

SOC 783 Weekly Discussion Papers

This class deals with complex ideas that require regular and thorough **completion of reading**, and **engagement with ideas**. To ensure that you do the reading, you are required to complete **weekly responses on course readings, to be posted in the homework vaults of the IS page for the class**.

Guidelines for responses are as follows:

- They must be at least 300 words in length (and aren't expected to exceed 500 words).
- They are due by **Thursday morning at 8:00 am**.
- These writings can be quite informal, but thoughtless or cursory thought pieces will not receive credit. They must be **in your own words**, and must respond to the **readings**.
- They must also include at least one, but preferably several, **discussion questions**, which I will present in class to guide our joint exploration of the topic(s) for the week.
- These responses are worth 20% of your total grade, two points for each week with reading.
- These responses will be graded according to the guidelines below. This is to provide you with some idea about how I expect you to engage with the readings.

√+ (**2 points**): **An excellent paper**. You clearly understand and engage with the readings and focus on major points/arguments from them. You are able to cohesively tie the readings together (if there is more than one). You make sophisticated connections from the readings to the real world. This is reserved for truly excellent responses that provide thoughtful discussion questions.

√ (**1 or 1.5 points**): **A good paper**. You make a good attempt to engage with and understand the readings, to tie them together and to address major arguments, or points of interest. You may also make good connections from the readings to the real world. But your analysis remains more of a surface reading/summary and you may have forgotten to provide discussion questions.

√- (**.5 points**): **A weak paper**. You seem to have done some of the reading but do not demonstrate a clear understanding of the major points/arguments. There may be some factual errors/misunderstandings that could have been avoided from more focused reading. You don't really engage with the reading or provide discussion questions.