**Archaeology 1170: Community Archaeology and Public Outreach in Providence and Beyond**

Tu./Th. 10:30-11:50, RI Hall 108

https://canvas.brown.edu/courses/917715

Instructor: Katherine Harrington

Rhode Island Hall Graduate Studio

Office Hours (RI 007): Thursdays 1:30-3:30 pm

Katherine\_Harrington@brown.edu

** **

**Course Description**

Who speaks for the past? In this course, we will explore this question by analyzing the roles of different producers and consumers of archaeological information in the public presentation of the past. Modern archaeology is about far more than just digging in the dirt. Archaeologists are increasingly aware of the need to become more involved with the local communities where they work and now seek to have an active public voice in the interpretation of the past, while still respecting alternate viewpoints. The first half of the course will function like a seminar, while the second half will involve a hands-on project in the Providence public school system and visits to local museums.

During the seminar, we will discuss how archaeologists can engage with the public—including collaborations with indigenous, descendant, or local communities, increased multivocality in interpretations, the use and abuse of the past by governments and others in power, the mass media, museums, and educational outreach programs. Ultimately, we will be concerned with how archaeologists can reach and involve different audiences in the presentation of the past. Typically, the Tuesday meeting of each week will take the form of a lecture, while the Thursday meeting will be devoted primarily to discussion of assigned readings.

In the second half of the course, we will begin teaching the “Think Like an Archaeologist” program in local 6th grade social studies classrooms. These on-site activities will give students vital experience in expressing archaeological information to the general public and will enhance the pre-existing 6th grade social studies curriculum for the students involved in the program. More information about the program can be found on page 2.

**Learning Goals**

After this course, students will be able to:

* Evaluate and critique sources of archaeological information.
* Critically analyze the various roles archaeology plays in the public eye.
* Identify possible local perspectives and voices surrounding given archaeological issues.
* Present archaeological information to a general audience.

**Prerequisites**

The course is open to all students, though some previous coursework in archaeology will be helpful. The course may be of particular interest to students concentrating in archaeology or planning a career in teaching.

**Teaching in the Schools**

During the second half of the course, students will gain practical experience with presenting archaeological information to the public by participating in the "Think like an Archaeologist!" program, an educational outreach collaboration between the Joukowsky Institute of Archaeology and the Ancient World, the Haffenreffer Museum of Anthropology, the RISD Museum, and 6th grade Social Studies teachers in the Providence public school system. The “Think like an Archaeologist!” program is designed to teach middle school students to think critically about how we know what we know about people in the past. Each session in the 6th grade classroom consists of a short lecture, followed by a hands-on activity. Students in this course will assist in teaching these sessions in classrooms in Providence. Students will also create their own classroom session on a new topic, for possible inclusion in the future “Think like an Archaeologist!” curriculum.

Each student will participate in the classroom-based units of the “Think Like an Archaeologist” program twice. These required teaching sessions occur outside of the Brown University classroom, but to offset this time commitment, the Thursday session of regularly scheduled class in weeks 9 and 10 will be an optional practice session for students who want to run through teaching sessions or consult with the professor on their final project. The teaching sessions will occur on-site at the middle schools participating in the program at several different times during the day. Scheduling classroom sessions can be complicated, so students will need to sign up for classroom teaching sessions by **WEEK 3** to assure that we have adequate coverage of teaching sessions. Transportation may be provided if necessary.

**Assignments and Assessment**

**Participation**—25%

**Response Papers**—20%

**Teaching Session Review**—5%

**Museum Response Paper**—5%

**Final Project**:

 Proposal—5%

 Rough Draft—10%

 Presentation—5%

 Final Product—25%

**Participation and Attendance**: Attendance and participation are extremely important for this course, especially at scheduled meetings at the Middle School. Students may have two unexcused absences from the seminar portion of the course and may discuss other absences with the instructor. Absences from the teaching portion of the course cannot be allowed except in situations cleared beforehand with the instructor, because we have an obligation to provide the schools with the program we have promised to them. Each student will be required to attend and actively participate in at least two teaching sessions during the term. Participation in classroom discussion is also important, because it helps deepen engagement with the readings. Oral contributions to discussion will be supplemented by written discussion questions, to be posted by 12 midnight before each Thursday discussion.

