Rhetoric of Science, Technology and Medicine
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**How This Course is Organized**

This course is an introduction to the rhetorical, historical and social analysis of science as a discursive and material practice. At least since Descartes in the seventeenth century, science grounded itself on the belief in objectivity and a corresponding belief in the transparency and neutrality of language. This inaugurated what John Dewey (1933) referred to as the “quest for certainty” and produced the enduring problem that Richard Bernstein (1983) calls the “Cartesian anxiety”—the anxiety about having certainty about issues that rarely admit of certainty. That anxiety becomes even more problematic in what Funtowicz and Ravetz call the age of “post normal” science. Think about climate change for example.

With the rise of postmodern theory and social constructionist positions in the human sciences, this faith in objectivity and a value free, non-rhetorical language has been widely rejected—at least in the humanities. Within rhetorical studies, scientific discourse is now understood as a discursive practice shaped by disciplinary and genre conventions, material conditions, and ideological commitments as well as a disciplined relationship to “external reality.” To argue in a facile way that science is nothing but a social construction usually ignores the fact that science and the scientific method have been extraordinarily powerful and productive. But to take that power and productivity at face value ignores questions of culture, of social power, of material practice, of discursive restrictions and exclusions, of language andmetaphor as the fundamental medium of scientific work. To quote the Goblin in Harry Potter: “It’s complicated.”

As a number of scholars have argued for some time now, we need what Bruno Latour calls a “realistic realism” to reground what he calls our “non-modern” science. Traditional, modernist, science and rhetoric ask epistemological questions about how science “hooks up” with a material world through language and how it authorizes and understands these procedures. These are essentially questions about knowledge, truth and certainty. We will read some of the contemporary response to this position that emerges from postmodern critique and, later, from the general position called “new materialism” or “post-perspectivalism.”

In this age of materialist ontological inquiry and post-normal science, we might reverse Descartes positivism and consider science as a remarkably successful, though not perfect, strategy for understanding and managing uncertainty. My own definition of science is “the management of uncertainty,” partly because of my particular interests. And I define “rhetoric of science” as how we do things in the world with words graphs, visuals, games, models, scenarios and simulations to rephrase J. L. Austin’s book title.

The history of rhetorical critique of science and its knowledge claims is deeply problematic in the current age of the anthropocene. The anthropocene is a term popularized in 2000 by the Nobel laureate Paul Crutzen to refer to the current geological era as one in which human activity is the dominant force on the planet’s natural systems. Climate change is the most obvious force in the anthropocene, but there are other significant environmental changes that are unintended consequence of human activity. My intention is to make science and rhetoric more accommodating and productive traveling companions through the 21st century. As I have argued in the POROI essay on “Engaged Rhetoric of Science,” connecting the work of rhetoric with the practice of science is essential in the age of the anthropocene.

The course is organized by three topics:

1) **Defining rhetoric of science**. What are its traditions? What are the topics and methods of the field? How do language, reality and knowledge connect? How might rhetoric and science collaborate productively?

2) **Science as a social, material semiotic**. How can we understand science as a cultural practice? How are science and materiality interconnected in ways that supersede postmodern critique of language as well as the modernist theory of reference? How does the rhetoric of science intersect with contemporary Science Studies and the field called the “new materialism”?

3) **Science, Risk and Citizenship in the Anthropocene Era.** How can rhetorical study help us understand the concept of risk, risk communication and the best ways to engage citizens in deliberations about risks in the anthropocene era? How can rhetoric help manage scientific uncertainty, public scientific controversy and social resistance to science in cases like climate change?

