

PEDAGOGY AND CULTURAL PRACTICE

Edited by Henry Giroux and Roger Simon

Recognizing that pedagogy begins with the affirmation of differences as a precondition for extending the possibilities of democratic life, the series analyzes the diverse democratic and ideological struggles of people across a wide range of economic, social, and political spheres.

4. *Writing Permitted in Designated Areas Only*, Linda Brodkey
3. *The Crisis of Meaning in Culture and Education*, David Trend
2. *Margins in the Classroom: Teaching Literature*, Kostas Myrsiades and Linda S. Myrsiades, editors
1. *The End of Education: Toward Posthumanism*, William Spanos

**WRITING PERMITTED
IN DESIGNATED AREAS
ONLY**

LINDA BRODKEY

**PEDAGOGY AND CULTURAL PRACTICE
V O L U M E 4**



University of Minnesota Press
Minneapolis
London

Copyright 1996 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota

Sections of "Poststructural Theories, Methods, and Practices" originally appeared as "Articulating Poststructural Theory in Research on Literacy" in *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Literacy Research*, ed. Richard Beach, Judith L. Green, Michael L. Kamil, and Timothy Shanahan, 293-318, copyright 1992 the National Conference on Research in English and the National Council of Teachers of English, reprinted by permission; "Writing on the Bias" reprinted from *College English*, no. 56: 527-47, copyright 1994 the National Council of Teachers of English, by permission; "Modernism and the Scene(s) of Writing" reprinted from *College English*, no. 49: 396-418, copyright 1986 the National Council of Teachers of English, by permission; "Tropics of Literacy" reprinted from *Journal of Education*, no. 168: 47-54, copyright 1986, by permission; "On the Subjects of Class and Gender in 'The Literacy Letters'" reprinted from *College English*, no. 51: 125-41, copyright 1989 the National Council of Teachers of English, by permission; "Writing Critical Ethnographic Narratives" reprinted from *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, no. 18: 67-76, copyright 1987, by permission of the American Anthropological Association; "Presence of Mind in the Absence of Body" reprinted from *Journal of Education*, no. 170: 84-99, copyright 1988, by permission; "Writing Permitted in Designated Areas Only" reprinted from *Higher Education under Fire: Politics, Economics, and the Crisis of the Humanities*, ed. Michael Berube and Cary Nelson, 214-37, copyright 1995 Routledge, by permission; "Telling Experiences" originally appeared as "Storytelling" in *The Oxford Companion to Women's Writing in the United States*, ed. Cathy N. Davidson and Linda Wagner-Martin, 854-56, copyright 1995 Oxford University Press, Inc., reprinted by permission; "Transvaluing Difference" reprinted from *College English*, no. 51: 597-601, copyright 1989 the National Council of Teachers of English, by permission; "Writing about Difference: 'Hard Cases' for Cultural Studies" reprinted from *Cultural Studies in the English Classroom*, ed. James A. Berlin and Michael J. Vivion, 123-44, copyright 1992 Heinemann-Boynton/Cook, by permission; poem from "Prologue by Carl Sandburg" in *The Family of Man*, ed. Edward Steichen, Museum of Modern Art, 1955, by permission; excerpt from Susan Griffin "Three Poems for Women," in *Like the Iris of an Eye*, published by Harper & Row, 1976, copyright Susan Griffin, by permission; selections from Beverly Slapin, *The Magic Washing Machine: A Diary of Single Motherhood*, Ide House, Mesquite, Texas, 1983, by permission.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Published by the University of Minnesota Press
111 Third Avenue South, Suite 290, Minneapolis, MN 55401-2520
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Brodkey, Linda.

Writing permitted in designated areas only / Linda Brodkey.

p. cm. — (Pedagogy and cultural practice ; v. 4)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8166-2806-8

ISBN 0-8166-2807-6 (pbk.)

1. Creative writing. 2. Creative writing—Study and teaching.

I. Title. II. Series.

PN181.B76 1996

808—dc20

95-44818

The University of Minnesota is an
equal-opportunity educator and employer.

