

ENGL105

Unit Project I – Natural Sciences: Nutritional Consultant's Report

Genre	Purpose	Audience	Role	Rhetorical Situation
Consultant's report	To advise a real-life client on nutritional choices related to a relevant medical condition	Real-life client with concerns about a medical condition (especially genetic or lifestyle related)	Nutritional consultant	A client has hired you to deliver a customized report that gives specific nutritional recommendations to address a specific medical condition.

Scenario

You are a Nutritional Consultant. One of your clients has a specific medical condition that can be affected by his or her nutritional choices. This client has hired you to write him or her a detailed report providing specific nutritional recommendations regarding their medical condition. This Nutritional Consultant's Report will have to include both secondary research and primary research on your part.

Feeder #1: Annotated Bibliography

For Feeder#1, you will review the latest research regarding the relationship between nutrition on a specific medical condition. You will locate and select scholarly sources, skim them (or their Abstracts), and use them to create an annotated bibliography of scholarly sources to inform you about your selected condition. This information will eventually guide your primary research for Feeder #2 and will eventually form a vital portion of your final paper.

Step 1: Choose a specific medical condition you'd like to research in regards to its relationship with nutrition. When choosing the medical condition, consider a condition that actually affects someone you know or affects a population in which you are somehow invested. You might have to begin rudimentary research on a few different conditions before you find one that has some sort of relationship to nutrition.

In a brief document, state your selected topic, and in few sentences, explain why you chose that topic. Below that, include a few back-up topics/conditions just in case your research doesn't prove fruitful. **Upload this short document to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Sun. Aug. 27. We will discuss our topics and begin researching them in class on Mon. Aug. 28.**

Step 2: Locate at least 3 recent scholarly sources on this condition. Some of these sources might provide general information that will be useful on the condition, but many need to also address how this condition has some relation with the concept of

nutrition. For instance, do any of your sources explain how a person's nutritional habits affect their condition (in either a positive or negative way)?

Create an annotated bibliography of your sources. Begin by just listing your sources according to CSE citation guidelines. (CSE uses three different formatting options. We will be using Name-Year format.) Each citation should include bibliographic information for each source: title, author, year published, journal title (if applicable), volume and issue number, page numbers, and URL.

Below each citation, you will write an annotation, a paragraph of about 150 words that summarizes and evaluates that specific source. Answer some or all of the following questions: How does this source contribute to the current research on this topic? How does this source contribute to your potential research? Does the source seem flawed or biased? Does it admit its own limitations or make suggestions on how its study could have been better? Consider also if and how that source is responding to other scholars and their work. As you compile sources and write your annotations, begin to visualize how these different sources are in a kind of "conversation" with each other.

We will discuss annotated bibliographies in class, but for more information, examples, tips, etc., see the Writing Center's page on annotated bibliographies: <http://writingcenter.unc.edu/tips-and-tools/annotated-bibliographies/>.

Upload your annotated bibliography, Draft 1 to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Tues. Aug. 29. We will workshop these in class on Wed. Aug. 30.

Step 3: Revise and add to your first draft by creating Draft 2 of your annotated bibliography. Draft 2 requires at least 6 sources instead of 3. If they are useful, keep your first 3 sources, and add 3 new sources. If you've realized some of your sources weren't very useful, you might need to cut some sources and replace them. But you must include at least 6 sources in this draft. **Upload your Annotated Bibliography, Draft 2 to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Thurs. Aug. 31. We will workshop these in class on Fri. Sept 1.**

Step 4: Based on your workshop experience, adjust and revise your annotated bibliography to make Draft 3 (the final draft). This final draft of Feeder #1 will be due via your Sakai dropbox by 10:00pm on Fri. Sept. 1.

Feeder #2: Primary Research Report

For Feeder#2, deliver a detailed report that presents data from your original primary research on a sample meal in terms of key nutritional considerations. Remember, this is a report on your original primary research, only detailing the methods and quantitative results of your research.

