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Developing Autonomy and Critical Thinking in a Survey of French Literature
Abstract

This portfolio traces the process of the design, teaching methods, and assessment tools I used in my first time teaching a survey of French literature course, FREN 302, or “Representative Authors II.” The primary goal of the course is to introduce students to “masterpieces” of French literature spanning from the Middle Ages to the present. The course is certified for the ACE 5 outcome, which emphasizes the use of analysis and interpretation. My own principal objective for the course, developing student autonomy and critical thinking skills, which intersects with this ACE 5 outcome, is the main focus of this study. Throughout the semester, I attempted to develop these skills through scaffolded activities such as in-class close-readings and small group discussions, short papers with a peer-reviewing element designed to teach students the value of incorporating feedback, and Canvas discussion board participation. This portfolio documents the effectiveness of these teaching methods and evaluates student learning through both qualitative and quantitative analysis. The difficult question I pose at the outset is: what kinds of teaching methods and activities encourage high-level critical engagement and independent thinking? While I might not come to any concrete conclusions, this process did show that there are activities that build upon one another in ways that do facilitate higher-level engagement and increased student autonomy. The process also helped me to reflect upon how I can improve these activities and teaching methods to maximize their potential to contribute to student learning in future iterations of the course.
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I. Objectives of the Peer Review Portfolio

In beginning this project, my primary objective was to understand how I might better be able to encourage critical, autonomous thinking both in and outside of the classroom in a 300-level course that introduces students to French literature. I had been frustrated through previous experience teaching upper-level courses in which students had trouble coming up with original ideas for papers, so I wanted to start developing this skill at a lower level. This is a particularly challenging goal for a class such as French 302, because not only am I expecting students to think at a higher level, but I am also asking them to do so in a second language. Clearly articulating one’s meaning in one’s first language is already quite a bit to ask, so this objective was daunting. The Peer Review Portfolio project was therefore a way to challenge myself to think through how I could achieve this goal, to help students find their critical voices and think independently, and to be motivated to do so. The question I asked myself at the outset was: what kinds of teaching methods and class activities encourage this type of higher-level independent thinking and engagement? I wanted to find strategies that would benefit not only the “ideal” student, the student who comes to class prepared every day having attentively read the day’s reading assignment, but the student who at the beginning of the semester didn’t think they liked literature, and was simply taking the course to fulfill their minor requirement. Even if the student might never study French literature again, I want them to leave my class having understood how to think critically about something, develop their own opinion about it, and be able to articulate their thoughts or arguments clearly to facilitate dialogue in a country (and world!) and political climate in which dialogue and the clear articulation of ideas is becoming increasingly crucial. Another reason I had in choosing this course for the Peer Review Portfolio was that it was my first time teaching this course at UNL, or any introductory survey of literature course, for that matter. I knew that the Peer Review Portfolio would help in the preparation of this course, force me to reflect on my syllabus and choice of course materials well in advance of the Spring semester, and encourage me to reflect more deeply on my teaching methods and goals after completing the semester in a way I might not do if I were not actively recording my experiences and analyzing grade trends.

II. Description of the Course

“Representative Authors II,” or French 302, is an upper-division literature course required of French majors and generally taken to satisfy minor requirements in the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures. Students often take this course following “Representative Authors I,” French 301, but are not necessarily required to take the courses in sequence. Both “Representative Authors” courses are survey courses, with the broad purpose of introducing students to major works (“masterpieces,” as our description in the course catalog defines them) of French and francophone literature from the Middle Ages to the present so that they have a foundational knowledge of how French and francophone literatures have evolved across the centuries. The course therefore has a significant historical component. These two courses also introduce students to the process of literary analysis in French, as they are the first courses
following mostly language, composition, and conversation courses for French majors and minors. The course is heavily reading-based, requiring students to read between 20 to 50 pages per class session in the target language.

In the course description on my syllabus, I indicate that while we examine works of “representative” authors, we also examine works from outside the canon in order to question what it means to say an author is “representative” of a particular time period or literary movement. This is one of the ways in which my teaching of the course differed from the ways in which it has been previously taught. I purposely chose works that were not well known and authors that might not traditionally be considered “representative” or “canonical.” I wanted students to be able to determine whether these lesser-known texts followed literary trends, or if these works defied conventions, so that students might be encouraged to question the canon. (See Appendix: Syllabus)

a. Course Goals

French 302 is a course certified for ACE outcome 5, which emphasizes the use of “knowledge, historical perspectives, analysis, interpretation, critical evaluation, and standards of evidence appropriate to the humanities to address problems and issues.” In my syllabus, I outlined five more specific goals that I hoped my students would achieve by the end of the semester (see Appendix: Syllabus). Specifically, I outlined five goals that students successful in the course would achieve:

1) develop critical thinking skills and the ability to come up with original ideas autonomously
2) gain a broad knowledge on authors and literary movements in France and the French-speaking world from the Middle Ages to the present
3) be able to develop and articulate coherent arguments (theses) with regard to the literature we examine
4) strengthen both oral and written French language skills
5) develop habits of active (or close) reading necessary to literary analysis

In reflecting on my course objectives when developing the syllabus, I realized that I had one over-arching course objective: the development of critical thinking skills. The other, or “secondary,” four goals for the course listed in the syllabus contribute in different ways to this broad, primary first objective. The development of a foundational knowledge of French literature and of the importance of historical context to the study of French literature, the improvement of oral and written language skills (grammar, syntax, vocabulary), and the development of general writing skills (articulating a coherent thesis, writing a well-structured paper) are all secondary goals that contribute to the development of critical thinking and awareness, but these are also the more “concrete” ways in which I can assess student learning and progress toward the overarching goal.

b. Enrollment/Demographics

This course began with 19 students, and all 19 completed the course. One student indicated that he was a heritage speaker of French, while another indicated that he spoke French better than English, although French was not his first language. For the other 17 students, French was their
second or third language. These students were at varying levels of language competency, although they had all completed or were enrolled in the prerequisite of French 204 (French Conversation and Composition II). Only two had previously taken French 301. The course consisted of 9 French majors, 5 French minors, and 5 students who were taking the course to satisfy other requirements. The course was fairly evenly distributed as far as level at the University, with 6 sophomores, 6 juniors, and 7 seniors.

The varying language levels, in addition to the variation in level at the university, of this group of students made teaching this course extremely challenging. While approximately 5 or 6 students felt comfortable speaking in class, many of the students were timid when it came to larger group discussions. I expected this would be the case, and made sure to include small-group discussions every day in order to ensure each student got a chance to speak to their colleagues in the target language.

III. Teaching Methods

a. In-Class Activities and Rationale

“Mini-Lectures”

This course, like all my literature classes, was largely discussion-based. I attempted to include pertinent information via “mini-lectures,” short, 5-minute “bursts” of information interspersed throughout the 50-minute class period, some that included questions so that students can be constantly involved. I occasionally included PowerPoint presentations with photos, information bullets, and discussion questions. I made these PowerPoints available on Canvas after class. The mini-lectures served the purpose of providing students with the information I felt was most relevant to understanding our course material: historical background, dates, political context, and cultural standards of the time-period we were studying. This facilitated students’ achievement of the course objective to “gain a broad knowledge on authors and literary movements in France and the French-speaking world” listed on my syllabus. Students were quite diligent at taking notes during these “mini-lectures,” as they were short and easily digestible spurts of information. These “mini-lectures” generally took place on the first day we began studying a new work of literature or a new time period, during the first five to ten minutes of class, with some “bursts” after other class activities.

Small Group Discussion Activities

My classes consisted of a variety of group work activities. I found that students enjoyed working in groups of 3 or 4 to do close reading activities. These types of activities varied, but an example would be a “speed dating” activity with several important passages from a text. In this activity, students had about 5 or 10 minutes to analyze a passage before moving on to the next one. I used my cell phone alarm to alert them when “time was up” with one passage, which seemed to give them a sense of urgency and excitement to “unravel” the meaning of texts. Another group activity students enjoyed was very challenging but ultimately successful. I cut up a passage from the day’s reading and had students reassemble it based on punctuation, context, and grammar (a verb needed to follow a subject, etc.). This activity targeted many goals, as it
required students to use their dictionaries to look up unfamiliar vocabulary and their knowledge of grammar and syntax. Following the reassembly of the passage, students needed to identify from where in the novel the passage was taken, put it in context, discuss why it was a significant passage and how it could be considered representative of the work as a whole. After small-group activities such as these, we always came together for a larger discussion. I aimed to allow approximately five minutes for this discussion at the end of each class session. In courses taught in English, I might have posed different questions than what students had in their small groups, but since this course was taught in French, I asked questions to which students have already been exposed, so that they had practice articulating their thoughts in the target language before being “put on the spot” in front of a large group. The goal of these small-group discussion activities was to facilitate the achievement of the following course objectives listed on my syllabus: developing critical thinking skills and the ability to come up with good ideas autonomously, developing and articulating coherent arguments, strengthening oral French language skills, and developing habits of active (or close) reading necessary to literary analysis.

As students discussed questions or passages in small groups, I circulated throughout the classroom, listening to students’ discussions and observations. These small-group activities were always successful in meeting at least one course goal, because at the very least, students were using the target language. They were able to use their dictionaries, so they acquired additional vocabulary, they spoke with one another, thus strengthening their language skills, and they were encouraged to come up with original ways of examining the literature being studied. Students were assessed for these in-class activities via course “contribution,” for which I have a guide outlining what I consider good course contribution (See Appendix: Participation Guide). I believe that these in-class small group discussion activities were also essential in helping to develop critical thinking skills, as many of the topics I heard students discussing came up again in either their Canvas discussion board contributions or their written work.

