

SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENT, ENTERPRISE AND DEVELOPMENT

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

INDEV 602/INDEV 404

THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT

Course Instructor: Larry Swatuk
Class Time: asynchronous online
Class Location: in the comfort of your own home
Office hours: by appointment
Office Location: in the comfort of my own home
E-mail: lswatuk@uwaterloo.ca

Note: *The guidelines in this syllabus are subject to change. Refer to the course website for updates.*

Course description

The theory and practice of international development has gone through several phases, with each phase corresponding to a significant period in world events, and each period giving rise to particular ideas regarding the dynamic processes of development and change among social structures and systems. There have been roughly four ‘phases’ of global change since 1945: (i) Phase I: 1945-75 (The ‘Great Boom’, decolonization and socio-economic modernization); (ii) Phase II: 1975-1989 (Global economic crisis, structural adjustment and the fall of the Soviet Union); (iii) Phase III: 1990-2001 (The rise of ‘governance’, neoliberal globalization and the internet of things); Phase IV: 2001-present (The age of global terror, the rise of China, the emergence of ‘platform capitalism’ and the return to earlier debates).

The meta-theoretical question driving international development theory is what facilitates social order, personal freedom, and improved standards of living for all people? Given the uneven outcomes of strategies and practices of development, one may say that the concept itself is contested. Many scholars argue that the theoretical approaches informing practice have themselves given rise to uneven development. Others argue that uneven development is a consequence, rather, of the incomplete or incorrect application of development interventions.

This course presents an overview of key theoretical and practical concepts and approaches through the study of the discipline’s seminal texts. It also situates the student (and practitioner) of development within a reflexive context, asking each of you to reflect deeply on two key questions: ‘why am I “doing” development?’ and ‘who am I that I should be able to participate in the world this way?’

Pedagogy

The course presents a series of narrated powerpoints, augmented by relevant readings and the occasional video. A central feature of the course is the weekly group discussions of the assigned material. The readings are not meant to embellish the topic; rather, the readings are intended to be the centre of discussion. Some of the readings are quite old, but they constitute the foundation of the theory and practice (and heated debate) of international development. Students are being asked to focus on the key concepts, theoretical assumptions, and empirical evidence provided by each author. Try to see the world through the author's eyes for these authors have helped shape the world as it is today. As the saying goes, those who ignore the past will be doomed to repeat it.

Intended learning outcomes

This course is designed to provide students with a critical understanding of:

1. The meaning of theory
2. The meaning of development to different people, agencies and cultures
3. The 'nexus' between development theory and practice
4. Interdisciplinary approaches to development practice
5. Key scholars in the field of international development and their philosophical stances
6. The role and scope of different actors in international development practice

Required course texts

There is no required textbook for this course. Readings from journal articles, books, internet sources and newspapers will be assigned on a weekly basis. **All required readings are available under the relevant content page on our uWaterloo LEARN course website.**

Assessment of learning: For details see course website on Learn

| Assignment | Weight % | Due date |
|-------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Research Paper Step 1 | 5% | 4 October |
| Participation | 30% | On-going |
| Research Paper Step 2 | 10% | 1 November |
| Research Paper Step 3 | 35% | 7 December |
| Critical Reflection x 2 | 20% | 13 December |

Late policy: Assignments are to be uploaded to dropbox on the date highlighted above. The penalty for late assignments is 5 % of the total possible mark per day, including weekends and holidays. I will not accept assignments more than 5 days after the due date unless we have a prior arrangement.

When You Cannot Meet a Course Requirement Due to Illness or Other Reasons: There will be no unpenalized extensions on assignments except for illness, severe personal extenuating circumstances, or weather emergencies. When you find yourself unable to meet a course requirement because of medical, compassionate or other reasons, please advise me in writing by ACE email; make sure to include your full name in your message. Where possible, you must contact me in advance of the assignment due

date, but otherwise as soon as possible after the due date. As a rule, you must provide appropriate documentation, for example, a note from your doctor indicating the dates during which you were ill, and describing the severity of your illness. Manage your time carefully. Pressure of work alone is not an acceptable reason for seeking an extension without penalty.

WEEKLY OVERVIEW:

Module 1: What is this course? What is Theory?

