The purpose of this teaching portfolio is to provide a sense of who I am as a teacher, including my pedagogical values and practices. I have chosen to include a wide variety of examples that highlight my teaching strengths (from my time at IPFW). As you’ll see, I am committed to meeting students where they are, modeling positive mentoring behaviors, helping them use digital and online technologies, and encouraging them to mentor each other towards greater knowledge inside the classroom and out. To this end, I’ve included the following materials in this portfolio.
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Statement of Teaching Philosophy

Teaching and mentoring are complementary modes of learning. I believe that when students are encouraged and supported in constructive mentoring relationships, their ability to learn expands. Positive mentoring enables students to develop more productive rhetorical skills, writing strategies, and relationships with one another. They even increase their chances of securing a job after graduation. One of the best ways I have aided students’ learning in the classroom is by motivating them to become active and positive peer mentors for one another. The peer mentoring relationships I foster in my writing classroom adhere to three feminist and decolonial qualities of positive mentoring: self-reflexivity, reciprocity, and transparency. These mentoring characteristics strongly influence my teaching of college writing in both face-to-face and online classroom spaces. It is my job as a teacher to help students understand that writing well means investing in solid relationships with one another.

To be self-reflexive in all writing and learning situations

Students come to the classroom with many and varied experiences, positions, and knowledges. And because of this, I encourage students to approach writing and learning in ways that are self-aware. Their self-awareness leads to a greater understanding of and appreciation for their positions within our classroom, university, and larger society. For instance, in my Technical Report Writing course, I schedule times throughout the semester for students to talk with one another about their interests, beliefs, and core values and how these are important to technical documentation. Low-stakes writing exercises as well as partner sharing, and small and large group conversations facilitate this process. As a result, students experience what I call “reflex” moments, or moments where they are able to make connections between themselves and complex issues of race, class, gender, age, and ability. Self-reflexive students become more capable writers and communicators who are better able to understand their active roles in the world.

To be reciprocal in all writing and learning situations

I want students to contribute to the quality of their and their peers’ education by forming reciprocal relationships with one another. These student-to-student relationships cultivate cooperation at every stage of the writing process. These relationships also emphasize the importance of outlining mutually beneficial goals and outcomes for everyone involved. One way reciprocity is enacted in my classroom is during the peer review process. For example, in my Writing Center Theory and Praxis course, student consultants create and implement their own peer review guidelines for each of our projects. The review guidelines reflect how both the writing and reviewing processes rely on students’ relationships with one another (which is crucial to the writer/consultant relationship in writing center consultations). As a result, student consultants learn that their attitudes toward and relationships with one another affect not only their approach to each project’s writing situation, but also their interpretations of the learning outcomes of each project, which make them better writing consultants.

To be transparent in all writing and learning situations

I believe that transparency in teaching is situated in the teacher, the curriculum, and the students. As an educator, it is my responsibility to be as clear as possible with students about my expectations of their performance and the learning outcomes of the course. One way I model transparency is through consistent and open dialogue of course outcomes in relation to audience expectations. To explain, in my Project and Content Management course, students participate in hands-on project work with real stakeholders. In partnership with stakeholders during user-feedback seminars, we discuss individual and collective approaches to project management that meet and even exceed stakeholders’ needs. This transparency strategy encourages students to be attentive, productive, and contributing members of our class, and helps them model effective ways to communicate their ideas to the broader community.

Teaching is exciting for me because I’m constantly developing and modeling new approaches to help undergraduate and graduate students learn. As a teacher and mentor, I am committed to engaging students in my class through positive mentoring relationships and practices. Ultimately, I aim to provide students with the skills necessary for writing effectively and thinking critically about knowledge as a rhetorical production.

If you’d like to see other materials, please visit my website: www.beth-keller.com.
**Classroom Teaching Experience and Courses Taught**

**Assistant Professor of English and Linguistics**
Writing courses for the English major (writing concentration and digital literacy concentration) and the Professional Writing minor
Department of English and Linguistics
Indiana University – Purdue University Fort Wayne
fall 2015 – present
Developed course syllabi, lesson plans, and assignments; provided feedback on student writing; graded writing assignments; assigned and submitted final grades.

**Degree Courses Taught (in order of level)**

**ENG W233: Intermediate Expository Writing (hybrid)**
Fall 2015 (two sections)
Second-year expository writing course. Students developed research questions, a research proposal, they analyzed and synthesized existing research, and conducted their own primary research, when applicable. Major assignments included three I-search proposals, a rhetorical analysis of a website (related to a selected research topic), an annotated bibliography, and a 10-page research document that incorporates research conducted throughout the term.

**ENG W234: Technical Report Writing (online)**
Summer 2016-present
Second-year writing course for engineering, computer science, and business majors focused on technical report writing. Major assignments include a job/internship search portfolio (resume, cover letter, and company/organization history report), a detailed instruction/how-to project, and a proposal/presentation for a local non-profit organization. In the proposal project, students identify a need for the non-profit, a solution or set of solutions for this need, a plan to implement solutions, and way(s) to evaluate the success of the plan/solutions.

**ENG W331: Business and Administrative Writing (online)**
Fall 2015-Spring 2016
Writing course for sophomore, junior, and senior business and English majors. Students compose in different genres such as resumes, letters, emails, memos, and reports. Major assignments included an employment portfolio (resume and cover letter), a business correspondence portfolio (emails, memos, letters, forms), and a group research portfolio (proposal, research bibliography, report, and oral presentation).

**ENG W367/C567: Writing for Multiple Media**
Spring 2018
This class involves students in thinking about, understanding, and producing new media compositions that center on digital film, image, and sound production. Students gain practical experience producing and engaging a variety of integrated-media texts and the situations that call for these types of texts. The main projects include writing in digital-video, creating integrated-media tutorials, and delivering live, multi-mediated presentations. We are working with the Mad Anthonys Children’s Hope House (see also: [https://www.childrenshopefw.org/](https://www.childrenshopefw.org/)) to provide them with projects that meet their needs.

**ENG W397/C507: Writing Center Theory and Praxis**
Spring 2016, Spring 2017, Fall 2017
Writing consultant theory and practice course for all majors and disciplines. Major assignments include a consulting philosophy, a semester-long project proposal, an annotated bibliography, and a final 12-page, researched based project/presentation. Students develop into effective peer consultants in writing who could then staff the various consulting spaces across campus, investigate the role of composition and learning theories on tutoring practice, and explore the role of tutoring practice on composition theory and research.

**ENG W462/C682: Special Topics in Rhetoric and Composition**
Project and Content Management
Fall 2016, Fall 2017
A Special Topics in Rhetoric and Composition course focused on the intricacies of communicating effectively in the workplace as an essential skill of project managers. Students learn planning and organizing strategies and models, process documentation, and management implementation strategies and philosophies. In the fall 2016,
students worked with the IPFW Helmke Library renovation project. Fall 2017 has students working in cross-functional teams with computer science, information systems, and visual communication design students to produce a cultural entertainment magazine, NeueView. Major assignments include a scoping proposal (per student), a semester project proposal (per group), a progress report, written content for NeueView, and a final semester project, presentation, and postmortem.

**ENG C780: Special Studies in Rhetoric and Composition**  
*Communities of Practice: Understanding Gender, Mentoring, and Leadership in Rhetoric and Composition*  
Spring 2017

Special Studies in Rhetoric and Composition graduate seminar, which examines the rhetorical practices, lived stories, and experiences associated with what it means to be (a) professional. Course readings come from a variety of disciplines, including rhetoric, composition studies, feminist theory, organizational psychology, among other fields. Major assignments include weekly reading responses, weekly discussion leaders, class participation, literature circle presentation, and a self-designed final project.

**Non-degree Courses Taught**

**BUS 670: Leadership Development, Track I: Self Mastery and Success (non-degree, one three-hour class)**  
Fall 2017

Students explored Robert Sternberg’s theory of *Successful Intelligence* (SQ) thinking: analytical (abstract thought processing), creative (new ideas), and practical (practical solutions to real problems) thinking processes and applications.

**BUS 480: Grant Writing (non-degree course)**  
Spring 2018

A six-week course designed to help local and community individuals develop effective grant writing skills that are essential to acquire competitive funding from government agencies and private foundations. This non-credit course will provide students with the background necessary to develop a basic funding proposal. It will also provide an introduction to the basic skills, principles, and techniques of successful grant writing.