For

Jesse

**WRITING ABOUT DIFFERENCE:
THE SYLLABUS FOR ENGLISH 306**

English 101 is called English 306: Rhetoric and Composition at the University of Texas. While I was there (1988-92), three thousand students (approximately half of every entering class) were required to take the one-semester introduction to college writing. There has been nothing comparable to English 102 taught at Texas since 1985, the year the English department fired its lecturers and dropped the second-semester class, English 307: Introduction to Literature and Composition, from its course offerings. When I was appointed director of lower-division English in 1989, I was given to understand by both the college catalog and the department chair that graduate-student instructors were not to use literature in English 306, only expository essays. I mention these institutional peculiarities at the outset of this discussion of "Writing about Difference," the syllabus developed for English 306, because nearly all the sections (more than fifty a semester) offered during the academic year were staffed by Ph.D. students in literary studies. My request that all graduate-student instructors teach English 306 from a common syllabus for at least one year was an attempt to teach the teachers how to teach writing while teaching writing to the students enrolled in their classes.

I like to think that "Writing about Difference" would have gone some way toward simultaneously instructing teachers and students, for the syllabus was designed to do that. Elsewhere, Richard Penticoff and I have discussed the intellectual rationale for concentrating on argument, difference, and court opinions in a writing course taught by graduate students in literary studies (see "Writing about Difference: 'Hard Cases' for Cultural Studies" in this volume). In this discussion of the syllabus for "Writing about Difference," however, I concentrate on the work of students and faculty who developed the course. Indeed, it is impossible for me to contemplate "Writing about Difference" apart from writing the syllabus—the writing and reading schedule, the writing assignments, and the reading material—in what became known as the Ad Hoc Syllabus-Writing Group.

Following the Lower Division Policy Committee decision to use a common syllabus in English 306 for the 1990-91 academic year, I circulated a memorandum inviting interested graduate students to join the five faculty members from the policy committee who had agreed to consult during the summer. Since "Writing about Difference" was to be taught by graduate-student instructors, it seemed reasonable to include them while decisions were being made, even though there were

no monies available for either faculty or student consultants. The following people met weekly at first and later biweekly from mid-May through mid-July 1990: Margaret Downs-Gamble, David Ericson, Shelli Fowler, Dana Harrington, Susan Sage Heinzelman, Sara Kimball, Allison Mosshart, Stuart Moulthrop, John Slatin, Maria Villalobos, and me. Richard Penticoff, the graduate student who was unanimously elected to chair the group, set and kept us to a rigorous work schedule.

Penticoff's schedule meant that we had already begun to revise the penultimate draft of the syllabus for a course that was to begin at the end of August by July 23, 1990, the day the dean of liberal arts announced his decision to "postpone" the course for a year (see Brodkey 1994a and "The Troubles at Texas" in this volume for narrative accounts of the postponement). For the two months before the postponement, however, one of two graduate-student assistant directors of lower-division English, Shelli Fowler, and I wrote and submitted more writing and reading schedules and writing assignments than I care to remember to the scrutiny of the Ad Hoc Group. As the group grew more accustomed to examining and questioning our work, criticism became more pointed and fruitful, and so within weeks Fowler and I were generating more-acceptable schedules and assignments, though none was accepted on sight. By mid-June we were blocking out new schedules weekly, writing new prompts and revising old ones, which were circulated in advance and discussed in detail during our meetings. I probably learned more in those two months about how to sequence and phrase writing assignments than I had in the previous fifteen years. My own experience of that collaboration was so positive that I would no longer even consider designing a course for others to teach without benefit of such counsel.

The policy committee decision authorized me as the director of lower-division English to develop a syllabus to be called "Writing about Difference" and to use court opinions in antidiscrimination cases in education and employment to teach argumentation in English 306. At the time of the postponement, I had not finished writing instructional material on argumentation, which we planned to teach along lines suggested first in Stephen Toulmin's *The Uses of Argument* and later adumbrated in *An Introduction to Reasoning*, the textbook he wrote with Richard Rieke and Allan Janik (see "Writing about Difference: 'Hard Cases' for Cultural Studies" in this volume for a discussion of teaching argumentation). On my recommendation, the committee voted to supplement court opinions with Paula Rothenberg's social issues reader, *Racism and Sexism: An Integrated Study*, in all sections of the course taught by graduate-student instructors. Also on my recommendation, the committee voted to adopt Maxine Hairston and John Ruszkiewicz's *Scott, Foresman Handbook for Writers* for the academic year. The selection of court opinions was left to my discretion, along with all other decisions about developing, sequencing, and integrating writing and reading assignments for the course.