E.H. Carr once said, ‘the wish is father to the thought’. What this suggests to me is that theory emerges as a flash of insight derived from a combination of experience and creativity. Theory generally addresses the ‘why?’ question. Very often we know how things happen, but not exactly why. For instance, we know all of the factors that go into making the Earth orbit the Sun, but why is there an Earth and a Sun in the first place? Offering explanations of phenomena such as that is the role of theory. In this first week we will get organized but more importantly we will read my little 7 page paper on theory and discuss it because it is important that we all start off on the same footing. Why? Because it is my theory that an equally well informed class will perform better overall and make the learning experience more enjoyable than an unequally informed class.

Module 2: Theorizing Development

According to Haynes, ‘The study of development has over time involved a focus on various issues, notably political, economic, social and cultural concerns.’ Debates have raged over each of these issues: concerning the appropriate political form (democratic, socialist); economic approach (market-driven or state-led); social balance (on the individual or the collective); and cultural (Western consumption – be it capitalist or communist – and Southern ‘alternative paths’). What do you believe ‘development’ to be? How do you know this to be true? In order to achieve development, one must theorize the steps to be taken. On what basis do you judge your interventions to be appropriate? This week we begin ‘at the beginning’, i.e. with two seminal papers on ‘development’: one by Dudley Seers and one by Amartya Sen.

Module 3: Theorizing Ourselves

‘Development’ is a highly contested term. In particular, where the term suggests a dichotomy – I’m developed; you are less or un or underdeveloped – a value judgement is implied. That is, my way of life is correct while yours is incorrect. If this makes you squeamish, good! I find it odd that it didn’t make the early Western ‘developers’ squeamish at all. Even if we define ‘development’ differently, as a joint effort among groups and individuals to overcome particular challenges, the coming together of differently enabled groups – in terms of skills and resources – sets up a hierarchy or ‘pecking order’ of sorts. When layered with other aspects of ourselves (e.g. race, class, ethnicity, religion, health and physical differences), the encounter can be fraught with difficulties of understanding, meaning and practice. Let us put ‘development practice’ to the side for a moment, and simply ask the question, ‘what does it take

to move through the world on a day to day basis in the body that I inhabit with the values I hold?' As Kermit the Frog once said: 'It's not easy being green.' Reflexivity is an important technique for the development practitioner: understanding yourself, your perspectives, your values and the messages you send out deliberately and accidentally to others as you move through the world each day. This week we will reflect, like Kermit, for clearly it isn't easy being green.

Module 4: Theorizing Engagement: What am I/We doing here?!

Why are you in this class? Is it because you are interested in helping those less fortunate than you? Is it because you are interested in a career in international development? Is it because you are interested in understanding what makes the world 'tick'? Or is it because you are, as Bishop Desmond Tutu described himself, 'a rabble rouser for peace'? Evidence provided by Tiessen and colleagues shows that volunteering can be a useful exercise, both to the volunteer and the host organization. But there are numerous caveats to this observation. This week we will reflect on our own engagement and theorize our practice.

Module 5: Theorizing Gender

Gender matters: make no mistake about it. Of the 1.2 billion people living in extreme poverty, 70% are women; 85 million school-aged girls are deprived of their basic right to education – this is 57% of the children who do not go to school. Women account for 64% of the adults worldwide who cannot read or write; of the 800 million people suffering from malnutrition, the majority are girls under 5 years of age and women who are pregnant or nursing. Globally women lack access to political power, are under-represented in leadership positions in both the private and public sector, and in some places are prohibited from participating fully as 'citizens' of their states either through the denial of the right to drive a car or open and hold a bank account. Such simple things being denied women. Why? But gender is not just about the oppression of women at home, in public, in the workplace. It is also about men – what it means to be 'male' and where 'maleness' places you in the world of development.

Module 6: Theorizing Power - Race/Class/Gender/Age/Caste

Development tends to focus on states and societies; rarely does it look inside of these constructs or consider the construction of the world differently, for example in terms of class, race, sex, age, culture, religion and gender. As we discovered last week, 'gender' is not a stand-alone concept. As COVID-19 illustrates, the most vulnerable people are poor, lower caste women of colour (who may also be in a refugee camp). Intersectionality is an approach which helps us see the links between gender, race, class, age and so on, as well as the ways in which these different aspects of our being may seriously divide us one from another.