The attendance grade will be determined through completion of the following components: attendance (5%), completion of classroom teaching (10%), posting discussion questions on time and contributing to in-class discussion (10%).

**Response Papers:** Students will write 4 short (1.5-2 page double spaced) response papers after discussion sessions. Students can choose which weeks to write responses based on their own interests. Students can answer their own discussion question, one posed by another student, or write on any topic of their choosing. The instructor is happy to consult with students on response paper topics in the case of writer’s block! Please see attached rubric on page 12 of this syllabus, which will be used for each response paper. Each paper will be worth 5% of the final grade.

**Review of Teaching Session:** Students will write constructive reviews of one teaching session in which they participated, in combination with a similar self-evaluation. This assignment will help students think about different approaches to presenting lessons in the 6th grade classroom and will help them improve their teaching. The instructor will provide a response form for the students to fill out. Worth 5% of the final grade.

**Museum Response Paper:** During week 13, the class will visit a local museum. Students will write a 3 page response paper to this experience, taking into consideration aspects of museum studies and public outreach discussed in class. The instructor will provide a rubric and more detailed instructors prior to the museum visit. If a student is unable to attend the museum trip due to Thanksgiving travel, they will be required to visit the museum on their own time and submit the paper on time.

**Final Project:** Students will design a lesson to present some aspect of archaeology (or a related field) to sixth-graders (or another specific audience, if approved by the instructor). The project may combine various media and will be presented in a shortened version to the other course participants at the end of the term. Students will also write a short, 3-page double-spaced essay reflecting on how their lesson plan responds to material from the first half of the course and the experience of teaching in actual 6th grade classrooms. More information about the final project and requirements will be handed out in class. The assessment of the project will have several parts: a paper proposal (5%), a rough draft (10%), a presentation (5%), and the final product (25%). Students will turn in a project proposal and meet with the instructor to get feedback on their plan in Week 6. Students will also turn in a rough draft two weeks before the final product is due, which will be graded quickly and returned with specific comments. Finally, students will present their projects in class and receive feedback from the professor and other students before the final project is due.

**Extra Credit:** Participation in two teaching sessions is required, but the instructor encourages all students to participate in more sessions if possible! Extra credit worth 2% of the final grade can be earned by participating in two extra sessions. Further extra credit only upon discussion with the instructor.

**Course Materials**

Required readings for the course will be scanned and placed on the course website. Supplementary materials will be available as handouts and on a reserve reading shelf in the second floor library of Rhode Island Hall.

**Expectations and Academic Honesty**

Readings will be completed before the class period for which they are assigned. Approximately 100 pages of reading can be expected per week during the first half of the term. Discussion questions need to be posted by midnight before each discussion.

For each day late an assignment is late, 5% of the grade will be deducted, unless the instructor gives prior approval.

Plagiarism is a serious offense and will result in a failing grade for the course. Always provide careful citations for sources you have used. We will discuss how to do this in class and never hesitate to ask questions if you are in doubt. Please read and abide by Brown University’s academic code: http://www.brown.edu/academics/college/degree/policies/academic-code

**Academic Support**

Please inform me if you have a disability or other condition that might require some modification of any of these course procedures.  You may speak with me after class or during office hours.  For more information, contact Students and Employee Accessibility Services at 401-863-9588 or SEAS@brown.edu.

Students are encouraged to speak to the instructor about any academic problems they might experience during the term. Further academic support is offered by the Writing Center. Information on the Center and its hours can be found on its website here: http://www.brown.edu/academics/college/support/writing-center/

**Schedule and Readings**

**Week 1: Introduction and Organization**

 *Thursday: Beginnings, Archaeology and the Public*

Moshenska, Gabriel, and Sarah Dhanjal. 2012. “Introduction: Thinking About, Talking About, and Doing Community Archaeology.” In *Community Archaeology: Themes, Methods, and Practices*, edited by Gabriel Moshenska and Sarah Dhanjal, 1–5. Oxford: Oxbow.