**Graduate Teaching Assistant**

First-Year Writing and Professional Writing  
Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and American Cultures  
Michigan State University  
spring 2010–spring 2011; fall 2012–spring 2013; fall 2014

Developed course syllabi, lesson plans, and assignments; provided feedback on writing; graded writing assignments; assigned and submitted final grades.

**Courses Taught**

**WRA 110 Writing: Science and Technology (hybrid)**  
*Social Media, Social Networks*  
Fall 2014 (one section)

First-year writing course with a science and technology theme. Major assignments include a literacy autobiography exploring media consumption and production habits, an analysis essay of the media habits of a prior generation, an analytical essay responding to scholarly assumptions about youth media consumption, and a remix project that explores how media habits may or may not prepare students for their future careers.

**WRA 140 Writing: Women in America**  
*The Politics of Women*  
Spring 2013 (one section)

First-year writing course with a women and gender theme. Major assignments included a literacy autobiography, a media artifact analysis, a research report and analysis of the gender politics in their discipline, a group remix project, and a final course reflection essay. Each assignment required students to critically examine the ways their gender affects their writing and their relationships.

**WRA 150 Writing: Evolution of American Thought**  
Fall 2010–Spring 2011 (one section each semester)
(Re)Thinking, (Re)Reading, and (Re)Writing American Popular Culture
First-year writing course with a popular media & culture theme. Major assignments included a personal literacy and popular culture narrative, a cultural artifacts, gender performance and popular culture analysis, a research paper on writing, rhetoric, and research in popular culture, a remix project, and a final course revision project. Students explored how American popular culture (from advertisements and music videos, to social web tools and clothing choices) informs their reading and writing practices, both in the classroom and outside of it.

WRA 150 Writing: Evolution of American Thought
Family Literacies and Traditions (one section)
Spring 2010
First-year writing course with a family literacies and traditions theme. Major assignments included a family literacy narrative, a cultural artifact analysis related to family performance, a disciplinary literacy project, a revised remix project, and a final course reflection essay. Each assignment required students to critically examine the ways their family traditions affect their writing and their potential careers.

WRA 202: Introduction to Professional Writing
Fall 2012 (one section)
A sophomore and junior-level course designed to introduce students majoring in Professional Writing to the concept of professional writing as a career and as a program at Michigan State University. The course used basic principles of rhetoric and composition applied to professional writing. Topics include page design, field definition, research tools and practices, genres and conventions, and professional style. Students wrote usability documents, recommendation reports, communication strategies, and various professional and job portfolios items. Students also interacted one-on-one with academic and community partners in user-feedback seminars.

Writing Center Teaching Experience
Coordinator, facilitator, online modules creator
The MSU Graduate School and the MSU Writing Center
Michigan State University
Fall 2010-present; Coordinator (fall 2013-summer 2014)

The Navigating the Ph.D. Workshop Series
These two interactive writing workshops, given at least once a semester, are designed to help Ph.D. students develop an individualized plan for graduate writing, especially comprehensive exams, dissertation proposals, and dissertations. Session 1 is designed for students in the early years of their Ph.D. study. Session 2 is designed for students in the latter years of their Ph.D. study.

Session 1: Navigating the Ph.D: Managing Time and Academic Relationships
In this 3-hour workshop, plans for time management and working with others will be the main focus. Participants will create academic timelines for their Ph.D. work at MSU and discuss technologies and habits that can help them stay on task. Participants will also discuss how to manage the stress that often pervades the life of Ph.D. students and share strategies for overcoming writer’s block and procrastination. Additionally, discussion about selecting and working with committees will provide a space for sharing about and learning how to communicate with faculty members about participants’ research and writing.

Session 2: Navigating the Ph.D.: Writing Processes & Strategies for Academic Writing
In this 3-hour workshop, the focus will be on writing processes and practices. Every Ph.D. program at MSU requires comprehensive exams, dissertation proposals, and dissertations. In the workshop, participants will explore and share their current writing practices and be given practical writing and revision strategies. During the latter half of the workshop, participants will develop a plan for developing and completing their dissertations.

Please visit this link for more information about the online modules:
http://writing.msu.edu/resources/navigating-the-phd-workshop-series/

The Navigating the Master's Degree Workshop Series
Developer, coordinator, facilitator
The MSU Graduate School and the MSU Writing Center
Michigan State University Spring 2014–present
This interactive writing workshop, given at least once a semester, is designed to help students develop an individualized plan for understanding graduate school more generally and graduate writing more specifically. This workshop is designed for students in both the early and latter years of their master’s degree study. In this 4-hour workshop, the focus will be on understanding the transition to graduate school, navigating master’s degree coursework and graduation options (thesis, exams, portfolios, etc.), locating and using professional and personal support resources, and writing for the degree and future job. Participants will create academic timelines for their master’s work (coursework, conference presentations, internships, etc.) at MSU and discuss technologies and habits that can help them stay on task. Participants will also discuss how to manage the stress that often pervades the life of master’s students and how to select and work with committee. We will end the workshop by having participants explore and share their current writing practices, and writing and revision strategies, as well as sharing strategies for overcoming writer’s block and procrastination.

Sample Syllabi & Schedules

ENG W234. Section 02I Fall 2017.
Dr. Elizabeth (Beth) Keller Department of English and Linguistics Liberal Arts Building, Room 141 Office Hours: Tuesday's 10:30a.m. – 2:30p.m., and by appointment elizabeth.keller@ipfw.edu
Skype: doctor.keller

Course Overview.
English W234, Technical Report Writing, has two purposes: (1) to help you develop communication skills you will use in the future, and (2) to enrich your understanding of the roles that writing and reading play in activities outside school. In other words, W234 is a course to help you write in a variety of situations – especially the workplace – and to a variety of readers. This course is also an imperative part of engineering and technology education as defined by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology.

Course Objectives.
Students who complete W234 should be able to demonstrate their competence in four areas:

**Rhetorical Knowledge**, including the ability to focus on purposes and audiences in academic, workplace, and civic settings (BF 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6*); to respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations (BF 2 and 5*); to adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality (BF 1 and 3*); to write in technical writing genres (BF 2, 3, and 6*).

**Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing**, including the ability to use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating (BF 1, 2, and 6*); to manage a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources (BF 1, 3, and 5*); to integrate one’s own ideas with those of others (BF 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6*); to understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power within academic, workplace, and civic settings (BF 2, 4, and 5*); and to recognize the importance of professional organizations (BF 3 and 4*).

**Writing Processes**, including the use of multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text (BF 1 and 2*); the development of flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading (BF 1 and 2*); learning to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing one’s own part (BF 3 and 4*); participation in collaborative and social processes and genres that require the ability to critique one’s own and others’ works (BF 1, 2, 3, and 4*); and using a variety of technologies to address a range of situations (BF 1, 2, 5 and 6*).

**Knowledge of Conventions**, including the ability to follow common formats for different kinds of technical genres (BF 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6*); to increase knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics (BF 1 and 2*); to practice appropriate means of documenting one’s work according to workplace and professional standards (BF 2, 3, and 4*); and to control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling (BF 1 and 2*).
The IPFW Baccalaureate Framework (BF) identifies six foundations of baccalaureate education which all undergraduate degrees at IPFW should meet. These six foundations are:

1. **Acquisition of Knowledge**: Students will demonstrate breadth of knowledge across disciplines and depth of knowledge in their chosen discipline. In order to do so, students must demonstrate the requisite information-seeking skills and technological competencies.

2. **Application of Knowledge**: Students will demonstrate the ability to integrate and apply that knowledge, and, in so doing, demonstrate the skills necessary for life-long learning.

3. **Personal and Professional Values**: Students will demonstrate the highest levels of personal integrity and professional ethics.

4. **A Sense of Community**: Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to be productive and responsible citizens and leaders in local, regional, national, and international communities. In so doing, students will demonstrate a commitment to free and open inquiry and mutual respect across multiple cultures and perspectives.

5. **Critical Thinking and Problem Solving**: Students will demonstrate facility and adaptability in their approach to problem solving. In so doing, students will demonstrate critical-thinking abilities and familiarity with quantitative and qualitative reasoning.

6. **Communication**: Students will demonstrate the written, oral, and multimedia skills necessary to communicate effectively in diverse settings.

