

University of Calgary
Department of Communication, Media and Film

COMS 369 L04: Rhetorical Communication

WINTER 2020: January 13 to April 15 (excluding Feb. 16 – 22 and April 13)

Lecture: Mondays and Wednesdays 09:30 - 10:45

Via Zoom Meetings

Instructor:	Tom St.Denis
Office:	SS 240
Office Phone:	403-220-6911
Email:	tlstdeni@ucalgary.ca
Web Page:	D2L available through MyUofC portal
Office Hours:	Any time via email or office phone; please allow 24 hrs for reply
Note:	Contact me via email or office phone weekdays 7 a.m. - 2 p.m.

Course Description

This course offers a general introduction to the basic principles of rhetoric, covering both theory and practice, with the emphasis on practice. Students will learn and practice rhetorical perspectives on such elements of communication as argumentation, persuasion, audience appraisal, and rhetorical situation. Students will analyze a variety of rhetorical examples, including prominent speeches (political and non-political), newspaper editorials and op-ed essays, and video and print advertising. They will practice their rhetorical skills through in-class activities and assigned writing and oral presentations.

Additional Information

The weekly schedule of topics and readings can be found at the end of this outline or on D2L. Students are responsible for reading and following all course and university policies discussed in this outline.

Objectives of the Course

The objectives of the course are:

- To understand the basic principles and terms of classical rhetorical theory
- To understand the importance of rhetoric to Western culture
- To understand how effective arguments are constructed and delivered
- To apply rhetorical theory to the criticism of a variety of public communication topics, media and genres
- To apply rhetorical theory to the development of analytical, informative and persuasive writing and speech
- To improve students' public-speaking skills and their ability to frame a message to a specific audience
- To enhance students' writing skills and their competence in citing and integrating sources
- To learn in a collaborative and safe environment

Textbooks and Readings

Heinrichs, J. (2017). *Thank you for arguing: What Aristotle, Lincoln and Homer Simpson can teach us about the art of persuasion* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Three Rivers Press. (At Bookstore and available on Amazon and Kindle)

Longaker, M.G. & Walker, J. (2011). *Rhetorical analysis: A brief guide for writers*. Boston, MA Longman (Pearson).

Recommended

Casson, L.E. (Ed.). (2018). *A writer's handbook: Developing writing skills for university students* (4th ed.). [\$15.95 print; \$10.95 pdf at Broadview Press]

Additional readings available online

Altman, C. (2013). *The writer's toolbox*. At <https://christopheraltman.wordpress.com/> This blog includes useful posts on punctuation, parallelism and counterarguments.

Aristotle. (n.d.). *Rhetoric*. (Trans. W. Rhys Roberts). Available <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.1.i.html>

Burton, G.). (2007). *Silvae Rhetoricae: The forest of rhetoric*. Available at <http://rhetoric.byu.edu/> This site summarizes key concepts in rhetoric and defines a huge number of stylistic devices.

Clark, R.P. (2016, July 26). 8 writing lessons from Michelle Obama's DNC speech. Retrieved from Poynter at <http://www.poynter.org/2016/8-writing-lessons-from-michelle-obama-s-dnc-speech/423307/>

Duke, G. (2012). The sophists [opening overview, 5 paragraphs], in the *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, available at <http://www.iep.utm.edu/sophists/>

Dlugan, A. (2013, Sept.2). Ethos, pathos, logos: Three pillars of public speaking. Available at <http://sixminutes.dlugan.com/ethos-pathos-logos/> [Read all parts]

Dlugan, A. (2014). Six minutes: Speaking and presentation skills. Available at <http://sixminutes.dlugan.com/>

- For the site's collection of short but useful articles on delivering effective talks, designing visuals, and analyzing speeches, see <http://sixminutes.dlugan.com/articles/>
- For links to 18 other blogs on public speaking, see <http://sixminutes.dlugan.com/public-speaking-blogs/>

Leon, L.K. (2015). Gifts of speech: Women's speeches from around the world. Available at <http://gos.sbc.edu/> [I recommend Margaret Atwood's speech about novel-writing]

Wheeler, L.K. (2016). Logical fallacies handlist. Available at https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/fallacies_list.html [for reference]

Zinsser, W. (2010). Writing English as a second language. American Scholar. Retrieved from: <http://theamericanscholar.org/writing-english-as-a-second-language/> [Despite the title, this essay on writing style has good advice for all students]

Policy on the use of Electronic Communication Devices

Laptops, tablets, and mobile phones will be used for Zoom meetings (the Zoom instructors suggest that the best experience is with a computer). No audio or video recording is allowed in any class without the instructor's permission.