Module 7: Theorizing Structure: 'BIG Change' I

Most development theory and practice today revolves around micro-level or meso-level theorizing. For example, 'asset-based community development'. Most of this theorizing takes the larger context as a given, e.g. that all states are agreed on a set of macro-economic practices to ensure economic growth

and stability; that all states have agreed to a process for achieving 'good governance' and creating an 'enabling environment' within which 'development' will then happen. What we need to understand is that this macro context is either assumed (and therefore under-theorized) or contested (but ignored by the mainstream). This week we look at the roots of 'BIG Change' theory through modernization.

Modernization

Samuel Huntington warned that social change creates the potential for social upheaval. Since the 1940s, 'development' has been preoccupied with changing the way some people live, shifting whole societies away from 'backward' to 'progressive' practices. We continue to call this process 'modernization'. Where did this idea come from? And as squeamish as this concept may make you feel, make no mistake, 'modernization' theory is alive and well in the world of development today.

Module 8: Theorizing Structure: 'Big Change' II

Most development theory and practice today revolves around micro-level or meso-level theorizing. For example, 'asset-based community development'. Most of this theorizing takes the larger context as a given, e.g. that all states are agreed on a set of macro-economic practices to ensure economic growth and stability; that all states have agreed to a process for achieving 'good governance' and creating an 'enabling environment' within which 'development' will then happen. What we need to understand is that this macro context is either assumed (and therefore under-theorized) or contested (but ignored by the mainstream). This week we look at the roots of 'BIG Change' theory through dependency/world systems.

Dependency and World Systems

What happened to 'take-off'? asked many scholars of the Global South, when attempts at modernization failed. Dependency theory arose as a reaction to modernization theory and practice and remains very persuasive to many scholars today. A variation on dependency theory, is world systems analysis, which emerged in the early 1970s out of the work of the scholar Immanuel Wallerstein and who introduced the notion of 'long-range cycles of economic growth' in the global capitalist system affecting states organized in terms of core, semi-periphery and periphery. Unlike modernization theory, which combines cultural perspectives of 'underdevelopment' with a great deal of agency, dependency emphasizes global socio-economic and political structures that limit a state's or a community's ability to exercise agency in hopes of attaining self-defined development outcomes.

Module 9: Theorizing the State

(i) the liberal/neo-liberal view

In the early 1970s, the global 'boom' of post-World War II expansion came to a screeching halt. Political economies everywhere were brought to their knees, forcing leaders of states to question the accepted orthodoxy that the key to development was a large and active state structure. So began, through Thatcherism, a multi-decade assault on the state, shifting it from a 'determiner' of development to a 'facilitator' of development. Today, while the examples of East Asia and China suggest that a strong

state remains necessary for development, most observers argue that this must be complemented with good governance.

(ii) the Marxist/neo-Marxist view

All of this talk about the need for deregulation, free markets and so on, has left me wondering about the role of structure in development. Doesn't the Bank place too much emphasis on agency and institutions: if you get the set-up right, then development will follow? It seems to me that we need a counterpoint to the Bank's approach. Why? Because 30 years of structural adjustment has left most parts of the world poorer off than when they were first forced to sign on the Bank/Fund SAP dotted line. But how to show this, rather than just say it? In this week, we focus on the work of the neo-Marxist Robert Cox whose ontological framing of world order yields insights unavailable to liberal theorists of the state.

Module 10: Theorizing Indigeneity in Development

At the heart of modernization is the idea that progress means improving on past practice. To be 'modern', in fact, means to dispose of all of those past practices that held back progress. Development therefore means change and change is difficult but necessary. What this idea legitimated over time was the widespread decimation of indigenous people everywhere. It was called the 'white man's burden' by the British and the 'mission civilatrice' by the French. Dominant ethnic groups within Global South countries have used this narrative to continue this 'low level genocide' through dispossession of land and denial of access to resources. There have been a wide variety of responses from indigenous groups and their supporters today. This week we will theorize 'the indigenous' and indigenous issues in development.