**Required Text.**

**Grading.**
Letter grades are equivalent to the following:

- A = 90 – 100 %,
- B = 80 – 89 %,
- C = 70 – 79 %,
- D = 60 – 69 %,
- F = 59 % and below.

Specific criteria for each project will be discussed at appropriate times throughout the semester. You must submit at least one version of each project in order to pass the course.

**Projects and Grade Distribution.**
Specific criteria for each project will be discussed at appropriate times throughout the semester. Details about each project, and templates, can be found on our class Blackboard website. Note: you must submit at least one version of every project in order to pass the course.

- **Netiquette Email**: To establish guidelines for professional communication; to open lines of communication between professor and student. Course Outcomes Met: Rhetorical Knowledge - audience, purpose, voice and tone. Percent of total grade: **2%**.

- **Job/Internship Search Project Rough Drafts**: Includes Investigative Report, Resume, and Cover Letter. To learn about the role of writing in the job search; to practice research skills; to practice document design and writing for workplace settings. Course Outcomes Met: Writing Process, Knowledge of Conventions. Percent of total grade: **10%**.

- **Instructions Project Rough Drafts**: Includes Evaluation Plan Memo and Instructional Text. To learn principles of documentation and the writing of instructions; to apply those principles to an actual case. Course Outcomes Met: Writing Process, Knowledge of Conventions. Percent of total grade: **10%**.

- **Proposal Project Rough Drafts**: Includes Formal Proposal and PowerPoint Presentation. To define a real need or opportunity and to propose a plan for addressing it. Course Outcomes Met: Writing Process, Knowledge of Conventions. Percent of total grade: **10%**.

- **Peer Workshops**: To help classmates develop their written projects, and to gather feedback on yours. Course Outcomes Met: Writing Process; Rhetorical Knowledge – audience and purpose. Percent of total grade: **15%**.

- **Portfolio of Final Drafts**: Includes the final, edited drafts of Investigative Report, Resume, Cover Letter, Evaluation Plan Memo, Instructional Text, Formal Proposal, PowerPoint Presentation, and Project Evaluation Memo. To use revision, editing, and reflection skills; to finalize written products; to exhibit knowledge gained throughout the
entire course. Course Outcomes Met: Rhetorical Knowledge; Knowledge of Conventions; Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing. Percent of total grade: 43%

Quizzes and Discussion Boards: To reinforce course concepts; to practice skills needed for the major projects. Course Outcomes Met: Critical Thinking—inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating. Percent of total grade: 10%

Class Policies.
General Information: This course is online only. Just because we are online does not mean you should not attend or address the procedures of the class. Everyone must participate for the class to function in this space, so please set time aside to take care of class work. I know it sounds weird, but you can still miss too much time even online, resulting in missing assignment deadlines and important announcements. Class projects require your active participation; it is important that you complete exercises, quizzes, and assignments, and respond to your classmates in the discussion board in a timely manner.

Preparation and Deadlines: Deadlines for projects and assignments fall on a Monday-Wednesday schedule. This means that all work will be due on one of those two days of the week. All deadlines are at midnight (11:59 p.m.) on the due date. Please work *ahead of schedule* if you are concerned about meeting these deadlines. *I reserve the right to refuse to read exercises and projects submitted late.* If I do accept late work, it is subject to a deduction. No work will be accepted more than one week later than its scheduled due date.

Formatting: Formatting on written work is to be single spaced, full block, and in an appropriate font. Basic formatting guidelines are posted on Blackboard. In addition, details about formatting in particular assignments are discussed on each assignment sheet. Citations are expected; we use IEEE citation methods in this class. For details about IEEE citations, please see Blackboard.

A note about file attachments: some of the documents you’ll be producing will have images and therefore will be larger files. Most files should be .doc, .docx, or .rtf. For large, cumbersome files, I would recommend that you convert to .pdf prior to sending them.

Peer Workshops: You’ll complete several peer workshops during the semester to give and receive comments on drafts of your work. Instructions for these peer workshops are in the Important Course Documents folder in Blackboard. These workshops are crucial to your success. The feedback you give and receive in these peer workshops is weighted heavily in your course grade and is the means by which you’ll receive written comments on drafts.

You may revise work that you have done or are doing in other courses as long as it meets the following conditions: 1. it is your own work, 2. you plan an extensive revision for this course, 3. you have informed, and have received the approval of, your instructor in both courses.

Office Hours and Contact Information.
During the fall semester, I hold regular, in-person office hours. If you need to speak with me, please stop by my office, or email me for an either in-person or a conversation in Skype.

The best way to contact me is via email at elizabeth.keller@ipfw.edu. I check my email several times a day during the work week (Monday to Friday), during normal business hours (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.). Emails received over the weekend or overnight may not be read until the morning of the following business day.

*Important Note: I do not use the email provided by Blackboard. Please email me directly at my IPFW account only. Further, you are responsible to check your IPFW student account regularly throughout the course.*

Ethics and Plagiarism.
You are expected to act ethically, both toward your classmates and your instructor. In addition to acting honestly, ethical behavior toward classmates involves contributing your fair share to group exercises and projects and addressing one another respectfully (both face-to-face and online). Ethical behavior toward your instructor involves speaking honestly and submitting your own work.

Check the IPFW Undergraduate Bulletin for policies regarding plagiarism and academic honesty. You must do your own original work in this course--and to identify that portion of your work which is collaborative with others, or borrowed from others, or which is your own work from other contexts. *Whenever you quote passages, borrow graphics, or use ideas from others, you are legally and ethically obliged to acknowledge that use, following appropriate conventions for documenting sources.*

You may revise work that you have done or are doing in other courses as long as it meets the following conditions: (1) it is your own work, (2) you plan an extensive revision for this course, and (3) you have informed, and have
W462/C682: Project & Content Management for Writers

Indiana University–Purdue University Fort Wayne
Fall 2017 | Monday 4:30PM - 7:15PM | Liberal Arts 42
Professor: Elizabeth (Beth) Keller
Email: elizabeth.keller@ipfw.edu
Skype: @doctor.keller
Office: Liberal Arts 141
Office Hours: Tuesday: 10:30a.m. – 2:30p.m., and by appointment

Course Description
Project management education smartly focuses a great deal on planning and organization, process documentation, and management implementation strategies and reports. However, building effective communication strategies and abilities is often overlooked and incorrectly thought of as a soft skill. In this section of W462/C682 we are going to specifically address the intricacies of communicating effectively in the workplace as an essential skill of project managers. In addition, we will also discuss planning and organizing strategies and models, process documentation, and management implementation strategies and philosophies. We’ll learn about these concepts through hands-on project work with two other departments on campus – Visual Communication and Design (VCD) and Computer Science and Information Systems (CS/IS). The work we do with VCD and CS/IS emphasizes individual and collective approaches to project management, and gives us a basis for thinking through issues that influence the workplace – from emerging workspace design to the effects of globalization on distributed teams and organizations. You should leave class with skills and knowledge that you can refer to when asked to lead and participate in a variety of projects in different organizational contexts.

Course Threshold Concepts
The goal of this course is to equip you with the knowledge and understanding necessary to manage small, large, and nested (projects that occur within projects) projects and communicate effectively with collaborators and stakeholders. Below are the threshold concepts we will focus on:

1. *Project managers are accountable for getting work done on time and on budget, and may not have a job very long if they can’t consistently get projects out the door.* Gathering requirements, scoping projects, facilitating iterative (repetitive) processes, delivering value, and *meeting deadlines on time and on budget* are important functions of a project manager within an organization. The role and title of a project manager can vary by organization, but the essential requirement of the job is to get work done on time and on budget, to get better at doing that work for each project, and to deliberately help businesses meet their goals. Project work often presents unforeseen circumstances that affect budgets and deadlines, so it is important that project managers can remain calm under pressure.

2. *Project managers are constantly seeking to learn new things to get better at the job.* Since organizational contexts, technologies, and people differ and change, learning how to adapt on the fly enables the project manager to lead effectively. Even more, taking ownership over failures and making proactive changes to behavior is key to meeting business objectives. Learning how to effectively lead a team is a key component of successful collaboration, coordination, and communication in today’s ever-changing global workplace. The cliche is true: learning to lead is as important as learning to follow, but this sort of learning is never done—it can’t be.

