EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document is intended as a companion piece to the Best Practices in Assessment Document that I prepared earlier this month. After a brief introductory section on the role of GSIs in our courses, it presents examples of different kinds of assessments that colleagues across the Social Sciences Division have agreed to share. They range from the simple to the complex, from a single assessment to an entire course’s worth of assessment. What they all have in common is that they are tied to a specific learning goal or goals, and have a variety of ways for students to earn credit while demonstrating their mastery of a subject. Several of them present grading rubrics, which demonstrate how assessments are equitably graded across an entire course. They are presented in order from a single assignment, based on a specific learning goal, to a full course’s worth of continuous assessment, which becomes more complex over time.  

I. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GSIS, TEACHING, AND ASSESSMENT
II. ASSIGNMENTS BASED ON LEARNING OBJECTIVES
III. FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS
IV. COLLABORATIVE ASSESSMENTS
V. SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS
VI. STAGED ASSIGNMENTS/CONTINUOUS ASSESSMENT

I. Relationship between GSIs, teaching, and assessment

Before going into specific examples of assessment, it is worth reminding faculty that (50% time) GSIs are limited, through a labor agreement, to work no more than 340 hours across the semester and are generally limited to 20 hours per week, with the knowledge that some weeks
may require more grading and increased hours. Faculty should take care to create assessments that do not require GSIs and readers to exceed this maximum.

Moreover, several instructors of very large courses in the Division (Martha Olney, Rebecca McLennan) have noted that GSIs bear the brunt of having to deal with anxious students. This is typically the case, but the emotional labor & workload associated with the pandemic appears to be even higher than normal. There are two kinds of anxiety that might arise: academic and emotional. GSIs should be fully empowered to deal with academic content matters as they would normally be, and be confident that they will receive instructor support.

On the other hand, in matters of emotional and other pandemic-related matters, it is important both to support our GSIs AND to make sure that they are communicating a consistent message to students across the course. To this end, GSIs should regularly communicate such student concerns to the instructor and the instructor should provide a clear response to those questions, preferably in a regular (e.g weekly) meeting with the GSIs. This will both provide clarity and avoid “piecemeal responses.” It will also ensure consistency and equity. GSIs might be asked to defer answering such questions until the instructor has been able to opine more globally on how to handle the situation.

There is, as well, potentially, a gendered quality to this process. As Professor McLennan has said, “female GSIs absorbed a great deal of the students’ anxiety last semester, for all the usual gender-socialization reasons: I’d foreground the importance, for all GSIs, of gently but firmly drawing boundaries right from the start (modeling rather than declaring), and I’d suggest ways of doing that and, also, inform them of the resources that are available to the students for emotional and/or practical support where the support needed goes beyond what a GSI should/can offer.”

Please consider your assessment choices with this in mind. While students might have an easier time than they did in the spring semester, because we are beginning the term with remote assessment, we can still presume that the fluid situation and diverse geographical locations (which may not be static over the course of the semester) will cause elevated levels of student anxiety. It is very important, as a result, (a) to remember that our GSIs are also students and therefore (b) NOT to place the entirety of this burden of assessment on the GSIs. It is best to stay in regular contact with them, and provide consistent guidance, so that all students, regardless of their GSI, receive the same responses and support. That will mean familiarizing yourself with available campus resources to respond to emerging issues and problems.

II. Assignments based on learning objectives

Julia Nee (GSI)

---

The contract can be found here: https://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/labor/bargaining-units/bx/contract.html. Article 31 is workload. The general rule is that GSIs work no more than 20 hours per week average over 17 weeks of appointment (340 hours total), but no more than 40 hours in any one week nor more than eight (8) hours in any one day. The number of hours worked in excess of twenty (20) hours per week may not total more than 77 hours per semester.
Linguistics

Please remember that no GSI should be expected to (or actually work) more than 340 hours in a semester. Adapting this excellent assignment should be evaluated against workload maximums.

“In my course, student grades are based on course learning objectives that are connected to specific course content. For each class, I have a page in the course modules (bCourses) that links to that day’s readings, discussion board, class lecture slides, and synchronous and taped Zoom content links, along with the learning objectives associated with that content.

“Each learning objective asks students to demonstrate their understanding of a key course concept, but students are free to submit written, spoken, or videotaped submissions. Students submitted assignments in all three formats.”
“I graded objectives using the rubric below. Students were given feedback and invited to revise and resubmit if they wanted a higher grade. This allowed for a greater sense of communication between teacher and student, as these comments and resubmissions helped to form a conversation.”
"One practice to note on the bCourses/SpeedGrader interface is that resubmissions will appear on the instructor's dashboard and course homepage as "To Do" tasks, while comments submitted on assignments do not. For this reason, I requested students re-submit assignments rather than provide a comment in response to my comment. The instructor can see all submissions, including previous submissions, so resubmissions didn't create any problems for my grading process. Students seemed to like this assignment format. In their mid-semester evaluations, 20/21 respondents reported "strongly agree" (15) or "somewhat agree" (5) to the statement "I feel that my submissions for the learning objectives reflect my understanding of the topic." Additionally, 20/21 respondents reported "strongly agree" (16) or "somewhat agree" (4) to the statement "I feel that my grades reflect my performance on the learning objectives." Finally, all students reported that they were able to get feedback on assignments (21/21 said "strongly agree") and that they feel comfortable incorporating feedback and resubmitting assignments (18 reported "strongly agree" and 3 "somewhat agree").