Discussion Leadership Activities

My students were also expected to lead discussion with a partner once throughout the semester. This was an intimidating activity, but it was a great way to ensure active student involvement. Students received a guide detailing expectations for this activity (See Appendix: Discussion Leadership Guide), but the basic idea was that they should furnish questions or a fun creative activity to generate a good discussion. They were expected to lead discussion for about 10 to 15 minutes – and they were made aware that this does not mean they needed to talk or lecture the entire time – they were simply there to facilitate discussion. This was intended to be a way for students to incorporate their creativity, to do outside research, to ensure that the class was student-centered, and to encourage students to actively engage with the course material. I also found that students were much more likely to engage in discussion when their peers were leading discussions, since they have a sense of solidarity with their peers that they don’t with their professor!

In-Class Quizzes

A final in-class activity I had were quizzes, held five times throughout the course of the semester. Most of the quizzes had several multiple-choice questions regarding historical context or rhetorical devices, and were followed by short-answer questions requiring 5-6 sentences of literary analysis (they had a passage to analyze or were asked to come up with an example from
their readings that reflected a major theme). Quizzes lasted approximately 20 to 25 minutes. I often used the questions students furnished from our Canvas discussion board to compile the quizzes. Students voted on the questions they believed would be appropriate. The quizzes were intended to be a way for me to measure their learning of historical context as well as their literary analysis skills.

b. **Course Activities Outside of Class and Rationale**

**Readings**

Students were required to read between 20 and 50 pages of the novels, dialogues, essays, and poetry I selected for the course, prior to each class session. I provided comprehension questions to guide their readings on Canvas. During the first two weeks of the course, I also provided discussion questions that we addressed in class.

**Canvas Discussion Board**

Canvas discussion board participation was also homework, and was to be completed before class on the days on which students were expected to participate (participation was staggered so that every student contributed once a week, but not on the same days – this way our board continually had discussion questions, but not 19 every single day, so that students and myself actually had the time to read the questions and comments). This activity (in principal) ensured that at least one third of the students were completing the readings! I provided students with a discussion board guide, indicating that their questions needed to be substantive. (See Appendix: Canvas Discussion Forum Guidelines)

**Short Papers and Peer-Review of Paper #2**

Students completed three short papers of two to three pages in length, distributed throughout the semester. For the second short paper, students did a peer review on Canvas: they read a paper written by another student in the course and gave them suggestions for corrections or different directions they could take in their papers. They also had the opportunity to give each other feedback on technical writing skills, such as grammar mistakes and vocabulary choices (See Appendix: Guide to Peer-Reviews). I wanted students to learn how to incorporate feedback (mine and their peers) to improve their writing and analytical skills over the course of the semester, and see that they could develop and articulate their own ideas. I also wanted to familiarize students with MLA style and academic writing conventions in preparation for their final paper and for future work they will be doing in upper-level classes (See Appendix: Academic Writing Conventions Guide and Essay Rubric).

**Final Paper (7 – 10 Pages)**

Students turned in a longer final paper of 7 – 10 pages in length. They were required to turn in an outline/rough draft about a week and a half prior to the final paper deadline. I quickly provided feedback so that students had my comments to incorporate during our writing workshop the next class session. As students will be expected to write final papers in almost all of their French courses following 301 and 302, this activity is intended to prepare them for future work, but it was also a way for me to determine whether they met the ultimate objective: could they come up with their own ideas for the final paper, and could they demonstrate original depth of thought?
\section*{c. Illustration of Changes From Previous Sections/Years}

This was the first time I taught FREN 302. The course was taught for many years by one of the most beloved professors in the department, to whom I turned for guidance. I kept two works from his reading list, but changed many others. Rather than teaching 16\textsuperscript{th}-century poetry, I chose to include a dialogue written by a little-known woman writer treating the topic of women’s education, and had students read an essay by Montaigne on the education of children following their reading of the dialogue. I took a risk by teaching a 19\textsuperscript{th}-century decadent novel that was censured at the time for its “pornographic” content, rather than a more typically taught 19\textsuperscript{th}-century novel such as Madame Bovary. Students did read 19\textsuperscript{th} century poetry, however. In terms of activities, I kept the quizzes and final paper that my predecessor included on his syllabi, and I reduced the number of short papers from 5 to 3, since I introduced the Canvas discussion board activity and felt this activity would be more appropriate for my goals for the course (and an adequate replacement for the writing they might “miss” from the additional two papers). I also decided against a final exam, and introduced the discussion leadership activity, as I felt this might better prepare students for the presentations they will need to do in higher-level French courses. After quizzes 1-4, I elicited feedback from students regarding course activities, length of reading assignments, and how they felt about in-class discussions. I used this feedback to help me determine whether to make changes during the course of the semester. I did take out a reading assignment and adjust the syllabus so that we could spend more time on both the first work and the last novel, which were both challenging, and students mentioned they were having trouble completing all the reading. I will be teaching FREN 302 again in Fall 2019, and will use this feedback from students and what I have learned in the Peer Review of Teaching project to modify the course for the next iteration.

\section*{IV. The course and the broader curriculum}

In the French Section of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, most students begin taking language classes at the 100 or 200-levels. These courses focus principally on grammar, vocabulary, and basic cultural knowledge. In FREN 203 and 204, students focus on composition and conversation, and principally work on their writing and oral skills, but they are introduced to short literary texts. Students then enter the 300-level, where they have choices that range from 303 and 304, Advanced Grammar and Composition courses, to FREN 398, a Special Topics course taught in English, whose topic changes depending on the instructor teaching the course (it is generally a literature or culture course). French majors must take FREN 302 as a requirement, while the course is an option for French minors, who must choose 12 hours in French at the 300 or 400-level. Students are usually in their second or third year at the university when they begin taking the 301 and 302 course sequence. Backgrounds vary, as many of our majors are also double-majors, and often they double major in another language, Global Studies, or English. This means that their familiarity with literature and literary analysis varies significantly. An additional challenge is that students’ French language levels vary considerably, as some have spent time in France for study abroad opportunities, and some come straight out of 200-level French language courses with no experience abroad. FREN 301 and 302 lay the foundation for the literary studies aspect of the French major. They are essentially the bridge courses between language acquisition courses and upper-level literature and culture courses.
Ultimately, these courses should prepare students for the higher-level thinking, writing, and discussions they will encounter in the 400-level literature courses required to complete the major. Majors are expected to complete 12 credit-hours of FREN courses at the 400-level, and 6 of those hours must be in literature courses. The 301 and 302 sequence lays the groundwork for these courses, preparing students for presentations, in-class discussions, and research papers written in French.

V. Analysis of Student Learning

a. Overview

Assessing student learning in this course proved difficult, because my primary goal was to foster critical thinking and the formulation of autonomous ideas. How does one assess whether students are thinking critically about a text, or the development of critical thinking skills over the semester? Several of the activities I included in the course were aimed toward this primary goal, such as the discussion board on Canvas. Yet, the method by which I would assess student learning via the Canvas discussion board was not initially apparent to me, as I wanted this activity to be low-pressure for the students, one that would facilitate conversations outside of class, but that would be a comfortable platform in which students could express their opinions. I therefore graded the discussion board principally based on contribution, although the guide I provided more specifically outlined my expectations and enabled me to give students feedback on their discussion board participation (See Appendix: Canvas Discussion Forum Guidelines). It was also very difficult to assess student learning based on their pair discussion leadership activities, and while they were an enjoyable element of the class and I will keep them on the syllabus for the next iteration of the course, I will not use them as a way to measure student learning for this Benchmark Portfolio. I determined at the outset of this project that I would use the 5 short quizzes, the 3 short papers, and the final paper for the assessment of student learning.

b. Quizzes

Four of the five quizzes I gave throughout the semester had multiple-choice questions regarding the historical context of the time periods in which the works of fiction we read were published. The final quiz did not include multiple-choice questions at all, but simply short answer questions. I wanted to assess whether students were taking into account that historical context, while not always the most essential element to our understanding of a work’s meaning, is indeed important and often does shape our understanding of an author’s message or of political and social debates taking place at a particular moment in history. I also asked multiple-choice questions regarding figures of style (for example, I asked students to identify examples of personification or metaphors). All the information on which I quizzed students was included in the PowerPoints I provided in class and then later posted on Canvas. The short answer portion of the quizzes were intended to assess students’ abilities to think quickly about a particular passage or theme and write something substantive about it. I took into consideration that students had only 20 to 25 minutes to complete the quizzes, and I let them know that spelling and grammar errors were not going to hinder a good score, if their thoughts were clear. I did emphasize that they write complete sentences, however! It is worthwhile to note that students voted on their short response quiz questions, so they were aware ahead of time about possible questions. All five quizzes
together made up only 10% of the final grade. Below I have compiled the collective quiz grades of students who consistently scored high, middle, and low scores, and one student who showed a marked increase in her scores over the course of the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Quiz 1 (10 points possible)</th>
<th>Quiz 2</th>
<th>Quiz 3</th>
<th>Quiz 4</th>
<th>Quiz 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madalyne</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students like Madalyne, who had consistently high scores, rarely missed a multiple-choice question, and consistently answered the short-answer questions in complete sentences, with few errors to hinder my understanding of their answers, and with specific examples from the texts. Students like Student A might miss one or two multiple-choice answers or respond to the short-answer portion of the quiz with a few sentence fragments, and did not use specific examples from the text to support their argument or claim. Students who received low scores did not do well on the multiple-choice portion of the quizzes, and/or they responded inadequately in the short answer portion that asked for complete sentences and specific examples. On Quiz 1, for example, the short answer prompt was: “In 5 or 6 complete sentences, explain how _Le Chevalier au Lion_ is a paradoxical text. Use specific examples.” (See Appendix: Examples of Quizzes) Madalyne discussed several specific examples from the text, but confused the notions of “paradox” and “conflict” slightly. Student A missed two multiple-choice questions, but responded very well in the short answer portion, using specific examples and complete sentences. Student B did not use complete sentences, provided a bullet-point like list of examples, and did not explain how they viewed them as examples of a paradox in the text. Kendall used quite a bit of English in her short answer, and her answer was in fact quite short, with vague statements such as “He is a knight in more than one sense of the word.” I circled the parts of the prompts for students that indicated they needed specific examples or complete sentences, and gave them brief feedback so that they could prepare adequately for the next quiz. While the four students whose quizzes I’ve chosen to analyze here showed improvement in the next quiz, the average quiz score for Quiz 2 dropped slightly, which indicated that I needed to provide a bit more detailed feedback on Quiz 2. Scores then increased for Quizzes 3 and 4, and slightly decreased for Quiz 5 (See Appendix: Quiz Scores). Thus, while I recognize that there were problems with the way I structured the quizzes (which I will address in the planned changes portion of this portfolio), I do find that the short answer portion of the quizzes was an effective way to assess student learning. I believe that most students did learn from the feedback I provided them on this portion, while I’m skeptical that the multiple-choice portion contributed to any significant retention of information.
c. Short Papers