The organizing problems and the readings for this course are not all uniform, but they do have a trajectory. Some of the readings function mostly as a survey of the field and its analytic and theoretical history (points 1 and 2 above). These are the materials for the first six weeks of the semester and they are a broad survey of the field. Most of the work in the course, however, addresses a set of issues gathered around the idea that rhetoric needs to better understand post-normal science and its relations to citizens and policy makers so that we can participate in the social and political work of managing what Latour and others refer to as the impending “ecocide” of the biosphere (point 3 above). This is part of the emerging interest in the “public work of Rhetoric” (to echo Ackerman and Coogan) or of engaged rhetorical practice (to quote myself. Vanity. All is vanity). I will situate these questions in the general context of the anthropocene and of climate change specifically. The anthropocene is one of the major challenges facing both science and rhetoric of science, not to mention humanity, and it is an emerging interdisciplinary focus in our college. To address these issues, we will try to meet for two classes during the semester together with Prof. Greg Herbert’s “Anthropocene” seminar in GeoSciences. Logistics may make this impossible, but Greg and I will keep trying. Our goal is to foster cross disciplinary understanding and initiate a conversation among graduate students interested in the anthropocene era and its challenges.

The course will be organized as a lecture/discussion in which all class members are expected to participate regularly and substantially. Course readings will include a large selection of articles and book chapters on RSTM and on the anthropocene as well as all or part of books by Annemarie Mol, Bruno Latour, Evelyn Fox Keller, Leah Ceccorelli. You will also have a substantial written project that you design individually (see “Complete a Writing Contract” below). Course grades are based on your grasp of the readings, class participation, and your writing project. If at any time you want to know how you are doing, I’ll be happy to discuss your progress. And I assign “+” and “-“ final grades, e.g. “A-“ or “B+.”

**Reality check**

It seems like Covid 19 has been with us forever at this point, and we are all pretty (expletive deleted) tired of it. Each of us is dealing with it differently and facing different challenges, but it is a physical, social and psychological burden. At the same time that I feel the need to teach a professionally respectable course that gives you your money’s worth, rewards your time, and meets department learning outcome expectations, I also recognize that these are not normal times. Everyone needs a little understanding on occasion. If you are struggling, let me know and I’ll do what I can to help.

**Teaching and learning during Covid**

Working face-to-face in a classroom is inherently risky during Covid. As the semester starts, Florida is in the middle of a spike of coronavirus infections, largely from the highly infectious Delta and Omicron variants. This situation requires some changes in normal course policies and a lot of compassion and consideration on all our parts.

The State University System Board of Governors has published a lengthy statement of policies concerning Covid for the 2021-2022 academic year. In part, they write:

**Vaccination Policies**

With the increasing spread of the Delta variant of the COVID virus throughout the country, it is critical and urgent that unvaccinated people get vaccinated and continue to wear a mask until they are fully vaccinated.

* We strongly recommend that state university faculty, staff, and students be vaccinated  for the COVID-19 virus.
* If an individual is fully vaccinated, the chance of developing symptomatic or asymptomatic COVID-19 infection and/or spreading it to others is markedly reduced and  the individual may not need to self-isolate following COVID-19 exposure.

##### **Mask Wearing**

The CDC has updated its guidance for fully vaccinated individuals based on new evidence on the Delta variant as follows:

* To maximize protection from the Delta variant and prevent possibly spreading it to others, wear a mask indoors in public if you are in an area of substantial or high transmission.
* Wearing a mask is most important if you have a weakened immune system or if, because of your age or an underlying medical condition, you are at increased risk for severe disease, or if someone in your household has a weakened immune system, is at  increased risk for severe disease, or is unvaccinated. If this applies to you or your household, you might choose to wear a mask regardless of the level of transmission in your area.
* In general, you do not need to wear a mask in outdoor settings in areas with high numbers of COVID-19 cases, consider wearing a mask in crowded outdoor settings and for activities with close contact to others who are not fully vaccinated.

In light of the Board of Governors’ statement and CDC recommendations, for everyone’s safety, please wear a mask in class. This is not mandatory, but a request.

**Learning Objectives**

By the end of the semester you will:

* Have a working definition of “Rhetoric of Science, Technology and Medicine” (RSTM) and an understanding of the field, its history and its future direction;
* Be familiar with the major theoretical positions in RSTM and the scholarship they produce;
* Possess enough background in the field to begin developing your own research agenda in RSTM including dissertation and thesis topics and proposals.
* Be familiar enough with the concept of the anthropocene and some of the rhetorical issues associated with it to pursue independent and/or interdisciplinary research on some aspect of the topic.