One main drawback of this assignment format is that it increased the burden of grading to some extent, though I found that the workload (at least in a course with 41 students) was quite manageable. In most cases, I was able to provide targeted feedback for students to incorporate into a resubmission that was then very easy to evaluate. For example, in the learning objective pictured above, I provided the following comment on one submission, "Great start! This submission demonstrates your understanding of the diversity of languages in North America. I would love to see a bit more connection to other things we've discussed in class or read about. For example, how does this diversity support or question narratives of indigenous erasure? You mention that the languages are moribund, but is that the case for all languages? Are any languages gaining speakers?" The student then responded to the questions I had posed, and I was able to re-grade the submission. In most cases, assignments were submitted only once or twice; in a few rare cases, three submissions were provided.

III. Formative Assessment
Sabrina Agarwal, Anthropology

Participation Assignment: Human Adaptation and Variation

I ask each of you to answer only one question below. Your answer should be 250-600 words – the idea is to be brief. You should use sentences, but this will not be graded for grammar/style. This assignment will be graded as “satisfactory” S or “unsatisfactory” U. If you receive a U, you will be given a chance to redo it. This is just to see if you have been reasonably engaged and participating in the course.

Please submit your answer under Assignments on BCourse by XXX

Choose ONE question:

1. Explain in your words why race is not a biological category.
2. **Describe** one way that humans can biologically adapt to their environment (temporarily or permanently genetically)

### IV. Collaborative Assessments

(1) Crystal Chang-Cohen

**ISSP**

**Oxford-style Debates as a Way to Engage Students in the Remote Environment**

Contact for questions: crystalchang@berkeley.edu

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kCdAzhgUs9A](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kCdAzhgUs9A)

(2019 AIS lightning talk on using debates in the classroom)

“One of the greatest challenges in the remote environment is creating an authentic learning experience and a tangible sense of community among students. Oxford-style team debates over Zoom can be an effective way to overcome these challenges and engage students. Through this exercise, students learn how to: 1) conduct online research in the UCB libraries, 2) write a concise and persuasive essay backed with evidence from vetted sources, 3) collaborate with teammates to craft a debate strategy, 4) confidently speak before an audience of peers, and 5) appreciate the value of comparing multiple perspectives surrounding controversial topics. The debates also compel students to confront their own assumptions around hot button issues as well as their fears of public speaking. Nearly all students showed up to watch the debates - with their video turned on - even though attendance was not being tracked for credit.

“I start by developing the debate motions. I craft statements which will force teams to take a side, such as “It is in Taiwan’s self-interest to formally join the P.R.C..” I then divide the students into groups of six students, three of whom will argue for the motion and three of whom will argue against the motion. To prepare for the debate, students write 750-word individual motion briefs in which they outline three arguments for their position and one potential counterargument, each backed by evidence cited from vetted sources. Each team decides who will give the 3-minute opening statement, the 3-minute rebuttal, and the 3-minute closing statement. On the day of the debate, we open with a Zoom poll to see where the class stands on the motion: For the motion, Against the motion, or Undecided. After the last closing statement and a short Q&A, a second Zoom poll is taken. The team that gains the most votes in the post-debate poll compared to the pre-debate poll is declared the winner. If there is time, we hold a short debrief session in which students share what arguments influenced their vote. Afterward, debaters must turn in a short essay to reflect upon what they did well during the debate, what their team did well and/or could have done better, and what the other team did
well. Students are also given the opportunity to have their performance recorded via Zoom as part of their self-evaluation. The motion brief is worth 13% of their final grade, the debate performance 5%, and the debate reflection 2%. (This totals 20% of the course grade.) The debate performance grade is shared among all team members. The course evaluations suggest that students overwhelmingly found the debates worthwhile and some made lasting friendships.

(2) Tiffany Linton Page
ISSP (Global 102)

Mini Research Project, with collaborative sections

Step 1: Data Science Assignment
Students complete two data science modules that teach them how to import and clean a data set, introduce them to some basic statistical concepts and quantitative analysis, as well as teach them how to make tables and graphs using python code in a Jupyter notebook.

Learning Objectives:

● Attain a basic understanding of quantitative analysis so that students have the skills to interpret tables and graphs in research based on quantitative methods and are able to evaluate the research.

● Learn some basic data science skills that students will later apply to a new data set, one created by the class.

Assessment: the completed data science modules

Grading Rubric for Data Science Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Answered all of the questions in the modules correctly and created all of the visualizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Answered almost all of the questions in the modules correctly and created all of the visualizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Answered most of the questions in the modules correctly and created all of the visualizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing</td>
<td>Quite a few incorrect answers or questions left blank. Not all visualizations were completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not passing</td>
<td>Didn’t answer the vast majority of questions correctly. Few visualizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2: Survey Assignment

Students complete readings on survey research. As a class, students develop a research question and then collectively create a short survey using Qualtrics. The class disseminates the
survey and collects responses. Students then use the skills they learned in the data science assignments to import the data collected into the Jupyter notebook from the earlier data science assignment, analyze the data and produce visualizations of it. It is more challenging this time because it is a different data set based on different types of survey questions. As a result, the students are challenged to use the skills they learned earlier in new ways that may be different than what was laid out in the first data science module.

