Substitution of assignments: It is requested that all writing assignments be submitted via email by 6:00 PM on the indicated due date to both Mr. Covert and Mr. Bezos to facilitate the process of providing meaningful and timely feedback to students. If the use of email presents a problem to any student, please discuss it with either professor so that accommodations can be made. Assignments should be submitted as attachments in Word format and must include the student's name and date. The e-mail subject line should read: “(Last name, first name) – Assignment #”.

Grading: Writing assignments 1-6 are each worth approximately 12.5% of the final grade. The final assignment (writing assignment 7) is worth approximately 25% of the final grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Topics</th>
<th>Assignments Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the course is organized</td>
<td>Pre-course case reading: Sage Prods., Inc. v. Devon Indus., Inc., 126 F.3d 1420 (Fed. Cir. 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the patent writing process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is an invention (problem-solution approach)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts, form, and content of a patent application -- A writing approach that works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss assigned case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Assignment #1: Claim interpretation and scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1997).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Multiform Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd., 133 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ In re Donaldson Co., 16 F.3d 1189 (Fed. Cir. 1994).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 30</td>
<td>Writing Assignment #1: Independent Claim Drafting Due: September 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim drafting, including discussion of types of claims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss assigned cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invention Disclosure #1 (Leak Detector)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Assignment #1: Independent Claim Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Due: September 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6</td>
<td>Writing Assignment #1: Dependent Claim Drafting Due: September 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim interpretation and scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Assignment #2: Dependent Claim Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Due: September 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13</td>
<td>Review of Writing Assignment #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claim drafting discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-class claim drafting (Eyeglasses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Assignment #2: Claim Drafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Silicon Graphics, Inc. v. ATI Techs., Inc.</em>, 607 F.3d 784 (Fed. Cir. 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20</td>
<td>Claim drafting including claim set strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invention Disclosure #2 (Chuck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Assignment #3: Invention #2 Claim Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Due: September 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Assignment #3: Inventorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Burroughs Wellcome Co. v. Barr Laboratories</em>, 40 F.3d 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Acromed Corp. v. Sofamor Danek Group, Inc. and Danek Medical, Inc.</em>, 253 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 27</td>
<td>Inventorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Assignment #4: Memo Regarding Inventorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Due: October 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4</td>
<td>Background of the Invention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brief Description of the Drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parts List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abstract and Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of the Invention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11</td>
<td>NO CLASS – OBSERVE MONDAY SCHEDULE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>Biotech/Chemical Patent Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Assignment #4: Subject Matter Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- USPTO Guidance on Subject Matter Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>Detailed Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Assignment #5: Detailed Description (Leak Detector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Due: November 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>Claim drafting, including discussion of claim sets and prior art -- sample problems in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Assignment #6: Prior Art (Water Heater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Due: November 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8</td>
<td>Review of Writing Assignments #4 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventor interview - final invention (Arrowhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Assignment #7: Complete Patent Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Due: November 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Summary of application drafting principles and case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claim drafting and prior art discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample problems in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 22</td>
<td>Altering claim scope (post-grant proceedings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation applications (technology modifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design-around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29</td>
<td>Review of Writing Assignment #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Assignment #7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>