For the first short paper, I gave students five prompts from which to choose, showed them where to find my essay grading rubric on Canvas, and emphasized that I was not necessarily concerned about grammar (unless it severely limited my comprehension of their essays) but more about how they analyzed the primary sources. I let them know they did not need to have secondary sources for these short papers, and that I wanted to see their original ideas on the novels we were reading. For the second set of short papers, I did not provide a prompt – I asked students to come up with their own topics and their own thesis statements. The second set of short papers were also exchanged with peers (anonymously). I gave students guidelines about how to give their peers constructive feedback regarding writing a clear thesis statement, and how to effectively organize a paper so that there is a thread to the paper’s argument (See Appendix: Guide to Peer Reviews). Students were also graded on their own feedback. Students were then to turn in a revised version of their second short paper. Finally, paper #3 received the least guidance. I asked students to develop their own topics and thesis statements, and to incorporate the feedback they had received from me over the course of the semester, as well as the feedback from their peer reviewed papers. I have included here the grade statistics for all three short papers:

![Grade statistics for: Paper #1](image)

- **Average Score:** 89.92
- **High Score:** 95
- **Low Score:** 75
- **Total Graded Submissions:** 19 submissions

Note: The low score for this paper was due to a student turning in their paper very late. I might have been too generous, but it was a well-written paper that would have earned a B-range score had it not been late.
Note: One student did not turn in this paper. The low score for papers actually turned in was a 75, making the average score (out of 18 papers) an 86.67 (B).

Note: One student did not turn in this paper. The low score for papers actually submitted was a 77, making the average score (out of 18) an 87.78 (B+).

Students performed better on the first paper than on the second two. I believe this can be attributed to the fact that I gave them prompts for this first paper, and I was slightly more generous in my grading, given that this was the first time for many of them to write a literary analysis in French. Below I compare students who received high, middle, and low scores consistently on all three short papers.
I want to look more closely at Paper #2, because I find it interesting that as a trend, students did not do as well on the paper they had peer reviewed as they did on the other two papers.

Tara

Tara’s second short paper had few language errors, generally followed MLA formatting properly, and used citations in the proper context to back up the claims she made throughout the paper. She had a clear, arguable thesis, and her paper followed a logical and progressive structure. These were all criteria that I have listed in my rubric as qualities that merit an “A” range grade. The principal reason for the “-” was a lack of motive – the “so what?” of the paper. Tara had received helpful feedback from her peer reviewer, who noted that her thesis was clear but that she needed some better transitional sentences between paragraphs to lend to a better structure. She did, indeed, use this advice, which contributed to the good organization of the paper. In my feedback on the post-peer reviewed version of the paper, I said (here I paraphrase and translate from the French): “It would be interesting to talk about why this approach is useful to our understanding of this text. So, for next, time, think about your motive – why are you reading or interpreting the text this way?” In the following paper, Tara heeded my advice. Her paper had an interesting, clear thesis statement and she reiterated her motive, which she established in her introduction, throughout the paper. To me, this indicated that she had learned to articulate her original thoughts.

Student C

Student C’s second paper had quite a few grammatical and vocabulary errors, formatting issues, and vague, unsupported statements. The peer-reviewer did let Student C know that they needed more specific examples to support their claims, and asked them for further explanation of their meaning at several points. In reviewing my feedback on the final version, I note that I highlighted many areas asking for more specificity or support. In my comments, I wrote that Student C had chosen a good, interesting theme, but that their thesis statement was vague and that they needed to flesh out their motive a little better to explain why they found it revelatory to compare the two texts they compared (they explored the notion of amorous love and platonic love in two texts written by women of the 16th and 17th centuries). These types of remarks remained consistent in the next short paper (and in their final paper): the topic they explore is interesting, but they make vague, unsupported statements rendering it difficult to determine what the argument is. Student C’s writing did improve over the course of the semester, but they continued to demonstrate trouble with specificity. This student did come to see me in my office to discuss how to avoid generalities, so I know they were making an effort to improve and that they were taking feedback into consideration, it was just a matter of execution. Despite the vague statements, I was pleased to see that this student gradually started formulating original ideas.
Student B

This student, although having noted that they spoke French better than English, had a terribly difficult time with writing. In their first paper, they did not use complete sentences, inserted aleatory citations, and summarized rather than analyzed the text. Yet, they had a clear thesis statement and some very interesting ideas, which I found merited a B-. The student’s second paper, however, was largely summary and lacked a clear argument. The peer-reviewer did let this student know that they needed more specific examples from the text, and commented on spelling and grammatical errors, but gave some suggestions that I would not have given (such as bringing in outside sources – on a 2-3 page paper, I wanted students to focus on their own ideas and not rely on those of others). My feedback on the final version of Paper #2 was largely focused on a lack of coherent thesis, a lack of support, and the fact that the student summarized rather than analyzed, much like my comments on their first paper. I also encouraged this student to ensure that their sentences were complete, and that they explained the citations they did use. The lack of consideration of my feedback from the first paper, as well as the lack of consideration of the peer-reviewer’s comments, led to the lower score. This student’s Paper #3 received similar criticism: there was a lack of support and still quite a bit of summary, but there was a clear thesis, and much fewer structural issues. The reliance on summary, however, showed me that this student had trouble articulating their own ideas (or perhaps did not want to put in the effort).

d. Final Papers

The final, 7-10-page research paper was intended to be a demonstration of the culmination of students’ learning over the semester. I was not surprised to see that students performed fairly consistently with regard to which students received A, B, or C-range grades. I did note that the average score was in general consistent with or lower than the cumulative short paper grades (see below, where I compare discussion board grades with the short papers and the final papers). The average score on the final papers was an 87.76 (B+). The highest score was a 95% (A) (two students wrote excellent papers), and the low score was a 76% (C). Before students submitted their final papers, I had them submit a rough draft to me, and told them a list of secondary sources would be useful, as well. On the Friday before their rough drafts were due, I showed them how to find appropriate secondary sources through the library’s database.

Tara, who performed very well throughout the semester, received an A. Her paper was beautifully written in a sophisticated tone, and consisted of interesting interpretations, a clear thesis statement, and she included appropriate academic secondary sources. She had incorporated my feedback on her rough draft and from previous assignments, and demonstrated original depth of thought.

Student C, too, was consistent with their previous performance on short papers. They received a B- due to their choices of inappropriate secondary sources (blogs), quotes taken out of context, and an inconsistently argued thesis.

Student B also performed consistently with his previous work, meriting a C-range paper. The paper was short and sloppily written, and contained principally summary. The student also relied heavily on only one secondary source, and did not include their own opinions on the work they analyzed. I was disappointed with the lack of originality in this students’ papers, despite my
efforts to encourage Student B to come up with their own ideas. I see that it is not always possible to instill in students the level of motivation I wish they all had. It is noteworthy that this student frequently asked me for more guidance, and was very frustrated when I did not provide prompts and told them it was up to them to come up with their own topic.

e. Discussion Board v. Short Paper Grades v. Final Paper Grades

While I mentioned above that the Canvas discussion board activity challenged me when thinking about assessing student learning, I realized when calculating final grades and doing the analysis for the Benchmark Portfolio that the discussion board correlates in an interesting way to student performance on short papers and final papers. Students were principally graded according to participation and not necessarily on their interpretations on the discussion board. What the comparison of grades below shows me, therefore, is that more engaged student participation on the Canvas discussion board contributed to higher scores on both the short papers and the final papers. When students had practice articulating their ideas, this contributed to better articulated ideas in their written work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Board</th>
<th>Short Papers</th>
<th>Final Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.00% of grade</td>
<td>20.00% of grade</td>
<td>15.00% of grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>86.41%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.13%</td>
<td>87.03%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.25%</td>
<td>93.44%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.75%</td>
<td>35.47%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.25%</td>
<td>89.53%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.21%</td>
<td>86.72%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.88%</td>
<td>89.53%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.13%</td>
<td>92.81%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>82.34%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.19%</td>
<td>93.44%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.44%</td>
<td>80.78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.18%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>87.19%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.25%</td>
<td>89.06%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93.13%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94.38%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.63%</td>
<td>90.16%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.75%</td>
<td>79.64%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85.47%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I assessed discussion board participation 4 times throughout the course of the semester. The scoring shown here is the cumulative discussion board score. The short paper column is also cumulative, and the final paper comprises both the rough draft and the final version of the paper.
VI. Planned Changes

Changes to Course Content

The main purpose of FREN 302 is to introduce students to a wide variety of texts spanning across centuries of French literature, which makes selecting texts for this course a bit overwhelming. A debate I often find myself facing, as this is a survey course, is whether to provide excerpts from major works or have students read entire novels. After completing this first iteration of the course, I have determined that a combination of entire novels and excerpts is probably the best course of action, and I will change some of the texts. Students complained that the first work we read, Le Chevalier au Lion, an Arthurian legend written in the Middle Ages, was too long. They also became frustrated with the 19th-century novel we read, Monsieur Vénus: Roman matérialiste, due to its complicated vocabulary (although they all seemed to enjoy the plot and the discussions we had about the inversion of gender roles in this scandalous novel). The final novel we read, L’Exil selon Julia, was also much more difficult for students than I expected. I plan on selecting another one of the same authors’ novels that is a lot simpler to follow. As this is an introductory survey and my course goals are oriented more toward fostering critical thinking, I believe that taking the challenge away from the reading portion of the course will allow students to dedicate more time to their literary analyses and to developing coherent arguments.