**Learning Objectives:**
- Attain a basic understanding of survey methods and the type of evidence it can provide in order to be able to evaluate research based on survey methods.
- Reinforce the data science and quantitative analysis skills learned earlier.

**Assessments:**
- Open-book, untimed bcourses quiz on the readings to be completed before class.
- In class discussion, I ask students to explain how what they learned in the reading is shaping the choices they are making in survey design, question wording and the survey distribution plan. I also ask students what they see as the strengths and limitations of survey research and quantitative analysis based on both their experience of conducting the research and based on the readings.
- The data science module using the newly collected data. Same grading rubric as above to assess this data science assignment.

**Step 3: Presentation of Survey Findings**

Students complete a reading on developing strong presentations. *In small groups*, they prepare a presentation (max 4 minutes) on the findings from the survey project and at the end of the presentation answer one audience question.

**Learning Objectives:**
- Learn how to prepare and deliver a strong presentation.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the survey research findings, be able to clearly articulate them in a way that engages the audience, and explain the visualizations created.

**Assessment: Presentation**

**Grading Rubric for Presentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good delivery: Presentation was practiced and material was presented with confidence and enthusiasm, spoke loudly and slowly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
enough, did not read from notes, phone or slides, seamlessly moved from one group member to the next

- All members of the group spoke for about an equal amount of time.
- Stayed within time limit (did not surpass 4-minutes)
- Slides reflected lessons learned in the reading
  - Hourglass structure
    - § Begin with a hook
    - § Details and nuance in the middle
    - § Concluded broadly with importance of the research
  - Used headlines
  - May use stories as ways to engage audience
  - Clutter-free slides & slides for the audience, not the presenter
  - Good visuals, not too much text
  - High quality images
  - Did not use pie charts or 3D graphs
- Response to Q&A
  - Were able to respond to the question and offer some additional information that was not in the presentation.
- Effectively framed the research project.
- Clearly and accurately articulated the main research findings.
- Included at least two visualizations of the data created by group members and explained them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Presentation included most of the above but may have not met several of the expectations for an excellent presentation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passing</td>
<td>Presentation incorporated some ideas from the reading and showed some understanding of the survey findings, but largely did not meet the expectations for an excellent presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Not passing | Did not employ ideas from the reading  
 Did not have a clear understanding of the survey findings  
 Did not effectively present the research |

V. **Summative Assessment**  
Sabrina Agarwal, Anthropology (Anthro 1)

“The summative assessment is a critical research report with nested “big picture” objectives: to identify, research, and critically evaluate concepts in biological anthropology that are presented in a popular fiction novel. The full assessment is worth a whopping 40% of the course grade, but
it is broken into three graduated assessments (each at a lower stake of 10-20%) that incrementally assess students’ student learning skills based on Bloom’s taxonomy; they grow from recall and identification of information to higher level skills of critical interpretation, evaluation and creative synthesis. **As such each individual assessment is a legitimate task/assignment.**

“In this example, an illegitimate assignment would be to ask students to write a one-shot high-stakes, journal-quality scientific report that the majority of students at the lower division level are unequipped to do. Instead, this graduated assignment gives them legitimate level tasks that they can accomplish at a given point in the course journey, and each assignment builds the skills to accomplish the next nested higher-level assignment. With the use of clear rubrics on expectation of a “complete or full score” assignment, a submit-again until complete/full score policy, nearly all students can achieve the course and assessment objective.³

**Fiction novel research assignment**

A significant part of your total grade (40%) is based on a three-part research assignment on a fiction novel. You must choose one novel to read from a list of four possible books (list provided online). The novels are from a variety of genres, but each deals with the course material in some fashion. Your assignment will involve your reading, reviewing and summarizing your chosen novel and critically researching and commenting on its scientific biological anthropology content (see also the detailed instructions for each research assignment online). The assignment consists of three incremental parts:

A) Book Review & Summary (10%)
B) Annotated Bibliography (10%)
C) Critical Research Report (20%)

**A) Book Summary:** this is a short summary of the novel (300-500 max words) and should include a synopsis of the book and very brief introduction to the two topics the novel touches upon that relate to material in this course (biological anthropology) that you will expand upon in your final critical research report. Your paper should include the following:
- a brief, clear and accurate synopsis of the book (the setting and main characters, plot and summarized story of the book) and

³ For my specific objectives in my course, you will note that I did not emphasize grammar/writing vs other objectives, as seen in my rubric weighting. Instead, I give more weight for demonstrating skills on how to find and read peer-reviewed scientific sources, and how to tie this material to the big ideas in the course subject matter.
- a brief introduction to the two distinct topics the novel touches upon that relate to material in this course (biological anthropology) that you will expand upon in your final critical research report. Use the keywords provided on the book list to point you in the direction of how the book relate to the course (this list of keywords is not exhaustive and there are many topics that you could choose).

