The idea is to monitor the discussion threads and try to provoke deeper, more reflective, critical analytic responses. Your peers are already good at narrative summary, so we usually need to dig a little deeper. You are not required to post your own posts in response to the unit, but rather to respond to your peers’ posts in ways that will provoke reflection and insight. However, late on Tuesday prior to your facilitation week, do post an introduction and the trigger questions/activities you choose, all as separate threads, rather like what you have seen in previous weeks.

Between you it will be helpful to decide whether you are planning to team facilitate or alternate or some other schema (please let me know).

I will be monitoring each forum regularly several times a day and will pitch in, if needed, plus I am there to support your efforts too. It might help to browse through the articles posted under Peer facilitation in the course concept map and you do not have to feel obligated to respond to everyone and responding to first posts is usually enough. You need not post anything that is not responding to one of your peers' first posts and please feel free to reach out if I am not paying enough attention. I think you might be surprised at how much you will enjoy facilitating, as it is a great learning experience and paves the way for easy flow posting in successive units.

Here is the rubric to guide your efforts. It will be used for grading your peer facilitation.

**Peer Facilitation Rubric**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Ratings****4                                3                                 2                                 0** |
| Knowledge of material | Exemplary. Very knowledgeable of the readings. Able to bring out the key concepts. | Proficient. Knowledgeable of the material, brought out themes and various details.  | Partially proficient. Somewhat knowledgeable of the material. Brought out specifics and more of the minor concepts.  | Unsatisfactory. Did not obtain mastery knowledge of the material.  |
| Outcome related | Exemplary. Able to draw clear relationships between unit outcomes and discussion content. | Proficient. Able to draw some relationships between unit outcomes and discussion content. | Partially proficient. Able to draw some relationships between unit outcomes and content, while some response content is not relevant. | Unsatisfactory. No discernible relationships between unit outcomes and content. |
| Critical thinking | Exemplary. Consistently does all or almost all the following:Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.Identifies the most important arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view.Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions.Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons.Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead. | Proficient. Does most or many of the following:Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.Offers analyses and evaluations of obvious alternative points of view.Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusions.Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons.Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead. | Partially proficient. Shows some proficiency, yet includes some of the following:Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments.Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions.Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons.Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends viewsbased on self-interest or preconceptions. | Unsatisfactory. Consistently does all or almost all the following:Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions,information, or the points of view of others.Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments.Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims.Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons.Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason. |
| Evidence base | Exemplary. All ideas, claims, arguments, assertions are supported by relevant primary source literature.  | Proficient. Most ideas, claims, arguments, assertions are supported by relevant primary source literature. | Partially proficient. A few ideas, claims, arguments, assertions are supported by relevant primary source literature.  | Unsatisfactory. None of the ideas, claims, arguments, assertions are supported by relevant primary source literature.  |
| Questioning and responding | Exemplary. Provided solid or provocative questions that got at the heart of the post or thread. Able to synthesize and summarize emerging themes.  | Proficient. Offered questions to the poster or group that hit on some of the key concepts in the post or thread. Responded to questions from the group but was not able to bring out the themes or key concepts or synthesize and summarize emerging themes.  | Partially proficient. Provided questions, but they were not readily linked to the key concepts. Responded to questions from the group, but answers were not readily linked to the themes or concepts emerging from the post or thread.  | Unsatisfactory. Did not ask the poster or group any questions or did not respond to peer questions. |
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