Activity Changes

Overall, I was dissatisfied with the quizzes. While I was generous with grades, I realize that this was because I recognized several problems in the quizzes themselves: the multiple-choice questions regarding historical context and rhetorical devices were ineffective, as students demonstrated in later papers that they had not retained the information I expected them to retain (many of them confused the Middle Ages with the Renaissance, for example). Furthermore, I found that I did not continue to emphasize the use of rhetorical devices throughout the semester, unless we examined poetry. I need to reflect on a better way to deliver this information, as much of it was delivered in mini-lecture form. The short-answer portion of the quizzes could have been more effective if the students had a bit more time and perhaps a bit more direction. For example, I should have placed more emphasis on using specific examples from the texts. Using the students’ discussion board questions was a fun way to link the two activities, and I think students appreciated knowing that their questions were interesting enough to furnish quiz questions, but as a whole the quizzes did not feel like an effective use of class time. I plan on removing the quizzes from the syllabus, and perhaps replacing them with in-class free-writes, which would be more aligned with my principal course objective. How I might assess these free-writes is a question I’ll need to consider for the next iteration of the course. Another option I might consider is having a mid-term and final “scavenger hunt” exam, in which students (with a partner) will need to answer questions regarding historical context and literary devices to move on to the next questions, or clues, in order to complete the exam. I plan to keep the other assignments, and students seemed to enjoy my teaching methods and in-class activities (close-reading activities such as speed-dating with passages from the texts, mapping out relationships between characters on the white board, discussing straightforward questions in small groups). Discussions following small-group activities were always productive and lively, and the feedback I solicited from
students throughout the semester indicates that these small-group discussions lowered students’ affective filters, making them feel more comfortable to speak in French.

I would also like to make a few changes to my rubrics (or, more accurately, guidelines or expectations) for both the short essays and the final paper. I want to emphasize that in the second paper, students should show they have read my feedback from the first paper, and that these are not papers in which we talk about how a book made us feel, but rather what is interesting and revelatory about the text. They also need more work choosing acceptable secondary sources. I was surprised to see students use the Huffington Post as a resource after I had discussed appropriate secondary sources in class! This shows me that I need to address this earlier in the semester, and perhaps have students write somewhat longer “short” papers with the incorporation of proper secondary sources. I might also consider moving the writing workshop to an earlier point in the semester, and focus on workshops of a short paper in lieu of the final paper, thus giving students some practice looking for the kinds of problems they have in their writing.

**Emphasis Changes**

As I analyzed my evidence of student learning for this Benchmark Portfolio, I realized that the discussion board activity I assigned had an interesting impact on student learning: as a trend, students who participated consistently on our discussion board wrote better papers. I had a tumultuous relationship with this board: it was difficult to grade, students sometimes posted superficial questions that did not facilitate interesting discussions, and several students did not take it seriously. On the other hand, many students contributed thrilling and thought-provoking questions and interpretations, and inspired fantastic discussions both on the board and in class. This was also a great way to launch some in-class discussions, and a way for me to incorporate students’ original thoughts into the course, contributing to my goal of developing autonomous critical thinkers. I am therefore going to emphasize participation on the discussion board for the next iteration of the course, perhaps by putting higher stakes on it (weighting it more heavily). I do want to find a better way of assessing this activity, as going through comments is cumbersome and time-consuming. I plan on speaking to our tech support to figure out a better way of keeping track of student participation on the board.

Another activity I realized I need to emphasize and refine is the peer-review of the short paper. When I solicited feedback from students following this activity, many of them mentioned that their peer reviewer’s feedback was not necessarily the helpful part of the activity. Rather, the process of going through another person’s paper looking for items like clear thesis statements, a motive, the proper incorporation of appropriate citations that support the claims made, enabled them to more readily find problems in their own papers. There were a few difficulties with this activity, however: some students did not take it seriously and gave unhelpful remarks (one student commented that her peer-reviewer was “mean”) or only highlighted grammatical errors versus giving content-based suggestions. Some students did not turn in a complete enough first draft of their second paper to give their peer-reviewers enough material to review, and some students gave misguided suggestions. Students who received better quality feedback ultimately had better scores on their revisions to Paper 2, which made grading these papers feel a bit unfair (I did take this into account as I graded, however). To combat these problems in the future, I will insist that students use the table I provide in the Peer-Review of Short Papers Guidelines (See Appendix: Guide to Peer Reviews). I might also be able to connect this activity to the writing
workshop, which I now plan to have earlier in the semester. Perhaps having students work on their peer reviews as a part of the writing workshop will produce better feedback on the reviewer’s end, and the better incorporation of that feedback on the writer’s end (See Appendix: Excerpts from Student Check-Ins on Peer-Reviewed Paper).

VII. **Summary and Overall Assessment of Portfolio Process**

Each step of the process of creating the Peer Review Portfolio has impacted the way I think about teaching. At the outset, using the “backward design,” setting my goals or intentions for the course and for what I ultimately wanted students coming away having learned before even thinking about course materials or the syllabus, made me think more intentionally and more explicitly about what my in-class and out-of-class activities actually do. This initial step also revealed that I had a large set of goals that was overwhelming, and that I needed to narrow these down so that my principal goal was achievable. I realized that I could have “mini goals” that would point to this principal goal, but on which I did not need to place as much focus. This step also helped me distinguish my own objectives for student learning from the broader course goals in relation to the curriculum, as well as from the set of objectives I include on the syllabus. Creating the framework table helped me envision in more concrete terms how my activities and assignments would enable me to achieve specific course objectives. I plan to be much more deliberate about articulating these goals (even if just to myself) in the future.

This process also changed the way I incorporate student feedback throughout the semester. In previous courses I’ve done mid-term “check-ins,” where I’ve asked students to anonymously comment on the course, on activities, on the way they feel in-class discussions were going, etc. Generally I try to incorporate this feedback and make any reasonable changes, but often at mid-semester it is too late. For this course, however, because I was intentionally recording as much data as I could for this process, I solicited feedback four times on the back of students’ quizzes, which proved immensely beneficial. I learned very quickly that some students were feeling overwhelmed by the amount of reading they were doing, or intimated by the higher levels of some of their classmates, or that they really appreciated the PowerPoints I provided on Canvas. I plan on continuing these types of check-ins in all my future courses.

Finally, the analysis portion of this process was more revelatory than I had anticipated. While I was unsurprised that students who began with high-level skills (both language and critical thinking) finished the course with the higher grades, and vice versa, the data analysis showed me to what extent my activities were interconnected. I found that all of my activities built on one another, which I certainly intended, but perhaps had not systematically planned. When I decided to use the Canvas discussion board as an activity, I thought about it in a strategic way: it would help students practice their writing, engage outside of class, it would force them to do their reading, and think about what kinds of questions provoke interesting conversations or debates. It would also be a place where more timid students could articulate their thoughts. I did not think that this activity would reveal so much about student performance on short papers and the final paper, however! Analyzing the data also revealed to me areas where I need to think through and refine activities and my guidelines a little better, such as the peer-review of a short paper. A firm structure and more detailed guidelines, paradoxically, are more necessary to the development of critical, autonomous thinking than I initially thought. Students need to have a scaffolded set of
activities that lead them through the process, so that ultimately, they can come up with creative ideas on their own.

Overall, this process has made me much more reflective and deliberate about my course design, my objectives, my teaching methods, and the activities I select that will hopefully lead to a better learning experience for my students. Participating in the retreats and listening to how others confront challenges in the classroom was useful, and helped me to develop ideas and strategies to combat similar challenges. Most importantly, I am encouraged by the realization that my activities are interconnected in ways I didn’t previously put together. I hope to draw this out more purposefully in the future so that my students might better understand why we do what we do, and how each step or activity over the course of the semester is intended to move them toward becoming critical, autonomous thinkers.
REPRESENTATIVE AUTHORS

FREN 302 | M/W/F 10:30am - 11:20am | OTHM 105

Course Description
This course is the second in a sequence of two literature survey courses whose main objective is to familiarize you with the literature of representative authors of the French canon. In this course, we will examine the “canon,” but we will also question it by studying some works of authors from “outside” the canon. We will read works of authors from the Middle Ages to the contemporary period, with a focus on the narrative form of the novel, and glimpses into poetry, essays, and short fiction. Ultimately, we will ask questions such as: “What is a representative author? What kinds of trends in literature can be associated with particular historical periods? What does it mean to be considered a part of the canon?”

Required Texts
The works on this list are available at the university bookstore or online at amazon.com. Additional required readings are also available in PDF format on our course Canvas site. Please ensure that you have acquired all of the materials on this list before mid-semester.