Assignments and Evaluation

The class will be divided into 6 teams of 5 students each. These teams may be self-selected or assigned by the instructor, and students may switch teams as they wish – so long as team numbers remain static. The teams will be responsible for the rhetorical assignment that starts each class and for the debates.

1. Rhetorical Assignments

At least twice in the semester each team will select and analyze the dominant rhetorical aspect of a cultural artefact and present that analysis to the class in a brief address. Each member of the team must contribute to the analysis and/or presentation. Analysis of dominant rhetorical aspects might include:

- audience analysis
- analysis of the rhetorical situation according to Bitzer's theory
- synopsis of a debate argument for or against a given proposition (point-form presentation of the major parts of a Toulmin argument: claim, grounds or data, warrant, backing, qualifier, and rebuttal)
- synopsis of a persuasive political speech (point-form presentation of the speaker's rhetorical intentions, assumptions about her audience, possible rhetorical strategies – using appropriate language, stoking audience identification, connecting key arguments to values held by the audience)
- identification of appeals to *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* in the selected artefact (identify the appeal and explain how it is operating in the artefact)
- identification of the use of *kairos* in political or corporation speeches
- identification of the visual appeals to *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* in advertising or press release

2. Writing Assignment

Students will critically analyze an author's argument in a document of their choice, using either the Aristotelian or Toulmin argument structure. Documents can include an academic paper, a blog post, an editorial or op-ed essay, or any document that highlights and develops an argumentative strategy.

The paper should be 2 1/2 - 3 pages, double spaced, font size 12 point Times New Roman, 1 inch/254 cm margins, pages numbered. Word length: 850 words.

3. Individual Speeches

In this class, students deliver speeches rather than presentations. A major difference between the two is that presentations can be supported by technology such as PowerPoint while speeches tend to be technology-free. In giving a speech, the object is to have the audience concentrate on one's words rather than on the supporting slides. The particular learning objective is the development of students' confidence in public speaking. **Because of the Covid-19 situation, these speeches will be delivered remotely via the Zoom platform; there are no other changes to this assignment.**

Length: 5 to 7 minutes

Topics: These should be well focused and aimed at informing or persuading an adult audience. The informative speech can be based on personal experience.

Written portion: Before delivering their speeches, each student will submit a copy of their script or speaking notes. This assignment will be marked separately from the speech itself. **These scripts or speaking notes are to be submitted by email.**

Informative Speeches should employ topics that build on common knowledge of the audience, and that take that knowledge further. Students may inform the audience of local

stories, historical anecdotes, scientific or technological advances, or similar short items of interest (*think TED Talks*). Sample topics:

- Personal experience: learning experience, hobby or adventure experience
- Brief history of an indigenous or immigrant culture in Canada or Alberta
- Good/bad effects of particular foods, exercises, habits, etc.
- Recent advances in science, technology, or some other field
- Interesting facts about a person, place or thing

Persuasive Speeches should extend beyond information into the realm of motivating audience belief and/or action. They beliefs or actions the speaker proposes must be relevant to the audience's lives and experiences, and also with their abilities to actually respond. The speaker's aim is to move the audience, but realistically. The persuasion has to be based on *logos* as well as *pathos*. Sample topics:

- A call for volunteers or support for a particular charity or campus activity
- Proposed actions to overcome stereotypes about a given country, city or specific group
- An argument for or against vaccinations for children
- An argument for or against rehabilitation over incarceration for criminals

4. Two Peer Critiques – one for an Informative Speech, one for a Persuasive Speech

Each student will be responsible for two brief and constructive critiques of others students' speeches from the perspective of an audience member. These critiques will each be 350 - 400 words in length. In their comments, students are to gauge each speech's effectiveness by his/her own reactions:

- did the informative speech inform you or cause you to question an assumption of yours?
- did the persuasive speech motivate you to support some cause or undertake some activity?