Holtorf, Cornelius. 2007. “Can You Hear Me at the Back? Archaeology, Communication and Society.” *European Journal of Archaeology* 10 (2-3): 149–165.

McManamon, Francis P. 2000. “Archaeological Messages and Messengers,” *Public Archaeology* 1: 5-20.

**Week 2: Archaeological Publics—Definitions and Beginnings**

 *Tuesday: What is Community/Public Archaeology?*

Selections from Atalay, Sonya. 2012. *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Selections from Smith, Laurajane, and Emma Waterton. 2009. *Heritage, Communities, and Archaeology*. London: Duckworth.

 *Thursday: Multivocality*

Fawcett, Clare, Junko Habu, and John M. Matsunaga. 2008. “Introduction: Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies.” In *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*, edited by Junko Habu, Clare Fawcett, and John M. Matsunaga, 1–14. New York: Springer.

Hodder, Ian. 2008. “Multivocality and Social Archaeology.” In *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*, edited by Junko Habu, Clare Fawcett, and John M. Matsunaga, 196–200. New York: Springer.

Gallivan, Martin D., and Danielle Moretti-Langholtz. 2007. “Civic Engagement at Werowocomoco: Reasserting Native Narratives from a Powhatan Place of Power.” In *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, edited by Barbara J. Little and Paul A. Shackel, 47–66. Lanham: Altamira.

**Week 3: Archaeology and Activism**

 *Tuesday: “Archaeology as Political Action”*

Introduction and Ch. 1 from McGuire, Randall H. 2008. *Archaeology as Political Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Skim Ch. 4)

 *Thursday: Can Archaeologists Change the World?*

Christensen, Kim. 2010. “Archaeology and Activism of the Past and Present.” In *Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeology Change the World?*, edited by M. Jay Stottman, 19–35. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

Little, Barbara J. 2012. “Envisioning Engaged and Useful Archaeologies.” In *Archaeology in Society: Its Relevance in a Modern World*, edited by Marcy Rockman and Joe Flatman, 277–289. New York: Springer.

Stottman, M. Jay. 2014. "From the Bottom Up: Transforming Communities with Public Archaeology. In *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*, edited by Sonya Atalay, Lee Rains Clauss, Randall H. McGuire, and John R. Welch, 179-196. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

**Week 4: The Use and Abuse of the Past**

 *Tuesday: Archaeology, Nationalism, and Nation Building*

Selections from Hamilakis, Yannis. 2007. *The Nation and Its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dietler, M. 1994. “Our Ancestors the Gauls: Archaeology, Ethnic Nationalism and the Manipulation of Celtic Identity in Modern Europe.” *American Anthropologist* 96, 584-605.

Arnold, B. 1990. “The Past as Propaganda: Totalitarian Archaeology in Nazi Germany,” in *Histories of Archaeology*, p. 120-144.

 *Thursday: The Appeal of Cult Archaeology and Pseudoarchaeology*

Zimmerman, Larry J. 2008. “Unusual or ‘Extreme’ Beliefs About the Past, Community Identity, and Dealing with the Fringe.” In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T.J. Ferguson, 55–86. Lanham: Altamira.

Holtorf, C. 2005. “Beyond Crusades: How (Not) to Engage with Alternative Archaeologies.” *World Archaeology* 37, Debates in World Archaeology, 544-551.

Fagan, B. and Feder, K. 2006. "Crusading Against Straw Men: an Alternative View of Alternative Archaeologies: Response to Holtorf (2005)," *World Archaeology*38, 718-729.

**Week 5: Archaeology and Communities in the US**

 *Tuesday: Native American Communities and Archaeological Collaboration, NAGPRA*

Lippert, Dorothy. 2008. “Not the End, Not the Middle, But the Beginning: Repatriation as a Transformative Mechanism for Archaeologists and Indigenous Peoples.” In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T.J. Ferguson, 119–130. Lanham: Altamira*.*

Nicholas, George P. 2008. "Melding Science and Community Values: Indigenous Archaeology Programs and the Negotiation of Cultural Differences." In *Collaborating at the Trowel’s Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology,* edited by Stephen W. Silliman, 228-249. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Silliman, Stephen W. 2012. "Between the Longue Duree and the Short Puree: Postcolonial Archaeologies of Indigenous History in Colonial North America." In *Decolonizing Indigenous Histories: Exploring Prehistoric/Colonial Transitions in Archaeology,*edited by Maxine Oland, Siobhan M. Hart, and Liam Frink, 113-131. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press.

