

**PAX 600: Narrative Negotiation Spring 2012**  
**Graduate Program in Conflict Transformation**  
**Eastern Mennonite University**

**Instructor:** Jayne Seminare Docherty, Ph.D.

Phone: 540-432-4627; Room 103 CJP Martin Store Building; [jayne.docherty@emu.edu](mailto:jayne.docherty@emu.edu)

**Consider this syllabus your first reading assignment!** It includes a narrative about the way the course was developed. The narrative explains why you are reading what you are reading and why we are running the class the way it is being run. You will get a lot more out of this course if you read this syllabus carefully.

**Course Meets:**

The course dates are: January 20 & 21; February 10 & 11; and February 24 & 25, 2012. Class starts at 8:30 a.m. and finishes at 5:30 p.m. *unless we need to flex around students attending religious services on Friday and/or Saturday.* A survey will be sent out to registered students before the course starts and precise course meeting times will be determined based on responses to the survey.

**Office Hours:**

Office hours will be Wednesday with hours to be determined. I will also see students on other days by appointment. *I will be presenting at the International Studies Association Convention and will not have office hours on April 4, 2012.*

**Course Description:**

This course uses a multi-dimensional framework for understanding negotiation. Daily social practices are a form of **social negotiation**; they shape patterns of interaction and institutions. **Dispute domain negotiations** are processes for deciding the appropriate venue and legitimate processes for addressing conflicts when they arise. **Transactional negotiation** is the actual give-and-take about a specific issue; this is what happens at the negotiation table. Most negotiation courses say nothing about social negotiation and little or nothing about dispute domain negotiation. In a world filled with cross-cultural encounters and complex, intractable problems effective negotiators need to understand all of these negotiation processes and they need to be able to manage all of the processes. Through emergent scenarios and reflective practice combined with analysis of negotiation processes, students will learn to recognize and manage multi-dimensional negotiations. This is an advanced skills class. PAX 533 (Analysis) and PAX 503 (Practice) are recommended (but not required) prerequisites; students with extensive field experience should contact the instructor to discuss enrollment in the course.

**Course Credit:** This is a 3 semester-hour course.

If you are taking the course for 2 hours, you will complete the three journal assignments and a fourth reflection paper. If you are taking the course for 1 hour, you will complete the three journal assignments. **Everyone, regardless of the number of hours for which they are enrolled, must prepare for and participate in all three course sessions. That includes being part of a team and preparing for the negotiation on our emergent scenario.**

**Course Method:**

This course is very interactive in the classroom. **Students are expected to prepare for class by reading the materials so that they can participate in the discussions and the exercises effectively.** Reading assignments will be sent out before the holiday break so you can get a

head start. You are encouraged to use the “**cooperate to graduate**” method and put together a reading/study group so you can divide the readings and discuss them with others before class.

Students will also be working in teams as part of an emergent scenario that extends over the three sessions of the course. This is the primary hands-on learning experience for the course. **Team preparation outside of class is expected.** Teams should be able to prepare using technology to facilitate their work if they are unable to meet together physically between class sessions.

### **Required Books:**

**This course assumes familiarity with *Getting to Yes* by Roger Fisher and William Ury.** It is an easy read. **If you have not read it, please do so before class begins.**

Docherty, J. S. (2005). *The Little Book of Strategic Negotiation: Negotiating During Turbulent Times*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books, Inc.

Docherty, J.S. (2001). *Learning lessons from Waco: When the Parties Bring Their Gods to the Negotiation Table*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Fisher, R., & Shapiro, D. (2005). *Beyond reason: Using emotions as you negotiate*. New York: Penguin.

Winslade, J., & Monk, G. D. (2008). *Practicing Narrative Mediation: Loosening the Grip of Conflict*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

### **Other Readings:**

The other required readings will be posted in Moodle along with resources you might want to read for further research.