# Your work

You have three assignments in this course:

1. **keep up with the reading and participate in class discussion (40% of final grade)**: As you will see below, there is a lot of reading in the course. (Like Tinky Winky’s bag or Hermoine Granger’s bag, the syllabus holds a remarkable amount of stuff.) Your first, largest and ongoing responsibility is to keep up with the reading and come to class prepared to discuss it at a fairly detailed level. I will lecture when necessary, but the classes will generally be open discussions of the readings driven by your questions and interests and by my own sense of what’s disciplinarily important. I expect everyone to come to class with questions about the readings: what does a passage mean? Where does an idea come from? What is the background for this concept, argument or problem? How do we respond to this problem? etc. I also want you to share insights, hunches and good ideas that you think of as you read. Participation is the “jacks or better” to open the betting in 0the course. Given that participation is 40% of your final grade, people who don’t participate do not make “A” grades. And, obviously, if you are not in class, you aren’t participating. Anyone with more than five unexcused absences will be dropped or receive a failing grade for the course.

2. **present an essay or book chapter to the class (10% of final grade)**: Each of you will facilitate the class discussion of an article or part of a book onceduring the semester. Typically, this will mean that you prepare and present one of the readings I have put on the syllabus. When you do this, you should do some background work on the author or the topic of the article so you can put the reading in a professional context, and then direct our discussion toward the key points of the article and how it articulates with other things we have read. I’d like you to circulate a succinct **(*maximum 750 words***) handout that captures your analysis, links the reading to other readings or criticism and offers questions for class discussion. Think of this as providing your colleagues materials they can use on the qualifying exam should they write about the article, author or chapter. Plan to present your materials and lead the discussion of this reading for 30 to 45 minutes so we have time to discuss the other readings scheduled for that class. Please do not simply read from a paper that you have handed out to the class. Finally, if you can connect the reading you are presenting to the other readings scheduled for that day so as to facilitate a coherent class discussion, that would be good.

I have selected readings with a fairly narrow set of interests and issues in mind. And that means that I have overlooked a great many important topics, ideas, and authors whose work may be of interest to some of you. If you want to bring in an essay for discussion that is not on the syllabus, that would be lovely. I don’t anticipate this happening often, but you may have something wonderful you want us all to read. We have very little open space on the schedule, but I’ll make room as necessary. You’ll need to talk with me well ahead of time if you want to bring in a new reading, and you’ll need to suggest where in the reading schedule it would logically fall. Also, you’ll need to scan the material and send it to me so I can post it on Canvas at least a week before the class discusses it.

3. **complete a writing contract (50% of final grade)**: I am open to any reasonable proposal for what you write in this course. The precise nature of your writing project will be negotiated individually so that you can each tailor the project to suit your scholarly strengths and interests, your place in the program and your research opportunities. And I encourage you to come talk with me about your interests and your ideas for a course writing project. I want an informal written proposal (150-200 words) from each of you laying out what you plan to write, why and when I’ll get it no later than **Thursday, February 10.** I encourage you, however, to decide what you want to write and to submit the proposal as early as possible, the sooner, the better. If you choose to submit an analytic reading log, you need to make that decision right away and get started in the first week or two of the semester.

Here are a few suggestions for the kind of thing you might decide to do for this assignment. The point is for you to do serious intellectual work that fits into your individual plans and place in the program and discipline. My only restriction is that the topic or project be part of the rhetoric of science and medicine and connected in some way to the readings of the course. As you review the options, recall what John Connor said to the Terminator: “you can mix them up too.”