Bruchac, Margaret M. 2010. "Lost and Found: NAGPRA, Scattered Relics, and Restorative Methodologies." *Museum Anthropology*33 (2): 137-156.

 *Thursday: Descendant Communities and Difficult Histories*

Stahlgren, Lori C. 2010. “Negotiating History, Slavery, and the Present: Archaeology at Farmington Plantation.” In *Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeology Change the World?*, edited by M. Jay Stottman, 95–109. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

McDavid, Carol. 2002. “Archaeologies That Hurt; Descendants That Matter: A Pragmatic Approach to Collaboration in the Public Interpretation of African-American Archaeology.” *World Archaeology* 34 (2): 303–314.

La Roche, Cheryl J. and Michael L. Blakely. 1997. "Seizing Intellectual Power: The Dialogue at the New York African Burial Ground." *Historical Archaeology*31 (3): 84-106.

**Week 6: Archaeology and Communities in the World**

 *Tuesday: Dealing with Issues of Conflict and Crisis*

González-Ruibal, A. 2007. “Making things public: Archaeologies of the Spanish Civil War.” *Public Archaeology* 6 (4): 203–226.

Shepherd, N. 2007. “Archaeology dreaming post-apartheid urban imaginaries and the bones of the Prestwich Street dead.” *Journal of Social Archaeology* 7(1): 3-28.

Horning, A. J. 2006. “Archaeology, conflict and contemporary identity in the north of Ireland. Implications for theory and practice in comparative archaeologies of colonialism.” *Archaeological Dialogues* 13(2), 183-200.

Ryzewski, Krysta, and John F. Cherry. 2012. “Communities and Archaeology under the Soufrière Hills Volcano on Montserrat, West Indies.” *Journal of Field Archaeology* 37 (4): 316–327.

**\*\*DUE: Project Proposal\*\***

 *Thursday: Working with Communities in Interpretation*

Joyce, Rosemary. 2008. “Critical Histories of Archaeological Practice: Latin American and North American Interpretation in a Honduran Context.” In *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*, edited by Junko Habu, Clare Fawcett, and John M. Matsunaga, 56–68. New York: Springer.

 Greer, Shelley. 2002. "Community-Based Archaeology in Australia." *World Archaeology*34: 265-287.

Lafrenz Samuels, Kathryn. 2009. "Trajectories of Development: International Heritage Management of Archaeology in the Middle East and North Africa." *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress*5: 68-91.

**Week 7: Communicating Archaeological Knowledge**

*Tuesday: Archaeology, the Media, and the Digital Age*

Scherzler, Diane. 2007. “Journalists and Archaeologists: Notes on Dealing Constructively with the Mass Media.” *European Journal of Archaeology* 10 (2-3): 185–206.

Morgan, C., & Eve, S. 2012. “DIY and digital archaeology: what are you doing to participate?” *World Archaeology* 44: 521-537.

Beale, Nicole. 2012. “How Community Archaeology Can Make Use of Open Data to Achieve Further Its Objectives.” *World Archaeology*  44: 612–633.

Watson, S. 2011. “‘Why can’t we dig like they do on Time Team?’ The meaning of the past within working class communities.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 17 4, 364-379.

*Thursday: Writing (and Speaking) for a General Audience*

Fagan, Brian. 2006. *Writing Archaeology: Telling Stories About the Past.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Look at the website for Archaeology for the People and come to class with questions for Profs. Cherry and Rojas: http://proteus.brown.edu/archforthepeoplecompetition/Home

Read this exemplary article for a general audience: Batuman, Elif. 2011. "The Sanctuary." *The New Yorker* (December 19).

Find one example of a popular article or short video clip which presents archaeological information to a general audience. Post a link to it with your discussion question for this week, and come to class prepared to explain and critique your example.