*The following books will be on reserve in the Hartzler Library.*

Honeyman, C., Coben, J., & De Palo, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Rethinking Negotiation Teaching: Innovations for Context and Culture*. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.

Honeyman, C., Coben, J., & De Palo, G. (Eds.). (2010). *Venturing Beyond the Classroom* (Vol. 2). St. Paul: DRI Press.

Kellett, P. M., & Dalton, D. G. (2001). *Managing conflict in a negotiated world: A narrative approach to achieving productive dialogue and change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Schneider, A. K., & Honeyman, C. (2006). *The Negotiator's Fieldbook: The Desk Reference for the Experienced Negotiator*. Washington, DC: American Bar Association.

### **Assignments for the Course:**

**Participation in the Class Sessions:** This is expected but it is not a test of whether you already understand multi-dimensional negotiation. **Assume that if you show up to class fully prepared to participate and you engage fully in the learning process, you have these earned these points.** However, **points will be deducted** from the final grade of any student

who does not prepare for and participate in the emergent scenario and other class activities as well as in the debriefing sessions during class. **30 points**

**Negotiation Journal:** Students will keep a negotiation journal. At the end of each class session, students will be given a set of reflection questions to guide their journaling. The first journal is due **February 1**. The second journal is due **February 20**. The final journal is due **March 2, 2012. 30 points** (10 points for each journal entry)

**Final Paper:** This course is organized around a **new** model of negotiation. For the final project, students will be divided into teams. Each team will **analyze a completed negotiation** using the multi-dimensional negotiation model tied to a **set of evaluative questions** which **Jayne will develop (with class input)**. This way, all of the analyses will be comparable. (Famous examples of peace negotiations include the Oslo negotiations between Israel and the PLO or the Good Friday agreement reached in Northern Ireland. There are many others to choose from.) **The work of the paper writing teams will continue after the last class session. Teams will have until April 13 to complete their papers.** Each team will receive coaching and assistance from Jayne or from someone else. Teams will have editing support. **If the class wishes, we will schedule a Brown Bag or symposium during SPI where we can present the full collection of papers to the CJP/EMU/SPI community. 40 points**

**NOTE ON THE FINAL PAPERS:** *The hope is that some or all of the papers will be of publishable quality. If so, we will submit a conceptual paper being written by Jayne along with the other papers to a journal for possible publication as a set of related papers.*

***Welcome to the adventure!***

This course is a synthesis of 15 years of reflective practice, research, comparing notes with colleagues, and writing (alone and with others). For almost three decades, negotiation courses have ***started at the table*** and they have focused on what happens at the negotiation table. ***This course takes a much different approach.*** We don't start with the table; we finish with the table because the table and all of the processes used at the table are ***socially negotiated***. In other words, negotiating a particular problem can only happen if the parties have first ***negotiated*** their relationships, a sense of reality that allows them to identify a shared problem, a vision of a shared future towards which they are willing to work, and a location and acceptable process for negotiating the problem they have identified. We will ***start with social negotiation*** and then we will move through ***dispute domain negotiation*** (negotiating the where, when, how and who for the problem-focused negotiation). We will ***end with transactional negotiations*** that focus on the problems the parties have agreed to address. This is an ***artificially linear experience***; in real life the three forms of negotiation are jumbled together. But you will be a more effective negotiator if you can recognize, disaggregate and manage these forms of negotiation.

### Implications for the way the course is run:

Traditional negotiation courses use relatively short games, simulations, and role plays to teach particular lessons. This course starts with the assumption that life is emergent, therefore conflict and negotiation are emergent. Negotiating social relationships can never happen exactly the same way twice. Therefore, negotiating locations to solve problems does not happen the same way twice, nor does negotiating the problems. **Life (and negotiation) takes time to unfold.** It is as much about artistry and creativity as it is about skills and reason.