3. *Project managers help teams achieve business outcomes.* To do so, many project managers use adaptive and agile (i.e., characterized by the division of tasks into short phases of work and frequent reassessment and adaptation of plans) methods that draw from a range of approaches because these kinds of projects frequently focus on solving or identifying problems that have no single correct solution. Many of these projects can be ambiguous and iterative, and as a result, feel messy. Focusing on achieving business objectives and outcomes, and understanding how projects help support business goals, are useful for guiding teams when inevitably faced with ambiguity.

4. *Project managers don’t just manage projects, they manage people.* Communication skills are often incorrectly considered a soft skill or “people skills,” but are actually a strategic use of communication approaches across multiple modalities, cultures, and contexts. In this class we understand communication from a rhetorical perspective, which means learning to engage and manage stakeholders in different workplaces and spaces. Rhetoric will help us negotiate resources, personnel, risks, conflict, trust, and so on. In short, to manage people we learn how to listen, how to be empathetic, how to be tactful, and how/when to respond.

5. *Managing projects is an ongoing process of building and maintaining relationships through documentation, research, and feedback.* We improve our skills and abilities through experience, but also through timely, useful, and continuous feedback. To help teams effectively achieve business outcomes, project managers must build responsive feedback loops by using tools such as modeling, scoping, activity diagrams, visual plans, project charters, etc. These tools also help to shape useful and actionable performance feedback. Additionally, these tools help project managers practice good judgment about contentious or politically uncertain issues, and make appropriate decisions about escalating problems.

**Course Outcomes**

In this class you will engage in general class activities, which will consist of readings, discussions, presentations, and other relevant activities. These activities will help you:

- Understand project management implementation strategies like waterfall, agile, LeanUX, and adaptive (CS/IS components);
- Practice rhetorical communication in multiple modalities with different project stakeholders;
- Use class materials and experiences to guide and support team and peer feedback (feedback from your classmates and also from the students in VCD and CS/IS); and,
- Develop a working project management philosophy, including ways of practicing good judgment, constantly learning and adapting approaches, and inviting participation from collaborators and stakeholders.

In this class you will also participate in a larger, multidisciplinary publication project. We will be working closely with students and instructors from VCD (Graphic Design III Publication Design, taught by Professors Peter Bella & Jim Gabbard) and CS/IS (Project Management/IS Project Management, taught by Professor Adolfo Coronado) in developing a sustainable, professional-quality magazine. This larger project will teach you how to:
Create a scope, charter, and proposal for a project, and learn how to complete the work on time (and on budget) to support business goals;

• Create and manage an internal documentation scheme to assist your team and make communication with collaborators and stakeholders more transparent; and,

• Evaluate your experiences managing a project and reflect on the outcome of the work in a postmortem report.

Textbooks
Title: *Making Things Happen: Mastering Project Management*  Author: Scott Berkun
ISBN 13:
Title: *Lean UX: Applying Lean Principles to Improve User Experience*  Authors: Jeff Gothelf and Josh Seiden
ISBN 13:
Title: *Peopleware: Productive Projects and Teams*  Authors: Tom DeMarco and Timothy Lister

**Other resources in the form of links, videos, and additional readings will also be assigned. It is your responsibility to obtain, access, and review these materials. These materials will be linked in our Blackboard course site, or mentioned in class meeting times.**

Course Technologies
You will need to have access to certain digital and online technologies to complete your work. In some instances, these technologies may be new to you. **You are responsible for making time to ramp up, troubleshoot, and learn.** This activity will require your patience, can-do attitude, and sense of adventure. And, really, it is something you will do throughout your career as a project and content manager, so it is important you learn to teach yourself new and emerging technologies. Make sure you have access to your @ipfw.edu e-mail account, too. Check this email at least twice daily.

Ethics and Academic Integrity
The work you submit must be produced originally for this class and cannot be used for another course in the same semester without my express permission. An additional expectation is that you will follow this basic ethical obligation: You should credit others’ contributions to your work. You should not claim, as your own, work (or writing) that is not your own. To do so is considered plagiarism. It is perfectly appropriate for you to borrow graphics, to quote passages, and to use ideas from others. However, whenever you do that, follow appropriate documentation conventions for your sources. Procedures for responding to cases of academic honesty and possible repercussions are outlined in IPFW Student Handbook. They can also be found on the web at: [https://www.ipfw.edu/committees/senate/regulations/honesty.html](https://www.ipfw.edu/committees/senate/regulations/honesty.html)

Resources for You
Me: You can always find me during my office hours. Email is a sure way to get in contact with me, since I check my email at least three times a day.

Your classmates, VCD, CS/IS collaborators: While you can always come to me for questions, also remember to rely on each other. In fact, for the success of these projects, **you have to rely on one another.** Together, you represent a vast body of knowledge and experience.

The Writing Center: The mission of the IPFW Writing Center is to help writers learn to use language more effectively, produce clear writing appropriate to their purposes and audiences, and develop positive attitudes about writing and about themselves as writers.

During the fall and spring semesters, the Writing Center is open from 9am-7pm Monday-Thursday, and 9am-3pm Friday.
Location: KT G21
Phone: 260-481-5740
Email: writingcenter@ipfw.edu
Website: [https://www.ipfw.edu/offices/casa/writing/index.html#wcservices](https://www.ipfw.edu/offices/casa/writing/index.html#wcservices)

Special Needs
If you need course adaptations because of a disability, if you have emergency medical information to share with me, or if you need special arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please make an appointment with me as soon as possible. My office location and hours are listed at the top of the syllabus.
Athletics and Extracurricular Activities
Although outside activities are an important part of college, academics are your number one priority. If you miss class due to a university-sponsored event, you are still expected to submit all work that is due on that day and the class is not “excused.” Please provide a written schedule signed by your coach or sponsor of any classes you may miss because of athletic or extracurricular activities.

Non-academic Resources
The university provides health care, psychological counseling, legal aid, career counseling, and affirmative action and sexual harassment counseling through various offices on campus. Please take advantage of these services if you are in need.

Attendance
Your participation in class discussion is essential both to your own learning and the quality of the course we will be creating together. **Attendance is expected and more than 3 absences can result in failure.** Please note: absences do not extend due dates for assigned work (unless the instructor permits a later date because of extraordinary circumstances). Please notify me ahead of time if you will be absent due to a religious holiday or a mandatory university sponsored event. For university sponsored events please see your student handbook or the university Ombudsman’s web page for official procedures for obtaining an excused absence at IPFW.

Late Work
All work is **due in class** on the day and time noted on the schedule. In-class assignments, exercises, etc. must be done in class and cannot be made up. Students may be allowed to make up homework assignments at the discretion of the instructor. An assignment received after the due date, **or not during class time** (unless prior arrangements have been made) is considered late. **Late work is penalized 20% for each day late. After 5 days, including weekends, late projects receive a 0. Final projects may not be accepted late.**

Email
Email correspondence, however easy it is to send off, is still **professional correspondence.** So use the conventions of professional correspondence in all your email writing for this class. Use informative subject lines, salutations and closings, proper spelling and capitalization, complete sentences, etc. Create a signature for your emails that consists of your contact information so I know how to contact you. This signature will also be useful when applying for internships, jobs, or other professional opportunities.

Calculating Your Course Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 920</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0 - 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919 - 860</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>3.6 - 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859 - 820</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0 - 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819 - 760</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>2.6 - 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759 - 720</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0 - 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719 - 660</td>
<td>C/D</td>
<td>1.6 - 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659 - 620</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0 - 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Professional Quality Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate for publication or workplace distribution, with minimal or no revision. Meets assignment requirements and intended outcomes by demonstrating mastery over strategy, research, design, style, and editing. The work is responsive to the context of use and builds value through sincere empathy and advocacy for the user.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Good Quality Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pending some revision, would be appropriate for professional distribution. Meets assignment requirements and intended outcomes by demonstrating proficiency over strategy, research, design, style, and editing. The work is generally responsive to the context of use and often builds value through sincere empathy and advocacy for the user.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adequate Quality Work
Requires subsequent development and revision before consideration for professional distribution. Most of the assignment requirements and outcomes are met by demonstrating competence over strategy, research, design, style, and editing. The work is generally responsive to the context of use and often builds value through sincere empathy for the user, but there are also some usability errors.

Low Quality Work
Requires a great deal of subsequent development and review before professional distribution. Completes few of the minimum assignment requirements and outcomes by demonstrating a lack of competence over strategy, research, design, style, and editing. The work is often not responsive to the context of use and rarely builds value through sincere empathy for the user, but too many usability errors exist.