* You might write part of a dissertation or thesis chapter, or part of a dissertation or thesis proposal that is in the general field of the rhetoric of science.
* You might identify an ongoing scientific dispute (e.g. intelligent design, climate change, etc.), gather materials, and analyze the rhetorical activity involved using some of the conceptual apparatus from the course or some other rhetoric or theory course.
* You might develop an interdisciplinary topic between rhetoric and science concerning the issue of the anthropocene.
* If the field of rhetoric of science is completely new to you, you might choose to write some form of analytic reading log that synthesizes and organizes your understanding of some of the important theoretical issues we will take up, e.g. hyrids, reference, technoscience, risk, science policy. That might be a series of relatively short (3-5 page, double spaced) entries. There is a brief description of my understanding of an analytic and synthetic reading log posted on the Canvas site titled “Synthetic Reading Log.” If you choose to write an analytic reading log, you must turn in installments no later than a week after we finish the relevant readings; the fresher it is in both our minds, the better. **If you choose to do a synthetic reading log, you should start as early in the semester as possible since you can’t go back and “make up” logs on things that are more than a week in the past.**
* You might write a review of a new book or books in the area using your class readings as the basis for the review, and then send the review to the appropriate journal (this last would be required if you write a review).
* You might use some of the readings in addition to outside reading to develop a thesis of your own or a new position on a controversial topic.
* I encourage you to develop proposals and papers for conferences such as the ARST conference.
* You might develop a substantial bibliographic essay on a relatively well focused issue or problem in RSTM that you will use eventually as you develop a thesis or dissertation “literature review.” This sort of essay is best if it synthesizes and identifies major research trends or current research questions in the field.
* You might draft material on a specific case study that lends itself to the material and ideas in the readings.
* You might even write collaboratively or prepare a hypertext file.

For traditional articles, essays that develop an argument, Ph.D. students should aim at 15-20 pages for a continuous argument not counting Works Cited; MA Students 10-15 pages. Since reading logs are not continuous or new argument, they should be longer (in total). For reading logs Ph.D. students 20-25 pages, MA 15-20 pages. **Two Caveats**:

1. all papers and logs have to be about the materials and topics in this class**.**
2. You should submit reading log entries electronically and within a week of our finishing discussing the relevant readings so that the material is fresh in both your mind and mine.

**One piece of advice**: the more you link the reading logs to other readings in rhetorical theory, research methodology or rhetoric of science, the better sense of the field you’ll have. The latest date you can turn in written assignments is the day scheduled for the final exam.

**Grades**

Your final grade will be determined by your participation in the class discussions (40%) your class presentation (10%) and your written work (50%). When you talk regularly and seriously about the readings, you learn more, you internalize the material better and you become a professional who can talk at conferences, at job interviews and at your oral exams. Being in class but never talking gets you a “C” on the 40% participation grade. Talking some gets you a B. Talking every class in significant ways gets you an A. As I said above, students who do not participate substantially and regularly do not typically make “A” grades. I’ll give you feedback on presentations and the associated handouts as soon after you do them as possible.

**Texts**

Keller, Evelyn Fox. *Refiguring Life: Metaphors of Twentieth-Century Biology*. Columbia, New York, 1995. ISBN 0-231-10205-4

Latour, Bruno. *Pandora’s Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999. ISBN 0-674-65335-1

Mol, Annemarie. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002. ISBN 0-8223-2917-4.

Winsberg, Eric. *Philosophy and Climate Science.* ISBN 978-1-316-64692-2

In addition to these books, there will be a number of articles and book chapters loaded in the “Files” tab in Canvas and accessible through the links in each week’s module.

**Reading Schedule**

**Week 1**

**Thursday 1/13** **Philosophical and Rhetorical Positioning**

Harris*,* Randy. “Introduction.” *Landmark Essays on Rhetoric of Science: Case Studies*. *Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras, 1997. xi-xlv.*

Myers, Greg. “Out of the Laboratory and Down to the Bay: Writing in Science and Technology Studies.” *Written Communication*. 13.1 (1996): 5-43.

Golinski*,* Jan “Speaking for Nature.” *Making Natural Knowledge: Constructivism and the History of Science.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2005, *103-132.*

Segal, J.Z. "A Kairology of Biomedicine." *Health and the Rhetoric of Medicine.* Carbondale, Il: Southern Illinois U P, 2005. 21-36.

Herndl, C. “Introduction to the Symposium on Engaged Rhetoric of Science, Technology and Medicine.” POROI 12.2. 2017.