Because the course is very new, we will be videotaping the emergent scenarios. We may also be interviewing individual members of the class in their roles. We will try to use the videotapes as part of the teaching and feedback process for the course. But much of that depends on technology. If the taping works well, Jayne will try to put together a guide for other negotiation professors using some clips from the video. **You will be asked to sign a waiver for the videotaping; you are absolutely free to decline to be included in any video that is shared outside the class.**

### **Schedule and Assignments**

M after a reading indicates that the materials are in Moodle.

### **January 20 – 21, 2012 Social Negotiation – the foundation of all negotiation**

**Before class, please review the basic assumptions behind interest-based negotiation.** You may do this by rereading or skimming *Getting to Yes* or by visiting (INSERT WEB SITE).

**Also read the packet of background materials for our emergent scenario.** These are located in Moodle in the folder titled “Luna”.

**Other readings to be completed** are listed in the following tale...

#### *The Story of Discovery, Part One*

This course is the current resting point on a journey of discovery about the limitations of interest-based negotiation. The *journey started with* Jayne and others focusing on the problem of *worldviews* in conflict.

**Before Class, please read *Learning Lessons from Waco*, Chapters 1-4.**

- Extra optional readings:
  - One more chapter from *Waco* to get a feel for worldviews in action in a negotiation.
  - Goldberg, R. M. (2009). How our worldviews shape our practice. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 26(4), 405-431. **M**
  - Blechman, F., Crocker, J., Docherty, J. S., & Garon, S. C. (2000). Complex Environmental Policy Dialogue: Research into Worldviews in the Northern Forest Lands Council Dialogue, 1990-1994. *Working Paper #14*. **M**
  - Avruch, K. (2006). The poverty of buyer and seller. In C. Honeyman & A. K. Schneider (Eds.), *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator* (pp. 81-86). Washington, DC: American Bar Association.

**M**

Then, Jayne started focusing on *the problem of instability in the context* during negotiation. She wrote *The Little Book of Strategic Negotiation* which you will read for the February 10-11 class. That led to discussions with other practitioners working in unstable or volatile settings, which introduced the concepts of *wicked problems* and *adaptive v. tame problems* into the discovery process.

**Before class, please read** Docherty, J. S. (2010). "**Adaptive**" negotiation: Practice and teaching In C. Honeyman, J. Coben & G. De Palo (Eds.), *Venturing Beyond the Classroom: Volume 2 in the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching Series* (pp. 481-509). St. Paul: DRI Press. **M**

- Extra optional readings:
  - Chrustie, C., Docherty, J. S., Lira, L., Mahuad, J., Gadlin, H., & Honeyman, C. (2010). **Negotiating wicked problems: Five stories**. In C. Honeyman, J. Coben & G. De Palo (Eds.), *Venturing Beyond the Classroom: Volume 2 in the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching Series* (pp. 449-480). St. Paul: DRI Press. **M**.  
*NOTE:* This paper includes stories of our practice that have led us to rethink negotiation. You might find these stories interesting.

Jayne and others have now concluded that *you can't start with transactional negotiation* (bargaining, trading, finding a win-win, etc.) if you want to really understand how people negotiate wicked or adaptive problems. You need to *start with the foundations upon which transactional negotiations rest* - social negotiation and dispute domain negotiations.

**Before class, please read** Docherty, J.S. (2011). "**Ripe for What?**" A multi-dimensional framework for understanding negotiation. Unpublished paper. **M**

- Extra optional readings:
  - Ricigliano, R. (2006). A three-dimensional analysis of negotiation. In C. Honeyman & A. K. Schneider (Eds.), *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator* (pp. 55-60). Washington, DC: American Bar Association. **M**
  - Fox, K. H. (2009). Negotiation as a Post-Modern Process. In C. Honeyman, J. Coben & G. De Palo (Eds.), *Rethinking Negotiation Teaching: Innovations for Context and Culture* (pp. 13-27). Saint Paul, Minnesota: DRI Press. **M**