Madame de Lafayette, La Princesse de Clèves ISBN: 9782070414437
Voltaire, Candide ISBN: 9782035866011
Monsieur Vénus ISBN: 9780873529297
Camus, L’étranger ISBN: 9782070360024

Dr. Julia Frengs
1128 Oldfather Hall  jfrengs2@unl.edu
Office hours:
Monday and Wednesday: 1:30 - 3pm
Tuesday: 3 - 4pm
or by appointment
Assignments and Grading

1. Contribution (Participation) 15%
2. Canvas discussion board 15%
3. Discussion leadership (in partners) 15%
4. Short papers (x3) 20%
5. Peer-review of short paper 10%
6. Quizzes 10%
7. Final paper 15%

Grading Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93 - 100%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 92%</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 - 89%</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 - 87%</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 82%</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 - 79%</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 - 77%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 72%</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 - 69%</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 - 67%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 62%</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 59</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Objectives

This course has been certified for **ACE outcome 5**: it seeks to teach you to use knowledge, historical perspectives, analysis, interpretation, critical evaluation, and standards of evidence appropriate to the humanities to address problems and issues. In addition, students who succeed in this course will:

* develop critical thinking skills and the ability to come up with original ideas autonomously
* gain a broad knowledge on authors and literary movements in France and the French-speaking world from the Middle Ages to the present
* be able to develop and articulate coherent arguments (theses) with regard to the literature we examine
* strengthen both oral and written French language skills
* develop habits of active (or close) reading necessary to literary analysis
Course Contribution (Preparation, Participation, and Absences)

Active and conscientious participation in class discussion is essential to your success in this course. The care of your preparation will be assessed primarily through the consistency and quality of your participation in class discussions. When you arrive in class, you should have a good understanding of the required reading(s) for that day, be ready to signal passages that you would like to discuss, and/or ask thoughtful questions with regard to our readings. You will also be asked to prepare short close-reading assignments to hand in (either individually or in groups, sometimes in class, sometimes to prepare as homework), which will be included in your participation grade. Please refer to the “Participation Guide” included on our Canvas page for more detailed information regarding my assessment of your contribution.¹

French Section Absence Policy

There are occasionally valid reasons to miss class: illness, family emergency, religious observances, natural disasters, revolutions, etc. These types of absences are discretionary. Excused absences are University obligations, sports, and field trips. If you have a valid reason for missing class (discretionary or excused), please communicate this to me beforehand and, if you hope for this absence to be excused, please provide a note from the relevant professor or physician. You have 3 discretionary absences. For each absence in excess of three, 1% will be deducted off the top of the final grade until the tally reaches nine, the equivalent of three full weeks of class. If the total number of unexcused absences exceeds this limit, you will incur an automatic failing grade in the course.

Tardiness also counts - 3 tardies will equate to one absence. Regardless of your reason for missing class, you are always responsible for obtaining notes, handouts, and assignments from a classmate.

Canvas Discussion Board

On our course Canvas page, there is a discussion forum. In the beginning of the course, I will ask questions to which you will respond on the discussion forum. As the semester goes on, you will become responsible for posing questions or making observations about our course readings, to which your peers will respond. I expect you to engage with each other and with me on this forum! This means that you will be expected to ask and respond to questions in ways that you think will continue or extend the conversation or provoke reflection on the works we are reading. You will be expected to post a question once a week, and respond to a peer’s question once a week. We will work out a schedule of postings during the second week of the semester.

¹ Participation/contribution will be graded at the end of the semester. If you would like to inquire about your participation at any time, please feel free to do so.
**Discussion Leadership**

With a partner, you will be responsible for leading a small portion of our class one day of the semester. You can choose how you would like to do this: you might select a passage or two from the text we are reading that you find particularly interesting and that you would like to analyse in-depth, or you might pose some questions to your classmates that you think will generate good discussions. This discussion leadership activity should last about 10 - 15 minutes. More information regarding assessment of this activity can be found on Canvas.

**Short Papers**

Throughout the semester, you will be expected to write three 2-3 page papers. These should be literary analyses, and can be about any text that we will have read up until the due date for the paper. In fact, you are welcome to turn in your papers earlier than the due date - as long as I have them by the date listed on the syllabus. For the first paper, you will receive a writing prompt. For the final two short papers, you will be expected to come up with your own ideas for a topic. Part of our work as literary analysts is to come up with good, original ideas on our own! Plus, you all are much more creative than I am. Short papers should follow MLA formatting guidelines - i.e., they should be double-spaced throughout, 12pt Times New Roman font, and have a list of references. A guide to writing academic papers can be found on our Canvas page.

**Peer Review of Short Paper #2**

You will be submitting your second short paper to both myself and to a peer reviewer, so that you can help each other improve your papers. In other words, you’ll be exchanging papers with a partner and helping your partner revise their paper, while your partner helps you revise yours. You’ll be looking over each others’ papers for grammar and vocabulary errors, for ways they could make their sentences clearer, and for structural or organizational issues. You’ll also be looking for ways to make your theses clearer and stronger, and for citations that support the claims you make. You will submit your feedback to me, I will return your papers with your reviewers’ comments, and you will have the chance to revise the paper before turning it in for a grade. The purpose of this activity is to help you develop ways to provide constructive criticism and useful feedback, to think through how arguments are structured and how to best articulate ideas in ways that are meaningful to others. This activity should help improve your writing skills, as well!

**Deadlines are final and non-negotiable, for the sanity of all parties involved! Any truly exceptional cases must be communicated in advance. Assignments must be submitted correctly (please do not submit PDFs) and on time to receive credit. Assignments turned in within 24 hours after the deadline will lose half a letter grade. Beyond that, assignments will lose a letter grade per day late.**
**Quizzes**

Over the course of the semester, you will have occasional quizzes on the course reading material. You will be in charge of the material on these quizzes by furnishing questions for our Canvas discussion board! Before a quiz, I will ask you to vote on questions from our discussion board that you believe will make good quiz questions.

**Final Paper**

Your final paper will be between 7 and 10 pages long, and will treat a topic of your choice with regard to the literature we have examined throughout the semester (remember, coming up with good ideas on your own is part of academic work! Don’t expect me to come up with ideas for you. I would be happy to discuss your ideas, however). You should prepare a **rough draft** of this paper, **due on Monday, April 23rd**. The rough draft should include, at minimum, an introduction and an outline, and will comprise 5% of your final paper grade. The following Wednesday, we will workshop your rough drafts in class.

**Accommodations**

Students with disabilities are encouraged to contact me for a confidential discussion of their individual needs for academic accommodation as determined by Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD). This includes students with mental health disabilities like depression and anxiety. It is the policy of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to provide individualized accommodations to students with documented disabilities that may affect their ability to fully participate in course activities or to meet course requirements. To receive accommodation services, students must be registered with SSD which is located in 232 Canfield Administration (472-3787).

**Academic Honesty**

The work that you do in this course should be entirely your own, unless collective work is clearly indicated in the assignment. Please cite your sources scrupulously, not only in citations and in paraphrasing, but also any information that is not of general knowledge, whatever the work may be. If you have any questions whatsoever regarding plagiarism/academic honesty/reliable sources, please do not hesitate to consult your professor. For further information, please consult the Student Code of Conduct: [http://stuafs.unl.edu/dos/code](http://stuafs.unl.edu/dos/code)

---

You will receive 5 bonus points, to be added to an assignment of your choice at the end of the semester, if you take the time to write me a short email with a list of 3 important items (perhaps regarding to whom you should speak about obtaining notes from a missed class, or late assignments) from this syllabus. The email must arrive before January 9.
Communication

I am always happy to have students visit during my **office hours (Mondays and Wednesdays from 1:30pm until 3pm, Tuesdays from 3-4pm)** or by appointment. Please come see me if you have any hesitations, questions, needs for clarification regarding assignments (after carefully reading the syllabus and other course materials, of course!), etc. During the week I check my email fairly regularly between 8am and 5pm. Please keep this timetable in mind when expecting a response. Do not expect quick responses to emails sent after 5pm, or between Friday at 5pm and Monday at 8am. Please remember to treat email as a formal means of communication with your professor, one that demands courtesy and respect. Use proper salutations, forms of address, punctuation, grammar, and syntax. I may not respond if you address me with “hey,” not at all, or if your email is impolite.

**Our Class Cell Phone and Laptop Policy**

As a class, we have agreed to keep each other accountable. Cell phones and laptops are permitted in class, provided they are used for the purpose of taking notes or using dictionary apps such as WordReference or the Larousse dictionary (Google Translate should be avoided!). If you see a colleague using a laptop or cell phone to look on Facebook, to do work for other classes, or to do something that distracts attention away from our classroom activities, you are permitted to call that classmate out! This will affect participation grades.