**Week 2 The Anthropocene**

**Thursday 1/20**

Steffen, W., Grinevald, J., Crutzen, P., McNeil, J. “The Anthropocene: Conceptual and Historical Perspectives.” *Philosophical Transactions: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences. 369.1938 (2011): 842-867.*

Steffen, W. et al. “The Trajectory of the Anthropocene: The Great Acceleration.” *The Anthropocene Review*. 2.1 (2015): 81-98.

SYR AR5 FINAL “Introduction”(36-37) “Observed Changes and Their Causes” (40-63)

Hulme. Forward & Preface (xxi-xxxix)

**Week 3**

**Thursday 1/27**

Funtowicz, Silvio and Jerome Ravetz. “Science for the Post-Normal Age.” *Futures* (September) 1993; 739-755.

Latour, Bruno. “Why has Critique Run Out of Steam” *Critical Inquiry* 30 (2004): 225-48.

Ceccarelli, Leah. “Manufactured Scientific Controversy: Science, Rhetoric, and Public Debate.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 14.2 (2011): 195-228.

Collins and Evans “Third Wave of Science Studies: Studies of Expertise and Experience.” *Social Studies of Science*. 32.2 (2002): 235-272.

**Week 4**

**Thursday 2/3**

Neitsche “On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense” (1168-1179)

Foucault “Discourse on Language” 215-231

Derrida “Structure Sign and Play in the Human Sciences”

**Week 5**

**Thursday 2/10**

Bazerman, Charles. “Making Reference: Empirical Contexts, Choices, and Constraints in the Literary Creation of the Compton Effect.” *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1988. 187-234.

Gross, Alan. “Epilogue: Reference Without Reality.” *The Rhetoric of Science*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1990. 193-208.

Latour, Bruno. “Circulating Reference” *Pandora’s Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999. 24-79.

Mol, Annemarrie. “Doing Theory.” *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002. 151-84.

**Week 6**

**Thursday 2/17** **Metaphors Matter**

Koerber, Amy. “From Folklore to Fact: The Rhetorical History of Breastfeeding and Immunity, 1950-1997. *Journal of Medical Humanities*. 27 (2006) 151-166.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. *Refiguring Life: Metaphors of Twentieth-Century Biology*. Columbia, New York, 1995. “Preface” (ix-xix) and “Language and Science” 1-42.

---. “Metaphors: Genes and Developmental Narratives” in *Making Sense of Life: Explaining Biological Development with Models, Metaphors and Machines.* 00113-121.

Ceccarelli, Leah. *On the Frontier of Science*. “Introduction” and “Conclusion”

Montoya. ‘Planetary Boundaries for Biodiversity: Implausible Science, Pernicious Policies” *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 33.2 (2018) 71-73.

**Week 7**

**Thursday 2/24** **Material/Semiotics and Materialist Rhetoric**

Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern. (WHNBM)* Chapter 1.

Latour, Bruno. *Pandora’s Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999. 1-24 and 80-174.

**Week 8**

**Thursday 3/3**

Latour, Bruno. *Pandora’s Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999. 175-303.

Wynne, Brian (2007) “Public participation in science and technology: Performing and obscuring a political-conceptual mistake.” *East Asian Science, Technology and Society: An International Journal. 1.1, 99-110*.

**Week 9**

**Thursday 3/10**

Mol, Annemarie. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002. 29-151.

Graham and Herndl “Multiple Ontologies in Pain Management: Toward a Postplural Rhetoric of Science.” *Technical Communication Quarterly*. 22 (2013): 103-25.

**Week 10**

**Thursday 3/17 Spring Break**

**Week 11**

**Thursday 3/24**

Gottschalk-Druschke and Rai. “Making Worlds with Cyborg Fish.” From *Tracing Rhetoric and Material Life: Ecological Approaches. 197-221.*

Stormer and McGreavy. “Thinking Ecologically About Rhetoric’s Ontology: Capacity, Vulnerability and Resilience.”

Haraway. “Introduction” (1-8) and chapter 2: “Tentacular Thinking” (30-57) From *Staying With the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene.*

**Week 12**

**Thursday 3/31 Anthropocene rhetorical problems**

Lash & Wynne. “Introduction.”In Beck. *Risk Society.* Trans Ciaran Cronin. Cambridge: Polity. 1-8.