Critics are admonished to be polite and treat their colleagues they way they wish to be treated by them.

Critics' comments will have no bearing on the speakers' grades, but will influence the critiquing students' participation scores.

These critiques are to be submitted by email.

5. In-class Debates

Class teams will be pitted against one another to debate 3 selected issues, with each team being assigned to argue For or Against. Prior each of the three debates, teams will prepare their "debate strategy" – a written document of short paragraphs delineating both the proposed argument's components (claim, data, warrant, backing, rebuttal) and its rhetorical appeals (use of *logos*, *pathos* and *ethos*). This strategy is to be submitted by email.

During the debate, team members will take turns to present an argument point or rebut the point made by the opposing team. It is imperative that each team member speaks during the debate. Again, because of the Covid-19 situation, these debates will be staged within Zoom meetings. Students not directly engaged in the debates will still be expected to join the meetings as audience – non-attendance will adversely affect the student's participation mark.

Teams will be graded on the written submission; the actual debates will not be graded. Students who do not show up for the debate will be **penalized 10%** of the team grade.

Weight	Assessed Components	Due
--------	---------------------	-----

10%	<p>Class participation</p> <p>Students are encouraged to participate in this class in a variety of different ways, including asking questions, facilitating discussion, and engaging with others while doing group activities.</p> <p>For each class, teams of 5 students will take turns to present an artefact and lead the class discussion of its rhetorical characteristics. All five members of each group must contribute.</p>	Ongoing
20%	<p>Writing assignment</p> <p>Students will critically analyze an author's argument in a document of their choice, using either the Aristotelian or Toulmin argument structure. Documents can include an academic paper a blog post, an editorial or op-ed essay, or any document that highlights and develops an argumentative strategy.</p> <p>Word length: 850 words</p>	Feb 3
15%	<p>Informative Speech</p> <p>Students will deliver a formal speech on a topic of their choice. They will be graded on the effectiveness of their oral communication style.</p> <p>Length: 5 to 7 minutes</p>	Feb 3, 5 Feb 10, 12
5%	<p>Informative Speech script or speaking notes</p> <p>A rough script or point-form speaking notes will be submitted prior to a speech being delivered. This item will be marked separately from the speech.</p>	
15%	<p>Persuasive Speech</p> <p>Students will deliver a formal persuasive speech on a topic of their choice. These speeches will adhere to the Monroe Motivational Sequence outline (see Feb 26 below).</p> <p>Length: 5 to 7 minutes</p>	Mar 16, 18 Mar 23, 25 Mar 30
5%	<p>Persuasive Speech script or speaking notes</p> <p>A rough script or point-form speaking notes will be submitted prior to a speech being delivered. This item will be marked separately from the speech.</p>	
10%	<p>Peer Critique for Informative Speeches</p> <p>Students will constructively review the selected speech from the perspective of an audience member and assess the speaker's effectiveness in terms of the rhetorical devices she/he used.</p> <p>Word length: 350 to 400 words</p>	Feb 10, 12 Feb 24
10%	<p>Peer Critique for Persuasive Speeches</p> <p>Students will constructively review the selected speech from the perspective of an audience member and assess the speaker's effectiveness in terms of the rhetorical devices she/he used.</p> <p>Word length: 350 to 400 words</p>	Mar 23, 25 Mar 30 Apr 1, 6
10%	<p>In-class Debates</p> <p>Writing task: Team argument – For or Against</p> <p>Teams will prepare a written document using short paragraphs delineating both their argument's components (claim, data, warrant, backing, rebuttal) and their proposed rhetorical strategy (use of logos, pathos and ethos). This is the only part of the debates that will be marked.</p> <p>Debate: The teams will be assessed on their debating style and use of rhetorical devices. The winning team will be chosen by the class.</p>	Apr 6, 8, Apr 15