**Make sure you understand the following concepts and ideas:**

- Interest-based negotiation
- Wicked problems and why some practitioners think that interest-based negotiation cannot deal with wicked problems
- Worldviews/worldviewing and how they relate to conflict and to conflict intervention practices
- Adaptive versus technical problems
- The three forms of negotiation (social, dispute domain, and transactional) and how they intersect
- The stages of conflict and the idea of ripeness for negotiation

**Bring your questions about the readings to class.**

Preliminary Schedule for the Class Sessions:

	Morning	Afternoon
January 20	<p>Practice seeing social negotiation in film clips</p> <p>Discussion of the major concepts and ideas for the course</p>	<p>Set up our emergent scenario</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review history of the real case</li> <li>• Watch a film based on the case</li> <li>• Get into roles</li> </ul>
January 21	<p>Work in our roles to establish the social bases for negotiating the problem(s) (Filming)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debrief and review (if possible look at some of the filming)</li> <li>• Connect back to our readings</li> <li>• Frame interesting questions</li> <li>• Review requirements for next class session</li> <li>• Review requirements for journal due February 1</li> </ul>

**February 10 – 11, 2012 Dispute Domain Negotiation – negotiating the location for transactional negotiation**

**Your first journal entries are due to Jayne by February 1 (midnight).** See separate handout for questions to guide your reflection.

*The Story of Discovery, Part Two*

The journey of discovery continued with the recognition that interest-based negotiation practices implicitly assume stability in the context.

**Before class, please read** Docherty, J. S. (2005) *The little book of strategic negotiation*.

- Extra optional readings:
  - Docherty, J. S. (2006). The unstated models in our minds. In A. K. Schneider & C. Honeyman (Eds.), *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator* (pp. 7-16): American Bar Association. **M**

In an unstable setting, ***problems are ill-defined and need to be framed.*** Framing is an issue that is discussed in interest-based negotiation literature, too. But framing is **much more difficult** in conflicts ***where the parties the parties have significant cultural and worldview differences.***

**Before class, please read** Caton Campbell, M., & Docherty, J. S. (2006). **What's in a frame?** In C. Honeyman & A. K. Schneider (Eds.), *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator* (pp. 37-46). Washington, DC: American Bar Association (**M**). **Also read:** Kaufman, S., & Gray, B. **Using retrospective and prospective frame elicitation** to evaluate

environmental disputes. **(M) If you want some practice working with frames, visit:** INSERT WEB SITE.

- Extra optional readings:
  - Docherty, J. S., & Caton Campbell, M. (2006). Consequences of Principal and Agent. In A. K. Schneider & C. Honeyman (Eds.), *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator* (pp. 497-504): American Bar Association **(M)**. *NOTE:* This paper builds off of the frame paper. It repeats ideas that are in the Little Book but connects some of them to framing more clearly.
  - Kaufman, S., & Smith, J. (1999). Framing and reframing in land use change conflicts. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 16(2), 164-180. *NOTE:* This paper includes research on some common frames that show up in environmental conflicts. You might find some of this helpful for understanding how other parties are framing the conflict(s) we are dealing with in class.

Problems or conflicts are often *framed through particular institutions*. For example, a legal system puts a particular shape on a conflict and disputants need to accept that shape (that framing) of their problem in order to access the legal system. A *dispute domain is an institution or structure where people go to negotiate their problems*. It can be a court, a group of elders, or a process that we all agree to use in the office; or it can be a temporary process that we all validate and work with for as long as necessary to deal with one conflict. In every society, there are *competing dispute domains*. Parties in a conflict may engage in “*forum shopping*” by trying to move the conflict into a particular system (dispute domain). They may favor a dispute domain because it is based on a set of values or a worldview that they hold. An example of this would be religious communities that want to run their own court system for handling family matters. Or they may try to locate the conflict in the dispute domain which is most likely to yield an outcome they prefer. For example, transnational corporations expend a lot of resources trying to locate legal matters in the courts of countries that are more favorable to their interests. Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) and conflict resolution (CR) practitioners can also craft *temporary dispute domains* to handle a specific problem, for example an ad hoc committee to convene a mediation process over a local environmental problem. Or they can develop a conflict intervention that combines established dispute domains with ad hoc domains. *Complex conflicts are often managed through multiple domains before they reach resolution. And complex conflicts can be made more intractable when the decisions of competing dispute domains compete for legitimacy and offer contradictory outcomes*. In spite of the fact that forum shopping and dispute domain selection/creation are commonplace activities, most negotiation courses and textbooks say very little about the

