being analyzed

Rhetorical Theory: Essay should be guided by a theoretical framework that applies a rhetorical theory for analysis of the digital artifact or application

Analysis: Essay should include substantial analysis of the digital artifact or application

Argument: Essay should make an original argument concerning the rhetorical function or circumstances of the digital artifact or application

Target Journal: Essay should target a specific journal in writing, rhetoric, or media studies and should be formatted according to the specifications of that journal. You will write about why you selected this journal in a cover letter, to be turned in with the final essay.

Major Project #3: Wikipedia Edit

[https://dashboard.wikiedu.org/courses/Indiana_University_of_Pennsylvania/Digital_Rhetoric_\(Spring\)?enroll=vymslfqp](https://dashboard.wikiedu.org/courses/Indiana_University_of_Pennsylvania/Digital_Rhetoric_(Spring)?enroll=vymslfqp)

We'll work in small groups of 3 or 4 to update Wikipedia articles on subjects relating to digital rhetoric. A central goal for this project will be to improve and develop your article so that it reflects the field's disciplinary knowledge. To prepare for this assignment, we will learn about Wikipedia conventions and policies, spend time reading from the encyclopedia, and practice writing in a neutral style appropriate to the genre. We will use the Wiki Ed course dashboard frequently in this project.

[https://dashboard.wikiedu.org/courses/Indiana_University_of_Pennsylvania/Digital_Rhetoric_\(Spring\)?enroll=vymslfqp](https://dashboard.wikiedu.org/courses/Indiana_University_of_Pennsylvania/Digital_Rhetoric_(Spring)?enroll=vymslfqp)

Process

Create Wikipedia Accounts

Complete Training Modules

Explore and read Wikipedia articles, esp. those on digital rhetoric

In-class Article Proposals

Research

In-class edits

Group reflection

Source Requirements

Writing in Wikipedia, as you will learn in the training modules, requires careful consideration of sources. Avoid plagiarism by always using multiple citations. Never copy/paste directly from a source. Never rely too much on quotes. Sources should be from reputable publishers (established and notable news outlets, published books, scholarly articles, etc.) As a group, your edits should make use of **at least 4 new sources**, preferably from books we have read in this course.

Length Requirements

This is a smaller assignment, and it is more difficult to contribute a lot of content to Wikipedia

because of the encyclopedic style which values brevity, clarity, and focus. Accordingly, the length requirement for this assignment is 200-400 words.

Reflection Requirement

Upon completing your edits, your group will write a collaborative reflection of approximately 600-800 words. Your reflective essay should discuss

- how you have improved the article and what content you added,
- what you learned by engaging in the project
- and the major challenges you faced in the project.

Project Criteria

Edits to your Wikipedia article should demonstrate an understanding of (and follow) the following Wikipedia writing conventions:

Articles use a **consistently neutral style**.

Writing is as clear and concise as possible. Be plain, direct, unambiguous, and specific.

Avoid redundancy and maintain scope. Do not bring in content that should be covered in other articles.

Demonstrate **careful and thorough research and source use**.

Sources should be **secondary, from reputable publishers** (academic research, notable news and media outlets, etc.).

Sources should be **carefully documented** using Wikipedia conventions for References.

No original research. Do not include your own opinions or interpretations of the topic.

Articles should be **organized** in a way that is consistent with the genre of the Wikipedia article, using heading and subheadings and sidebars if needed.

Follow the **basic article structure** common to Wikipedia: lead, body, appendices (references, external links).

Groups and Articles

Dr. Vetter will work on generating a list of articles and assign groups. You may also suggest an article you would be interested in working on.