Registrar-scheduled Final Examination: NO

Note: You must **complete** the following course components in order to pass the course:
Informative speech, Persuasive speech

Submission of Assignments

Please include your name and ID number on all assignments and hand in your essays directly to your instructor or tutor. If you are unable to do so, please use the drop box in SS320; a date stamp is provided for your use. A night drop box is also available for after-hours submission. Assignments will be removed the following morning, stamped with the previous day's date, and placed in the instructor's mailbox. **Note:** It is your responsibility to keep a copy of each submitted assignment and to ensure that you submit the proper version (particularly in courses requiring electronic submission).

Be prepared to provide photo ID to pick up assignments in SS 320. Private information related to individual students is treated with the utmost regard by University of Calgary faculty. Student assignments will be accessible only by the authorized course faculty, and personal information is collected in accordance with the **Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act**. Please note that instructors may use audio or video recorded for lesson capture, assessment of student learning, and self-assessment of teaching practices.

Policy for Late Assignments

Assignments submitted after the deadline may be penalized with the loss of 5% for each day late. Requests for an extension will usually be granted if asked for in advance of the deadline.

Student Accommodations

Students seeking an accommodation based on disability or medical concerns should contact Student Accessibility Services (SAS); SAS will process the request and issue letters of accommodation to instructors. For information on support services and accommodations for students with disabilities, visit www.ucalgary.ca/access/. Students who require an accommodation based on a protected ground other than disability should communicate this need in writing to their Instructor. The full policy on Student Accommodations is available at <http://www.ucalgary.ca/policies/files/policies/student-accommodation-policy.pdf>.

Students seeking accommodation for transient illnesses (e.g., the flu) or another legitimate reason should contact their instructors. Whenever possible, students should provide supporting documentation to support their request; however, instructors may not require that a medical note be presented. For the policy on supporting documentation the use of a statutory declaration, see Section M.1 of the *University Calendar*: <https://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/m-1.html>. Also see FAQs for Students: <https://www.ucalgary.ca/registrar/registration/appeals/student-faq>

Expectations for Writing

Department policy directs that all written assignments and, to a lesser extent, written exam responses be assessed at least partly on writing skills. Writing skills include not only surface correctness (grammar, punctuation, sentence structure, etc.) but also general clarity and organization and proper documentation of research sources. For further information, please refer to the *University of Calgary Calendar* section on writing across the curriculum: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/e-2.html>

Grading & Department of Communication, Media and Film Grade Scale

The following table outlines the grade scale percentage equivalents used in the Department of Communication, Media and Film. Final grades are reported as letter grades. For components graded using percentages or numerical scores, those values will be used directly in calculating the final course grade, while for components graded using letter

grades, the letter grades will be converted to the midpoint values listed in the final column of the table below in calculating the final course grade.

In this course, letter grades will be used for all assignments.

Grade Point Value	Description	Grade	Dept of CMF grade scale equivalents*	Letter grade % equivalent for calculations*
4.00	Outstanding performance	A+	96 - 100%	98.0%
4.00	Excellent performance	A	90 - 95.99%	93.0%
3.70	Approaching excellent performance	A -	85 - 89.99%	87.5%
3.30	Exceeding good performance	B+	80 - 84.99%	82.5%
3.00	Good performance	B	75 - 79.99%	77.5%
2.70	Approaching good performance	B-	70 - 74.99%	72.5%
2.30	Exceeding satisfactory performance	C+	65 - 69.99%	67.5%
2.00	Satisfactory performance	C	60 - 64.99%	62.5%
1.70	Approaching satisfactory performance	C-	55 - 59.99%	57.5%
1.30	Marginal pass. Insufficient preparation for subsequent courses in the same subject	D+	53 - 54.99%	54.0%
1.00	Minimal pass. Insufficient preparation for subsequent courses in the same subject	D	50 - 52.99%	51.5%
0.00	Failure. Did not meet course requirements.	F	0 - 49.99%	0%

* Column 4: If percentages are used to calculate final grades, then grades falling within these ranges will be translated to the corresponding letter grades. Column 5: These percentage equivalents will be used for calculating final grades unless an alternative method of final grade calculation is outlined above.