Poor Quality Work
Fails to complete all of the minimum assignment requirements and outcomes by demonstrating little to no competence over strategy, research, design, style, editing, and source citation. The work is not responsive to the context of use and does not build value through sincere empathy for the user. The work is not usable.

*Credit goes to Dr. Craig Baehr, Dr. Ben Lauren, and Dr. Liza Potts for inspiring these definitions.

Grades will be made available to you throughout the semester. If you have questions about grades please speak to me in class or contact me at elizabeth.keller@ipfw.edu.

Major Assignments

Class Participation (50 points; Due: Ongoing)
University classrooms work best when we all engage and participate. If you do not participate, your course grade will be affected. Participation includes engaging with your peers and with me in class, engaging with the variety of texts you are assigned, completing assigned in-class activities, and responding to each other in various digital spaces as assigned.

Documentation Scheme (a.k.a a calendar and timeline) (50 points; Due: Ongoing)
Sometimes teams lose track of goals and communication falls apart. Ultimately, someone feels another person did not earn her/his grade. The team participation grade will help to alleviate some of those issues. You will be tasked with keeping meeting notes and posting them to Google Drive or Blackboard on a weekly basis. I will give you a notes template in class, but basically, the expectation is you will list the date, the activity, and the attendees for all scrums, activities reports, weekly meetings in and out of class, and all general project activities, including ongoing team communication via email, phone, Skype, status updates, and so on. Your documentation scheme grade will be based on individual completion of this work.

Scoping Proposal (100 points; 3-4 full, single-spaced pages)
Due: In class September 11 on Blackboard
Your first project will be a scoping proposal for the magazine Neue View. We will start the project by brainstorming with collaborators from VCD and CS/IS about how to contribute to, revise, design, develop, and sustain the magazine. The expected deliverable is a scoping proposal that outlines:

- Vision, mission, and goals statements for the magazine
- The general project requirements (what will be done, why is this contribution worthwhile, etc.);
- Introduction
- Statement of Need
- Scoping Plan/Projection (this section will be varied and detail-driven)
- Recommendations
  - A monetary budget for executing your contribution to the magazine;
  - The human and material resources (people and stuff) needed to get your contribution off and running; and,
  - The details about smaller activities and/or smaller projects associated with your contribution.
We are doing this project to help you practice low-stakes project planning and development documents prior to beginning our semester long magazine project. How you design this is mostly up to you (stay tuned for in-class specifics!). Simply put, think of this step as a way for you to persuade your reader that your recommendation is legitimate and worthwhile.

**Semester Project Proposal (200 points; 7-9 full, single-spaced pages) Due: End of class September 25 on Blackboard & email**

For your semester project, you will participate on a team for the collaborative magazine project. As a team, you will meet with VCD and CS/IS students, and, if necessary, instructors and interview them to learn more about the potential and real needs of the magazine, and identify possible and likely problems. After meeting with students and, if necessary, instructors you will conduct some research and build upon your experiences developing the scoping proposal to write a project proposal that will be turned in to me, Professor Bella, Professor Gabbard, and Professor Coronado. We will then review the materials and either request more information or sign off on your approach to doing the work.

**Progress Report (100 points; 1 full, single-spaced page)**

**Due: End of class on October 23 on Blackboard & email**

Approximately halfway through the semester your team will write a progress report to update us on your team’s work, specifically addressing any challenges or problems you’ve had to overcome. The progress report may also be followed up with a meeting (should there need to be one).

**Written Content Contribution to Neue View (150 points; pages vary)**

**Due: As assigned**

Project managers or content editors (which many of you will one day become) are often required to contribute content to the project they’re working on (in our case, the magazine). As such, you will be required to propose 6 relevant topics that are reflective of the issue’s theme, and turn one of those topics into an article that will appear in the next issue of Neue View. Once a focus of the next issue is decided, you will write your from a viewpoint of someone in your general age range. I’d suggest coming up with a few thoughtful questions that relate to current events, fads, interests, etc. to get started. Open and consistent communication with your collaborators is crucial for the written content to work well with the layout, design, photography, and sustainability of the magazine.

NOTE: Yes, this means you’ll be working on your bigger semester project AND your article simultaneously. This also means you can’t wait until the last minute to tackle and complete either of these projects. Multitasking for the win!

**Semester Project Final Report & Postmortem (200 points; at least 18 full pages [with appropriate images, tables, diagrams, timelines, etc.])**

**Due: In class December 4 on Blackboard**

At the end of the project, you will turn in the deliverables specifically requested by VCD and CS/IS. In addition, you will furnish me, Professor Coronado, Professor Bella, and Professor Gabbard with a summary report. Individually, you will turn in a short 2 page postmortem where you reflect on successes and failures when managing this project and discuss what you learned in the class.

**Final Semester Project Presentation for the Client (150 points; at least 10 PowerPoint slides)**

**Due: In class December 4**

Your final presentation for our classes will summarize the project and present the final deliverables to us in both electronic and physical formats. Your team should be prepared to speak for approximately 10 minutes and take questions for at least 10-15 minutes. Everyone on the team must participate in the presentation to receive points.

**Course Schedule**

Day-to-day class plans will be hosted on Blackboard. Please note: the course schedule below is subject to change and probably will, depending on the development of our projects. I’ve planned the following topics, but may make changes as needed. If/when changes are made, the schedule will be updated on Blackboard and in class, and you will be notified of the change during the next class meeting and through your IPFW email account.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/21</td>
<td>Course Introduction &amp; Introduction of Project Management (MTH, 1); (Agile Project Management (or, Burning Your Gantt Charts by Karlesky &amp;Voord, 2008); Introduction of Neue View Magazine with VCD and CS/IS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2    | 8/28    | Neue View Magazine Project Introduction  
Assembling Teams & Managing the Human Resource (MTH 2, 3) (PW 1-3)                                                                                                                                     |
| 3    | 9/4     | LABOR DAY – NO CLASS  
Writing the good vision: Interviewing and gathering requirements (MTH 4)                                                                                                                                    |
| 4    | 9/11    | Assembling Proposals: Scoping, Planning, and Quality Management (MTH 5, 6, 7) (PW 4-6)                                                                                                                                 |
| 5    | 9/18    | Team Communication Strategies: Creating a Workflow and Environment for Everyone (MTH 8, 9) (PW 7-9)                                                                                                       |
| 6    | 9/25    | Team Communication Strategies: Managing Workflow & Productivity (MTH 10, 11) (PW Intermezzo-10)                                                                                                             |
| 7    | 10/2    | Implementation Strategies & Methods: A brief discussion of Waterfall, Agile, LeanUX, and Adaptive (LUX sections 1-2) (PW 11-13)                                                                            |
| 8    | 10/9    | FALL BREAK (continue reading LUX section 3)                                                                                                                                                          |
| 9    | 10/16   | Adding Value and Finding the Right People: Middle Game Strategy (MTH 13, 14) (PW 14-16)                                                                                                              |
| 10   | 10/23   | Progress Reports; Collaboration, Technology, and Turnover (PW 17-19)                                                                                                                                  |
| 11   | 10/30   | Growing Productive Teams: Refactoring Spaces and Places of Project Work (PW 20-24)                                                                                                                     |
| 12   | 11/6    | Building Trust and Continuing to Grow your Team (MTH 12) (PW 25-28)                                                                                                                                 |
| 13   | 11/13   | Corporate Culture and Fertile Soil (PW 29-33)                                                                                                                                                        |
| 14   | 11/20   | Power and Politics, and Change and Chaos (MTH 16) (PW 34-36)                                                                                                                                       |
| 15   | 11/27   | End Game Strategy (MTH 15) (PW 37-39)                                                                                                                                                               |
| 16   | 12/4    | Final Reports, Postmortem, and Presentation Due                                                                                                                                                      |

This syllabus is subject to change throughout the semester based on the needs of the class. Please feel free to talk to me about any questions or concerns you may have over the course of the semester.