Beck, Ulrich. “On the Logic of Wealth Distribution and Risk Distribution.” *Risk Society.* Trans Ciaran Cronin. Cambridge: Polity. 19-30.\* **(stop at page 30** though the photocopy goes on)

Beck, Ulrich. “Introduction: Staging Global Risk.” *World at Risk.* Trans Ciaran Cronin. Cambridge: Polity. 2009. 1-13.

Beck, Ulrich. ”Relations of Definition as Relations of Domination: Who Decides What is and is not Risk?” *World at Risk.* Trans Ciaran Cronin. Cambridge: Polity. 2009. 24-39.

Danisch, R. “Political Rhetoric in a World Risk Society.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 40.2 (2010): 172-192. Print

Cox, Robert. “Human Health and Ecological Risk Communication.” *Environmental Communication and the Public Sphere.* Ch. 7. 149-177.

**Week 13**

**Thursday 4/7**

Winsberg, E. *Philosophy and Climate Science* Chapters 1-4, chapters 6, 8 and 13 and 14.

**Week 14**

**Thursday 4/14**

Pfleugfelder, E. *Geologic Rhetoric* Introduction and Chapter 2

**Week 15**

**Thursday 4/21**

Walker, K. *Climate Politics on The Border* selected chapters

**Thursday 4/28 Class Cancelled for Writing**

Last day to submit final papers: Saturday 5/7.

**University and Course Policies**

**University policies are available at:** <https://www.usf.edu/provost/faculty/core-syllabus-policy-statements.aspx>

**Inclusion Statement**

I believe in the value of diverse learning spaces. As such, this class will value and respect those of diverse backgrounds including but not limited to: gender, sexuality, disability, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, culture, and religion. Please be sure to inform me of what name and pronoun you want to go by. I will make every effort to ensure that an inclusive environment exists for all students. If you have concerns or suggestions for improving the classroom climate, please do not hesitate to speak with me.

**Attendance**

I expect you to be in class and engaged in discussion every day. This is often difficult material, and you’ll learn more if you are in class working at it every day. More importantly, discussing things with your colleagues will get you a broader range of perspectives on readings and help build a graduate student community. I will not deduct points for the first two absences. After you miss two classes without a medical excuse, I will deduct half a letter grade from your semester participation grade for each absence, e.g. from B+ to a B. If you have a major illness (like COVID) or accident that makes it impossible for you to be in class, give me documentation and we will work out a suitable accommodation. If you miss more than 5 classes, I will enter a grade of “F” for you unless you have medical documentation of a major health crisis and arrange some accommodation with me.

You are excused from class for major observances of your religion. Inform the instructor at the beginning of the term when you expect to be absent for these events.

**Accessibility and Students with Disabilities**

I believe that every student should have easy and appropriate access to classes, learning and community participation. I encouragestudents with a disability who require an accommodation to consult with me during the first week of class. I will do whatever I can to accommodate your needs and make the course a pleasant and productive experience for you. Each student making this request must bring a current “Memorandum of Accommodations” from the office of Student Accessibility Services (SAS). Contact SAS at 974-4309 or email: sas-info@usf.edu. I will accommodate your specific needs as much as possible and keep these arrangements confidential. If you have a disability that makes it difficult for you to leave the building in case of emergency, please let me know. For more information about student responsibilities related to disability accommodations, see <https://www.usf.edu/student-affairs/student-accessibility/>

**Sexual Misconduct/Sexual Harassment Reporting**

Sexual assault and harassment are continuing problems in American society and in our community. I will do what I can to make you all feel safe, respected and secure in our class. USF is committed to providing an environment free from sex or gender discrimination, including sexual harassment and sexual violence (USF System Policy 0-004).