**Course Schedule**

This schedule is subject to change with notice. Readings are to be completed for class on the day on which they are listed. Please bring your reading material to class!!!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Readings (to be done BEFORE class)</th>
<th>In-class activities/due dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, January 8</td>
<td>Le Chevalier au Lion 51 - 61 (N.B. - only read the right-hand pages!)</td>
<td>Introduction au cours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, January 10</td>
<td>Le Chevalier au Lion 61 - 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, January 12</td>
<td>Le Chevalier au Lion 61 - 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, January 15</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Day</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, January 17</td>
<td>Le Chevalier au Lion 123 - 193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, January 19</td>
<td>Le Chevalier au Lion 195 - 263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, January 22</td>
<td>Le Chevalier au Lion 263 - 333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, January 24</td>
<td>Le Chevalier au Lion 333 - 403</td>
<td>Discussion Leaders: Keeleigh et Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Readings (to be done BEFORE class)</td>
<td>In-class activities/due dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, January 26</td>
<td>Le Chevalier au Lion 403 - 471</td>
<td>Quiz #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, January 29</td>
<td>Catherine des Roches, Dialogue d’Iris et Pasithée (on Canvas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, January 31</td>
<td>des Roches, cont.</td>
<td>Discussion Leaders: Lexie et Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 2</td>
<td>Montaigne, Essais, “De l’institution des enfants” (excerpts on Canvas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 5</td>
<td>La Princesse de Clèves Première Partie (p.35 - 71)</td>
<td>Short Paper #1 Due (on Canvas, no PDFs!!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 7</td>
<td>La Princesse de Clèves Première Partie (p.71 - 92)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 9</td>
<td>No class - Prof. Frengs has a conference!</td>
<td>No class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 12</td>
<td>La Princesse de Clèves Deuxième Partie</td>
<td>Discussion Leaders: Hannah et Madalyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 14</td>
<td>La Princesse de Clèves Troisième Partie (p.146 - 171)</td>
<td>Quiz #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 16</td>
<td>La Princesse de Clèves Troisième Partie (p.171 - 199)</td>
<td>Discussion Leaders: Mikayla et Kendall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 19</td>
<td>La Princesse de Clèves Quatrième Partie (p.200 - 229)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 21</td>
<td>La Princesse de Clèves Quatrième Partie (p.229 - 252)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 23</td>
<td>Candide, Chapters 1 - 8</td>
<td>Discussion Leaders: Quinlan et Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 26</td>
<td>Candide, Chapters 9 - 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 28</td>
<td>Candide, Chapters 18 - 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 2</td>
<td>Candide, Chapters 27 - 30</td>
<td>Discussion Leaders: Alex et Fernando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, March 5</td>
<td>Monsieur Vénus p. 5 - 44</td>
<td>Short Paper #2 Due to Peer Reviewer (on Canvas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 7</td>
<td>Monsieur Vénus p. 44 - 78</td>
<td>Quiz #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 9</td>
<td>Monsieur Vénus, p.78 -108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Readings (to be done BEFORE class)</td>
<td>In-class activities/due dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, March 12</td>
<td>Monsieur Vénus, p. 108 - 133</td>
<td>Peer Reviews Due (on Canvas and to partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 14</td>
<td>Monsieur Vénus, p. 133 - 170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 16</td>
<td>Monsieur Vénus, p. 170 - 211</td>
<td>Revised Short Paper #2 Due (on Canvas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18 - 25 - Spring Break</td>
<td>Spring Break</td>
<td>Spring Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, March 26</td>
<td>19th Century Poetry (on Canvas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 28</td>
<td>19th Century Poetry (on Canvas)</td>
<td>Discussion Leaders : Emily et Hailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 30</td>
<td>L’étranger, Première Partie, Chapters 1 - 3</td>
<td>Quiz #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, April 2</td>
<td>L’étranger, Première Partie, Chapters 4 - 6</td>
<td>Discussion Leaders : Joelle et Tessa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 4</td>
<td>L’étranger, Deuxième Partie, Chapters 1 - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, April 6</td>
<td>L’étranger, Deuxième Partie, Chapters 3 - 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, April 9</td>
<td>L’exil selon Julia, p. 11 - 52</td>
<td>Discussion Leaders : Megan et Laurent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 11</td>
<td>L’exil selon Julia, p. 55 - 76</td>
<td>Quiz #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, April 13</td>
<td>No class - Prof. Frengs has a conference!</td>
<td>No class Short Paper #3 Due (on Canvas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, April 16</td>
<td>L’exil selon Julia, p. 77 - 120</td>
<td>Discussion Leader : Jillian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 18</td>
<td>L’exil selon Julia, p. 121 - 166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, April 20</td>
<td>L’exil selon Julia, p. 167 - 192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, April 23</td>
<td>L’exil selon Julia, p. 193 - 219</td>
<td>Rough Drafts of Final Papers Due (on Canvas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Workshop on Rough Drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, April 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 2, 12pm (noon)</td>
<td>Final Paper Due</td>
<td>Final Paper Due at noon (on Canvas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures on Twitter! @UNLModLang
Participation Guide

The professor's role in this course is to facilitate discussion and to act as a knowledgeable and experienced guide. In other words, I will make every effort to keep this class YOUR CLASS by ensuring that we do not get off topic, but by principally letting you, the students, do the majority of the talking (and thus, the learning). Occasionally I will lecture briefly on a topic, but our classroom experience will be principally based on class discussion. Your responsibility is to be prepared to engage in serious discussion of the materials. Your participation represents a significant part of the course, not just in the percentage of your grade but, more importantly, in the impact that it has on your learning, my teaching, and the environment in which we all work. Your participation affects not only your learning but that of all your classmates. Participation includes active and voluntary involvement in class discussions and cooperation in all group activities. Please keep in mind that speaking, listening, and positive body language are all essential contributions.

You are expected to come to class ready to contribute to discussion. This means that you have read the assigned material; it also means that you have formulated questions about the material and reflected on it ahead of time. You should also ALWAYS bring your books to class. The presence of written notes and the ability to refer easily to specific places in the text are good indications of your professor of conscientious preparation. Write down page numbers or locations so that everyone can easily turn to passages that you want to discuss should you bring them up in class. Because we may have different versions of the texts, you may also want to refer to chapters.

An essential part of the course is constructive critique. Good participation involves a willingness to serve as a serious, constructive, and respectful critic of other people's work. Healthy intellectual disagreement is of course fine and even encouraged, but disparaging remarks directed toward scholars we read, and especially toward classmates, will not be tolerated.

Participation Rubric

A: You are engaged in discussions, show interest in the topic, and voluntarily participate every day. Your comments and questions show a high level of synthesis with some keen insight. You have carefully done the reading, noting questions and comments, and can easily refer back to specific places in the text. You regularly seek information beyond the required texts and are able to share your knowledge in relevant ways with the class. You support the learning of other students, and you demonstrate leadership in small groups. You make a positive difference by your energy and presence and you help us all to enjoy and appreciate the course a little more.

A-/B+: You are engaged in discussions, seem generally interested in the topic, and appear to be thinking during class discussion. You frequently participate and show some level of synthesis or critical thinking in your contributions. You may make great points in class, but ignore other students or occasionally get off topic. You incorporate information and knowledge gleaned from outside sources, but not necessarily in a way that promotes further discussion.
B: You seem engaged in discussions, ask occasional questions, and participate mostly when directly called upon. **This is the default grade for students who simply show up and pay attention all the time and make an honest effort to speak up a few times per class.** All grades at this level or above require a consistent effort to understand the reading material. This grade may be assigned to students who dominate discussions, interrupt, or do not listen to their classmates. This grade may also be assigned to students who use outside resources and/or jargon in ways that confuse or intimidate classmates.

C: You come to class regularly, but are not always prepared, appearing not to have completed or understood assignments and readings. You sometimes ask questions that, while not stupid, show a lack of preparation or outside initiative. You contribute little to discussions, do not seem to pay attention consistently, and are passive in small groups, letting others do the work. A + or – can be added to the grade depending on further impressions of your contributions and/or your impact on the classroom dynamics.

D: You do not come to class consistently. You are unprepared and contribute very little to classroom discussion. You disrupt class and/or detract from the supportive environment we strive for in class. We sometimes wish that you would just stay home!

F: You have attended class so little that I do not even recognize you, or you have been so disruptive and toxic to our atmosphere that we dread the days that you are in class.

---

1 This participation guide is adapted from Shira Weidenbaum’s participation guide included on her syllabus for the Spring 2015 concentration course “Women’s Voices” at Quest University Canada.

2 When I assess your participation/contribution, you are not being evaluated for your language accuracy. I expect you to make grammar and vocabulary errors while you are speaking in your second language! Please remember that I am not concerned with language in terms of participation, but rather with your engagement with the course materials and your behavior toward myself and your classmates.
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**Discussion Leadership Guidelines**

Once during the semester, you and a partner will be responsible for leading about 10 – 15 minutes of discussion in class. The purpose of this activity is to give you autonomy in this class, to get you thinking critically about the material we are studying, and to let you have some fun with it! You are encouraged to be as creative as possible with this activity. I’ve had students bring in Play-Doh before, believe it or not! Of course, if you do something like this, there does need to be an intellectual justification…we can’t just play with Play-Doh and call that learning. But, scavenger hunts through the texts, role plays, etc, are all activities that can get us actively thinking about how a text works, so I encourage creativity and innovation in these discussion leadership activities! You do NOT have to be prepared to speak for 10 – 15 minutes – this is not a presentation, this is a discussion. You are encouraged to get your peers involved!

