Anthony Cuzo

5/3/23

Professor Rodwell

ENGL 20700: Writing for Engineers

At the beginning of this course, I definitely considered myself a decent writer and I felt as if there was no purpose for a English course for something STEM heavy such as mechanical engineering. I always felt like there was no need for me to revise my work and write drafts, I believed in a "one shot" writing process. Throughout this course, upon seeing how much work was needed to be completed prior to the submitting the final assessment, I needed to submit and write drafts. At first, I only read over my drafts and revised them so my best draft and final assessment were not the same. Writing for Engineers has proved my process to be dull and ineffective, as writing drafts and revising them multiple times showed me how my writing can improve and reach high standards. Throughout the course I struggled to keep my work up to Professor Rodwell's standards as every draft and final submission always had notes on every other page on how I can improve my writing. Instead of giving up and using my "it is what it is" mentality, I asked myself "why does Professor Rodwell make us do this? And why is she so harsh at grading?". As I reach the final week of this class, I fully understand why there were so many tedious steps to every writing assignment. Each assignment helped us achieve one of the 8 Course Learning Outcomes (CLO).

One of the assignments we had to complete in the beginning of the course was the formal letter of introduction. Despite being a straightforward letter to Professor Rodwell about my major,

career goals, and long-term goals, I still faced some difficulty completing the first assignment in this course. I had to look up how to have a proper heading, as well as how to properly close a formal letter. Even when I thought I had met the standards for this assignment, I still had a handful of constructive criticism such as how I should structure the letter, and how personal to get with the assignment. The formal letter of introduction helped me achieve two of the course learning outcomes, those two were formulating and articulating a stance through my writing and negotiating my own goals and audience expectations regarding conventions of genre. The formal letter of introduction helped me form a stance through my writing, aka setting up my future goals for myself and what stance I will take to achieve my goals. The second course earning outcome achieved when I negotiated my goals and audience expectations by telling Professor Rodwell what my future goals are and how I will achieve them. Although this was quick and simple in achieving the course earning outcomes, this assignment was only the start to what this course had to offer and teach me; in turn the formal letter of introduction was almost like an introduction to all future assignments throughout this course.

The reflection memorandums we had to complete after every assignment after the letter of introduction was difficult to write. Although having a whole class to how to write memos, I still found difficulty writing about the memo, and finding out which CLO the memo was supposed to help me achieve. The self-reflection memos helped me negotiate my writing skills regarding conventions of genre, medium, and rhetorical situation. Looking back on all the memos I wrote I found memos easier to write the more I analyzed my work and reflected on the rhetorical situation of my work.  My first memo was not clear, and I failed to reach the class expectations. Rather than write about the assignment, where I struggled, and how I improved, I wrote an over

explained summary of the assignment. Getting feedback from my peers and Professor Rodwell herself improved my writing since I saw where I went wrong, and how to go about analyzing the rhetorical situation of my work. Before writing the memo, I must acknowledge my audience, my goals, and what I'm trying to express through my writing. Therefore, achieving the CLO by helping me negotiate my writing skills by genre, whether it be persuasive or neutral, and rhetorical situation, such as who my audience is, what my message is, and how I went about reaching my audience. The self-reflection memos strengthened my writing since I knew what the rhetorical situation as in every assignment.

Doing the Lab Report analysis assignment helped me articulate and formulate a stance through and in my writing and helped me practice using sources such as library resources and online databases appropriate for my writing projects. The lab report analysis assignment helped me achieve these two CLO since I had to do an analysis on 3 lab reports found in a library on an online database, and part of the assignment was to compare the three and have a stance on which assignment was written best in my opinion. Along with every assignment throughout this course this was not easy and was something I could not have written the night before it was due. Writing the outline and draft for the lab report analysis were difficult since I didn't know where to start with my assignment, how to organize my paragraphs, and what the content of my paragraphs should contain. The peer review for this assignment helped me achieve the CLO as my peers reviewed my draft, but the specifically told me to pick one report and explain why that report was better written. Most importantly I achieved the online databases and library CLO since we had to get our lab reports chosen in the CCNY library approved before we could begin to analyze and use the contents of our resources in our lab report analysis.

Our final assignment in this course was our collaborative project that helped me acknowledge mine and others range of linguistic differences as resources and draw on those resources to develop rhetorical sensibility, which is a CLO. This CLO was achieved through this assignment since we all had to do our separate research and then come together to create an innovation. This was the hardest assignment for me since we never talked to each other, and because this assignment had a lot of parts, we had to go from not knowing each other's names and research linguistics to having to communicate with each other daily. Incorporating everyone's different writing style and voice to create a technical description, and actual innovation meant we all had to acknowledge everyone's resources to develop one rhetorical situation. For example, one of my team members did research and was better at communicating when they were alone, whereas I communicated my resources and research better when I was face to face with everyone. The most difficult part of this assignment was getting everyone to have one audience (buyers and investors) and one goal (selling our innovation and making our product a real life creation that could be invented through our resources).