Major Project #3: Wikipedia Edit-a-thon

For this assignment, we will work together to plan and facilitate a Wikipedia Edit-a-thon, to be held April 21 (10am-2pm) on IUP's campus, Stabley 201 and 210 (Library). This is a campus-wide event, and all IUP community members are invited to participate. Last year we had about 90 participants. I expect this year's number to be between 60-90. In order to help with this event, you will become "Wikipedia literate" by completing training modules produced by the Wiki Education foundation, and by practicing working to improve a Wikipedia article in a small group. During the Edit-a-thon event, you will be take on one of four roles to help participants with various aspects of the Edit-a-thon. These roles include:

Edit-a-thon Facilitation Roles

Role 1: Registration – Help participants join Wikipedia and register for the event

Role 2: Topic Development – Help participants develop a topic and identify a Wikipedia article to edit during the event

Role 3: Identify Sources/Research - Help participants locate possible sources to add to their targeted article

Role 4: Editing – Help participants learn how to cite references and perform other basic editing tasks

Major Project #4: Revision / Development of Previous Project

For the final project in this course, you will choose one of the Major Projects you previously completed, the Multimodal Essay, Rhetorical Analysis, or Wikipedia Edit/Edit-a-thon, and substantively revise and/or develop it. This could take different forms depending on 1) the project you choose, 2) your development and/or revision goals, and 3) the feedback you receive from Dr. Vetter and/or peers. You will also write a 1-2 page reflection on your revision and development to explain how and why you worked with the project you chose. More details to come and I think we can also negotiate this project in class a little as we get further along in the course.

Contract Grading

At this point in your educational career, you are quickly transitioning from student to professional, and as such, my goal in this class is to provide opportunities for you to be independent, take risks, and explore the course content. I also want to facilitate an inquiry-driven, egalitarian classroom community. Given this framework, we will use “Contract Grading” in this course.

The contract is simple: everyone in this course begins with an A, and maintains that grade as long as *all of the course requirements are met*. The terms of the contract are as follows:

- +high quality, Ph.D. level writing and thinking on all projects;
- +consistent engagement and collegiality promoting your own and others’ learning and contributing to a positive learning environment;
- +on time submissions of work and drafts;
- +consistent, on-time class attendance;
- +regular contributions to the classroom community.

This is not to say your work needs to be perfect, rather, I want you to make a substantive effort on drafts and projects in this class. Show me that you are thinking and working through these issues like a professional. Teaching is going to be a big part of your future career (or already is)—demonstrate that importance in class and in your work now. If I feel you are not meeting the standards and expectations of the course and are doing sub-par work, you are “breaking the

contract.”

I will assess your work informally in the course using the following language:

“**Meets contract expectations**” indicates that you are meeting minimum standards (e.g. B work).

“**Exceeds contract expectations**” indicates that you are exceeding standards (e.g. A work).

“**Below contract expectations**” indicates that you are not meeting standards (e.g. C or below work)

More than one major project that receives a “below contract expectations” assessment amounts to a break in the contract. If you are breaking the contract, I will discuss my concerns with you, and I will use an alternative grading system, as described below:

- Informal Project 1: Collaborative Digital Commonplace Book (10%)
- Informal Project 2: Discussion Lead (10%)
- Major Project 1: Multimodal Memoir (Literacy Narrative or Academic Memoir) (20%)
- Major Project 2 - Rhetorical Analysis of Digital Media (20%)
- Major Project 3 - Wikipedia Edit and Edit-a-thon Planning (20%)
- Major Project 4 - Revision / Development of a Previous Project (20%)

Course Schedule *Subject to change according to class needs

Date	Topic/Activity	Readings/Assignments due
1/21	Introductions; Syllabus review; Defining rhetoric and digital rhetoric; Discussion lead example (Vetter) Defining multimodal composition; Google and Wikipedia Sign-ups; Assign and coordinate groups for IP#1 and IP#2, AssignMP#1;	Read: Syllabus; Introduction and Ch. 1 in Eymann, <i>Digital Rhetoric</i> ; Ch. 1 in Ball et al., <i>Writer/Designer</i>
1/28	Digital identity; In-class brainstorming for MP#1; What makes a successful commonplace book entry?; Multimodal methods for MP#1; Discussion lead group 1	Read: Introduction and Selections from Hidalgo, <i>Pixelating the Self</i> ; Ch. 4 in Ball et al., <i>Writer/Designer</i> Due: Commonplace book entry
2/4	Digital identity; Academic memoir as genre; Literacy narrative as genre;	Read: Introduction and Selections from Rhodes and Alexander, <i>Techne: Queer Meditations on Writing the Self</i> ; Ch. 3 in Ball et. al, <i>Writer/Designer</i>