Fowler and I began by trying to coordinate the court opinions with sections of

the reader and the handbook. We soon realized, however, that neither of us could find enough relevant material in *Racism and Sexism* to justify asking students to buy it. I explained the problem to the department chair, for in the absence of a quorum on the Policy Committee, some of whose members were out of town, I needed his permission (which he granted) to cancel the order for the reader. When Fowler and I encountered similar problems with the handbook, I rationalized the expense on the usual grounds that it could be used as a reference book in other courses.

While I would rather learn that a textbook is not suitable before than after requiring three thousand students to buy it, neither Fowler nor I was eager to develop writing assignments based only on court opinions and an English handbook. After all, it was not legal argumentation as such we planned to teach in English 306. Instead, we hoped to engage students in a discussion of difference by providing them legal decisions in which arguments about discriminatory practices in employment and education are worth examining because it matters not only whether the court rules in favor of the plaintiff or the defendant but also what the argument made to justify a decision does and does not take into account. In other words, we wanted students to treat cases heard by the court as arguable and not to accept decisions with which they agreed or dismiss those with which they disagreed without examining the evidence. Since we chose opinions that argue social rather than legal issues on the advice of legal scholars, we used the same principle to select supplementary essays.

The decision to accompany each opinion with an essay, however, opened up so many possibilities that it is highly unlikely that all our final selections would have withstood the rigors of practice. The best that can be said of them is that they elaborated topics discussed in the opinions. Part I of the Appendix lists the court opinions and essays we planned to use. Legal opinions are in the public domain and do not require permission. We noted the titles but did not reproduce essays we had not received permission to reproduce without cost by the date of the postponement. Also included in the Appendix are the writing assignments (Part II) and a day-by-day syllabus (Part III). In one instance, teachers were asked to choose between two opinions, a case on the right of a male student to bring a male escort to a high school prom (*Fricke v. Lynch*) and one on the right of a female student to play on an all-male high school football team (*Lanz by Lanz v. Ambach*). While both cases deal with issues with which recent high school graduates are likely to be familiar, some teachers doubted they could keep students focused on free speech in a case where the right to political protest is affirmed on behalf of homosexuals.

The decision to divide each class into five writing groups was determined by enrollment, which was capped at twenty-five, with most sections running near or at full enrollment. The syllabus we developed assigned students to groups by the second week, required students to work regularly in their groups, and required each

group to present its case to the rest of the class. We established the groups to focus students and teachers alike on student writing, and we increased the amount of formal and informal writing required of students by reducing the amount of reading. The plan required the entire class to read three essays and one legal opinion in addition to the opinion and essay assigned to each group. Harvard law professor Martha Minow was kind enough to grant us permission to use two proof chapters (edited to make one reading) from *Making All the Difference*, scheduled to be released later, in the fall of 1990. Peggy McIntosh gave us permission to use the working paper "White Privilege and Male Privilege." Richard Kluger, author of *Simple Justice*, allowed us to reproduce "The Spurs of Texas Are upon You," a discussion of *Sweatt v. Painter*, the 1950 Supreme Court decision that ended legal segregation at the University of Texas. While students were required to read only two opinions (*Sweatt v. Painter* and the opinion assigned to their group) and four essays (the three mentioned here and the one assigned to their group), their packets were to have contained all the opinions and essays used in the course.