Then, use your textbooks and other library sources to help determine two clear topics. If you are unclear talk to your GSI and/or Prof. Agarwal. You will need to identify the two distinct topics and briefly elaborate on what specific aspect(s) of the topic is dealt with in the novel.

- Refrain from giving a review of your novel (i.e. do not detail what you thought of the novel, author, quality of the writing etc.). With a strict word limit you do not have space to do this.
- You will not be graded for grammar and spelling on this part of the assignment. However, grammar and spelling will be evaluated and given feedback on. Note: Papers must be double-spaced in 12pt. font, preferably Times New Roman. Any paper over the 500-word maximum will not be graded.

Breakdown of Grading Criteria/Rubric for Book Summary
10 point total = 10% of final grade

Summary (5 points)

5 Summary **explains** the basic plot (main events) of the story
**Identifies** the main characters and their role in the plot
**Accurately describes** the conflict(s) in the story and how the conflict resolves or ends
**Accurately tells** what the setting is (and/or time and place)

4 Summary meets the first two criteria for 5 and meets one of the remaining criteria

3 Summary meets only the first two criteria for 5

2 Meets any two of the four criteria

1 Meets only one criterion

Two Topic Choices (5 points)

5 Summary clearly **identifies two** distinct topics in biological anthropology and elaborates on the specific aspect(s) of each topic found in the novel (ex. Novel is “Curious George the Monkey” topic 1: primate communication, specifically elaborate on the mating calls and sign language between Curious George and his friends; topic 2: dental morphology, specifically elaborate on the specialized back teeth and jaw shape of Curious George)
Two distinct topics in biological anthropology are clearly identified in the novel but the specific aspect(s) of one or both of the topics is not elaborated on.

The two topics that are identified and elaborated on are not distinct from one another (ex. topic 1: how primates communicate with one another, specifically sign language; topic 2: monkey singing, specifically mating calls; not distinct topics, they are the same topic of primate communication.)

Or only one topic is clearly identified and elaborated on

Or one of the topics chosen does not relate to this course (biological anthropology)

Both topics chosen do not relate to this course (biological anthropology)

No clear topic is stated or elaborated on

Non-graded evaluation of grammar and spelling (graded on the final paper)

B) Annotated Bibliography

Annotated Bibliography: includes a list of at least 10 sources you have found and read that deal with the topics you have decided to focus on in your critical research paper. For this assignment, you must annotate five of these sources. This is worth 10% of your final grade.

**Be sure you are clear on the final biological anthropology topics you have chosen before completing this assignment!! **

This assignment is designed to help you learn and practice skills in library research techniques that you will need in future classes, and to allow you to explore a topic in biological anthropology in a final critical research paper. You will prepare a list of at least ten (10) appropriate sources you have found through research (online or at the library) and read; you will then annotate at least five (5) of the sources you have read from your list (see below for list of what is an appropriate source). Note that you may annotate all the sources on your list, but you must annotate at least five (5) of the sources. Also note, four (4) of the annotations must be from peer-reviewed sources (see below for what is peer-reviewed source).

What is an annotation?

An annotation is a descriptive summary of the article/reading that also includes an evaluation of the questions, evidence, and conclusions presented in it. Your annotations for this assignment should focus on critically evaluating the perspective, results, and conclusions presented by the author. Critical evaluations are not necessarily argumentative or negative, but they are reflective!

In your annotation you should address (some or all of these): What is the significance of this study? How does it relate to the biological anthropology topic I’ve chosen for my paper? What are the results and how are they presented by the author? How they obtain the data they present to support their argument? Is the author convincing? Do they contradict or complement other research?
* General Bibliography Checklist (see also grading criteria below) *

Be sure that:

- you have at least 10 sources listed

- you have cited each source on your list in the AJPA

- your sources comply with the list of appropriate sources listed above. Note that not all sources are equal in quality. Try to obtain as many good quality sources as you can, especially articles from peer-reviewed journals and texts. (Remember that in your final critical report you will have to have at least 5 peer-reviewed sources).

- you have annotated at least 5 of your sources and that 4 of these are from peer-reviewed sources

- each of your annotations include all the key elements as given above. Each annotation should give a brief description of how the source is related and useful to the topic(s) being studied in the critical report; an accurate review of the main idea(s) and/or argument(s); and the author’s (s’) conclusion(s) or final point in the piece.

- each of your annotations does not exceed 300 words

- you have proof-read your annotations for grammar and spelling

**Grammar and Spelling:**

What constitutes minor spelling and grammatical errors: these are small errors in spelling and grammar (i.e. capitalization or misspelled words, minor errors in sentence structure) that usually result from not proof-reading or editing your work.

What constitutes major spelling and grammatical errors: these are more significant errors in spelling and grammar (i.e. multiple and repeated errors in spelling and grammar, significant errors in sentence structure and/or tense) that often can be corrected with having someone else edit your work or with aid from a writing center.