The USF Title IX policy states:

Title IX provides federal protections for discrimination based on sex, which includes discrimination based on pregnancy, sexual harassment, and interpersonal violence. In an effort to provide support and equal access, USF has designated all faculty (TA, Adjunct, etc.) as Responsible Employees, **who are required to report any disclosures of sexual harassment, sexual violence, relationship violence or stalking**. The Title IX Office makes every effort, when safe to do so, to reach out and provide resources and accommodations, and to discuss possible options for resolution.  Anyone wishing to make a Title IX report or seeking accommodations may do so online, in person, via phone, or email to the Title IX Office. For information about Title IX or for a full list of resources please visit: <https://www.usf.edu/title-ix/gethelp/resources.aspx>. *If you are unsure what to do, please contact Victim Advocacy – a confidential resource that can review all your options – at 813-974-5756 or**va@admin.usf.edu**.*

**Counseling Center**

The Counseling Center promotes the wellbeing of the campus community by providing culturally sensitive counseling, consultation, prevention, and training that enhances student academic and personal success. Contact information is available [online](https://www.usf.edu/student-affairs/counseling-center/about-us/contact-us.aspx).

**HB 233 policies “Intellectual Freedom and Viewpoint Diversity”**

- Students with disabilities will continue to have appropriate accommodations for recordings as established by [SAS](https://www.usf.edu/student-affairs/student-accessibility/).

- Students may record class lectures which will be considered instructor-delivered academic content. No recordings of other students, class participation, or discussion will be permitted.

- Students do not need advance permission or to provide notice to record. But, students must monitor their recording so that it does not include participation by other students.

- Students may not publish (post or share) the recordings except as provided by statute. In the event permission is requested to publish (post or share), the student’s request and instructor’s consent must be in writing.

- Students and instructors are responsible for compliance with the statute and related potential sanctions. Misuse of the recordings may result in referrals as possible violations of the student code of conduct or considered academic disruptions.

- Additional links for reference:

* [House Bill 233 (2021): Postsecondary Education](https://nam04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.flsenate.gov%2FSession%2FBill%2F2021%2F233%2FBillText%2Fer%2FPDF&data=04%7C01%7Ccgh%40usf.edu%7Ca91e5718eeb048b087e408d95c2c5cae%7C741bf7dee2e546df8d6782607df9deaa%7C0%7C0%7C637642168013369233%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=Ytq4BN5vq9iaZNzRWMksijqgShoe9rn7sjNwBf7G6eA%3D&reserved=0)
* [USF Regulation 3.025](https://usf.app.box.com/v/usfregulation3025), Disruption of Academic Process
* [USF Regulation 6.0021](https://usf.app.box.com/v/usfregulation60021), Student Code of Conduct

USF statement on Classroom Devices/Student Recording:

Students may, without prior notice, record video or audio of a class lecture for a class in which the student is enrolled for their own personal, educational use. A class lecture is defined as a formal or methodical oral presentation as part of a university course intended to present information or teach enrolled students about a particular subject. Recording class activities other than class lectures, including but not limited to lab sessions, student presentations (whether individually or part of a group), class discussion (except when incidental to and incorporated within a class lecture), clinical presentations such as patient history, academic exercises involving student participation, test or examination administrations, field trips, private conversations between students in the class or between a student and the faculty member is prohibited. Recordings may not be used as a substitute for class participation and class attendance and may not be published or shared without the written consent of the faculty member. **Failure to adhere to these requirements may constitute a violation of the USF Student Conduct Code (**[**https://usf.app.box.com/v/usfregulation60021**](https://usf.app.box.com/v/usfregulation60021)**).**

**USF Incomplete policy**

An “I” grade may be awarded to a student only when a small portion of the student’s work is incomplete and only when the student is otherwise earning a passing grade. The time limit for removing the “I” is to be set by the instructor of the course. For undergraduate students, this time limit may not exceed two academic semesters, whether or not the student is in residence, and/or graduation, whichever comes first. For graduate students, this time limit may not exceed one academic semester. “I” grades not removed by the end of the time limit will be changed to “IF” or “IU,” whichever is appropriate.

