

## **Geography 426: The Historical Geography of British Columbia.**

University of British Columbia

David Brownstein

### **Peer-led learning.**

Prepare a 30-minute group presentation, illustrated with maps and figures as appropriate. These will have rolling due-dates, as selected by you in class. Two or three students per group, depending on our ultimate class size. The presentation will be followed by 60 minutes of discussion focused on the assigned readings for that day. These sessions will be worth 25% of your final grade. Marks will be awarded to individuals, rather than to groups.

This session is in lieu of a term-paper and I expect you to devote some considerable effort in preparation.

Your task is to create a thoughtful, carefully-constructed argument that explores your chosen theme. In all cases, **your presentation must convey an argument**. A good argument is exactly that, something about which you can imagine two people disagreeing. When preparing, imagine that I, your sceptical audience, disagree with what you are trying to say.

I will lead a session in class on how to construct an argument. Please inform your approach by familiarizing yourself with the existing literature.

#### Advice:

Pick a tight, focused theme and stick to it.

Consider using electronic tools to coordinate your collaborative efforts.

All presenters should get equal speaking time.

In advance of the class, circulate some questions so that your peers can focus their reading of the texts for your day.

#### Our Insurance Policy.

“The free-rider problem” is always an issue with group-work. On the day of your presentation, you will also have a (minimum) five-page written diary/peer evaluation due. Use this venue to track two things: your research as you go along (full, proper citations please), and to indicate how well you thought your group worked. Evaluate each individual, including yourself, according to how much they contributed, and what they did (or didn't) do. I will use this feedback to adjust individual marks up or down, as compared to the group as a whole. The diary is meant to be a record of your experience as you go along, rather than something thrown together the night before.

See over for a detailed marking rubric...

	<b>Sophisticated 80 - 100</b>	<b>Quite good 70 - 79</b>	<b>Sufficient 60 - 69</b>	<b>Inadequate &lt; 60</b>
Discussion questions circulated in advance?	Yes: 1 mark	Yes but late: ½ mark	Yes but late and required a prompt from the instructor: ¼ mark	No: 0 marks
<b>Empirical Content</b>				
Argument and narrative?	Yes: clear, robust, direct, understandable. Logical, analytical, well explored.	Yes, present but could have stood another set of revision to sharpen, missed important points	Yes, present but possibly weak. Vague, rambling, incoherent. Addressed, but spotty treatment and examined in patches while ignoring crucial aspects	No argument, or position is vague, illogical, poorly explored or no analysis. Woefully inadequate
Presentation is insightful	A group of lucid thinkers capable of making connections between non-obviously related points	Good, though presenters tended to stick to well-worn narratives, minimizing their own observations	Entirely adequate, though presenters rely upon parroting material memorized from the literature	Presenters unable to connect or work through ideas on their own.
Topic covered in sufficient depth	Great mastery and assembles a deep coverage	Good depth of coverage, fairly strong familiarity	Adequate depth, but lacking in places	Entirely inadequate

Critical use of wide variety of Sources?	Sufficient use of relevant primary sources, and scholarly secondary sources. Presenters cast a critical eye over everything, including their foundational, most trusted works	Sufficient sources but not critical, or critical of an insufficient number of sources	Over reliance on secondary sources. Insufficient quality, or weak sources. Critical of sources in a weak fashion, or here and there rather than throughout	Insufficient or inappropriate sources. Presenters use all material in an uncritical, unreflective fashion
Contemporary implications?	Presenters take a stand on the issue and explain the consequences of their analysis	Yes, though in weak fashion	Only as a gesture but with little understanding	No thought given to contemporary context, and implications of their argument
Clearly delimit presentation's bounds, and suggest avenues for future work	Yes, presenters highlight the boundaries of their work like experts	Yes, though critical components might be overlooked	Yes, though in weak or half-hearted fashion.	No attempt to link work done with abutting issues or topics, little comprehension of wider context of the topic
<b>Creativity</b>				

Original, innovative, creative	Original, innovative, creative.	Flashes of the unique, but overall derivative of others	Small aspects of originality, though not entirely innovative. Pedestrian, predictable rather than creative.	Unoriginal, sticks very close to the established secondary literature
<b>Structural elements</b>				
Appropriate length	Appropriate length, presenters aware of the time and almost certainly rehearsed their material before sharing it with the class	Perhaps slightly too long or too short, likely a consequence of preparing it at the last minute and thus the actual presentation came as a surprise	Starting to press the patience of the group with too much or too little material	Far too long or too short, for any number of reasons
Distribution of speaking time	A balanced, cooperative effort with all presenters taking an equal amount of time in the spotlight	One or more presenter tended to be more prominent in the proceedings	Noticeable unbalance among speakers	One or more presenters dominated the proceedings. Either because they spoke too much, or because another did not speak at all.

Slides	Clear, careful and polished. No errors. Aesthetically perfect	Quite good, though minor imperfections	Adequate, though issues present with formatting, improper font size, too much text per slide, or slides slapped together at the last minute. Slides may contain small errors	Very poor slides that are hard to read and detract from what the presenters are saying. Messy. Errors.
Maps, figures, and tables	Clear, relevant and well-integrated	Minor issues, or not enlisted to tell group's story as well as they could have	Present, but possibly unclear, of questionable relevance or not as well integrated into the narrative as they could have been.	Few, or no maps, figures or tables, or those present were not related, or those shown were not integrated into the argument at all
<b>Style</b>				
Voice	Clear, audible speaking voice with a confident delivery	Good on all fronts except perhaps one	Adequate manner, though needs to work on volume, or comportment	Inaudible, mumbling, extremely fast or soft
Delivery	Very relaxed delivery, welcoming body language	Friendly and welcoming manner, though some individual aspects may need more work	a bit too fast here and there, some fidgeting or distracting body language	Rushed throughout, inappropriate or disinterested body language

Eye contact	Good constant eye contact that engages all members of the audience	Read from notes or screen more often than was ideal	Only occasional eye contact with the audience	Read material exclusively
Facilitation	Transitions were smooth, an elegant discussion period, moved from one question to another with grace, an obvious effort to include all audience members in a respectful fashion, good discussion questions, strong answers provided in response to questions from audience	Overall strong, even if there was the occasional misstep	Rough or awkward, unnecessary silences while group decided how to proceed, unfortunate or uncontrolled interactions with rest of class, allowed discussion to be dominated by a few individuals, questions inadequate to explore the material, weak answers provided to questions from audience	Required sustained intervention by the instructor to keep things on track or discussion questions were absent or entirely inadequate to sustain stimulating, interested conversation, unable to respond to questions from audience

Session is fun for both leaders and classmates	An interesting, productive, good time was had by all	A fun session for the majority of participants	We did learn new things but not in an atmosphere of fun or excitement	A boring, lacklustre class that was endured rather than enjoyed
<b>Diary</b>				
Research	Clearly indicates all sources located, whether ultimately used or not (via full bibliographic citations), their appraisal.	Indicates most sources located but may have incomplete citations, little info about them	Does not indicate research path pursued or does not include citations	Both research path and individual sources are entirely absent.
Record of collaborative process	Shares an open and intimate window into the group's collaboration, providing a fair appraisal of all contributors including self	Shares window into group process, evaluates peers but does not evaluate own contribution	Minimal details re how the group functioned	No insight into how the well the group worked (or not).

I look forward to hearing your presentations!