Module 11: Theorizing Democracy and Social Movements

According to an EIU 2018 report, there are only 20 'Full Democracies' in the world. Canada is one of them. The United States is not. It categorizes the U.S. as 'Flawed Democracy' along with 54 other countries. Taken together these 75 countries constitute 47.7% of the countries in the survey. The rest are either 'Hybrid Regimes' or 'Authoritarian' states. Of the 5 indicators of democracy, worldwide the only one said to be 'on the rise' was participation. While orthodox forms of political participation are on the wane, such as joining political parties and voting in elections, unorthodox forms are waxing. If we take a brief survey of the world today, we see protest everywhere. People are mobilizing in their interests, challenging the routines of established authority. What are social movements? Why are they on the rise? What are we to make of them as a political phenomenon?

Module 12: Theorizing the Future

We have had an election in the United States. We are in the midst of a global health crisis. What will the future, near and far, bring to us? On what basis do you make these claims?

PARTICIPATION (30%): Instruction

Participation is essential in an e-course. Class discussions are an important part of this course. Participation will be assessed via the rubric below. The instructor will assess you (20%) and you will assess yourself (10%) based on the criteria set out in the rubric. Before contributing to the discussion topics, please read the following sections.

- Discussion Description and Expectations
- Accessing the Discussion Forum
- Discussion Assessment Rubric
- Discussion Topics

For details on late submissions, read the [Course Policies](#).

Description and Expectations

There are discussion questions for each module related either to the videos for the week or/and to the main topics in the course. These prepared discussion questions give you a chance to reflect on the course material and apply what you have learned but are **meant to function only as starting points for discussion**.

To participate effectively in the discussion students must have done the following:

- Read the assigned readings
- Listened to the prepared lecture
- Watched the video(s) if there is one

The order in which you do these things is not important, although you will find that following the order above will yield the best learning outcomes. After each of these steps, you should prepare discussion notes that include observations regarding the case studies, reflections and critiques of particular perspectives, and no doubt many questions.

Minimum Criteria and Guidelines

Each module requires you to contribute to a discussion by posting once to the discussion and responding to two other posts. Your initial post must be minimum 100 words in length. Your post should move the existing discussion forward in some way. It is preferable for the student to cite course material where applicable, either in the form of 'According to Petch (1986) Belize has a complex history' or as a bracketed reference at the end of a sentence: 'Belize has a complex history (Petch, 1986)'.

You must **post and respond** by the specified deadlines; late posts and responses will not be graded. As stated above, your contribution to each discussion (post and responses) will be graded according to the rubric below. When final marks are calculated, the lowest discussion mark will be dropped and you will receive a final mark out of 20%.

Consult your [Course Schedule](#) for the due dates for each discussion.

Accessing the Discussion Forum

You can access all of the discussion forums by clicking **Connect** and then **Discussions** on the course navigation bar above.

Groups

You will be working in **Weekly Discussion** groups of approximately 10 students. You will remain with the same group throughout the course for the weekly discussions. To find out which **Weekly Discussion** group you are in, click **Connect** and then **Groups** on the course navigation bar. If you are not in a **Weekly Discussion** group by the date specified in the [Course Schedule](#), please contact the instructor at lswatuk@uwaterloo.ca.

Individual Discussion Topics

Module 1 Theorizing theory

Answer the following questions:

- In your estimation, what is the value of 'theory' in development? How convincing is the sustainable livelihoods framework to you?

Module 2 Theorizing Development

Answer the following questions:

- Seers' paper is more than 50 years old. Does it have relevance today? What are the advantages of theorizing development, as does Sen, in terms of 'freedom'?

Module 3 Theorizing ourselves

Answer the following questions:

- Second wave feminists argued that the personal is political. What aspects of your individual identity, if any, are part of a political struggle? How do you reconcile your individual identity with your social identity? Does identity politics help or hinder development practice?

Module 4 Theorizing engagement

Answer the following questions:

- Why are you a student in international development? Reflecting on Tiessen and Huish and their colleagues, discuss your own motivation for engaging internationally.

Module 5 Theorizing gender

Answer the following questions:

- What are the key challenges to gender equality in the world today?