problem. Indeed, there has not been that much written on the subject even in academic and legal journals.

**Before class, please read:** Meinen-Dick, R. S., & Pradhan, R. (2002). **Legal pluralism** and dynamic property rights. *CAPRI Working Paper No. 22*.

- Extra optional readings:
  - Unruh, J. D. (2003). **Land tenure and legal pluralism** in the peace process. *Peace & Change*, 28(3), 348-373.

*In any complex conflict, we have to ask, what is the nature of the problem?* Not every part of a complex conflict can be handled at the negotiation table. So one of the first negotiations the parties must undertake is about what comes to the “big table” and what is handled in another way? Examples of issues that cannot be managed through negotiation include: What is the “real” history of our conflict? Who did the greatest harm to the other in the conflict? *If we make the transactional negotiation process the center of our attention, then we tend to frame the problem to fit the table and large parts of the conflict remain unaddressed.* We also tend to set the agenda at the table so that we can use interest-based negotiation tools.

**Before class, please read the introductory story in:** Goldberg, R. M. (2009). How our worldviews shape our practice. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 26(4), 405-431. **M**

Had the parties in the Goldberg reading focused on their stories instead of their interests and needs, they might have discovered their framing error much sooner. *Narratives* (which can be expressed in complete stories or in *symbols* or *metaphors*) are one very important *link that holds social negotiation, dispute domain negotiation, and transactional negotiation together.* Very little attention has been given to stories in negotiation, but mediators have developed a set of practices known as narrative mediation. So, Jayne turned to John Winslade and Gerald Monk for some guidance and advice. She even brought Gerald Monk and Stacey Sinclair to Thailand/Myanmar to help figure out how to develop narrative-based negotiation training materials suitable for the Myanmar context.

**Before class, please read** Winslade, J., & Monk, G. D. (2008). *Practicing Narrative Mediation: Loosening the Grip of Conflict*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Chapters 1-4.

Stories can help us *name the problems* in our conflict, but eventually we need to *negotiate an agenda* to guide our formal negotiations.

**Before class, please read:** A READING ON AGENDA SETTING FOR COMPLEX NEGOTIATIONS TO BE DETERMINED.

**Make sure you understand the following concepts and ideas *and think about them in relation to our emergent scenario:***

- Framing and reframing a conflict
- Problem stories and the process of creating an alternative story
- Behind the table and at the table processes
- THINK ABOUT: What is your frame of the conflict (in role) and what frames are other parties using? Are there ways you could “test” your ideas about their frames? Are there ways you could “test” the accuracy of your own frames?
- Legal pluralism – THINK ABOUT: what venues exist for dealing with the Luna case? What sets of laws or rules are in competition? Where do you want the case to be negotiated and why?
- Agenda setting in public conflicts and the role of the media. THINK ABOUT: What role is the media playing in setting the agenda for the Luna case? How can you (in your role) work with the media to set the problem definition as you see it? What issues can come to a negotiation and table and what issues cannot?
- The problem of “miswanting” or negotiating for the wrong thing... How can this be avoided in the Luna case?