What constitutes significant spelling and grammatical errors: these are serious errors in spelling, grammar or language use as above that significantly disrupt the reading and/or understanding of the writing. Should you have this difficulty with your writing you are strongly recommended to seek advice from a writing center. Note: The Student Learning Center located in the Cesar Chavez Center on Lower Sproul Plaza offers writing workshops and courses.
Breakdown of Grading Criteria/Rubric for Annotated Bibliography:
20 point total = 10% of final grade

**Format (10 points)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10+ appropriate sources are listed in correct AJPA format with at least 5+ of the sources annotated (including at least 4+ annotations from peer-reviewed sources).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5+ appropriate sources are annotated and include 4+ annotations from peer-reviewed sources but:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>there are only 5-9 appropriate sources listed in total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or the sources are not cited in correct AJPA format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There are less than 5 appropriate sources listed in total or less than 5 of the sources are annotated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Less than 4 annotations are from peer-reviewed sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No peer-reviewed sources are annotated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elements of the Annotations (5 points)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Each annotation gives a brief description of how the source is related and useful to the topic(s) being studied in the critical report. Each annotation includes an accurate review of the main idea(s) and/or argument(s) and the author’s (s’) conclusion(s) or final point in the piece.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Each annotation gives a brief description of how the source is related and useful to the topic(s) being studied and gives an accurate review of the main ideas in the piece, but does not give the conclusion(s) or final point of the piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Each annotation gives a brief description of how the source is related and useful to the topic(s) being studied but does not give an accurate review of the main ideas and conclusions of the piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Each annotation does not give a brief description of how the source is related and useful to the biological anthropology topic(s) chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None of the annotations give a brief description of how the source is related and useful to the biological anthropology topic(s) chosen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality of the Annotations (5 points)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Each annotation does not exceed 300 words and shows accurate spelling, grammar and language use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Each annotation shows accurate spelling, grammar and language use, but one or more of the annotations exceeds 300 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The annotation(s) have minor spelling or grammatical errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The annotation(s) have major spelling or grammatical errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The annotation(s) have significant spelling or grammatical errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C) Final Critical Research Report:
20 point total = 20% of final grade

This is the final step of the assignment and is a 1500 word (max 6 page double-spaced) critical report that discusses the two topics you have chosen to focus on in detail, using and citing at least 5 of the supporting sources you have given in your bibliography. Along with the detailed instructions for the whole research assignment you will also be given a detailed breakdown of the evaluation and grading criteria for this report. It is worth 20% of your final grade.

Purpose: The first goal of this final report is to give you an opportunity to research two topics in biological anthropology in depth. The second goal is to critically evaluate how the two topics in biological anthropology are presented or addressed in your novel.

What your final report should include:
- An introduction: introduce your book (summarizing what the book is about) and the two topics that are addressed in the book that you have chosen
- A detailed discussion of how each topic is specifically discussed in the book (include page references). (Note: if your topic is mentioned multiple times, elaborate and give specifics for a few of the topic examples in the book. If your topic is only mentioned briefly, or only once, this is ok: just be sure to give the details on how the topic is presented or discussed and mention that it is only addressed briefly; you can still critically comment on how it is presented or discussed).
- A detailed cited discussion of the sources you have found that directly deal with each topic
- A supported critical discussion of how these source(s) elaborate on, support or do not support how the topic is presented or addressed in the book
- A conclusion: a few lines of summing up; also include here a short summary that puts your book in context [for example when was the book written? (does your research reflect recent data or knowledge that was not known when the book was first written; or does it reflect the political cultural climate of when the book was written?)]. You may also include here your final /personal thoughts on the book or the research in the field of your topics.

Format:

Your paper must not exceed 6 double-spaced pages (12pt font) not including your bibliography. This will not be easy – one of the most challenging aspects of good writing is to know how to express your ideas and thoughts succinctly, and to learn what to include and what not to include while still making your point. Refrain from including too much personal unsupported comment in your critical evaluation (save this for the few lines in your conclusion). Your critical evaluation is to be informed based on supporting research.
**Spelling and Grammar:** as with the last assignment, spelling and grammar does matter. Consult the instructions for the annotated bibliography on what constitutes major spelling or grammatical errors.

**Organization:** it is best to organize your paper organically: start with your introduction, followed by your discussion of *each topic separately* (how the topic is addressed or presented in the book, your research on the topic, and your supported critical evaluation of the topics), then lastly your conclusion. Your list of cited references (bibliography) should follow last, and list only include the sources that you directly cite in your paper. The organization of your paper, along with your writing style and grammar will make a significant impact to your grade (see criteria for grading).

**Sources:** you must use and cite at *least five (5) sources in this final paper* (you can certainly use more); three (4) of these cited sources must be from a peer-reviewed source. *Only one (1) source can be a web/internet source.* It is ok to include new/different sources that were not in your annotated bibliography; however, you should confirm that these are acceptable sources before handing in your paper with your GSI.

**Breakdown of Grading Criteria/Rubric for Critical Research Report**

*Discussion of Topic 1 (5 points)*

*Repeat for Topic 2 (5 points)*

5 A brief discussion is given of how the topic is specifically presented or addressed. A cited discussion is given of the findings from your researched sources that deal directly with the topic. Using the above findings, a supported critical evaluation is given of how the topic is presented/addressed.