Plagiarism

Using any source whatsoever without clearly documenting it is a serious academic offense. Consequences include failure on the assignment, failure in the course and possibly suspension or expulsion from the university. These requirements apply to all assignments and sources, including those in non-traditional formats such as Web pages or visual media.

You must document not only direct quotations but also paraphrases and ideas where they appear in your text. A reference list at the end is insufficient by itself. **In-text citations must be provided, and readers must be able to tell exactly where your words and ideas end and other people's words and ideas begin.** Wording taken directly from a source must be enclosed within quotation marks (or, for long quotations, presented in the format prescribed by the documentation style you are using). Paraphrased information must not follow the original wording and sentence structure with only slight word substitutions here and there.

For information on citation and documentation styles (MLA, APA, Chicago, IEEE, etc.), visit the Student Success Centre resource links at <https://ucalgary.ca/student-services/student-success/writing-support> or the Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL) Research and Citation Resources at https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/resources.html

If you need help with your writing or have questions about citing sources, please consult your instructor or visit the Student Success Centre, 3rd floor, Taylor Family Digital Library. To book an appointment, go to https://ucalgary.ca/student-services/student-success?utm_source=ssc&utm_medium=redirect&utm_campaign=redirect

Instructor Intellectual Property & Copyright Legislation

Course materials created by the instructor (including course outlines, presentations and posted notes, labs, case studies, assignments and exams) remain the intellectual property of the instructor. These materials may NOT be reproduced, redistributed or copied without the explicit consent of the instructor. The posting of course materials to third party websites such as note-sharing sites without permission is prohibited. Sharing of extracts of these course materials with other students enrolled in the same course section and term may be allowed under fair dealing. Check with the instructor if you have any questions about sharing materials with classmates.

All students are required to read the University of Calgary policy on Acceptable Use of Material Protected by Copyright (www.ucalgary.ca/policies/files/policies/acceptable-use-of-material-protected-by-copyright.pdf) and requirements of the copyright act (<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-42/index.html>) to ensure they are aware of the consequences of unauthorized sharing of course materials (including instructor notes, electronic versions of textbooks etc.). Students who use material protected by copyright in violation of this policy may be disciplined under the Non-Academic Misconduct Policy.

Academic Misconduct

For information on academic misconduct and its consequences, please see the *University of Calgary Calendar* at <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/k.html>

Research Ethics

Whenever you perform research with human participants, including surveys, interviews, or observations as part of your university studies, you are responsible for obtaining research ethics approval and for following university research ethics guidelines. In some cases, your instructors may apply for course-based research ethics approval for certain assignments, and in those cases, they must review and approve your research plans and supervise your research. For more information about your research ethics responsibilities, please see <https://arts.ucalgary.ca/research/arts-researchers/resources-researchers-and-instructors/ethics>

Deferrals of Course Work and Requests for Reappraisal

For university regulations and procedures related to deferrals of exams and course work, requests for reappraisals, and other matters, please see the relevant sections in the *University Calendar*: <https://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/academic-regs.html>

Student Support Services and Resources

Please visit <https://www.ucalgary.ca/registrar/registration/course-outlines> for information about student support services and resources, including Wellness and Mental Health Resources, Student Success programs and services, the Student Ombuds Office, the Student Union, and Safewalk.

For resources on D2L, visit <http://elearn.ucalgary.ca/desire2learn/home/students>. IT support is available at itsupport@ucalgary.ca or by calling 403-220.5555.

