

## **PHIL 1012 Participation and Attendance Guidelines**

Attendance and participation grades work on a 5 point system. Unless you have missed class, there is nothing to submit.

If the professor is lecturing and you are attentive but we don't get to much discussion, your score will be a 5. If, during class discussion, you are in class and visibly attentive, you get 3 points. If you contribute to discussion for the day, you will score a 4 or 5. If you are visibly distracted, more engaged with your computer than the class or engaging in side conversations, your score will range from 0-2. Likewise, if you are dominating class discussion, speaking in discussion without having read the day's material, or being intentionally hostile or disrespectful to the community space, your score will be in the 0-2 range. You certainly do not need to speak in class every day to have a good grade in the class. No one should expect to always get a 5, but you will see this accumulate over time in your course grade.

Finally, if you do miss class, this is the place to upload your make-up reading response. The guidelines for make-up responses are below.

### **Reading Response Guidelines (used for making-up absences)**

There are some required reading responses for all students throughout the semester. Students are also able to make up nine absences by writing a reading response to the readings for each class missed. All reading responses need to be turned in through Google Classroom and in MLA format.

Each response should be written for a wider audience than our class. It should paraphrase and summarize the content of the reading with brief citations, providing textual support in MLA format. It should directly identify the main idea or thesis of the reading as you understand it. It often helps to present a theme you noticed in the text and engage with critical readings we cover in class or that you research on your own. It should also record your reflections, opinions, and criticism of the readings through a professional synthesis of concepts presented in the reading while building on previous readings from our class.

By "criticism" I'm not looking for knee-jerk, consumer criticism about whether you liked or disliked the reading, found it challenging or boring or exciting, etc. We are not here to say what the author should have done to make it better or to read as consumers.

While it's okay to write in first-person, you should not narrate your reading with self-referential phrases like "as I was reading, I was reminded of..." or "I was confused when..."

or say how enlightening it was for you – how you'd "never thought of that before," etc. Instead, your criticism should be professionally discursive (and civil). Disagreements are fine. Long, accusatory diatribes are not okay. By "professionally discursive," I mean it should engage with the material we are reading in class and seek to further critical discussions we have been having in class. Responses should illustrate that you have read, engaged with, and tried to understand the text to the best of your abilities. A good way to do this is to employ specific analytical terms that come up in class in your reading.

At the end of each response, you should provide two well-thought discussion questions for class discussions. Go beyond yes/no or taste-based questions about what people liked or disliked. Go beyond overly general questions like, “what did you all think?” Reading response formatting should be used if you are making up an absence.