4 A cited discussion of the findings from the researched sources that deal directly with the topic and a supported critical evaluation of the how the topic is presented/addressed, but:

how or where (page number(s)) the topic is specifically presented/addressed is not discussed

3 A cited discussion of the researched sources is given but:

the researched sources do not deal directly with the topic identified and as such the critical evaluation of the topic is not well supported or a critical evaluation of how the topic is presented/addressed is missing

2 The topic discussed or the researched sources used are not distinct from the other chosen topic

1 No cited discussion of researched sources is given

*Content (5 points)*

5 The paper has a clearly defined and focused topic
The content is relevant and up to date
The content is serious, in depth and critical
The paper has correct spelling and grammar

4  The paper is well organized with an introduction and a conclusion but:
   The paper is somewhat difficult to follow and understand
   or there are minor spelling or grammatical errors

3  The paper does not give an introduction to the novel and chosen topics
   or does not give a conclusion that summarizes and evaluates the fiction novel in context
   or the paper is significantly difficult to understand and/or arguments are difficult to follow

2  There are major spelling or grammatical errors

1  There are significant spelling or grammatical errors that disrupt the reading and/or understanding of the writing

Format (5 points)

5  A total of 5+ appropriate sources are cited in the text, with 4+ of these from peer-reviewed sources and no more than 1 web-based source
   The total length of the text in the paper does not exceed 6 double-spaced pages (12pt)
   The bibliography and in-text citations are correctly formatted
   The text of the paper is double-spaced

4  The first three criteria for 5 are met but:
   the paper is not double-spaced

3  The first criteria for 5 is met but:
   the total length of the text in the paper exceeds 6 double-spaced pages (12pt)
   or the bibliography and in-text citations are not correctly formatted

2  Less than 5 appropriate sources are cited in the text or more than 1 web-based source is used

1  Less than 4 of the sources cited are peer-reviewed

VI. **Staged Assignments and Continuous Assessments**

Rosemary Joyce, Anthropology
Anthro 136G

This is a best practice that shows continual assessment over the course of the semester, with low stakes that are tied to specific tasks and related to an overall final project. It is long, but complete. Note also that there is (slightly) greater weight to later assignments, which allows students to be rewarded for improvement.
**General Overview from Prof. Joyce:** Here is the series of assignments that I use in my upper division course on Cultural Heritage Policy. It is the best freestanding example of a sequence of assignments that I have (The current iteration of this course is all embedded there). The schedule of assignments (which I revise and post in bCourses) shows the continuous workload and low value at each step; in the most recent semesters I made the first iteration of assignments lower value, so there was a cycle of completion--response- -(possible revision) for each kind of assignment.

The semester project, broken down into stages, makes up the largest part of the course grade. But no part of it weighs substantially more than all the other required work.

**Assignments 1, 3 and 4 are the prompts for threaded discussion posts, graded complete/incomplete, that are followed up with in-class discussions.**

The single assignments 2 and 5 use the same procedure with different primary documents as the focus.

Together these assignments mean that every week students have something to hand in, none of these are the kinds of assignments amenable to finding existing papers or essay responses, **so they make cheating hard (if not impossible).** The low value and fact that they are all graded satisfactory/unsatisfactory (with revise and resubmit always an option) keeps the grading workload down (this course only gets a reader, and only if it enrolls high, so often I am doing all the grading of 30-40 students).

When combined with the idea that you spend your grading time more intensively with those who need it and do check/minus or plus/check/minus responses in general, it really does work.

**SCHEDULE OF ASSIGNMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Assignment description</th>
<th>% grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every class</td>
<td>Attendance and participation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26</td>
<td>Assignment 1: Smithsonian Museum policies posted</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>Assignment 2: second policy document</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>Assignment 3: cosmopolitanism review</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>First stage of final project: proposed topic and sources</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3, 3/5</td>
<td>Second stage of final project: In-class presentation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>Third stage of final project: bibliographic entry</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>Assignment 4: intangible cultural heritage post</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>Assignment 5: third policy document</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9</td>
<td>Final draft of final project</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semester-long project: write a policy brief on a cultural heritage issue of your choice

Purpose: A policy brief provides an opportunity to hone analytical writing skills while using empirical evidence to make an argument. The brief is written to a policy maker (an individual, committee, or other group/institution) to facilitate (inform and influence) the decision to choose among alternative policy positions in a current policy debate. It requires a clear identification of the policy issue that is the subject of debate, enough context and background to evaluate the debate, a presentation of the competing views in the debate, and a recommendation for the policy maker. It requires the author to be direct and succinct, yet thorough.

Your mission: Choose an issue that is related to the topics of this class-- cultural heritage policy or cultural diplomacy-- in some way. An issue for this course starts with identifying a question that needs to be answered or a problem that requires a solution. It can be something that is in the news, something that emerges from your internship, or something related to a cultural heritage institution (such as a museum) with which you are familiar or in which you are interested.

You are not required to have any particular expertise in the question or problem. Your job will be to relate the question to the reading in this course, to the vocabulary we are identifying and exploring, and to propose what you think should be the course of action for a policy decision maker.

Stage 1: Proposal of topic (Due: 2/23) 10 points

For this step, you should describe the cultural heritage policy issue on which you want to complete this project. You should identify the legislation or international convention(s) that could relate to this issue. You should attempt to identify where the policy decision involved would be made (the office, not the person). Provide links to institutions where possible; cite the specific legislation of convention and, if not included as a source text in the course, provide a link or printed copy as an appendix to the proposal. Cite/provide links to news coverage if applicable, or to professional research articles if they are your sources.