Schedule of Lecture Topics and Readings

Abbreviations

TY – *Thank You for Arguing: What Aristotle, Lincoln and Homer Simpson can teach us about the art of persuasion*

RA – Rhetorical Analysis: a brief guide for writers

OWL – Purdue University Online Writing Lab

Date	Day	Topics and Activities	Readings
Wk 1 Jan 13	Mon	<p>Introduction to course objectives Review of course outline and assignments Participation policy</p> <p>Introduction: What is rhetoric and what's it for? YouTube: Marc Antony speech (3.09) Atkinson Father of the Bride speech</p>	<p>TY ch 1 - 2 RA ch 1 (pp 1 - 4)</p> <p>Antony's speech handout</p>
Jan 15	Wed	<p>How rhetoric works: information, evidence, persuasion, argumentation. (Types of rhetoric: deliberative, forensic, epideictic) Introduction to classical rhetoric: appeals or proofs (ethos, pathos, logos); enthymemes, syllogisms, kairos</p> <p>YouTube: Camille Langston <i>How to use rhetoric to get what you want</i> (5.49) Debate Professor <i>What is rhetoric?</i> (6.02)</p> <p>Sign up for speaking dates & to review 2 speakers</p>	<p>TY ch 3 - 4; 23 RA ch 2 (pp 7 - 19); ch 3 (pp 44 - 48) Classical Argument OWL handout</p>
Wk 2 Jan 20	Mon	<p>Activity Team 1: Present rhetorical artefact</p> <p>The canons of rhetoric (invention, arrangement, style, memory, delivery) Rhetorical situation; Bitzer's theory</p> <p>Argument structures: Aristotelian and Toulmin</p> <p>Each team find an example of argument to be analyzed as a class, with teams leading</p> <p>Assignment: Analyze an argument (student's choice) using either technique. Length: 850 words Due Feb 3</p>	<p>TY ch 5 - 6; 24 - 25 RA ch 3 (p 50 - 54; p 62 - 64) Nordquist Five Canons handout OWL Rhetorical Situations handout (1 & 2) Bitzer's theory handout Argument 3 OWL handout</p>
Jan 22	Wed	<p>Activity Team 2: Present rhetorical artefact</p> <p>Writing Academic Papers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis statements • Research • Organization <p>Writing: Argument</p>	<p>Writing Guides handouts</p> <p>Argument 1 & 2 OWL handouts</p>

Wk 3 Jan 27	Mon	<p>Activity Team 3: Present rhetorical artefact</p> <p>Introduction to informative speaking https://courses.lumenlearning.com/boundless-communications/chapter/introduction-to-informative-speaking/</p> <p>Purdue OWL video: <i>Introduction to Rhetoric</i> (3.26) <i>In Defence of Rhetoric: No Longer Just for Liars</i> (14.08)</p> <p>Individual activity: students begin drafting an informative speech on the topic of their choice</p>	<p>TY ch 7, 10, 11 RA ch 4 (pp 115 - 119); ch 5 (pp 136 - 141)</p>
Jan 29	Wed	<p>Activity Team 4: Present rhetorical artefact</p> <p>Writing: Logic</p> <p>Citation – APA Style: Simon Fraser U Library (2019) https://www.lib.sfu.ca/help/cite-write/citation-style-guides/apa + examples (2 pp & References)</p>	<p>Argument 4 OWL handout Logic 1, 2 & 4 OWL handout</p>
Wk 4 Feb 3	Mon	<p>Assignment: Informative speeches 8 x speeches & reviews</p>	<p>Argument critique due</p>
Feb 5	Wed	<p>8 x speeches & reviews</p>	
Wk 5 Feb 10	Mon	<p>8 x speeches & reviews</p>	<p>Feb 3 reviews due</p>
Feb 12	Wed	<p>6 x speeches & reviews</p>	<p>Feb 5 reviews due</p>
Wk 6 Feb 17 & 21		<p>Reading Week No classes</p>	
Wk 7 Feb 24	Mon	<p>Activity Team 5: Present rhetorical artefact</p> <p>Learning take-aways from informative speeches</p> <p>Stasis Theory</p> <p>Sign up for speaking dates & to review 2 speakers</p> <p>Feedback Day: written comments on the class</p>	<p>TY ch 8, 9, 12, 13, 25 RA ch 3 (pp 76 - 80)</p> <p>Stasis Theory OWL handout</p> <p>Feb 10 & 12 reviews due</p>