**Bring questions to class.**

Preliminary Schedule for the Class Sessions:

	Morning	Afternoon
February 10	<p>Review our last class and prepare to continue our case negotiation with a focus on negotiating a dispute domain or domains for addressing the problem(s)</p> <p>Use our readings to develop a checklist for our goals for the emergent scenario this weekend</p>	<p>Reconvene our emergent scenario. Work in roles to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frame the conflict or conflicts</li> <li>• Identify possible dispute domains and processes</li> <li>• Identify issues that go to a negotiation table and issues that require other responses</li> <li>• Begin crafting an agenda for any negotiations you might decide to convene</li> </ul>
February 11	<p>Work in our roles to finish setting up the dispute domain(s) in which the parties agree to negotiate their conflict(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debrief and review (if possible look at some of the filming)</li> <li>• Connect back to our readings</li> <li>• Frame interesting questions</li> <li>• Review requirements for next class session</li> <li>• Review requirements for journal due February 20</li> <li>• Look at the final project assignment and start forming teams for that effort</li> </ul>

**February 24 – 25, 2012 Transactional Negotiation – the use of direct negotiation to resolve specific problems or conflict**

Your second journal entries are due to Jayne by February 20 (midnight). See separate handout for questions to guide your reflection.

*The Story of Discovery, Part Three*

Jayne's hypothesis is that **successful transactional negotiations depend in some measure** on the parties successfully navigating both social and dispute domain processes. Once they do that, then they can start using all of the "basic" negotiation tools such as creating value and claiming value, finding the win-win, etc. **But always with an eye on the implications for social negotiation and attention to the feedback loops between social negotiation and transactional negotiation.**

**Before class, please review:** Docherty, J. S. (2005). *The Little Book of Strategic Negotiation: Negotiating During Turbulent Times*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books, Inc. with careful attention to the "at-the table and behind the table" issues. **Also review:** Caton Campbell, M., & Docherty, J. S. (2006). **What's in a frame?** In C. Honeyman & A. K. Schneider (Eds.), *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator* (pp. 37-46). Washington, DC: American Bar Association (M). **Also read:** Docherty, J. S., & Caton Campbell, M. (2006). **Consequences of Principal and Agent.** In A. K. Schneider & C. Honeyman (Eds.), *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator* (pp. 497-504): American Bar Association (M).

And one last (for now) discovery! All may not be as it seems at the table. The negotiators are **not rational actors**. If new brain research is taken seriously, we need to see that people make decision based on emotion much more than they make decisions based on reason.

**Before class, please read:** Fisher, R., & Shapiro, D. (2005). *Beyond reason: Using emotions as you negotiate*. New York: Penguin.

They are also steeped in their culture and its related narratives, so they are always making meaning at the table. Good negotiators never forget that **they and the others at the table** are meaning makers.

**Before class, please read:** Docherty, J. S. (2004). **Culture and Negotiation:** Symmetrical Anthropology for Negotiators. *Marquette Law Review*, 87(4), 711-722. **Also look at designated sections of:** Docherty, J.S. (2001). *Learning lessons from Waco: When the Parties Bring Their Gods to the Negotiation Table*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press. **Jayne will give you a handout to focus your review of the Waco lessons.**

**In preparation for class:** Work with your team to make sure you understand the negotiation process that has been designed, your goals and your BATNA/WATNA, and your negotiation strategy. Come to class prepared to negotiate (and to have fun and learn)!

	Morning	Afternoon
February 24	Set up the scenario and make sure everyone knows the process. Start negotiating!	Continue negotiating.
February 11	Conclude the negotiations by mid-morning  Start reviewing results after break	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What have we learned?</li> <li>• Review requirements for journal due March 2</li> <li>• What next?</li> <li>• <b>Form teams for final project papers and review the process for completing the projects</b></li> </ul>

**March 2: Third journal is due to Jayne by midnight.**

**February 12 - April 13 Work on final papers.**

**JAYNE IS BLOCKING THE ENTIRE DAY MARCH 29 AND MARCH 30 FOR WORKING WITH PAPER TEAMS. She will also meet with teams by appointment during March.**

Jayne is away at ISA April 2-5.

Final papers due April 13 (midnight) – Jayne is happy to receive them earlier!