The plan called for considerably more student writing, as well as discussion of student work in progress, than in previous years. In addition to the usual entering and exiting in-class writing assignments (prompts not decided on by the date of postponement), every student was to have written ten brief responses to reading assignments, which we called scripts and created to teach students to locate and summarize arguments, define terms, and acquire a language in which to discuss arguments as arguments. Not incidentally, the scripts were also designed to provide students with "scripts" for in-class discussions of readings. Each student was also to have written six full-length essays, not counting revisions, designed to integrate material from scripts, writing groups, and class discussions into their essays, and to culminate in an opinion (the case had not been decided on at the time of postponement). This final assignment was to have been photocopied and distributed to the rest of the class. The prompts for "Writing about Difference" were written to assist teachers as well as students. The prompts for the ten scripts are characteristically brief. Script Assignment 6 was "Summarize (in about 50 words) a principal claim and its grounds in the plaintiff's argument in *Sweatt v. Painter*." The prompts for the six formal writing assignments, however, include task analyses, instructions on the kinds of intellectual work the assignment requires. These analyses are the result of submitting assignments to the Ad Hoc Syllabus-Writing Group, whose graduate-student members were quick to ask what students would need to know and do in order to write a successful essay in response to a prompt.

In addition to the informal and formal writing assignments, group members also were to have written four peer critiques and to have presented the case assigned to their group in a format decided on by the group. Writing prompts for peer critiques were to have been developed in workshops at the presemester orientation (in late August) for teachers of English 306, where we also planned to discuss how to fa-

cilitate student presentations of cases. The writing and reading schedule appended to this essay notes where peer critiques and group presentations (a day was set aside for each group) were to have occurred in the schedule, as well as the assignments and due dates for the scripts and essays. The day-by-day writing and reading schedule is for Monday-Wednesday-Friday classes. We planned to write the Tuesday-Thursday version after perfecting the three-day schedule.

I copyrighted all the material developed in the Ad Hoc Syllabus-Writing Group for "Writing about Difference" under my name to ensure that all inquiries about the course would be directed to my office. Publicity about the course generated incessant curiosity and speculation about the readings, but it was a rare journalist who even asked about, much less requested a copy of, the writing assignments or the writing and reading schedule. I discuss the consequences to composition and writing pedagogy of unrestrained, unverified, impoverished, ill-informed, and ill-willed media accounts of the course in "Making a Federal Case out of Difference: The Politics of Pedagogy, Publicity, and Postponement" (1994) and in "Political Suspects?" (1991) which Shelli Fowler and I wrote for the *Village Voice*. Readers interested in deciding for themselves the relative merits of the syllabus we were developing for "Writing about Difference" are invited to examine it for themselves.

APPENDIX

The table of contents for the reader (Part I), the prompts for the scripts and writing assignments (Part II), and the day-by-day schedule (Part III) have been adapted for this essay from the course packet under preparation for "Writing about Difference," the syllabus for English 306: Rhetoric and Composition, at the University of Texas at Austin.

Part I: Readings for Writing about Difference

Martha Minow, "Making a Difference" and "Sources of Difference"

Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of

Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies"

Sweatt v. Painter

Richard Kluger, "The Spurs of Texas Are upon You"

Group 1

Chambers v. Omaha Girls Club, Inc.

Group 2

Gutierrez v. Municipal Court of S.E. Judicial District, County of Los Angeles

Bill Platt, "Toward Domestic Recognition of a Human Right to Language"

Group 3

Nelson v. Thornburgh

Richard K. Scotch, "Disability as the Basis for a Social Movement: Advocacy and the Politics of Definition"

Group 4

University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC

Group 5

Fricke v. Lynch

Donna J. Dennis and Ruth E. Harlow, "Gay Youth and the Right to Education"

Lanz by Lanz v. Ambach

Deborah Rhode, "Association and Assimilation"

Part II: Writing Assignments for Writing about Difference

Script Assignment 1: Cite a passage from Martha Minow's essay (give the page number) and explain (in about 50 words) why you think it is worth thinking about.

Script Assignment 2: Explain (in about 50 words) which of Minow's arguments against the five assumptions about difference you find the most or least convincing.

Script Assignment 3: Make a list of five privileges (similar to the ones generated by Peggy McIntosh) that people who either see or hear do not have to think about or explain.