Feb 26	Wed	Activity Team 6: Present rhetorical artefact Speaking persuasively Monroe's Motivated Sequence (MMS)	TY ch 12 - 13, 25 RA ch 5 (pp 142 - 159) MMS handout
Wk 8 Mar 2	Mon	Activity Team 1: Present rhetorical artefact Speech writing In-class analysis of political speech New Zealand PM speech (pathos)	TY ch 23 & 26 RA ch 5 (pp 160 - 167); sidebar p 215 UNC handout
Mar 4	Wed	Activity Team 2: Present rhetorical artefact Speech writing In-class analysis of political speech J.S. Woodsworth speech (logos) Individual activity: students begin drafting a persuasive speech on the topic of their choice	TY ch 26 - 27
Wk 9 Mar 9	Mon	Activity Team 3: Present rhetorical artefact In-class activity: Examine an argument (e.g., a government or corporate press release) using the Toulmin structure Individual activity: continue drafting a persuasive speech	TY ch 16 - 17 RA review ch 3 (pp 50 - 54)
Mar 11	Wed	Activity Team 4: Present rhetorical artefact Rhetoric in everyday life: <i>The Newsroom deconstructs Nancy Grace (3.49)</i> Logical fallacies and other pitfalls Debating Procedures Rules	TY ch 14 - 15 RA ch 3 (pp 63 - 66) Argument 4 OWL handout Logic 3 OWL handout Guide to Debating handout How to Debate handout
Wk 10 Mar 16	Mon	Assignment: Persuasive speeches 8 x speeches & reviews Class Cancelled: these 8 speeches will be delivered on March 30.	
Mar 18	Wed	8 x speeches & reviews	
Wk 11 Mar 23	Mon	8 x speeches & reviews	Mar 16 reviews due

Mar 25	Wed	6 x speeches & reviews	Mar 18 reviews due
Wk 12 Mar 30	Mon	Activity Team 5: Present rhetorical artefact 8 x speeches originally scheduled for Mar 16 Learning take-aways from persuasive speeches Team activity: work on debate plans – short paragraphs delineating both the argument components (claim, the data, warrant etc.) and the proposed rhetorical strategy (use of <i>logos</i> , <i>pathos</i> , <i>ethos</i> etc.)	TY ch 18 & 27 Mar 23 reviews due
Apr 1	Wed	Activity Team 6: Present rhetorical artefact Assignment: Debates Team 1 vs Team 4	Mar 25 reviews due
Wk 13 Apr 6	Mon	Team 2 vs Team 5	Mar 30 reviews due Debate plans Team 1 & 4 due
Apr 8	Wed	Team 3 vs Team 6	Debate plans Team 2 & 5 due
Wk 14 Apr 13	Mon	Easter Monday: no class	
Apr 15	Wed	Debates postmortem & review	Debate plans Team 3 & 6 due

Appendix
Rubric for Evaluation of Speeches (as a guideline for what is expected)

	Appropriate handling of any unexpected interruptions or technical challenges
--	--

GENERAL

CONTENT

	Content fit within assigned genre, focus, and purpose of either informative or persuasive genre. It did not wander off topic or off genre.
--	--

	Assigned sections included (Intro, Thesis, Body, Conclusion).
	Introduction: sufficient coverage of theme and purpose.
	Thesis: clear and appropriate.
	Body: coverage, degree of detail and scope appropriate for length and audience's common knowledge/belief.
	Conclusion content: not merely a summary; appropriate to the genre.

ARGUMENT

	Main claims within the body are clearly expressed and related to the overall thesis and genre.
	Sufficient and relevant data and evidence were provided for each claim.
	Sufficient explanation of any facts from secondary sources.
	Sufficient reasoning/analysis provided to comment on claims and data provided.
	Insightful and audience-relevant conclusions.

ORGANIZATION

	All information clearly belongs within its section.
	Covered major topics/sections in a logical order, not random.
	Within main points, information, arguments, and data presented in logical order.
	Effective transitions from one section to another.
	No unnecessary repetition,

STYLE AND DELIVERY

	Verbal delivery: rate, volume, pitch, enunciation, dramatic pause.
	Non-verbal delivery: appearance, facial expression, posture, gesture, eye contact, movement.
	Clarity, correctness and appropriateness of verbal style, word choice.