Step 1: *Choose a specific meal.* If your "client" is a real person, consider a meal that person eats regularly or imagine a meal your hypothetical client might eat regularly

or particularly enjoy as a treat. List each part of your sample meal, and describe each part in terms of its nutritional values or other pertinent nutritional information. Cite the official sources where you found this information in CSE format at the end of your document as a list titled "References." **Upload this description of your sample meal to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Tues. Sept. 5. We will workshop these in class on Wed. Sept. 6.**

Step 2: *Form a hypothesis.* In one document, first state how you plan to represent, measure, or otherwise quantify an individual's overall health or the state of his or her given medical condition. Then clearly state your hypothesis using the method of measurement you've chosen.

Choosing a hypothesis: Based on the information from your sources in Feeder #1, do you think this meal would have a negative or positive effect on that person's specific medical condition? Or will the results be more complicated or unclear? Ask yourself: how you will quantitatively represent or measure a person's medical condition or overall health?

Here is a very simple and rough example of a hypothesis: "Hypothesis: The introduction of [some nutrient/s] to [someone's] digestive system via this sample meal will cause an increase in [whatever you've chosen to measure as an indicator of health such as cholesterol, cognitive function, or potassium levels, etc.]." **Upload this document to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Thurs. Sept. 7. We will workshop these in class on Fri. Sept. 8.**

Step 3: *Create a plan for your experiment or primary research.* What primary research or experiment would you conduct to determine how your sample meal affects or might affect your client's health (to determine the validity of your hypothesis)? As you begin to draft this document, try to use language and syntax appropriate to a scientific study. State the methods of your study in a manner consistent with the "Methods" section of a scientific lab report. This should also include an explanation of the way you plan to measure or quantify health, a version of what you wrote when determining your hypothesis. **Upload this document to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Sun. Sept. 10 for in-class workshop on Mon. Sept. 11.**

Step 4: *Determine the outcome of your experiment as though you actually carried it out,* using as your guide the nutritional information you've learned about your sample meal and the information you've gleaned from your sources on this specific medical condition and its relationship with nutrition. State the results in a manner consistent with the "Results" section of a scientific lab report. **Upload this document to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Tues. Sept. 12 for in-class workshop on Wed. Sept. 13.**

Step 5: *Compose your report on your primary research.* At the top of this report, state your hypothesis clearly. Then explain your methods and your results using the

revised version of the sections you've already written from Steps 3 and 4 of this Feeder.

This report should include:

- Your hypothesis regarding the effects (negative or positive) this sample meal will have on an individual with a medical condition
- A detailed but appropriate description of the methods for your primary research
- A report on the results of this primary research

Remember, this document should not include any analysis of the findings but should focus on what you did, how you did it, and the quantitative results of your primary research. **Upload this document to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Thurs. Sept. 14 for in-class workshop on Fri. Sept. 15.**

Step 6: Based on your workshop experience, adjust and revise your primary research report into a final draft of Feeder #2, due via your Sakai dropbox by 10:00pm on Fri. Sept. 15.

Unit Project: Consultant's Report

Deeply revise and carefully weave together Feeder #1 (Annotated Bibliography) and Feeder #2 (Primary Research Report) into a Nutritional Consultant's Report for a specific real-life client as if that client hired you to advise them on the relationship between nutrition and a specific medical condition. This Consultant's Report will be structured in the manner of a traditional scientific lab report (<http://writingcenter.unc.edu/tips-and-tools/scientific-reports/>), consisting of the following sections: Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and References.

Step 1: *Write your Introduction.* Introduce your study and explain its purpose. How does your study tie into previous scientific research? Why is this study important? Answer this by providing background information on your topic, synthesizing the sources from your annotated bibliography (Feeder #1) as well as the sources on the nutritional properties of your sample meal (from Feeder #2). Explain how all of this information led to your hypothesis. State your hypothesis. **Upload Draft 1 of your Introduction to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Sun. Sept. 17 for in-class workshop on Mon. Sept. 18.**

Step 2: *Write your Discussion.* Interpret the data of your Results. What does the data mean, especially regarding your hypothesis? What larger implications does this study have beyond its immediate context? What are the limitations or flaws of this study and how might it be improved if done again by you or someone else? **Upload Draft 1 of your Discussion to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Tues. Sept. 19 for in-class workshop on Wed. Sept. 20.**