ENG C780-01 Communities of Practice: Understanding Gender, Mentoring, and Leadership in Rhetoric and Composition

Spring 2017

Tuesdays | Liberal Arts Building 160 | 4:30p.m. – 7:15p.m. Elizabeth (Beth) Keller | Department of English and Linguistics
LA 141 | elizabeth.keller@ipfw.edu | Skype @doctor.keller
Office Hours: Tuesday 10:30a.m. – 2:30p.m., and by appointment

Course Description

This Special Studies in Rhetoric and Composition course examines the rhetorical practices, lived stories, and experiences associated with what it means to be a professional. Specifically, we’ll examine how the professional is understood through gender, mentoring, and leadership. We’ll ground our discussions in selected texts from the following areas and/or fields of study: composition studies, professional and technical communication, computers and writing, feminist studies, critical theory, and organizational psychology.

Course Objectives

During our time together this semester, we’ll explore three major themes: the rhetoric of cultural and professional identities, pedagogies of professional development, and gender identity construction through professional development. In each of these themes, we’ll learn about definitions, language, community, identity, and other social constructs in connection to gender, mentoring and leadership, and other related rhetorical locations.

The readings I have selected for each theme should be seen as places to start rather than as exhaustive or all encompassing. Additionally, the readings for the literature circles are designed to reflect to each major theme. Through class discussions, literature circle presentations, and final course projects, you’ll have the opportunity to
consider the possibilities for applying these perspectives and research findings to your own research and scholarship.

**Course Themes**
Theme I: Narratives of Becoming: Cultural and Professional Identities
Theme II: Pedagogies of Professional Development: Mentoring and Modeling
Theme III: Understanding Gender Identity Performance through Professional Development

**Required Texts (4)**
Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*
Villanueva, Victor. *Bootstraps: From an American Academic of Color*
Lave, Jean and Etienne Wenger. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*
Warner, Michael. *Publics and Counterpublics*

**All other readings will be posted on Blackboard as PDF files.**

**Literature Circle Texts (choose only one of the following)**
Belenky, Mary Field., et al. *Women’s Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice and Mind*
Sandberg, Sheryl. *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead*
Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*
Caplan, Paula. *Lifting a Ton of Feathers: A Woman’s Guide to Surviving in the Academic World*
Vygotsky, Lev. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*
Rose, Mike. *Lives on the Boundary: A Moving Account of the Struggles and Achievements of America’s Educationally Underprepared*
Rose, Mike. *The Mind at Work: Valuing the Intelligence of the American Worker*
Enos, Theresa. *Gender Roles and Faculty Lives in Rhetoric and Composition*

**Do you have a book you’d like to present to the class that meets the requirements for the Literature Circle assignment? Ask me about it, and we’ll discuss its potential usefulness!**

**Course Projects**
You must submit all assignments to receive credit for the course.

Weekly Critical Reading/Writing Responses (25%)
Each week you’ll have a 1 – 2 page critical response writing due about the assigned reading for the next day’s class. These are to be posted **Sundays by midnight**, two nights before our class meeting, which gives me and/or discussion leaders time to prepare for Tuesday’s class. These responses will serve several purposes:

- to record your reactions/responses/questions about the assigned readings;
- to list the issues from the readings that we should discuss in class;
- to begin a dialogue about the readings and then continue discussions in/from class;
- to explore issues which especially interest you by engaging with the readings;
- to relate readings to your individual and group projects.

There will be 12 required weekly response writings. Twice during the semester you can substitute your extensive, detailed notes on the readings in lieu of a critical response.

Discussion Initiator (5%):
One time during the semester, you will take responsibility for reading and synthesizing the weekly reading assignments and your peers’ critical response writings. Your written synthesis can include critical questions, an attempt to sketch relationships between readings/responses, or to provide information about the theorists or concepts we’re working with that day. It should NOT be a presentation that doesn’t invite interaction and discussion. Your role as discussion initiator does not mean you are “in charge” for that class period or that you’re expected to take a position on an issue and defend it or that you should plan a formal presentation. The point of this role is to initiate class discussion; that’s it. You will sign up for these during the first week or two of class. You will typically have 20-30 minutes for your portion of the class.

We will also have a number of presentations and facilitations throughout the semester; when you miss someone’s presentation or facilitation, you miss important information and interaction that cannot be duplicated. If you are not in class, you cannot participate; therefore, coming to class late, leaving early, and more than three absences
will reduce your final grade. If you must be absent, please let me know beforehand and check with your classmates to get missed notes.

Literature Circles (25%) — Each of you will read a text from the literature circle list that informs our class topic of gender, mentoring, and leadership. In a formal oral presentation and facilitation — with a handout — you will summarize the text for the rest of the class and explain what it has to offer to conversations about gender, mentoring, and leadership. You will assign (and provide through Blackboard) an excerpt from this text, an explication of this text, or a published response to this text for the class to read in order to aid class discussion the day of your presentation.

As you’re planning for your presentation, remember the following question: What can we learn from this text, as rhetoricians, professional writers, theorists, researchers, educators, activists, and so on?

Self-designed Final Project (30% | proposal (5%) + final project (25%); details below) — Project ideas should be discussed with me early in the semester; written proposals are due by the end of February, just before spring break. Past projects have included:

- Conference paper
- Journal article
- Course syllabus and/or course design
- Website
- Annotated bibliography
- Other multimodal pieces

After being introduced to some scholarship around gender, mentoring, leadership in Rhetoric and Composition, you’ll write a brief two-page proposal for the final project “deliverable” you’d like to produce. The proposal will include descriptions of the project, intended audience(s), mode, methods for the work you’ll do, a timeline for completion, and any other relevant information. Once your proposal has been approved, you’ll do what you proposed you’d do. You’ll research, write, create, design, and compose your final project for a specific audience. The mode (i.e. genre) for this project is open. You may opt to write a “traditional” research paper; you may create a digital video or other multimodal piece; you may create a website; you may do a multi-genre style paper; or you may think of something even better. Your project must have both text and visual elements.

Final report/synthesis (15%): The final report for this course is a critical, rhetorical reflection that synthesizes the experiences you brought with you, the readings/discussions/experiences we had together, and the experiences you had in creating your final deliverable. The form and content of this synthesis is fairly open. We’ll discuss focus, genre, media, and scope throughout the term.

**Grading**

Grading is tricky in a graduate level seminar. When I evaluate your performance at the end of the semester I’ll ask myself two things:

- What were your daily performance, participation, and contributions to the class (weekly reading responses, class participation, discussion facilitation, and attendance)?
- What did larger things did you produce for the class (literature circle work, self-designed final project)?

Though I won’t formally grade your materials during the semester, I will respond to you evaluatively in writing and verbally. If you have any questions or concerns about what my responses to you mean, about the quality of your work in general, or how your work might translate into a grade, please don’t hesitate to talk to me.

**Grade Scale:**

A = 92 – 100% B = 82 – 91% C = 72 – 81% D = 62 – 71% F = 0 – 59%

**Academic Honesty**

The university has firm policies regarding academic honesty and you will be held to these policies. You may not present another person’s work or ideas as your own—including pictures and other images, you may not allow another person to write an assignment for you, and you must properly acknowledge source materials. Be sure to save all notes and drafts that lead up to a finished piece, so you can avoid problems and correct errors if they exist.

If in doubt about how to document source materials or about the originality of your work, please feel free to discuss it with me.
Participation and Collegiality
Because the work you will submit will be read by me and your classmates, and because your final project must have a real audience, you are expected to select assignment topics that you are comfortable sharing with others. You need to participate in class discussion and course activities. The class is small and at least half of the responsibility for making the class interesting and productive falls to you, the students. This is an intellectual community and it takes all of us to keep it engaging.

Ethics and Plagiarism
Check the IPFW Graduate Bulletin for policies regarding plagiarism and academic honesty. Because of the nature of this class requires that we deal with text, images, artifacts, and people, we'll be exploring different ways to give attribution to primary and secondary sources, interviews, and graphics. You are expected to submit your own work in the course.

IPFW Support Services
IPFW Academic Support Services provides several resources for its students including academic counselors and various workshops to support student needs. If you need assistance with study skills, writing, technology, or other assistance, please visit http://www.ipfw.edu/academics/support/.

IPFW Disability Statement and Services
If you have a disability and need assistance, special arrangements can be made to accommodate most needs. Contact the Office for Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD). They are located in Walb Student Union, room 113, telephone number 481-6657, as soon as possible to work out the details. Once the Director has provided you with a letter attesting to your needs for modification, bring the letter to me (or email it to me). For more information, please visit the web site for SSD. For a complete explanation of the IPFW Disability Guidelines, please see http://new.ipfw.edu/dotAsset/249850.pdf.