	Discussion lead group 2; In-class drafting for MP#1; Informal MP#1 pitch	Due: Commonplace book entry
2/11	(Literacy) narrative as pedagogy; In-class workshop of MP#1 drafts (essays); Explore DALN; Discussion lead group 3; Planning multimodal production of MP#1; Working with Assets; Working with Technologies	Read: Introduction and Selections from Comer, Harker, and McCorkle, <i>The Archive as Classroom</i> ; Ch. 6-7 in Ball et al., <i>Writer/Designer</i> Due: Draft of MP#1 (proposal and essay) due to D2L discussion board for workshop; Commonplace book entry
2/18	Race, racism, and digital media; rhetorical theory; In-class work on multimodal production for MP#1; Discussion lead group 4	Read: Introduction and Selections from Cruz and Pimentel, <i>Racial Shorthand: Coded Discrimination Contested in Social Media</i> ; Ch. 2 in Eyman, <i>Digital Rhetoric</i> ; Due: Commonplace book entry
2/25	Rhetorical analysis; rhetorical theory; digital rhetoric; Introduce MP#2; Discussion lead group 5; Peer review of MP#1 (Multimodal draft)	Read: Introduction and Selections from Hess and Davisson, <i>Theorizing Digital Rhetoric</i> ; Chapter 5 in Ball et. al, <i>Writer/Designer</i> Due: MP#1 draft due to D2L; Commonplace book entry
3/3	Social media, rhetorical analysis; social media pedagogies; Discussion lead group 6; In-class work on MP#2;	Read: Introduction and Selections from Vie and Walls, <i>Social Writing/Social Media: Publics, Presentations, and Pedagogies</i> ; Handout (PDF) on rhetorical analysis; Ch. 2 in Ball et al., <i>Writer/Designer</i> Due: Commonplace book entry; MP#1 Final
3/10	Spring break - No class	Spring break - No class
3/17	Rhetorical analysis; Journal article review and analysis (Class choice); Discussion lead group 7	Read: Selections from <i>Kairos, Present Tense, and Enculturation</i> (Class choice) Due: Commonplace book entry
3/24	CCCC - Meet Online; Digital rhetoric methods; Introduction to Wikipedia We will not have class this week as Dr. Vetter will be travelling to Milwaukee. Complete the reading, Wikipedia training modules, and discussion board entry by Wednesday, 3/25 midnight. Responses to peers in discussion board by Thursday, 3/26 midnight.	Read: Eyman, Ch. 3; Vankooten, "Methodologies & Methods for Research in Digital Rhetoric" in <i>Enculturation</i> ; Read "Editing Wikipedia," pp. 1-5 and "Evaluating Wikipedia" (in Wiki Dashboard Week 1) Due: Commonplace book entry; Discussion board entry and two responses; Complete Wikipedia training modules "Wikipedia policies" and "Sandboxes, talk pages, and watchlists"

3/31	Digital rhetoric methods; multilingual communication; Discussion lead group 8; Brief share on MP#2; Assign MP#3	Read: Introduction and Selections from Gonzales, <i>What Multilinguals Can Teach us About Digital Rhetoric and Writing</i> Due: Commonplace book entry; MP#2 to D2L assignment dropbox; Complete Wikipedia training modules “Evaluating articles and sources,” “How to edit: Wikicode vs. visual editor” and “Evaluate Wikipedia”
4/7	Wikipedia and Systemic Bias; Wikipedia-based Education; Editing tutorials and practice; In-class work on Wikipedia Edit, Exercise “Add to an article”; In-class research (finding sources for Wikipedia Edit); Discussion lead group 10	Read: Introduction and Selections from Reagle and Koerner, <i>Wikipedia @ 20</i> Due: Wikipedia training modules “Finding your article,” “Choose your article,” “Adding citations” Commonplace book entry
4/14	In-class planning for Wikipedia Edit-a-thon; Review training modules; In-class work on Wikipedia Edit	Due: Wikipedia Training Modules
4/21	Wikipedia Edit-a-thon: 10am-2pm in Stabley 201/210	Due: Wikipedia training modules; Wikipedia Edit and facilitation of event
4/28	Course evaluations; Assign MP#4; Review survey results and dashboard from Edit-a-thon; In-class work on MP#4	Due: Final Wikipedia Edit and Reflection Due

Course Policies

Atmosphere: I ask that everyone in our class practice civility, kindness, and collegiality. Let’s build a community that values constructive critique and mutual support of each other’s work, educational and cultural background, and individuality.