Script Assignment 4: Define (in about 25 words) the legal terms assigned to you by checking the recommended sources in the Undergraduate Library. Since your definition is part of the lexicon for the class (which your instructor will duplicate), you need to define each term on a separate page and cite the sources used to compose the definition.

Script Assignment 5: Summarize (in about 50 words) one claim and its grounds from Richard Kluger's "The Spurs of Texas Are upon You" and explain (in about 50 words) why you think it is worth thinking about.

Script Assignment 6: Summarize (in about 50 words) a principal claim and its grounds in the plaintiff's argument in *Sweatt v. Painter*.

Script Assignment 7: Summarize (in about 50 words) a principal claim and its grounds in the defendant's argument in *Sweatt v. Painter*.

Script Assignment 8: Summarize (in about 50 words) a principal claim and its grounds in the argument made by the Supreme Court reversing the decision made by the lower court in *Sweatt v. Painter*.

Script Assignment 9: Summarize and assess (in about 100 words) one of the primary claims and its grounds in either the plaintiff's or the defendant's argument in the case assigned to your group.

Script Assignment 10: Summarize and assess (in about 100 words) one of the primary claims and its grounds in the deciding opinion, minority opinion, or dissenting opinion in the case assigned to your group.

Writing Assignment 1: Martha Minow challenges what she identifies as "five closely related assumptions that underlie difference dilemmas" (p. 106). Summarize the argument that Minow makes against the assumption assigned to your group. This assignment requires you to (1) identify the claim Minow makes concerning the (un)stated assumption underlying "difference" and (2) identify the grounds (or evidence) she uses to support her claim that the assumption is problematic, that is, open to doubt. Once you have identified the claim Minow asserts and the grounds she uses in support of her assertion, you will be able to write a 200- to 300-word summary of her argument against the assumption.

Group 1—Assumption #1: Difference Is Intrinsic

Group 2—Assumption #2: The Unstated Norm

Group 3—Assumption #3: The Observer Can See without a Perspective

Group 4—Assumption #4: The Irrelevance of Other Perspectives

Group 5—Assumption #5: The Status Quo Is Natural, Uncoerced, and Good

Writing Assignment 2 (Group Assignment): Working with the summaries each of you has already written, your writing group will develop a collective summary that best represents Minow's argument against the assumption assigned to your group. The group summary you turn in will be distributed to the other members of the class. This assignment requires each of you to:

1. Read the five summaries written by the group members.
2. Rank the summaries. Assign each summary a score. Give a 1 to the summary you think is best, a 2 to the second best, and so on. Assign each summary a different score even if you feel that two or more are comparable.
3. Name the criterion (or criteria) that you think is (are) governing your ranking.

Once the summaries have been individually ranked, members of the group need to compare their rankings and discuss the criteria governing their selections. At least one member of the group needs to take notes. As a group, you will then need to decide which criterion or criteria to use in constructing the group summary.

The summary you turn in as a group may well include passages from one or all

of your individual summaries, or you may decide to write a new summary based on your rankings and discussions. The final version should be about 200 to 300 words. Append a brief statement (about 50 words) explaining the criterion or criteria used to create the group summary along with the notes taken during your group discussions.

Writing Assignment 3: Write a documented essay of about 700 words defining, examining, analyzing, and critiquing one of the stereotypes (an oversimplified belief or opinion about a person or group of people) assigned to your group. Apply what you have learned concerning unexamined assumptions about difference to explore problems raised by the stereotype. This assignment requires each of the you to:

1. Choose one of the stereotypes assigned to your group (see below).
2. Generate a list of characteristics associated with the stereotype.
3. Research the stereotype by (a) locating books and periodicals that complicate the "stereotype"; (b) keeping a bibliographic record of your sources (see *The Scott, Foresman Handbook for Writers* [HB] 593-601 if you need help); and (c) copying materials from sources you think you might want to cite in your essay (see HB 602-5, if you need help).
4. Discuss your list and research with the other members of your group.

The draft of this essay needs to include (1) a definition of the stereotype, (2) an analysis of insights and limitations of that commonly accepted definition, incorporating information from your library sources, and (3) a critique of unstated assumption(s) not dealt with by the stereotype, incorporating information from Minnow's essay.