Final papers will be posted in Moodle for the whole class to see and comment on.

**JAYNE WILL BE WORKING ON FINAL EDITS FOR POSSIBLE PUBLICATION OF THE PAPERS APRIL 30 – MAY 4.**

## Supplemental information for CJP graduate course syllabi:

Approved 3/20/06; updated 12/11

### **Writing Guidelines:**

*Writing* will be a factor in evaluation: EMU has adopted a set of writing guidelines for graduate programs that include four sets of criteria: content, structure, conventions and style (see below). It is expected that graduates will be able to write at least a “good” level with 60% writing at an “excellent” level.

For the course papers, please follow the APA style described in CJP’s *GUIDELINES for GRADUATE PAPERS* (see student handbook or request a copy from the Academic Program Coordinator).

### **Academic Integrity Policy (AIP):**

EMU faculty and staff care about the integrity of their own work and the work of their students. They create assignments that promote interpretative thinking and work intentionally with students during the learning process. Honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility are characteristics of a community that is active in loving mercy, doing justice, and walking humbly before God. EMU defines plagiarism as occurring when a person presents as one’s own someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source. (Adapted from the Council of Writing Program Administrators). [Taken from “Academic Integrity,” 2011-12 Undergraduate Catalog.] This course will apply EMU’s AIP (see catalog, pp. 16-19) to any events of academic dishonesty. For more information see <http://www.emu.edu/academic-support/writing/academicintegritypolicy03-09.pdf> If you have doubts about what is appropriate, one useful website is <http://www.indiana.edu/~istd/>

### **Grading Scale & Feedback:**

*Grades* will be based on an accumulation of numerical points that will be converted to a letter grade at the end of the course. Each assignment will receive a score expressed as a fraction, with the points received over the total points possible (e.g. 18/20). The following is the basic scale used for evaluation. *Points may be subtracted for missed deadlines.*

95-100 = A outstanding	90-94 = A- excellent
85-89 = B+ very good	80-84 = B good
75-79 = B- satisfactory	70-74 = C passing
Below 70 = F failing	

Graduate students are expected to earn A’s and B’s.

A GPA of 3.0 is the minimum requirement for graduation.

*Regarding feedback on papers/projects:* Students can expect to receive papers/assignments back in a class with faculty feedback before the next paper/assignment is due. This commitment from faculty assumes that the student has turned the paper in on the agreed upon due date.

### **Institutional Review Board:**

All research conducted by or on EMU faculty, staff or students must be reviewed by the Institutional Review Board to assure participant safety: <http://www.emu.edu/irb/>

**Academic Support Center & Disability Support Services:**

If you have received services in the past related to a learning disability or attention deficit disorder and/or you feel you may have such a problem in this course, please make an appointment to speak with the faculty member or with the Coordinator of Student Disability Support Services in the Academic Support Center, third floor of the Hartzler Library (432-4254).

Please take advantage of the free individual tutoring from writing tutors. Writing tutors are strong writers who hold scheduled one-on-one sessions with students and are an excellent resource for writers at any level or at any stage in the writing process. Please remember that writing tutors do not provide editing or proofreading services. They will help you put what you learn into practice and will work with you to improve your own proofreading and editing skills. To make an appointment, please visit or call the Academic Support Center on the 3rd floor of the Sadie Hartzler Library or by accessing WOnline on myEMU portal.

**Class Attendance:**

Students are expected to attend all class meetings. If unusual or emergency circumstances prevent class attendance, the student should notify the professor in advance if possible. Multiple absences from class will result in lower grades. The student is responsible for the material presented in classes missed. (EMU Graduate Catalog)

Students should be aware of the importance of regular class attendance, particularly in the case of CJP classes that meet weekly or over several weekends. Being absent for more than one class leads to a student missing a large portion of the class content. In addition to consistent class attendance, students should make every effort to arrive to class on time out of respect for the learning process, fellow students and faculty.