**Week 8: Educational Outreach**

Tuesday: Why we're doing what we're doing

Jameson, J. H. 2003. "Purveyors of the past: education and outreach as ethical imperatives in archaeology." In Ethical issues in archaeology, edited by Larry J. Zimmerman, Karen D. Vitelli, and Julie Hollowell-Zimmer, 153-162. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.

Jeppson, Patrice L., and George Brauer. 2007. “Archaeology for Education Needs: An Archaeologist and an Educator Discuss Archaeology in the Baltimore Country Public Schools.” In Past Meets Present: Archaeologists Partnering with Museum Curators, Teachers, and Community Groups, edited by John H. Jr. Jameson and Sherene Baugher, 231–248. New York: Springer.

Jeppson, Patrice L. 2010. “Doing Our Homework: Reconsidering What Archaeology Has to Offer Schools.” In Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeology Change the World?, edited by M. Jay Stottman, 63–79. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

Thursday: How can we do it better?

Nichols, Stephen, Jonathan Prangnell, and Michael Haslam. 2005. “Hearts and Minds : Public Archaeology and the Queensland School Curriculum.” Australian Archaeology 61: 71–79.

Smith, Claire and Heather Burke. 2007. "Lectures as Usual? Teaching Archaeology for Fun" In Archaeology to Delight and Instruct: Active Learning in the University Classroom, edited by Heather Burke and Claire Smith, 11-34. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Stone, Gaynell. 2007. "Excavating the Past: 20 Years of Archaeology with Long Island, NY Students." In Past Meets Present: Archaeologists Partnering with Museum Curators, Teachers, and Community Groups, edited by John H. Jr. Jameson and Sherene Baugher, 281–298. New York: Springer.

Ellick, Carol J. 2007. "Audience, Situation, Style: Strategies for Formal and Informal Archaeological Outreach Programs." In Past Meets Present: Archaeologists Partnering with Museum Curators, Teachers, and Community Groups, edited by John H. Jr. Jameson and Sherene Baugher, 249-264. New York: Springer.

**Week 9: Teaching Units 1 and 2**

 *Tuesday: Providence Outreach Introduction, Unit 1 and 2 Introduction*

Unit 1 and 2 script and supplementary materials

 *Thursday: Unit 1 and 2 practice*

**Week 10: Teaching Units 3 and 4**

 *Tuesday: Unit 3 and 4 Introduction*

Units 3 and 4 script and supplementary materials

 *Thursday: Units 3 and 4 practice*

**Week 11: Teaching Unit 5—Museums**

 *Tuesday: What is a museum?*

Selections from MacDonald, Sharon. 2008. A Companion to Museum Studies. Malden, MA: Blackwell. (Chapter 8--The Origins of the Public Museum)

Burcaw, E.G. 1995. "Museum Defined." In Introduction to Museum Work, 3-13. Walnut Creek: Altamira.

Gurian, Elaine Heumann. 2006. "Chapter 5: Choosing Among the Options." Civilizing the Museum, 48-56. London: Routledge.

Hein, Hilde F. 2000. "Introduction," From Object to Experience. The Museum in Transition. A Philosophical Perspective, 1-16. Washington: Smithsonian Press.

 *Thursday: How do museums work?*

Appleton, J. 2007. “Museums for ‘The People’?” In Museums and Their Communities, edited by S. Watson, 114-126, London: Routledge.

Weil, S. 2007. "The Museum and the Public." In Museums and Their Communities, edited by S. Watson, 32-46. London: Routledge.

Clifford, James. 1999. "Museum as Contact Zones," In Representing the Nation: A Reader. Histories, heritage and museums, edited D. Boswell and J. Evans, 435-457. London: Routledge

**Week 12: Museums Continued**

*Tuesday: Museums and Communities*

Read 3 of the 4 following chapters:

Nash, Stephen E. and Nancy O'Malley. 2012. "The Changing Mission of Museums." In *Archaeology in Society: Its Relevance in the Modern World*, edited by Mary Rockman and Joe Flatman, 97-109. New York: Springer.

Moyer, Teresa S. 2007. “Learning Through Visitors: Exhibits as a Tool for Encouraging Civic Engagement through Archaeology.” In *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, edited by Barbara J. Little and Paul A. Shackel, 263–278. Lanham: Altamira.