Module 6 Theorizing power

Answer the following questions:

- Race, class, sex, gender, age, caste: we are divided in so many ways. Identity politics seems to push us into separate boxes in support of 'making America great again', or #BLM or #MeToo. Even though you are from a working class background, people tell you that you benefit from 'white privilege'. How to have a fruitful conversation about the intersectional nature of oppression and resistance?

Module 7 Theorizing BIG change - modernization

Answer the following questions:

- Is modernization reconcilable with sustainable development?

Module 8 Theorizing BIG change - dependency and world systems

Answer the following questions:

- Like modernization, 'dependency' theory is regularly declared dead, but still lives on: why is this? What are the advantages to macro theoretical approaches such as 'world systems'?

Module 9 Theorizing the state

Answering the following questions:

- What is the role of the state in development? Which theoretical approach to understanding the state do you find more persuasive and why?

Module 10 Theorizing indigeneity in development

Answer the following questions:

- The place of the indigenous in development seems to have flipped on its head: from object of development to guide for development. What accounts for this shift in perspective? What hope is there for reconciliation in countries with large indigenous populations?

Module 11 Theorizing religion and culture in development

Answer the following question:

- Modernization erases both religion and culture in development. Is there a place for either in development practice?

Module 12 Theorizing the future of development

Answer the following questions:

- We have had an election in the United States. We are in the midst of a pandemic that has had massively uneven impacts. What to do about the state of our world? Can you offer some insights and ways forward?

Please read the **Discussion Rubric** at the end of the syllabus for guidance on best practice in a seminar-style class.

Individual Critical Reflections

Description and Expectations

There are two critical reflections in this course. Each reflection is worth 10%. You can achieve a maximum mark of 20% in total.

Reflections are intended to enable the student to delve deeper into particular topics of interest to her or him, such as Africa in underdevelopment, the rise of the state, Globalization and the NIDL or some other key issue area. Each reflection should be no less than 500 and no more than 750 words, i.e., about the length of an op-ed piece written for a newspaper or a well-written blog posting. Each week, a new issue is presented. At the end of every 6 modules, you will choose one of the issues and prepare a critical reflection based on your choice. You will reflect on the lecture, readings, video, and discussion for each issue. You will then shape your reflection as a type of critical insight into the issue based on these elements adding your own insights as you see fit. It is not necessary to include a bibliography. However, it should be clear to the reader that your insights derive from knowledge gleaned from the sources provided for the chosen module, i.e. readings, videos, discussions, lectures.

Reflection 1

Write a 500-750 word reflection paper on one of the topics from modules 1 - 6.

Reflection 2

Write a 500-750 word reflection paper on one of the topics from modules 7-12.

Presentation and Submission

Reflections should be double-spaced, use 12 point font, and one-inch margins.

The following information should appear in the top-left corner

- your full name
- your student ID number

- the course name and number (Political Economy of Development, INDEV 200)
- the date you are submitting it

Tips

Please have a look at the writing style of

- [George Monbiot](#)
- [Doug Saunders](#), and
- [Jeffrey Simpson](#)

for ideas regarding format of the reflection.

How Your Assignment Will Be Graded

Assessment of the reflection is based on the following criteria:

- Professional presentation
- Substantive content
- Demonstrated ability to integrate information across sources
- Clarity, brevity and relevance of the content (One of the most difficult but important skills for a writer is the ability to say a lot with a limited number of words; in other words, not sacrificing content due to brevity)

How To Submit Your Assignment

Please note that the following instructions pertain to this specific assignment. Instructions for other assignments may differ.

Your critical reflections must be submitted online to the appropriate **Critical Reflection** dropbox by the deadline specified in the Course Schedule. Dropboxes can be accessed by clicking **Submit** and then **Dropbox** on the course navigation bar above.

Your assignment must be submitted in one of the following file types:

- Microsoft Word (DOC or DOCX)
- Rich Text Format (RTF)

Please refer to the [Submitting to a LEARN Dropbox](#) page for general guidelines and how to submit to a dropbox.

For details on late submissions, read the Course and Department Policies.