Participation: I expect a high level of participation in a graduate-level course. You should come prepared to every class session, having completed all assigned readings and writing assignments due for that session. Weekly commonplace book entries should be completed before every session. You should be ready to contribute through active listening and discussion.

Attendance: Attendance and punctuality are required in this course. I strongly recommend that you attend every session, but you may miss one class with no grade reduction. Health related issues or other documented excused will be handled on a case-by-case basis. Absences after the first one will result in a 5% reduction to your final course grade.

Late Work: I will only accept late work if we have talked and come to some agreement. If something is going on that is going to hinder you from finishing a project, please talk to me **before** the project is due.

Communication: I use e-mail to communicate important information about the class. You are responsible for checking your school account regularly. You should also check Slack often for announcements concerning reading and writing assignments. You may email me at mvetter@iup.edu. I will do my best to respond within 24 hours.

Ethics: I define plagiarism as deliberate cheating, whether by claiming another's ideas or work as your own (fraud) or making up or falsifying information (fabrication) will result in a course grade of F and a report to Community Standards. You are at all times responsible for handling sources ethically by acknowledging the author and source of directly borrowed ideas and language in your writing.

Accessibility: The Office of Advising and Testing, in Pratt Hall, room 216, offers evaluation and support for students with disabilities. Please let me know as soon as possible if you need an accommodation in order to work successfully in this class. This classroom strives for full accessibility, and it is not necessary for you to have an official accommodation letter from Disability Services in order to request changes to the classroom that will better serve your needs as a student, although you are encouraged to explore the possible supports they can offer if you are a student with a disability. Both able bodied students and students with disabilities are encouraged to suggest any improvements to the learning environment.

Electronic Devices: Laptops, smart phones, and tablets are encouraged in my classroom, and should be used to reference assigned readings, our blogs or other course activities.

Writing Center: Trained graduate tutors in the IUP Writing Center can help you at any stage in the writing process, from developing a topic to drafting and revising. They can help you to document sources, understand your professor's feedback, and more. The Writing Center has three locations: For walk-in tutoring (no appointments), visit Room 218 in Eicher Hall, or visit the Satellite Writing Center in the Library, first floor. You can also make an appointment for an online tutoring session (at least 24 hours in advance). The Writing Center's website contains a link for making appointments for online sessions, or call 724-357-3029.

IUP Sexual Violence Policy: Indiana University of Pennsylvania is committed to maintaining a learning and work environment that is free from sexual harassment and sexual violence. Acts of sexual harassment or sexual violence, including sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, seriously undermine the atmosphere of trust and respect that is essential to a university community. Moreover, sexual harassment and sexual violence are legally prohibited and will not be tolerated. To report a complaint of sexual harassment or sexual violence, including sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, against a student and discuss options, contact a Campus Security Authority coordinator; the Office of

Student Conduct, 307 Pratt Hall, at 724-357-1264; or the Compliance Officer/Title IX Coordinator. If the student does not want to proceed with a student conduct complaint or police report, the Compliance Officer/Title IX Coordinator will still investigate to determine what occurred and take appropriate steps to resolve the situation, mindful of the University's obligation to provide a safe and nondiscriminatory environment for all students.

IUP Sexual Violence Policy: Indiana University of Pennsylvania and its faculty are committed to assuring a safe and productive educational environment for all students. In order to meet this commitment and to comply with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and guidance from the Office for Civil Rights, the university requires faculty members to report incidents of sexual violence shared by students to the university's Title IX coordinator. The only exceptions to the faculty member's reporting obligation are when incidents of sexual violence are communicated by a student during a classroom discussion, in a writing assignment for a class, or as part of a university-approved research project. **Faculty members are obligated to report sexual violence or any other abuse of a student who was, or is, a child (a person under 18 years of age) when the abuse allegedly occurred to the person designated in the university protection of minors policy.** Information regarding the reporting of sexual violence and the resources that are available to victims of sexual violence is set forth above, or at: [Title IX Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Resources](#).