Step 3: *Begin building your final report.* Revise your Methods and Results sections from Feeder #2 based on the in-class workshops and other feedback. Revise your Introduction and Discussion sections based on the in-class workshops. You should also have all of your sources cited already from Feeders 1 and 2. Draft your References list (a complete CSE style [Name-Year format] list of References of all sources mentioned in your final report). Combine all of these sections into Draft 1 of your Consultant's Report. **Upload Draft 1 of your Consultant's Report by 11:59pm on Sun. Sept. 24 for in-class workshop on Mon. Sept. 25.**

Step 4: Based on the in-class workshop, *revise your Consultant's Report. Compose your Abstract.* The Abstract is one or two paragraphs that sum up the entire study. Consider a sentence or two for each of the main sections (introduce the topic and its significance, articulate the hypothesis being tested, summarize the methods of the experiment, state the outcome of the experiment, what that outcome means, and what future studies should do). The abstract would allow someone to know all of the vital information in the report without actually reading the report. Insert your abstract into your report. **Upload this second draft of your Consultant's Report to your Sakai dropbox by 11:59pm on Tues. Sept. 26 for in-class workshop on Wed. Sept. 27.**

Step 5: Based on the in-class workshop, revise your Consultant's Report into a final draft, due via Sakai dropbox by **10:00pm** on Fri. Sept. 29.

Grading

Feeder 1 (Annotated bibliography): 5% of your final grade

Feeder 2 (Primary Research Report): 5% of your final grade

Unit Project (Consultant's Report): 15% of your final grade

This Unit, as a whole, will then amount to 25% of your final grade.

Grading Rubric for Feeder #1: Annotated Bibliography

Organization & Content: 70 points

- Student has displayed considerable investment in the revision process.
- Each source is properly cited in CSE (Name-Year format)
- Each annotation must answer some or all of the following questions:
 - How does this source contribute to the current research on this topic?
 - How does this source contribute to your potential research?
 - How does this source respond to other scholars and their work?
 - Where does this source fit in terms of the ongoing scholarly “conversation” around your topic?
 - How does the source seem flawed or biased?
 - How does the source admit its own limitations or make suggestions on how its study could have been better?

Style: 20 points

- Employs proper style in terms of passive voice, detached or objective tone
- Employs formal vocabulary
- Free from typographical errors, spelling or grammatical mistakes

Layout & Design: 10 points

- Follows proper CSE formatting (page numbers, etc.)
- Minimum number of appropriate sources listed
- Each source has an annotation

Final grade for Feeder #1 will be worth 5% of student's final course grade.

Grading Rubric for Feeder #2: Primary Research Report

Organization & Content: 70 points

- Student has displayed considerable investment in the revision process.
- Hypothesis: clearly states the specific predicted outcome of your experiment (10)
- Method: steps are chronological, written clearly, in past tense; describes participants and materials (25)
- Results: states quantitative results of experiment clearly but devoid of analysis (25)
- References: correct CSE (Name-Year) format; all sources appearing in report appear in CSE list; all sources in CSE list appear in the report (10)

Style: 20 points

- Employs proper style in terms of passive voice, detached or objective tone
- Employs formal vocabulary
- Free from typographical errors, spelling or grammatical mistakes

Layout & Design: 10 points

- Follows proper CSE formatting (page numbers, separate sections with headings, etc.)

Final grade for Feeder #2 will be worth 5% of student's final course grade.

Grading Rubric for Unit Project: Nutritional Consultant's Report

Organization & Content: 70 points

- Student has displayed considerable investment in the revision process.
- Abstract: summarizes report clearly and concisely
- Introduction: includes literature review that explains the significance and background of the topic but also points to a gap in research, ending with a research question and hypothesis
- Method: steps are chronological, written clearly, in past tense; describes participants and materials
- Results: states quantitative results of experiment clearly but devoid of analysis
- Discussion: discusses the conclusions and inferences drawn from the results; also discusses implications for future research or actions; address limitations of the study
- References: correct CSE (Name-Year) format; all sources appearing in report appear in References list; all sources in References list appear in the report

Style: 20 points

- Employs proper style in terms of passive voice, detached or objective tone
- Employs formal vocabulary
- Free from typographical errors, spelling or grammatical mistakes

Layout & Design: 10 points

- Follows proper CSE formatting (page numbers, separate sections with headings, etc.)

Final grade for Nutritional Consultant's Report will be worth 15% of student's final course grade.