Group 1: Unwed mother/philanthropist/pregnant teen/role model

Group 2: Blind man/blind woman/handicapped individual/activist

Group 3: Foreigner/English speaker/Hispanic/employee

Group 4: Asian woman/professor/M.B.A./bureaucrat

Group 5: Homosexual/heterosexual/the perfect date/good student or female athlete/male athlete/good sport/jock

Writing Assignment 4: Reviews of academic books and essays are a specialized genre. For this assignment, each of you will write a 500- to 700-word review essay of the article assigned to your group. Because scholarly writing concentrates on convincing readers that the evidence used to ground claims is warranted, the purpose of a review is to evaluate how well a particular book or essay has accomplished this goal.

This assignment requires you to (1) reread the article, (2) select what you think are the principal claims, (3) identify the grounds used to support the principal claims, and (4) assess how well the grounds warrant the claims made.

Write a title for your review and begin your essay with a full citation of the article. See HB (647-68): citing articles and chapters from books. In the review itself, construct an argument evaluating the effectiveness of the entire article. Support your position by assessing how well the grounds supporting the principal claims are warranted.

Writing Assignment 5: A court opinion summarizes and evaluates the arguments made by the plaintiff and the defendant and provides a rationale for affirming or denying the case made by the plaintiff. An opinion may consist of one or more of the following: (1) the argument that supports the court's decision (majority opinion); (2) an argument that dissents from the argument in the majority opinion but supports the court's decision (minority opinion); (3) an argument that dissents from both the opinion and the decision of the court (dissenting opinion). If your group has been assigned a case in which there is a majority opinion, a minority opinion, and a dissenting opinion, focus on one in your essay.

Building from the work you have already done in scripts 9 and 10, this assignment requires you to (1) reread the case assigned to your group, (2) choose an opinion (if there is more than one), (3) reread the relevant law(s), (4) identify the principal claims and grounds in the opinion, and (5) assess how well the grounds warrant the principal claims in the opinion.

Write an essay of about 700 words summarizing and evaluating an opinion in the case assigned to your group. Summarize the opinion before assessing the grounds used to warrant the argument.

Writing Assignment 6: A legal opinion is an argument explaining the court's reasons for finding in favor of the plaintiff or the defendant. In its argument the court applies principles of law to specific cases. Forming an opinion is first a matter of deciding to what extent the complaint against the defendant is justified by law(s) and then deciding to what extent the circumstances of a particular case mitigate law(s). Arguments for both the relevance of legal principles and mitigating circumstances concern warranting the grounds used to support the claim(s) made to justify the decision.

This assignment requires you to (1) read the materials (the brief and possible laws), (2) summarize the plaintiff's case, (3) summarize the defendant's case, (4) evaluate the plaintiff's case with respect to law, (5) evaluate the defendant's case with respect to law, (6) evaluate the plaintiff's case with respect to circumstances, (7) evaluate the defendant's case with respect to circumstances, (8) decide in favor of the plaintiff or defendant, and (9) formulate an argument supporting your opinion

Write an opinion (500 to 700 words) in which you give your reasons for finding

in favor of the plaintiff or defendant. Your opinion needs to take into account both a legal principle and the circumstances of the case. You may, if you wish, use additional materials for establishing circumstances. You are, however, restricted to either the laws cited in the case or the others in your course packet. [These materials were not yet in the course packet when implementation of the syllabus was postponed.]

Part III: Monday-Wednesday-Friday Schedule for Writing about Difference

Required Texts:

The Scott, Foresman Handbook for Writers (HB)

English 306: Course Packet

Note: Syllabus indicates the number of copies of each assignment needed *in addition to the original*.