Essay Step 1 Requirements:

Step 1 (5%): Due 4 October 11:55pm

This first step is designed to help you identify a topic, initiate your research, and delve into it by identifying sources, reading them, thinking about them, and then telling us why you think they will help you in putting your story together. To achieve this, you must do the following:

- Provide a title for your paper;

- Provide a thesis statement regarding the topic;
- Provide a short statement of motivation as to why this topic matters to you;
- List 10 academic sources (i.e. books, peer-reviewed journal articles, government/intergovernmental reports/documents) that you will use in preparing your essay; and
- Write a brief precis -- i.e. 3-5 sentences for each -- explaining the particular value of 3 of these 10 sources: why is it that each of these 3 are particularly useful for your essay?

Essay Step 2 (15%): Due 1 November 11:55pm

The second step is designed to ensure that you have an appropriate structure to your paper, that it flows logically from beginning to end, and that the supporting evidence is appropriate. To achieve this, you must do the following:

- Provide a refined title and thesis statement;
- Provide relevant topic headings (see peer-reviewed journal article structure for ideas);
- Write three or four sentences under each topic heading, outlining what information will appear here and why, citing links to the sources that you will use in gathering the information shown here;
- Provide a refined bibliography

Step 3 (35%): Due 7 December

The third and final step is completion and submission of your policy brief. A first class essay reflects the format of a first-class peer-reviewed journal article. So, look at the format of your favorite article and try to follow that: appropriate title; appropriate headings and sub-headings; well-constructed content that is sufficient in relation to the essay's stated purpose; appropriate use of footnotes or endnotes; a strong bibliography reflecting the depth of research and understanding that you bring to the topic area; an essay free of grammatical errors and errors of style and syntax; something you are proud of and that anyone would enjoy reading. The final paper should be 3500-5000 words (15-10 pages) in length inclusive of bibliography. It should be typed, 1.5 line spaced, 12 point font.

Please see the final policy brief rubric below.

INDEV 404/602 ESSAY RUBRIC FALL 2020

NAME:

MARKED BY:

CONTENT: Value 80%

| VALUE | | 1 INADEQUATE (.30) | 2 GOOD (.60) | 3 VERY GOOD (.75) | 4 EXCELLENT (.85) | 5 OUTSTANDING (.95) |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Argument (5%) | The paper takes a clear position on a well-articulated issue | | | | | |
| Thesis Statement (5%) | The thesis statement is clear and coherent | | | | | |
| Relevance and sufficiency (20%) | The paper focuses on the topic and covers significant areas sufficiently to support the argument | | | | | |
| Analysis (40%) | The analysis is supported by a strong body of evidence | | | | | |
| Clarity (5%) | The argument and analysis are logically laid out and easily followed | | | | | |
| Research (5%) | The paper uses a good variety of academic sources | | | | | |

FORM: Value 20%

| VALUE | | 1 INADEQUATE | 2 GOOD | 3 VERY GOOD | 4 EXCELLENT | 5 OUTSTANDING |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------|--------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| Organisation (5%) | The brief is well-organised in terms of its basic shape, use of headings and sub-headings, use of adequate and proper footnotes or endnotes, and bibliography | | | | | |
| Paragraph construction (5%) | The paper flows smoothly with the argument logically building from beginning to end | | | | | |
| Grammar, spelling, syntax (5%) | The paper is free of errors of grammar, spelling and syntax | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Overall presentation (5%) | The paper's shape and form mirrors research papers as published in scientific journals | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

GRADE:

Discussion Rubric Using Numbered Grading: total marks possible = 20

| Criteria | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Discussion Interaction (how student acts in the discussion forum) | Student interacts with others in a respectful way, supports the views of others, and comments or critiques the ideas of others in a constructive way | Student interacts with others in a respectful way, usually supports the view of others but may have some difficulty when his or her own ideas are challenged | Student interacts with others but not in a respectful way and sometimes attacks others while in discussion | Student participates but interacts with others in a consistently disrespectful way, often argues or attacks others during discussion, and does not respect the ideas of others | Student does not participate at all |
| Conversation Leadership (how student acts as a leader in the discussion forum) | Student usually leads the discussion and encourages others to participate; student provides feedback to others using constructive criticism or questions | Student leads the discussion and encourages others to join the discussion but is not always successful | Student rarely leads discussion and when he or she does lead, the student prefers his or her own views and does not include the views of others | Student follows the discussion but does not lead; student may disrupt conversations or stop the flow of discussion | Student does not participate at all |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Development of Argument or Viewpoint (well-formed and substantiated arguments or positions) | Student's comments or arguments are well formed, logical and always supported by course material; student uses secondary research sources and makes valuable contributions to the course discussion | Student's comments or arguments are well formed, logical and mostly supported by course material; student makes valuable contributions to the course discussion | Student's comments are opinions that are not backed up with evidence from the course; student's comments demonstrate confusion or a misunderstanding of the course material | Student's comments or arguments do not make logical sense and are not backed up with evidence; student criticizes the readings without explaining why; others cannot follow along | Student does not participate at all |
| Discussion Focus (student follows along with the discussion) | Student always follows the discussion, adds valuable information, and keeps the discussion focused on the topic | Student usually follows the discussion, often adds valuable information, usually keeps the discussion focused on the topic, and asks questions when unsure | Student often does not follow the discussion properly and may repeat information already discussed; student rarely adds valuable information | Student participates but does not follow the discussion at all and adds irrelevant information to the discussion | Student does not participate at all |

University policies

Unclaimed assignments: will be retained until one month after term grades become official in Quest. After that time, they will be destroyed in compliance with UW's confidential shredding procedures. Using UW-LEARN course website: See <http://uwace.uwaterloo.ca/> to sign on to UW-ACE. In case of difficulties, contact uwacehelp@ist.uwaterloo.ca.

Academic Integrity: In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo community are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/

All students are encouraged to visit the on-line tutorial at <http://www.lib.uwaterloo.ca/ait/> (see 'Check your understanding') to learn more about what constitutes an academic offence.

Research Ethics: The University of Waterloo requires all research conducted by its students, staff, and faculty which involves humans as participants to undergo prior ethics review and clearance through the Director, Office of Human Research and Animal Care (Office). The ethics review and clearance processes are intended to ensure that projects comply with the Office's Guidelines for Research with Human Participants (Guidelines) as well as those of provincial and federal agencies, and that the safety, rights and welfare of participants are adequately protected. The Guidelines inform researchers about ethical issues and procedures which are of concern when conducting research with humans (e.g. confidentiality, risks and benefits, informed consent process, etc.). If the development of your research proposal consists of research that involves humans as participants, please contact the course instructor for guidance and see <http://iris.uwaterloo.ca/ethics/>

Note for students with disabilities: The Office for Persons with Disabilities (OPD), located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the OPD at the beginning of each academic term.

Religious Observances: Please inform the instructor at the beginning of term if special accommodation needs to be made for religious observances that are not otherwise accounted for in the scheduling of classes and assignments.

Grievance: A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70 – Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4, www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm. When in doubt please contact your Undergraduate Advisor for details.

Discipline: A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offence, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offense, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offenses (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about “rules” for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate Associate Dean. For information on categories of offences and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy 71, Student Discipline, www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm. For typical penalties, check Guidelines for Assessment of Penalties, www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/guidelines/penaltyguidelines.htm

Appeals: A decision made or penalty imposed under Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances (other than a petition) or Policy 71 – (Student Discipline) may be appealed if there is a ground. A student who believes he/she has a ground for an appeal should refer to Policy 72 (Student Appeals) www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm

Strongly recommended sources on writing skills: To further hone your skills, I strongly recommend the two sources below to all students. Writing Effective Essays and Reports, by Rob de Loe (free online resource): http://www.environment.uwaterloo.ca/u/rdeloe/writing_booklet/

Improve your grammar (free online resource): www.grammarbook.com

Consequences of Academic Offences:

Students are expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offenses, and to take responsibility for their actions.

Students who are unsure whether an action constitutes an offense, or who need help in learning how to avoid offenses (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about rules for group work / collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, TA, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate Associate Dean.

For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy #71, Student Academic Discipline, <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm>

Within FES, those committing academic offences (e.g. cheating, plagiarism) will be placed on disciplinary probation and will be subject to penalties which may include a grade of 0 on affected course elements, 0 on the course, suspension, and expulsion.

Students who believe that they have been wrongfully or unjustly penalized have the right to grieve; refer to Policy #70, Student Grievance, <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm>