This syllabus serves as an agreement between you, the student, and me, the instructor, and should serve as your guideline for the semester. By staying in this class, you are agreeing to follow all the guidelines given above and to be responsible for your own actions. This syllabus is subject to change throughout the semester based on the needs of the class. Please feel free to talk to me about any questions or concerns you might have.
Sample Course Evaluations
Below is a summary of quantitative data from students’ anonymous, end-of-semester evaluations. Students respond to twenty questions on a four-point scale, where 5.0 is excellent, 4.0 is above average, 3.0 is average, 2.0 is below average, and 1.0 is poor. Questions pertain to student evaluation of the instructor, interaction between instructor and student, course content, course organization, and overall evaluations of the course. I have selected five questions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Means</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Expository Writing (ENG W233)</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015 section 18 (13/21; hybrid)*</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015 section 20 (11/21; hybrid)</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Administrative Writing (ENG W331)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015 (12/21; online)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016 section 051 (14/21; online)</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016 section 061 (10/21; online)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Center Theory and Praxis (ENG W397/C507)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2016 (7/13; online)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Report Writing (ENG W234)</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016 section 031 (8/21; online)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016 section 021 (10/21; online)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Topics in Rhetoric and Composition (W462/C682)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What did the instructor do to help you learn in this course?

C780-01 Student Responses
- Dr. Keller’s enthusiasm and incredible knowledge of the information she presented made this one of the best classes ever. She is an amazing professor and IPFW is very lucky to have her!
- The readings were decent. Lots of discussion.

W462/C682-01 Student Responses
- Provided us with an opportunity to not only learn concepts and theories relating to project & content management, but also apply what we read about and discussed to an actual project, with actual stakeholders and an actual team.
- Dr. Keller made learning fun and exciting. She is really personable and professional. She always came to class excited and ready to share her knowledge. I would take any class that she taught. She is an inspiration us.
- How to work in groups for a bigger overall project.
- The professor recognized issues and hiccups and was willing to discuss them with the class collaborators to resolve the matter.
- Was very knowledgeable about the subject and showed a genuine passion for it. Was very receptive to questions and always was willing to work through them with students.

W234-01I
- The instructor made clear she was available for office hours.
- The course calendar was extremely helpful. :)
- Dr. Keller added videos to Blackboard to help students understand the subjects more clearly. This helped finish projects with a clear conscience of what was expected.
- I learned how to write grant papers and instructions which is very useful in my degree field
- The course was laid out very well and the book we used was excellent. The assignments we had dealt with the matter we were studying at the time.
- yes the professor was very effective in helping me learn throughout this course!

What suggestions do you have for this course the next time this instructor teaches it?

C780-01 Student Responses
- None. Every class meeting was well organized and Dr. Keller was always well-prepared.
- None. This course was better than I expected.

W462/C682-01 Student Responses
- Have better communication with stakeholders before the course begins.
- Have us complete individual written forum assignments outside of class-time, instead of during class. That time could have been spent conducting actual discussions or doing small/short activities, which would have been a much more beneficial and efficient use of our class time. I would have a much more clear path for the project. Or having a project that is a little clearer for the students. But the experience was worth it.

W234-01I Student Responses
- Not much. She was awesome
Letter of Support from Colleagues at IPFW
May 26, 2016
TO: Faculty Review Committee, Department of English and Linguistics
FROM: Mary Ann Cain, Professor of English
RE: Peer review of Dr. Beth Keller's teaching

Last spring, Beth requested that I do a peer review of her teaching, in conjunction with my role as chair of the department's Peer Review committee. Prior to this request, we had met last fall and discussed her research agenda and teaching, so we had already established a rapport.

Before we began the peer review, I offered Beth some options for how we might proceed, including a syllabus review, pre-observation discussion, classroom observation, and post-observation discussion. She chose to do all four options for her course W397/C507 Writing Center Theory and Practice, an upper-division, graduate cross-listed course. Beth teaches this class as key part of her work with the campus writing center, assisting with the selection and training of peer consultants. Based on my experiences as a CELT peer reviewer, I also offered the options of a formative versus summative review—in other words, either focusing on specific questions or concerns that she raised for the sake of improving teaching or evaluating teaching for the sake of tenure and promotion. We agreed that this peer review would serve both formative and summative purposes. The following describes our interactions and my observations of Beth's teaching.

Syllabus Review/Pre-observation Discussion
To prepare for the syllabus review, Beth had emailed her syllabus and daily schedule in advance of our pre-observation meeting. Not only was the basic information thorough, but her goals and assignments were clear and appeared to be well paced. Overall, the syllabus was clear, well-organized, and specific.

As part of our pre-observation discussion, Beth raised questions and concerns that she had about the class. First, Beth had only three students enrolled in this vital class for Writing Center peer consultants. That is a challenge in itself, but given that she has not taught upper-level classes in the major before upped the stakes for her a great deal. It was also her first theory/praxis course. She noted that from the students’ point of view, the class was going well so far, over two months into the term. But because she was new to this sort of teaching, she felt a bit uncertain. For an example, she said that during the first class, she discussed definitions of key terms such as literacy. Because of the extensive conversation that followed, she realized she had not anticipated just how much background students were lacking. She continued naming her concerns, asking whether her methods, namely facilitating discussion and the application of theory, were appropriate. On Wednesdays, the class met in a computer lab and so did work, both individual and collaborative, on Blackboard and the internet. But on Mondays, which was the day I visited, they met in LA160, a seminar-style meeting room. She said that what I would observe would be seminar-style teaching. She said that while all three students were always ready and willing to engage, and that they were able to cover a great deal of material, she was still concerned that she fell behind on discussing assigned readings and worried that she might be moving too quickly for the sake of coverage. She also worried that she was using monotonous methods, especially in the computer classroom, despite her students’ affirmations. She noted how previous student evaluations commented on how quick she was to fill in silences after she has asked a question.

Overall, our pre-observation established that Beth gives a great deal of attention not only to her class preparations, as shown by the well-prepared syllabus and daily schedule, but also in the frankness and focus of her concerns. While Beth may be new to the tenure-track position, she is clearly not a beginner as a teacher. She knew what questions to ask and where she should be concerned. My classroom observations bore this out.

Classroom Observation
On March 28, 2016, I arrived in LA 160 at 4:28 p.m. Beth was already at the head of the room, working on the computer. The three students filtered in during the next five minutes. (I recognized one student from a fall class he’d taken with me.) Beth had displayed Blackboard threads containing student comments posted about the readings. She chatted with students about their work and the class while waiting for the last student to arrive. Then she moved seamlessly into beginning class. I took this easy transition as a sign that Beth had established a
comfortable rapport with students.
Beth asked them about their weekends then announced the format for the class: “think-pair-share.” She then turned to consultation forms for their upcoming observations of consulting sessions and their own practice consultations. As she worked through the form, she forecast the role playing they would do, joking about how she was eager to play the “disgruntled student” for them. She finished by noting how Purdue OWL had a tip sheet on how to write such analyses. When she asked for questions, I noted that she waited only a couple of seconds before moving on.
Beth then directly addressed me, explaining how they had been about a week behind and what they had done in the computer lab the previous week by way of catching up by answering discussion questions on Blackboard. She then explained what “think-pair-share” entailed. By 4:43 she asked students to open their textbook and reread the “implications” section regarding the article by Newkirk. I noted that up to this point, students had spoken very little. Silence then ensued as everyone read and collected their thoughts. I observed that no one wrote, only read. Beth then directed them to come up with a list of responses to put on the screen for the group to discuss.
The first question prompted by the reading was, “What are the rules of studenthood?” Beth commented on how easy it is to take over the consultation and talk too much, noting that this was something she struggled with herself. Her candor here was aimed at putting students at ease while at the same time noting a key method in peer consulting, to draw students out and ask their own questions about their writing. Beth asked how consultants would go about changing peer assumptions about leaning on consultants as a “crutch.” One student refers to a passage in the text about not rushing in to provide answers and advice. Beth asked again. One of the students struggled with this concept of not playing the role of “expert,” so Beth persisted. I chimed in as well. Another student used the word, “control” which the first student then tied into the question of “ownership” raised by the reading. By 5:17, it was clear that we would not reach a final resolution. Beth quickly switched to the day’s assigned reading. The shift struck me as a bit abrupt, signaling perhaps Beth’s concern about falling behind again.
Beth returned to the “think-pair-share” model for this next reading. I listened in to two students discuss; Beth paired with the third student. This reading focused on questions of disciplinary specialization for consultants and the need or lack thereof for diversity of majors for consultants.
When the class came back together, I found myself speaking a fair amount, excited and engaged. Everyone else seemed equally so. At one point, Beth began typing their responses onto Blackboard. She asked them, “What would you do if you didn’t know how to help a student from another discipline?” She typed their answers. The discussion continued to explore this theoretical position regarding students and their relationship to the “expertise” of a consultant. By 5:46, she wrapped up, looking ahead at the upcoming research paper, reminding them how best to reach her if they have questions. By 5:47, class ended, and Beth was chatting amiably with students as they departed.