Week 1

Wednesday 8/29

Class activity

Course overview

Syllabus

Policy statement

Scholastic honesty statement

Friday 8/31

Reading Assignment

Martha Minow, introduction to *Making All the Difference* (due Wednesday 9/5)

HB, Planning, 34-44; Summarizing, 602-5; Sexist Language, 402-9; Denotation/Connotation, 158-62 (due Friday 9/7)

Script Assignment 1

Issue raised in Minow (50 words, one cc due Wednesday 9/5)

Library Assignment

Undergraduate Library tour (due Wednesday 9/5)

Class Activity

In-class writing assignment 1 (35-40 minutes)

Week 2

Monday 9/3 Labor Day (no class)

Wednesday 9/5

Class Activity

Turn in one copy of script 1

Summarizing re claims and grounds

Demonstrate using Minow essay assigned on 8/31

Assign students to writing groups

Writing Assignment 1

Summary of assumption in Minow essay (one copy to instructor, four copies for writing group, due Monday 9/10)

Friday 9/7

Writing groups

Plan summaries of Minow section

Week 3

Monday 9/10

Class Activity

Turn in five copies of writing assignment 1

Discussion: Sorting and ranking summaries of Minow

Writing Group

Sorting and ranking summaries of Minow

Writing Assignment 2 (Group Assignment)

Group summary of assumption in Minow essay (one copy, due Friday 9/14)

Wednesday 9/12

Reading Assignment

McIntosh, "White Privilege and Male Privilege" (due Monday 9/17)

Script Assignment 2

Working definition of difference re Minow (about 100 words, one cc due Wednesday 9/14)

Writing Group

Sorting and ranking summaries of Minow

Friday 9/14

Class Activity

Turn in one copy of writing assignment 2

Turn in one copy of script 2

Discussion of Minow essay

Part I (group summaries)

Part II (defining difference)

Script Assignment 3

Working definition of privilege re McIntosh (about 100 words, one cc due Monday 9/17)

Reading Assignment

HB, Bibliography, 593-601; 602-5 (due Wednesday 9/19)

Writing Assignment 3

Documented essay analyzing a stereotype (two cc due Monday 9/24)

Week 4**Monday 9/17****Class Activity**

Turn in one copy of script 3

Discussion of "White Privilege and Male Privilege" (re claims and grounds for definitions)

Reading Assignment

HB: MLA Documentation (23 C) 638-71 (due Wednesday 9/19)

Wednesday 9/19**Class Activity**

Discussion: Documenting sources

Writing Groups

Explore arguments for writing assignment 3

Script Assignment 4

Compiling a documented lexicon of legal terms (one cc due Monday 10/1)

Friday 9/21**Class Activity**

Discussion: Exploring arguments for writing assignment 3

Writing Group

Explore arguments for writing assignment 3

Reading Assignment

"The Spurs of Texas Are upon You" (due Wednesday 9/26)

Fourteenth Amendment (due Wednesday 9/26)

Sweatt v. Painter (due Friday 9/28)

Script Assignment 5

Claim and ground from "The Spurs" (50 words, one cc due Wednesday 9/26)

Week 5**Monday 9/24****Class Activity**

Turn in two copies of writing assignment 3 (complete draft; revision due Monday 10/8)

Discussion: Critiques

Critique Assignment 1

Critique of writing assignment 3 (two cc due Friday 9/28)

Writing Groups

Exchange copies of writing assignment 3 (draft essays)

Begin critiques of writing assignment 3 (draft essays) (two cc of critiques due Friday 9/28)

Wednesday 9/26**Class Activity**

Turn in one copy of script 5

Discussion: Claims and grounds in "The Spurs of Texas"

Friday 9/28**Class Activity**

Turn in two copies of critique 1

Discussion: *Sweatt v. Painter*

Reading Assignment

Group case (due Wednesday 10/10)

Essay related to the case (due Wednesday 10/10)

First Amendment, Title VII, Title IX, Rehabilitation Act, Pregnancy Discrimination Act (due Monday 10/8)

Script Assignment 6

Summary of claims and grounds of plaintiff's argument in *Sweatt* (one cc due Monday 10/1)

Week 6**Monday 10/1****Class Activity**

Turn in one copy of script 6

Turn in one copy of script 4 (legal lexicon)

Discussion: The plaintiff's argument in *Sweatt*

Reading Assignment

HB: "How to Write a Review," 762-67 (due Wednesday 10/3)

