|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Needs Improvement** (comments) |
| **Reading Summaries**  *Well summarized, accounting for the full spectrum of the author’s subject matter, thesis, and arguments.* |  |  |  |
| **Show and Tell**  *Balance of “show” (providing detailed examples) and “tell” (explaining the examples’ relevance), with examples well selected to support the student’s central theme.* |  |  |  |
| **Central Theme**  *Readings are analyzed to identify significant and interesting patterns and meanings, or put into dialogue to reveal non-obvious relationships or other points of convergence and divergence between the authors’ arguments and analyses, via comparison along some relevant dimension. The essay is organized to support the central theme.* |  |  |  |
| **Course content knowledge**  *Student creates opportunities to demonstrate understanding of topics covered in this class, the significance and complexity of the issues being engaged, and their relevance for medical anthropology. Specialized terminology is explained upon introduction.* |  |  |  |
| **Uses an anthropological lens\***  *An “anthropological lens” is reflected in the writing conventions used. The writing is done from an anthropological perspective.* |  |  |  |
| **Style**  *Essay understandable to someone who has not read the materials discussed (student does not envision the professor as the only reader). Writing is clear, logical, well-organized, and avoids wordiness. Ideas are presented in a logical matter, with transitions between them. Few or no grammar and spelling mistakes.* |  |  |  |

\*An **anthropological lens** is a disciplinary perspective that includes:

* **Critical distance:** Stepping back far enough from your own perspectives and biases to provide a relatively dispassionate interpretation and analysis. At the same time, recognizing the limits of critical distance through reflexivity: acknowledgment of the personal element in the collection and analysis of data. It is common to use “I” when writing in anthropology.
* **Counteracting Inequalities:** Anthropologists generally feel a responsibility to think carefully about the words that they used. This includes the use of emic terms (the words people use to label themselves), avoiding unnecessarily gendered language, and employing scare quotes to recognize the interpretive baggage of words for which there is no viable substitute. Words that can be problematic for implying judgment include “weird,” “normal,” “traditional”, “civilized,” and “primitive,” as well as “we” and “our” for indicating exclusivity in imagined audiences. Authors should also make clear their understanding of “race” as a social construct
* **Relativism**: Presenting difference in its own terms, without judgment, arranging it into a hierarchy, or making assumptions about emotion or value in why people do what they do. In focus is often issues of local concern and the articulation of insiders/native points of view.
* **Making the Familiar Strange:** Direct or indirect questioning and de-naturalization of conventional knowledge, cultural norms, and other presumptions about how the world works, while also showcasing the commonalities that unite humanity over space and time.