**Course Extensions and Outstanding Grades:**

For fall and spring semesters, all coursework is due by the end of the semester. If a student will not be able to complete a course on time, the student must submit a request one week before the end of the semester for an extension (up to 6 months) using a course extension form provided by the Academic Program Coordinator. If the request is granted the student will receive an "I" (incomplete) for the course which will later be replaced by a final grade when the work has been turned in on the agreed upon date. If the request for an extension is denied, the student will receive a grade for the work that has been completed up until the time the course was expected to have been completed. If no work has been submitted, the final grade will be an F (or W under certain circumstances).

Extensions will be given only for legitimate and unusual situations. Extensions are contracted by the student with the program for up to a maximum of 6 months after the deadline for the course work. PLEASE NOTE: If the outstanding course work is received within the first 6 weeks of the extension, no grade reduction will be imposed; after 6 weeks any outstanding coursework will be reduced by ½ letter grade. If the extension deadline is not met, the student will receive a final grade for the work completed.

**Writing Standards –Graduate Level (Grid Version)**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>A excellent</b>	<b>B minimal expectations</b>	<b>C below expectations</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Content</b> <i>(quality of the information/ideas and sources/details used to support them)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- shows clarity of purpose</li> <li>- shows depth of content</li> <li>- applies insight and represents original thinking</li> <li>-demonstrates quality and breadth of resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- shows clarity of purpose</li> <li>- shows substantial information and sufficient support</li> <li>- almost always represents original thinking</li> <li>- uses quality resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- shows clarity of purpose</li> <li>- lacks depth of content and may depend on generalities or the commonplace</li> <li>- represents little original thinking</li> <li>- uses mostly quality resources</li> </ul>	
<b>Structure</b> <i>(logical order or sequence of the writing)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is coherent and logically developed</li> <li>- uses very effective transitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is coherent and logically developed</li> <li>- uses smooth transitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is coherent and logically (but not fully) developed</li> <li>- uses some awkward transitions</li> </ul>	
<b>Style</b> <i>(appropriate attention to audience: effective word choice, sentence variety, voice; appropriate level of formality for academic writing vs. informal text messages and email)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is concise, eloquent, and rhetorically effective</li> <li>- composes varied sentence structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- displays concern for careful expression</li> <li>- composes some varied sentence structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- displays some personality <u>but</u> lacks imagination and may be stilted</li> <li>- composes little varied sentence structure</li> <li>- frequently uses jargon and clichés</li> </ul>	
<b>Conventions</b> <i>(adherence to grammar rules: usage, mechanics)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- composes well-constructed sentences</li> <li>-makes virtually no errors in grammar and spelling</li> <li>- makes accurate word choices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- almost always composes well-constructed sentences</li> <li>- makes minimal errors in grammar and spelling</li> <li>- makes accurate word choices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- usually has well-constructed sentences</li> <li>- makes several errors</li> <li>- makes word choices that distract the reader</li> </ul>	
<b>Source Integrity</b> <i>(appropriate acknowledgment of sources used in research)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cites sources for all quotations</li> <li>- composes credible paraphrases, cited correctly</li> <li>- includes reference page</li> <li>- makes virtually no errors in documentation style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cites sources for all quotations</li> <li>- composes credible paraphrases, usually cited correctly</li> <li>- includes reference page</li> <li>- makes minimal errors in documentation style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cites sources for all quotations</li> <li>- composes mostly credible paraphrases, sometimes cited correctly</li> <li>- includes reference page</li> <li>- makes several errors in documentation style</li> </ul>	
<p>The weighting of each of the five areas is dependent on the specific written assignment and the teacher's preference. Plagiarism occurs when a person presents as one's own "someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source" (adapted from Council of Writing Program Administrators).</p>				<b>Grade</b>

*Approved by University Faculty*

*April 28, 2004*

*Revised by the Writing Committee*

*April 2008*

*Updated March 2009*