Post-observation Discussion
Beth and I met shortly after the classroom observation to discuss her concerns and questions. I asked Beth how she felt about how much she spoke versus students. She was comfortable with the balance, as was I. Although “think-pair-share” was a new activity for this class, she felt good about how it had worked. I agreed. It seemed like a good method to break up the typical seminar format.
I raised my concern that what she was teaching philosophically with regards to student-consultant relationships might not be supported in the Writing Center. Given that one of her students was actively questioning this philosophy, I wondered if Beth’s efforts would be undone in actual practice. I also raised my concern that students might receive mixed signals about what role they should play if the Writing Center director did not support or reinforce what Beth taught. We discussed these issues at length; I could see that Beth had already been thinking about them and had some ideas about how to deal with potential differences or conflicts.
Overall, Beth claimed to feel a little rushed but basically ok. I noted the place where I thought the transition was a bit abrupt but agreed that overall the pacing was brisk but effective. I told her how much I enjoyed returning to my roots in writing center work. It was clear that students really enjoyed discussing these theories and praxes.

Conclusions
My sense of Beth’s questions and concerns was that she was seeking confirmation about her approach more than having any serious problems with how the class was going. As first-year faculty, she is, of course, still establishing a context and so would be prone to have some doubts and concerns. From my perspective, Beth displayed an exceptional confidence and poise, particularly when faced with resistance from students about what their roles as consultants should be. She was firm in her philosophy but also very open to whatever the students asked. I admired how she could have a clear position while sincerely engaging others’ perspectives.
While I am concerned that Beth’s teaching may not be well supported in the Writing Center, I am also confident
that Beth is already making good inroads into having a greater influence on how peer consultants are trained. I
courage her to seek help and advice as she needs it, and to continue to ask for peer reviews of her teaching.

To: Dr. Elizabeth Keller, Assistant Professor
From: Dr. Suzanne Rumsey, Associate Professor
Date: November 28, 2016
Re: Classroom observation on November 21, 2016

In this memo, I reflect on my observations of your teaching in English W462/C682, Project & Content
Management for Writers, on November 21, 2016 from 4:30 p.m. to 7:15 p.m. You will find two types of
information in this document: (1) descriptions of what I observed in the left column, and (2) comments and
suggestions in the right.

I began my observation of your classroom by looking over your
materials on Blackboard earlier in the day. Your Blackboard space is
minimalistic, but has the basic content necessary such as your contact
info, the syllabus and calendar, descriptions of all major assignments,
drop boxes for those assignments, additional reading materials, and a
few discussion boards.

Your syllabus is well designed both in terms of content and visual
appeal. I note that you have a course description, course threshold
concepts, and course outcomes. Threshold concepts are a key addition
for a professional writing course. You include images of the textbooks
as well as their relevant information. The document includes most of
the information I’d expect to see for an undergraduate syllabus, such as
a section on resources, attendance and late work policies, descriptions
of each major assignment and a calendar. I notice that your only
notation toward the graduate students in the course is on page 10
where you offer a note that they must also complete an annotated
bibliography and meet with you separately to talk.

The class began early at 4:25 because everyone but one was present.
Beth introduced me and then jumped right into reminders about a
certain textbook. Beth went over chapter 19 of this book to point out
some key features that are important for their final projects: "there is no
magic bullet." Beth made a joke about trying to use Ctrl + F when
reading a paper based book which made everyone laugh.

She then shifted to discussing with students when they’ll have practice
sessions of their upcoming presentations to the library. They decide
that they’ll spend the later part of this class period to work on
presentations. Beth seems to be negotiating with the students about
how to spend class time over the remaining weeks. Beth stalled a bit
until the last person got there.

Beth invites the student who is in charge of leading discussion (Jenna)
to come up and write discussion questions on the whiteboard. The
students and she share a funny story that Beth can’t ever get the screen
at the front of the room to go up so someone has to help her. Beth
then explains what textbook they are discussing today to me. The

It is unclear how much you and your students use Blackboard, given its minimalist content.
I'm interested to find out whether you and your students also use other online technologies and
workspaces, given the nature of this course.

See my suggestions at the bottom.

The overall tone of the class is pretty casual.
Clearly at this point in the semester, Beth and her students are comfortable with one another
and there is a set pattern that they are following.
textbook (MMM) is a software engineering text and the reason she assigned it is to show connections software development and design and design thinking while managing projects. Jenna writes these 3 questions:

1. How does each method (lean, waterfall, etc) incorporate the "throw the first one away" proverb and the "benefit of hindsight?"
2. How does the concept of conceptual integrity apply to PM?
3. What was one of the most important ideas you took from MMM and applied to your project?

Beth gives them a few minutes to think about their responses, then begins the discussion. She draws a diagram of waterfall and reminds them of what it means. Students agree verbally. Then they begin to talk more and Beth jots their responses on the whiteboard. She asks questions back to students to clarify what they say. She draws arrows and connections between thoughts on the board. She asks them to go back to their notes from earlier in the class to confirm something.

The discussion is quiet but engaging. There are only seven students and Beth, so there are long quiet pauses between answers. Discussion seems to be mostly taking place between four of the seven students.

"Given cloud storage, as project managers, we should never really throw things away." Beth talks, too, about the differences between waterfall and lean management. She offers an historical perspective about why now we're able to interchange methods, whereas in the 70s and 80s only waterfall existed. "Iterations" are a key aspect of current trends, which is something that waterfalls do not account for.

When the class moves on to the next question, Beth changes color of markers to jot down their responses. She moves easily across the front of the class and as she talks to each student as they voice their thoughts. She continues this practice for the third question.

Beth calls on a student that hasn't said anything yet in class. Question 3 allows her to ask "what did you learn" which is a means of getting the quieter students involved. Students commented that scheduling times to work together on this large-scale project was one of the most challenging aspects of the course. "Plan. But be flexible," Beth says. They talk of the challenges of working with the library and that their timeline didn't always match with what a semester timeline is.

At the close of the discussion, Beth takes a picture of the whiteboard to record the information, which she'll upload. They then shift to a different text, and a different student's set of questions.

1. Is it possible to work with people without ANY politics at all?
2. Why are "politics" often associated with misuse of power?
   How can you still trust?
3. In what ways can you influence pivotal members of a group?
Beth uses the same discussion methods for this set of questions. I notice that the student who wrote this set has a lot to say, however, she said nothing in response to the previous set of questions. This set of questions elicits a LOT more participation (including mine). Beth used my comments to ask some engaging questions (go team!). There is still one student who has not said anything. He is doodling, which may be a means of listening closely, or he may be checked out; it is hard to tell.

Because this discussion is so much more engaging, there is a lot of laughter and joking, as well as good questions, and students are responding to what others say, not just to what Beth says. "Project management = people management."

At the 6:00 p.m. mark, she gave them a break. It was at this point that I also departed. The remainder of the class was to be work time.

Suggestions and Summary
I have two suggestions for your syllabus and planning for future versions of this class. It is hard to have a cross-listed class, and different people handle it in all sorts of ways. I do not have an issue with keeping most things the same but adding an annotated bibliography. However, I suggest making this additional assignment worth a set amount of points and providing a separate grading scale for graduates. Also, paying a bit more attention to graduate students might be a good idea. For example, for the class discussion, you might also require them to come up with an activity or to do a presentation on a topic from their annotated bib. The idea is to elevate what they are responsible for, not just give them more work.

My other suggestion is to substitute your statement about “Special Needs” with something more specific to IPFW with instructions on where to go to get additional help. You might also include references to Documentation Guidelines for Disability Services at IPFW and How to request Disability Support Services.