**Academic integrity and plagiarism**

Essentially, plagiarism refers to using another writer's words or ideas without proper attribution and citation. This boils down to doing your own work and giving credit to others when you copy and use their words. You can’t copy and paste materials from the web or an article, book chapter or another student’s paper into your writing without acknowledging the source of the materials. And buying a paper off the internet is the equivalent to an academic felony. If I catch someone plagiarizing, I will give them an “F” in the course and turn them over to the university’s disciplinary mechanism**.** The final decision on an academic integrity violation and related academic sanction at any USF System institution shall affect and be applied to the academic status of the student throughout the USF System, unless otherwise determined by the independently accredited institution.

**Academic Grievance Procedures**

The purpose of these procedures is to provide all undergraduate and graduate students taking courses within the University of South Florida System an opportunity for objective review of facts and events pertinent to the cause of the academic grievance. An “academic grievance” is a claim that a specific academic decision or action that affects that student’s academic record or status has violated published policies and procedures, or has been applied to the grievance in a manner different from that used for other students.

If a serious issue or conflict arises, the student should first make an attempt to reach a satisfactory resolution with the course instructor. If the instructor and student are unable to resolve the situation to their mutual satisfaction, the student may, *within three weeks of the incident*, file a letter of notification with Dr. Joyce Karpay, the Assistant to the Chair of the English Department.

**Student Conduct**Students are expected to come to class prepared, having read or completed the day’s assignment. Students may expect to be called on in class. Please silence all cell phones before class begins. Also, students are not permitted to sell notes or tapes of class lectures.

**Disruption to Academic Process**

Disruptive students in the academic setting hinder the educational process. Disruption of the academic process is defined as the act, words, or general conduct of a student in a classroom or other academic environment which in the reasonable estimation of the instructor: (a) directs attention away from the academic matters at hand, such as noisy distractions, persistent, disrespectful or abusive interruption of lecture, exam, academic discussion, or general University operations, or (b) presents a danger to the health, safety, or well-being of self or other persons.

**Emergency Policy**

In the event of an emergency, it may be necessary for USF to suspend normal operations. During this time, USF may opt to continue delivery of instruction through methods that include but are not limited to: Canvas, TEAMS, Skype, and email messaging and/or an alternate schedule. It’s the responsibility of the student to monitor Canvas for course specific communication, and the main USF, College, and department websites, emails, and MoBull messages for important general information.

**Email policy**

Please use your official USF email account for all course correspondence. I will send you emails through Canvas and, sometimes, from my university account to your university address. If you use non-USF servers and accounts, your email may well end up as Spam and not get read.

**Electronics in class**

Many of you will work on a laptop computer in class; it is a useful tool. It can also be a problematic distraction for you and those around you. Please don’t let the computer distract you from paying attention to the professor or to other students.

Similarly, please silence your cell phone during class**.** I realize that you guys have lives and emergencies do happen. Some of you have kids (I do) or take care of elderly parents or an ill spouse (I do). If you have to take an emergency call during class, please go outside the classroom.

**List of Important Journals in the field of RTSM**

Primary Venues for Rhetoric of Science

1.       *POROI*

*2.      Rhetoric Society Quarterly*

*3.      Technical Communication Quarterly*

*4.      Social Epistemology*

*5.* *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*

*6.      Quarterly Journal of Speech*

*7.      Argumentation*

*8.      Rhetoric and Public Affairs*

*9.      Written Communication*

*10.   Argumentation and Advocacy*

*11.   Science Communication*

STS and Content-Area Specific Journals

1.      *Social Study of Science*

*2.      Science Technology and Human Values*

*3.      Public Understanding of Science*

*4. Philosophy and Public Policy Quarterly*

*5.      Science and Public Policy*

*6.      Environmental Science and Policy*

*7.      Environmental Communication*

*8.      Policy Sciences*

*9.      Journal of Medical Humanities*

*10.      Social Studies of Medicine*

*11.   Journal of Agricultural Ethics*

Peripheral Rhetoric and Related Journals

1*.      College Composition and Communication*

*2.      College English*

*3.      Rhetoric Review*

*4.      Philosophy and Rhetoric*

*5.      Western Journal of Communication*

*6.      Southern Communication Journal*