The basic questions you need to answer are: what is the issue? how do you know about it? what cultural heritage/diplomacy policies does it relate to? who/what institution would make decisions about it? You should not already have reached a recommendation.

Ideally, this will be 500-750 words (plus any appendices and cited sources).

Stage 2: Preliminary presentation in class: 5 points

Due: 3/3; 3/5
Over the course of several class meetings, we will discuss the projects each of you propose. You must attend all these class meetings to receive full credit for this part of the assignment. In other words, your presence and attention to others is part of ensuring your own final project will be the best possible demonstration of your learning.

Given the number of students in the class, each of you will have five minutes to briefly describe the cultural heritage issue you are addressing and the policy involved. You will be timed on this, so prepare as succinct an explanation as possible. If you have heard the term "elevator speech" (what you could tell someone about your work during an elevator ride): that is precisely what you want to prepare. Think of the presentation as aimed at someone who might be in a position to make the decision on the issue and policy. For example, you could be explaining to the US Secretary of State that you think the US should support the Hopi nation's attempts to recover artifacts being auctioned in Paris, to advance a specific policy of the US.

**Stage 3: Bibliographic Entry**

**Due: 3/12**

Identify (in consultation with Professor Joyce) at least one scholarly article that discusses the issue, similar issues, or the policy document/framework involved. Read that source, and provide a 500-750 word annotated summary (with full bibliographic citation) of what the source tells you about cultural heritage issues, and how you see it relating to the question or problem that is the focus of your project. You may submit annotated summaries of up to three published sources for this step; in total, they should add up to no more than 1500 words.

**Stage 4: Submitted final project**

**Due: 5/9**

You should write your final assignment in memo form with four sections: Policy Recommendation; Statement of Issue, Policy Options, and Sources. The first section should be brief and propose a specific action by the institution you have identified as authorized to take action. The rest of the briefing supports that recommendation. It outlines the cultural heritage problem. It explains what options might exist, given the legislation and conventions that apply. It cites sources in support of the final option.

The brief should be 1000-1750 words – no fewer than 2 pages, no more than 4 pages, single-spaced (8 pages, double-spaced). The font should be 12 point and the margins should be 1” on each side.

The list of sources cited, including policy documents, news coverage, and academic writing, is not included in the word/page count. It is critical for the assessment of the final draft. Please cite sources using an Author-Date style such as the one in the model provided in...
bCourses. Not using a uniform style will result in a lower final grade. Spell check and grammar check as well. If you were submitting a petition to a decision maker, your ability to influence a decision would be weakened by errors of spelling or grammar.

**Assessment:** Each stage of the assignment will be checked for completeness of the required steps. In the preliminary stages, feedback provided is intended for improving the next stage of the project; you may be asked to revise the draft and turn it in for a second reading, to ensure you are on track for the next step in the process. It will not be possible to revise the final version of the project.

**Additional Assignments, related to the larger project as well.**

**Assignment 1: Smithsonian Museum policies**

5 points

The Smithsonian Institution today is made up of a number of different museums. Material that can be described as "cultural property" or considered someone's "cultural heritage" is found in many different museums, in each case, considered the basis for different kinds of interpretation: as art, historical document, or anthropological or archaeological data. Your task is to choose one Smithsonian Institution museum that has items that can be considered cultural property/heritage. Visit the website of that museum (start at the main Smithsonian website). Find the "About" section of the museum website; this is where you will find policy statements.

Using the museum's description of its mission, programs, and/or FAQs, identify one way the public might interact with the collections of cultural property/heritage. Is there an explicit policy defining how to do this? If not, does the website describe what factors will be considered, who will make the decision, and how to go about asking to interact with the collections?

As an example (which you should not use for your own project), all Smithsonian Institution museums allow the public to interact with some objects by visiting the museum. Each museum has specific opening days and times. This is the museum's visiting policy.

See what other ways the public can engage with the collections, and see whether there are formal policies or not. Post a comment with a link to the specific museum webpage that gives the closest thing to a policy statement that you can find.

**Assignments 2 and 5**

(Policy Document Review Assignment)

5 points; 10 points

**Purpose:** One step toward preparing a policy briefing (the main course project) is to analyze policy documents to identify the relevant framework for action. The Document Review is an intermediate text useful to inform the final policy briefing. It will also form the basis of
discussion in class. You are encouraged to talk to others preparing a text about the same document, but your written work must be independently developed.

**Due dates:** For Assignment 2, you are required to submit one policy document review on 2/9. For Assignment 5, you must submit a policy document review on 4/2.

**Substance:** There are four goals for your Document Review: (1) identify the key section(s) in the document that deal with issues of cultural heritage; (2) identify relevant vocabulary from the course that is used in, or provides concepts for understanding, the document and its relevance; (3) identify new keywords or vocabulary and provide support for understanding them (through a link to a website, or by providing a brief discussion of them); and (4) provide context for the document's existence (through citation of a website, article we have read, or other source external to the document).