Merriman, Nick. 2004. “Involving the Public in Museum Archaeology,” In *Public Archaeology*, edited by Nick Merriman, 85-108, London: Routledge.

Kreps, C. 2006. "Non-Western Models of Museums and Curation in Cross-cultural Perspective." In *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by S. Macdonald, 457-472. Malden: Blackwell.

*Thursday: Ethical Issues in Museum Practice (the readings focus on the antiquities trade, but review also the readings from earlier weeks about indigenous archaeology and descendant communities)*

Renfrew, Colin. 2006. "Museum Acquisition: Responsibilities for the Illicit Traffic in Antiquities." In *Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and the Antiquities Trade*, edited by N. Brodie, M.M. Kersel, C. Luke and K.W. Tubb, 245-257. Gainsville: University Press of Florida.

Gerstenblith, Patty. 2007. "The Acquisition and Exhibition of Classical Antiquities." In *The Acquisition and Exhibition of Classical Antiquities*, edited by R. Rhodes, 47-63. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press.

Mead, R. 2007. "Den of Antiquity." *The New Yorker* (April 9th, 2007) 83: 52-61.

Cuno, J. 2007. "Art Museums, Archaeology and Antiquities in an Age of Sectarian Violence and Nationalist Politics." In *The Acquisition and Exhibition of Classical Antiquities*, edited by R. Rhodes, pp. 9-26. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press.

**\*\*DUE: Teaching Session Review\*\***

**Week 13: Museums in Practice**

 *Tuesday: Visit to Local Museum, TBA*

 **\*\*DUE: Rough draft of final project\*\***

*Thursday: Thanksgiving Break*

**Week 14: Project Presentations, Wrap-Up**

*Thursday:*

**\*\*DUE: Museum response paper\*\***

**Week 15: Project Presentations, Wrap-Up**

**Finals Period:**

**\*\*DUE—Final Project\*\***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Response Paper Rubric** | **Needs Improvement**  | **Developing**  | **Sufficient**  | **Above Average**  | **Score** |
| **Clarity (Thesis supported by relevant information and ideas.)** | The purpose of the paper is unclear. The paper lacks supporting arguments or supporting arguments are very unclear. (8) | The purpose of the paper is somewhat obscured, and/or the supporting arguments are not clearly connected to the main theme. (12) | The purpose of the paper is clear. Supporting arguments support the main purpose, but could be somewhat clearer. (16) | The purpose of the paper is well-defined, and supporting arguments relate clearly to the main theme. (20) |  |
| **Organization (Sequencing of elements/ideas)** | The paper is disorganized, or organized in a way that severely hampers readability. (8) | The paper displays some organization, but with some serious jumps in sequence or logic. (12) | The organization of the paper is quite good, with some small slips in logical flow. (16) | The flow of the paper is logical and enhances the argument. (20) |  |
| **Mechanics (Correctness of grammar and spelling)** | 5 or more misspellings or serious grammatical mistakes. Readability is poor. (4) | 3-5 more serious misspellings or grammatical mistakes, which affect readability in a more major way. (6) | 1 to 3 minor spelling or grammar mistakes which minimally impact readability. (8) | Grammar and spelling are correct, except for one to two small typos. (10) |  |
| **Reflection (Bringing new ideas to the argument)**  | The paper shows little reflection. Original ideas are rare or not clearly expressed. The paper merely summarizes the readings. (16) | The paper primarily summarizes the readings, with minimal reflection. (24) | The paper shows a good level of critical thought, but focuses too much on the readings. (32) | The paper shows critical thought and reflection. The student adds their own ideas to those of the authors of the assigned readings. (40) |  |
| **Use of Sources (Correct citation, responsible summarization)**  | Sources are not cited, or are cited seriously incorrectly. Summarization of information is incorrect. (4) | Some serious mistakes in citing sources or some citations missing. Summarization is not entirely correct. (6) | Some small errors in citing sources or summarizing material. (8) | Sources are cited correctly and information is appropriately summarized and attributed. (10) |  |
|  |  |  |  | **Total** | /100 |