Our primary objective is to perform as intellectual teammates for everyone in the class, to help her or him design the best syllabus possible for specific learners in specific contexts while drawing on our course readings, discussions, and outstanding PPT presentations on Composition theory and research. To this end we are embarking on a syllabus design process that will span a month. My rationale is to get everyone to establish as good a “shell” as possible now so that you can garner formative feedback that you will ponder while also participating in teaching performances and embarking on your research. In my experience, the more you can have the “big picture” stuffs in place early on, the better you can fill in the details as you go. (You will probably tweak the big picture a bit, too.) To that end, I propose the following protocol:

1. **Draft some meta-commentary** in tandem with drafting your syllabus, the better to use this “thinking about thinking” to hone your thoughts. Once you have arrived at the syllabus you will share, revise this meta-commentary for your reviewers as follows:
   - Describe the institutional context and learners in as complete detail as possible, to enable us to put ourselves in the shoes (or slippers) of learners and react.
   - *Situat[e your syllabus] against our readings, discussions, and PPT presentations (and blogs?) succinctly. (No more than a page, s.s., please.) Let us know what sources you are drawing on most as you proceed.
   - Tell us what you think is most successful about what you have produced to date, and how you intend to build upon it.
   - Tell us where you need the most help.

2. **Provide a written, printed version for your reviewers to review.** We will be focusing more on the praxis we see before us than the bureaucratic stuff, but even such policies as late papers or allowed absences should enter the discussion as they inflect your Composition praxis.

3. **Respond to your peers’ syllabus drafts firstly in the role of intellectual teammate**, striving to compose “What if you tried x, y, z?” and “I wonder if you could … ?” kinds of questions. Attempt to apply some of the tenets of Bean’s Chapter 16, “Writing Comments on Student’s Papers” (Be sure to review Wyatt’s excerpts from Laulima postings.) Make sure you address the parts that your peer has deemed most successful as well as where they need help. You will have 30 minutes per syllabus, which is brief, so please focus quickly and scribble like crazy.

4. **At the conclusion of in-class review, reflect on our grading criteria.** We can either build them from scratch or adapt the criteria that course participants arrived at in 2012. (They include a number of pukas that are similar to my English 100 rubrics, e.g., meta-commentary, effort, extra credit …).

5. **As soon as you can set aside time, write back to yourself** about what you plan to do in your revision. Try to capture your reactions in the raw, maybe through freewriting, blogging, or visuals that help you think about revision.

6. **Fill in the details over the next three weeks.** I tend to be super detailed in my daily activities before I enter the classroom on Day 1, the better to have in mind the overall performance I seek as lessons are a part of it. But others leave these details out. You can choose either route, but I think you will find that the more you stipulate lesson activities, the more you end up glancing back out at the bigger picture. And, when Day 1 arrives, you will be playing no more “catch-up” at this level. Of course, you want to build in some flexibility, too ….