January 17, 2011

Blog Project:

For the period between January 31 and February 15 we will have no short e-mail written assignments and no Monte Carlo quizzes. Instead, you’ll be participating in a blog on the material we will read. You will get two short assignment grades for this project, one for your contributions from January 31-Feb 8, and one for contributions from Feb. 9-16th.

How to get started:

Go to the course home page and you should see a link there called Locke-Marx Blog. Click on that and you’ll see some questions and maybe some comments from your classmates. Find something you think is interesting and make a comment about it, or start a new thread yourself. But remember to stay on top of this from the beginning. Part of your grade is based on the distribution of your posts. Don’t think you can get through by making a bunch of posts at the end of the marking periods.

Ground Rules:

1. Treat everyone with respect.
2. Discuss ideas, not personalities.
3. No offensive language.
4. Blog material is confidential, do not circulate to others outside the class without permission.
5. If you are using assigned texts, cite quotations from text with author name and page number. No works cited needed.
6. If using outside sources, give enough information so that reader can exactly locate your source.
7. If material is quoted or paraphrased from another source, you must indicate the source of the quotation or paraphrase.
8. Original posts that start a new thread are not required. It is perfectly acceptable to participate actively only through replies. However, starting a new thread, with a strong original post that takes the conversation in a new direction is impressive work, especially if it raises interesting questions about the reading. This will be viewed favorably in grading the blog for the month.
9. You may write in an informal style. You won’t be graded on grammar as long as what you say is clear and readable.

Here are the criteria I’ll be using in constructing your grades for the April blog.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outstanding (A)</th>
<th>Good (B)</th>
<th>Fair (C)</th>
<th>Poor (D or F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>At least five substantive posts with at least two in each marking period, distributed over the marking period.</td>
<td>Posts at least twice in each marking period, distributed over time.</td>
<td>Average of one posting in each marking period, but not evenly distributed,</td>
<td>Fewer postings, concentrated in a few days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to readings</td>
<td>Several relate discussion to assigned readings and reflect understanding of assignments</td>
<td>Some posts relate directly to readings and reflect understanding, but many posts could be written without having done the assignments</td>
<td>Posts are mostly reactions to other posts, reflecting little or no understanding of issues from the reading</td>
<td>Posts have no relationship to assigned readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections and directions</td>
<td>Posts reflect thoughtful engagement and careful reading of previous posts, Move discussion in new and interesting directions</td>
<td>Reflects clear understanding of ongoing discussion, raises interesting ideas about it</td>
<td>Mostly appears to state opinions without reasons, mostly ignores or summarizes discussion without adding insights</td>
<td>Little relationship to ongoing discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>