As with the discussion board, accuracy in language is not the primary learning goal of this activity, so I do not want you to feel undue pressure to have perfect French when you are leading discussion. You are going to make mistakes – this is normal, and actually useful, because we can learn from our mistakes. In your feedback, I will point out errors – this is not to “dock” points or to be unnecessarily picky – this is to help improve your language skills! Take note of the errors I point out, and try to learn from that feedback.
Assessment

A discussion leadership activity meriting an A-range grade has these qualities:
- is conducted entirely in French
- engages with the reading of the day in a substantive way (you reference the text multiple times, you have page numbers ready, you have specific passages picked out that you want to examine)
- encourages the participation of your peers
- is thought-provoking
- is well-organized/planned (your questions lead to more questions along the same lines, your activity flows logically, you have a theme of some sort that guides your activity)
- you present your ideas in a way that is meaningful and comprehensible to others
- if you use any secondary material (any articles or other reading materials that are not part of the required reading for the day), you reference this properly
- you remain within the allotted time (10 – 15 minutes)

A discussion leadership activity earning a B-range grade has these qualities:
- is conducted in French, with maybe a few slips into English
- engages with the reading of the day in a fairly substantive way (you reference the text, you have page numbers ready, you have specific passages picked out that you want to examine)
- encourages the participation of your peers, but perhaps is a bit forced, or you need further explanation before your peers can understand how the activity/discussion works
- is mostly thought-provoking
- is mostly well-organized/planned (maybe you have a few questions that don’t seem to fit together logically, or you go off on a tangent)
- you present your ideas in a way that is meaningful and comprehensible to others for the most part, but you use some jargon without explaining, or there are some things that are not all that clear
- if you use any secondary materials, they are referenced properly
- you do not remain within the allotted time by a minute or so (either a bit too short or a bit too long)

A discussion leadership activity that merits a C-range grade has these qualities:
- is conducted mostly in French but you use a lot of English
- engages with the text, but perhaps not enough (you go into hypotheticals, you don’t have page numbers ready, you don’t have specific passages ready you’d like to examine)
- does not encourage the participation of your peers very well
- is somewhat thought-provoking
- is not well-organized/planned
- your ideas are not clearly articulated
- contains improperly cited secondary materials
- you do not remain within the allotted time by a few minutes (either too short or too long by several minutes)

A discussion leadership activity that merits a D-range grade has these qualities:
- is conducted using way too much English
- does not engage with the text very well at all (we have trouble telling what the activity has to do with the reading of the day)
- does not encourage the participation of your peers
- is not thought-provoking
- is completely disorganized
- we cannot understand you at all
- contains improperly cited secondary materials
- you do not respect the time limits (either wayyy too short or wayyy too long)

A discussion leadership activity that merits an “F” has these qualities:
- is conducted in English
- isn’t conducted at all
- is completely whack and has nothing to do with the course material
Canvas Discussion Forum Guidelines

You are expected to post one question or comment per week regarding the reading assignment for the day. In addition, you are expected to respond to a peer’s question or comment. Your questions should be based on what seems interesting to you, and show some time spent reflecting. Your questions should be content-based (that is, these should not be questions about the meaning of a vocabulary word – hopefully you look up unfamiliar terms in your dictionary!). Ideally, your questions should prompt further discussion and reflection, so they should not be yes/no questions. Feel free to use the questions I will have posted in the first few weeks of class as models.

You are free to use the discussion board to make follow-up comments on our discussions in class, to pose questions that you feel may not have been answered, to remark upon a passage of particular interest, to suggest topics to discuss in class, etc. You can include articles and photos, if you wish! I encourage you to be as creative and as thoughtful as possible.

I do not expect you to spend hours pondering what kind of questions or comments you need to be making. I do NOT want this element of our class to be a source of stress, but rather an open forum in which we can keep our discussions going outside of class and hopefully get as much out of this time we have together as possible. I also don’t want you to be posting inattentive or irrelevant questions or comments that don’t contribute to our class topics or take us places we just don’t want to go. Your postings should be productive, reflective, and substantive – that is, you will show me that you have thought through what you are saying as well as how others could perceive your comments. Please keep in mind that we will be using some of these questions for quizzes!

You should also adhere to academic writing conventions, include page numbers when appropriate, and pay close attention to your grammar, syntax, and vocabulary. The main focus of the discussion forum is not on language accuracy, but it is important that you practice your French language writing skills and that others can understand your questions/comments. I will provide feedback on your language for your benefit – but remember that I am assessing your questions/comments principally for content.
Grading Rubric for Discussion Forum

I will update you every two weeks on your discussion forum grades. Please note that if I make suggestions or comments after the first posting and you ignore them in the following postings, your grade may suffer. The grading system will work as follows:

A-range: Your questions/comments show original depth of thought and thorough engagement with the course material, and succeed in furthering discussion. You demonstrate that you have carefully done the reading, making thought provoking and insightful observations. You are consistently supportive and respectful of other students and provide constructive and relevant commentary to others’ postings, regardless of whether you agree with their opinions (you have mastered the art of healthy, respectful intellectual disagreement).

B-range: Your questions/comments show depth of thought and engagement with the course material, and that you have carefully done the reading. Your comments are thought provoking and interesting, yet sometimes you use jargon or outside sources in a way that confuses or intimidates classmates. Your questions are interesting, yet they are presented in a way that does not necessarily promote further discussion. Or, perhaps there are a few grammatical or vocabulary errors that makes the comprehension of your question a little difficult.

C-range: Your questions/comments do not demonstrate original thought or an understanding of the reading. You make comments that show a lack of preparation or outside initiative, or you take us on a tangent. Perhaps there are too many grammatical errors for others to be able to understand your questions, or they are very simple and do not promote further discussion. In some ways, you are disrespectful of opinions with which you may not agree.

D-range: Your questions demonstrate thoughtlessness and a lack of respect for the course material. Your contributions add little to our discussions.

F: You post a question/comment once in a blue moon or not at all. Your comments are disrespectful and toxic to our classroom dynamics.
Peer Reviews of Short Papers Guidelines

In your evaluations of your peer’s paper, please provide brief feedback on the following elements:

- Grammar/syntax/clarity of writing (you don’t need to go super into detail, but if you see errors, highlight or underline them)

- Thesis statement (it should be clear, arguable, and compelling) – see if you can single-out your peer’s thesis statement – what is the main argument of the paper? If you can’t understand what the main argument is, let them know (gently!) that you’re having trouble determining their thesis, and perhaps suggest how they may make their thesis more apparent. Thesis statements don’t need to be complicated – they can be simple and sophisticated at the same time! Clarity is key.

- Motive (why is the paper worth reading?) – What do we learn by the end of the paper? The motive can show how a paper’s thesis helps to answer a question, or it can show how the paper’s thesis builds upon and contributes to earlier research in the field. Essentially, your motive is your “so what?”

- Organization – Does the paper’s argument develop progressively? Does the paper have a solid introduction, body paragraphs that support the claims made in the thesis, and a conclusion that reinforces the importance of the analysis just done? Does the conclusion synthesize (not just summarize) the different points made throughout the paper?

- Support (evidence is provided, analyzed, and properly cited) – Do the citations your peer uses help support the argument they make? Do they have page numbers (or locations, if using an eBook)? Is the evidence interpreted/analyzed/contextualized – in other words, does your peer explain why the citation they use is supportive of their argument?

I’ve made a table below in which you can write some brief notes for your peer. Please be gentle in your evaluation, but try to clearly articulate how your peer might improve their paper. For example, if the paper is strong but the conclusion doesn’t really “conclude” well, why is that? Is it too short? Is a synthesis of the important parts of the paper lacking? You could put that comment in the “Organization” section, saying “You have a really great argument throughout your paper, but your concluding paragraph is very short. Can you add some more synthesis so that we can understand why it was important to read your paper/analyze the text the way you did?” Or, in the “Support” column, you might write “Your argument is really interesting but there aren’t enough citations in your paper to support what you say. Can you put in a quote in your 3rd paragraph that shows how Candide starts changing his mind about Pangloss’ philosophy?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar/etc</th>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>Motive</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Writing Conventions

While the works we will be reading in this course purposely subvert traditionally accepted writing conventions, we, as an academic community, do not have the liberty to do so. All submitted written work in this course should follow academic writing conventions. These conventions include a variety of requirements: stylistic, structural, and bibliographic, among others. Following these conventions helps you to establish your authoritative voice and increases the persuasiveness of your writing for an academic audience. This sheet details these conventions, which you are expected to follow meticulously on all written assignments.

Language
--- writing is free of spelling mistakes
--- writing is free of grammatical errors
--- writing is free of punctuation errors
How to do this: reread, spell-check, proofread hard copies, read aloud, swap papers with a classmate…

Citations
--- Any ideas from other sources, whether quoted, paraphrased, summarized, or simply mentioned, must be cited correctly following MLA style.1 Anything else is plagiarism. Don’t do it!
How to do this: keep track of sources while you research and write, ask when uncertain, use OWL: http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/01/

Formatting
--- Double-space
--- 1-inch margins
--- 12-point serif font (i.e. Times New Roman)
--- Full name on the top of the first page
--- Last name on every page, starting on page 2 (using header/footer function)
--- Page numbers, starting on page 2 (using header/footer function)
--- Label the assignment with date, course, name of assignment, essay title, etc.
How to do this: Your word processing program should do all of these things easily. If you don’t know how to do this, ask a tech-savvy friend.

Submission
--- Online submissions should be made via our Canvas site. Since we are trying to be environmentally friendly, I will not accept hard copy submissions.
Format in .doc, .docx, or pages. Do not submit a PDF.

Paper titles
--- You should choose a title that appropriately conveys the topic of your paper. Please do not title your paper “Essay.” You are more creative than that!