Script Assignment 7

Summarize the claims and grounds of the defendant's argument in *Sweatt* (one cc due Wednesday 10/3)

Wednesday 10/3**Class Activity**

Turn in one copy of script 7

Questions: Reviewing

Discussion: The defendant's argument in *Sweatt*

Writing Assignment 4

Review the essay assigned to the group (two cc of draft due Monday 10/15)

Script Assignment 8

Summarize the claims and grounds of the court's opinion in *Sweatt* (one cc due Friday 10/5)

Friday 10/5**Class Activity**

Turn in one copy of script 8

Discussion: The court's opinion in *Sweatt*

*Week 7***Monday 10/8****Class Activity**

Turn in two copies of revised writing assignment 3

Discussion: Antidiscrimination law

Wednesday 10/10**Class Activity**

Questions: Antidiscrimination law

Exploring arguments for review essay

Friday 10/12**Class Activity**

Questions: Review essay

Writing Group

Exploring arguments for review essay

*Week 8***Monday 10/15****Class Activity**

Turn in two draft copies of writing assignment 4

Critique Assignment 2

Critique of writing assignment 4 (two cc due Friday 10/19)

Writing Group

Work on critiques

Wednesday 10/17**Writing Group**

Continue working on critiques

Friday 10/19**Class Activity**

Turn in two copies of critique 2

Writing Assignment 5

Summarize and assess the arguments of the plaintiff, the defendant, and the court in the case assigned to your group (one cc due Monday 10/29)

Writing Group

Work on writing assignment 5

*Week 9***Monday 10/22****Class Activity**

Analyzing arguments

Script Assignment 9

Summary and assessment of plaintiff's or defendant's argument in the group case (about 100 words, one cc due Wednesday 10/24)

Wednesday 10/24**Class Activity**

Turn in one copy of script 9

Discussion: Plaintiff's or defendant's argument

Script Assignment 10

Brief summary and assessment of argument in the court opinion or dissenting opinion (about 100 words, one cc due Friday 10/26)

Writing Group

Discussion: Summarizing and assessing the court opinion(s)

Friday 10/26**Class Activity**

Turn in one copy of script 10

Discussion: Arguments in the court opinion(s)

Group Presentation Assignment

Presentations are to include summaries of arguments, assessments of arguments, relevant essays, positions of all group members, and arguments not considered by the court (one cc due 11/12-21)

*Week 10***Monday 10/29****Class Activity**

Turn in one copy of writing assignment 5

Writing Assignment 6

Write an opinion based on the transcript (one draft cc due Monday 11/9)

Writing Group

Plans for writing assignment 6

Wednesday 10/31

Class Activity

Discussion: Formulating an opinion

Writing Group

Discussion of opinions

Friday 11/2

Class Activity

Discussion: Formulating an opinion

Week 11

Monday 11/5

Class Activity

Library/group conferences with instructor

Wednesday 11/7

Class Activity

Library/group conferences with instructor

Friday 11/9

Class Activity

Turn in one copy of writing assignment 6 to writing group

Critique Assignment 3 (two cc due Wednesday 11/14)

Writing Group

Exchange drafts

Begin critiques

Week 12

Monday 11/12

Writing Group 1

Present case

Wednesday 11/14

Class Activity

Turn in two copies of critique 3

Writing Group 2

Present case

Friday 11/16

Writing Group 3

Present case

Week 13

Monday 11/19

Writing Group 4

Present case

Wednesday 11/21

Writing Group 5

Present case

Friday 11/23 **Thanksgiving**

Week 14

Monday 11/26

Class Activity

Turn in two copies of writing assignment 6 (groups exchange)

Critique Assignment 4 (two cc due Friday 11/30)

Wednesday 11/28

Writing Group

Work on critique 4

Friday 11/30

Class Activity

Turn in two copies of critique 4

Week 15

Monday 12/3

Class Activity

Discussion: Opinions

Wednesday 12/5

Class Activity

Turn in writing assignment 6 (copies for everyone)

Course evaluation

Friday 12/7

Class Activity

In-class writing assignment 2 (35-40 minutes)