**Format:** The Document Review should have a Summary section; a Detailed Discussion that backs up the summary; and References Cited. The text of the Document Review should be 500-750 words, not counting the References Cited. Please prepare the document with 1 inch margins, in 12 point type, with pages numbered.

**Citation:** Please use a social science reference style, such as that used by the journal *American Anthropologist*. A copy is provided in the course Box folder, and available for download here: http://www.aaanet.org/publications/style_guide.pdf

This is an example of in-text citation of sources by the last name of the author and year of publication (Joyce 2014). Any Author-Date system of citation is acceptable. Do not use footnotes or endnotes. Alphabetize the sources cited.

**Basis for assessment:** An acceptable document review will provide all the required sections with References Cited conforming to the description given of Author-Date in text citation. A fully satisfactory document review needs to do more: it analyzes the document (identifying all, but only, the sections that relate to cultural heritage policy, and discussing the most important of these first). It will provide sufficient context for a reader to understand why the document is important. It will identify shared concepts, even where specific vocabulary is not used.

**Assignment 3**

**Discussion of cosmopolitanism: Due 2/16**

*Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* by Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006) is a book that has inspired vigorous debate about the meaning of "cultural heritage" in a world that values both globalization and diversity. This assignment is intended to facilitate a discussion of the core concept of "cosmopolitanism" and different reactions to Appiah's use of it.
Appiah wrote that "however self-serving it may seem, the British Museum’s claim to be a repository of the heritage not of Britain but of the world strikes me as exactly right' (2006: 2). Cosmopolitan claims are like this are contested by others. In 2011 Ben Dibley wrote that "cosmopolitan appeals"

are premised on the assumption that a cosmos, a world, a universal, pre-exists its articulation, and, that it is the task of reason and of science to adjust the citizen-subject to this already-present condition.

(In "Museums and a Common World: Climate Change, Cosmopolitics, Museum Practice". Museum and Society 9(2):154-165.)

Your task is to read one of 10 reviews of Appiah's book or interviews with him and use it as part of a class discussion. You have each been assigned one of the ten items linked below. Please download it; read it; and post on the discussion thread established for this assignment a key passage (quotation) and question it raises about cosmopolitanism that you think we should discuss.

Notice that there are a mix of general magazines (The New Republic, The Hedgehog Review, and The Nation) and scholarly journals represented here. If you are reading a review/interview from a scholarly journal, add to your comment posted on the discussion board a specific point in the review that you feel reflects the discipline of the journal. For the general magazines, look at the brief biography of the author, and consider how the author's academic discipline is related to the comments on the book.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link to file</th>
<th>Author and content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev1</td>
<td>Thomas Nagel, review in The New Republic 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev2</td>
<td>Matthew Witt, review in Administrative Theory and Praxis 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev3</td>
<td>Bruce Robbins, review in boundary 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev4</td>
<td>Anand Bertrand Commissiong, review in New Political Science 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev5</td>
<td>Ethan Lieb, review in Policy Review 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev6</td>
<td>Julia Liss, review in Rethinking History 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev7</td>
<td>The Hedgehog Review interview 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev8</td>
<td>John Gray, review in The Nation 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev9</td>
<td>Journal of Philosophy interview 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev10</td>
<td>Willie Smyth, review in Western Folklore 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assignment 4**

**Intangible cultural heritage**

The concept of intangible cultural heritage is now under active discussion and scrutiny. With the 2003 UNESCO Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage providing the framework, many
countries have proposed items for listing as their intangible cultural heritage. Some of these cases have been very hotly contested by other countries.

For this assignment, you should identify one item on the proposed or approved list of Intangible Cultural Heritage. For that item, using the UNESCO website, identify who is described as the community for whom the item is cultural heritage. There may be multiple groups of people related to an item. If so, describe as many as you can.

For each community you identify, give some indication of the scale (how large or extensive) and the kind of claim to connection that allows the item to be described as its heritage.

Finally, identify the originators of the proposal for the item to be listed as UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage. How are they related to the communities you identified?

As an example (which you should not use for your own post), the tango is listed as intangible cultural heritage of the modern countries of Argentina and Uruguay. It is also described as a development in the specific cities Buenos Aires and Montevideo. Thus, tango is intangible heritage at a regional scale of two countries, and of two specific cities.

In the description, tango is more specifically equated with the cultural practices of "the urban lower classes". That would imply that rather than being the heritage of the entire country or even a city, tango is equated with one class or segment of the urban population. These people are said to be a mix of European immigrants to the region, descendants of African slaves and the natives of the region known as ‘criollos’.

As a historical statement, then, tango belongs to specific people, a mixed-race group living in these countries, especially these cities.

As an alternative, tango is described as the product of a community of practitioners: musicians, professional and amateur dancers, choreographers, composers, songwriters, teachers of the art and the national living treasures who embody the culture of tango.

Tango is thus related to its communities either by local connections (in certain cities), descent (from certain immigrants to Argentina and Uruguay), or practitioners of tango. The actual petition for tango to be listed came from the national governments of the two countries.

[If you happen to read Spanish, you can download copies of documents, described on the UNESCO website as "consent of communities", in which political authorities at the national and city level, and associations of artists and musicians, wrote in support of the application for listing. But that is not necessary for me to create the kind of post I have above.]

http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/