Timeliness
--- Deadlines are final. Any truly exceptional cases must be communicated in advance. Please see details about penalties for late work on the syllabus.
Please note two personal deviations from MLA style. First, the most recent MLA style guide allows for eBooks to be cited without page numbers. If you happen to use an eBook in this class, you must cross-reference your citations with a hard copy in order to provide page numbers. Second, no title page is necessary – save paper!
Essay Grading Rubric

An “A-range” paper has these qualities:
- zero or very few grammatical, syntactical, spelling, or punctuation errors
- appropriate vocabulary choices
- you have a clear, interesting, arguable thesis
- you establish a clear motive to suggest why your thesis is worthwhile
- you employ a logical and progressive structure
- you analyze your evidence insightfully and in-depth
- you cite page numbers when you use quotes from the texts
- you draw from well-chosen sources
- you follow MLA format properly

A “B-range” paper has these qualities:
- a few grammatical and syntactical errors that don’t hinder my understanding of your essay
- a couple spelling or punctuation errors
- mostly appropriate vocabulary choices
- you have a vague or inconsistently argued thesis
- you have a functional but unsubstantial motive
- you have a generally logical but somewhat disorganized structure
- you have well-chosen but sometimes unanalyzed evidence
- you cite page numbers when you use quotes from the texts
- you have a limited but correct use of sources
- there are a few (not super serious) problems with regard to MLA format

A “C-range” paper has these qualities:
- several grammatical and syntactical errors that render your sentences confusing
- more than three “sloppy” mistakes (spelling/punctuation)
- ambiguous vocabulary choices
- your thesis is confusing, simple, or descriptive
- your motive is simplistic (or there is none at all)
- your essay lacks a coherent structure
- you fail to present enough evidence (or your evidence is insufficiently analyzed)
- your sources are not properly contextualized or cited
- there are quite a few problems with regard to MLA format

A “D-range” paper has these qualities:
- I cannot understand your sentences due to grammar and syntax flaws
- You have way more than three sloppy mistakes (spelling/punctuation)
- Poor vocabulary choices that render the reader confused
- Your thesis is unintelligible
- No motive
- Your essay lacks a coherent structure
- Improperly contextualized or improperly cited sources (or none at all)
- You have significant MLA formatting problems
-
An “F-range” paper has these qualities:
- you didn’t write the essay
- Your essay is totally incomprehensible
- You have no sources at all, and you do not follow MLA formatting guidelines

1 This rubric applies to all written work in this course, i.e. short papers and your final paper. I do not expect you to have secondary (outside) sources for your short papers. I expect your short papers to be your own analyses (close readings) of the fiction we read in class. For the final paper, I do expect a minimum of 2 secondary (outside) sources. These should be critical articles you find through the library database, through Project Muse or JSTOR.
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Quiz #1
10 points

Choix multiple (5 points). Entourez la meilleure réponse.

1. *Le Chevalier au lion* est un/e :
   a. article critique  
   b. roman de chevalerie  
   c. poème  
   d. pièce médiévale

2. Quand on verse de l’eau sur le perron de la fontaine…
   a. on provoque un monstre de la forêt  
   b. on provoque un raz-de-marée  
   c. on provoque une tempête, suivi d’un gardien nommé Esclados qui veut combattre celui qui a versé de l’eau  
   d. un troupeau de taureaux féroces arrive

3. « Mais le lion sait, sans aucun doute, que son maître, loin de haïr son aide, ne l’en aime que davantage » (331).

Le passage ci-dessus est un bon exemple de :
   a. la personnification  
   b. une métaphore  
   c. une allégorie  
   d. une anaphore

4. « Tous les gens disent que jamais ils ne virent deux chevaliers plus courageux :
   ‘Loin de se battre pour s’amuser, c’est avec le plus grand sérieux qu’ils le font. On ne leur rendra jamais une récompense qui soit à la mesure de ce qu’ils méritent’ » (431).

Le passage ci-dessus est un exemple de :
   a. une hyperbole  
   b. la personnification  
   c. une métaphore  
   d. une litote

5. Yvain réussit à sauver les 300 prisonnières du/de la :
   a. Château fort  
   b. marécage  
   c. Château de la Pire Aventure  
   d. forêt

Réponse courte (5 points). En trois à six phrases, expliquez comment *Le Chevalier au lion* est une œuvre paradoxale. Relevez des exemples précis du texte.

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
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Check-in questions (this is not part of your grade!)

1. Are the reading comprehension questions helpful? Are you using them, and should I continue with them?

2. How are you feeling about the pace of the course /amount of reading? Too much, too little, too fast, just right?

3. How are you feeling about in-class discussions? Are you understanding (for the most part)? Is there anything I can do to help your understanding or make you feel more comfortable participating?

4. Anything else you’d like to comment on? Things that might help you learn more/better?
Representative Authors
Quiz #3
10 points

Choix multiple (4 points). Entourez la meilleure réponse.

1. Le 18e siècle est aussi connu sous le nom de :
   a. Le Moyen Âge    b. la Renaissance    c. le Grand Siècle    d. l’âge des Lumières
2. Les Lumières mettent de l’importance sur la raison et la tolérance.
   a. vrai    b. faux
3. *Candide, ou L’Optimisme* est
   a. un roman épistolaire    b. un roman à thèse    c. un conte philosophique    d. un poème épique
4. Dans *Candide*, Voltaire se moque de la philosophie de
   a. Spinoza    b. Leibniz    c. Descartes    d. Barthes

Réponses courtes. Répondez à chaque question en trois à six phrases complètes. Relevez des exemples précis. (6 points, 3 points chacune)

1. Quand la vieille raconte son histoire, elle dit « je voulus cent fois me tuer, mais j’aimais encore la vie. Cette faiblesse ridicule est peut-être un de nos penchants les plus funestes ; car y a-t-il rien de plus sot que de vouloir porter continuellement un fardeau qu’on peut toujours jeter par terre ? » (51). La vieille, est-elle pessimiste ? Ou est-ce qu’il y a de la vérité dans ses opinions du monde et de la souffrance humaine ?

__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
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2. Expliquez, dans vos propres mots, la dernière ligne de *Candide* « Il faut cultiver notre jardin. »


Check-In!

Your learning to date: What do you feel you have learned so far in our course? What has been most effective about this class in the facilitation of that learning? Here are just two of our learning objectives for this course, and a blank space for you to fill in your own comments/learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Your progress toward this objective/your learning</th>
<th>Class activities that are helping you reach this objective (feel free to add anything you might do outside of class to facilitate your own progress toward this objective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain broad knowledge of historical context/authors/literary movements in France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop habits of active (or close) reading necessary to literary analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Quiz Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiz 1 Out of 10</th>
<th>Quiz 2 Out of 10</th>
<th>Quiz 3 Out of 10</th>
<th>Quiz 4 Out of 10</th>
<th>Quiz 5 Out of 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpts from Student Check-Ins on Peer-Reviewed Paper

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   Yes, I caught issues in my own paper I wouldn’t have otherwise. Great!

2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   Not particularly – I revised my thesis as suggested, but not enough feedback was given to strengthen my argument or change my thesis all together.

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   Yes, it helped me see how to improve my writing and arguments. Great!

2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   Yes, they gave me good advice on what to add to my argument.

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   I found it useful to look over someone else’s paper to better review mine. Great! Often this is the case.

2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   I didn’t get as much review over my paper as I would’ve expected, nevertheless, it was helpful to some extent.
The Peer Review Activity

1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.

   Yes, I liked the feedback + being able to have "fresh eyes" look at your writing. Great!

2. Were your peer reviewer's comments useful to you, and in what ways?

   Yes! I saw new ideas I hadn't noticed. It was also able to point out some areas that seemed slightly confusing. Wonderful.

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity

1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.

   Yes, it is often easier to see mistakes in others' papers than your own because you get used to your own writing style. Great!

2. Were your peer reviewer's comments useful to you, and in what ways?

   Yes, because sometimes you know what you are trying to say but having someone else read it can reveal that your words weren't as clear after all. Great!

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity

1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.

   I like criticism, so I do like peer reviews because writing is not a strong point for me.

2. Were your peer reviewer's comments useful to you, and in what ways?

   Sorry but no. I thought my peer reviewer was just mean and was pointing out things that didn't need to be pointed out. For example, the page numbers.
Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity

1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.

2. Were your peer reviewer's comments useful to you, and in what ways?

not really

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity

1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.

Yes, I love editing papers as it helps me clarify the purpose of my own paper and the novel I was being analyzed.

2. Were your peer reviewer's comments useful to you, and in what ways?

My paper had (as always) a lot of grammatical errors that I wish I could've gotten feedback for. I did really appreciate the help with my thesis, however!

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity

1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.

It helped me realize some issues I had in my own paper and I learned how best to give feedback.

2. Were your peer reviewer's comments useful to you, and in what ways?

They were very useful; they more focused on a paragraph that didn't make sense which was creating holes in my analysis, which was helpful.
Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   
   Yes. Determining the thesis helped me better understand the work of other essays. Great!

   2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   
   Yes! It helped me when it came to introducing a quote and then following the quote with an explanation rather than just throwing in a quote because “why not?”

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   
   Yes, it also gave me a slight idea of the level I should be working at, and helped me to find issues in my own paper. Great!

   2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   
   Yes, it helped to see others where I was unclear to help me to write more effectively.

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   
   Yes, it helped me to look for the thesis and see if their argument lined up with what the point of their thesis was. Great!

   2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   
   Somewhat. They corrected some of my grammar and suggested different ways I could rewrite sentences which was somewhat useful when it came to correcting mistakes.
Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   I think I could use more help on thesis/structure. I need more guidance to see if there are any errors.

2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   Yes, it was helpful to have another pair of eyes looking for grammar mistakes.

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   It was helpful to have another pair of eyes looking for issues. It helped me focus on my own writing and improve.

2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   They were. They helped me improve my writing and give me specific feedback.

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   I’ve never really thought about this before when doing a peer-review, so that was an interesting area to discuss.

2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   They gave me an alternate way of looking at certain passages in the book. Great!
Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   
   "It was helpful in writing my own paper. Sometimes it’s easy to start writing and not take a step back to reflect on issues that the goal is and not be searching for someone else’s issue."

2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   
   "I remember one or two useful comments."

Check-In!

The Peer Review Activity
1. Did you find this peer review activity useful in terms of training yourself to look for thesis/motive/structural issues in a paper? Please explain how.
   
   "Yes! Reminded me to tie everything back to my thesis in a way that makes sense. Great!"

2. Were your peer reviewer’s comments useful to you, and in what ways?
   
   "Mine were mainly grammar correction - nothing of thoughtful feedback. Yeah, that’s a bummer - but at least she offered some help! don’t hesitate!"