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**Course Description**

Knowledge-claims in the 21st century have gone beyond the modernist mind-set of departmentalization. In an emerging network culture and unprecedented complexity of learning, students need to adopt a more mobile and permeable "interdisciplinary" approach to what they learn at tertiary level. This seminar is designed for students in English to achieve a sense of integration among the various components in their curriculum. Besides reading materials which deal directly with ideas such as counter-disciplinary praxis, the intersection of natural science, social sciences and humanities, environmental humanities, cultural ecology, the Anthropocene. the philosophy of difference which stresses a relational ontology, as well as the concept of nonphilosophy, etc., students will be initiated into the actual working of what is now called "Interdisciplinary Studies" as an umbrella concept of such an approach.

**Course Outcomes, Teaching Activities and Assessment**

|  |
| --- |
| **Course Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)** |
| Upon completion of this course students should be able to: |
| **ILO1** | delineate the concept of interdisciplinarity |
| **ILO2** | synthesize the knowledge they have learned earlier in an interdisciplinary way |
| **ILO3** | apply the interdisciplinary approach in research |
| **ILO4** | construct their own model of interdisciplinarity  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)** |
| **TLA1** | Exemplification of core issues and concepts with relevant examples |
| **TLA2** | Close reading of materials |
| **TLA3** | In-class Discussion |
| **TLA4** | Group Oral Presentation |
| **TLA5** | Response to oral presentation |

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessment Tasks (ATs)** |
| **AT1** | In-class discussion*Students are to respond actively to specific questions made by the lecturer as well as participate in class discussion in either in lecture or tutorial*. | 20% |
| **AT2** | Oral presentation *Students are to deliver an oral presentation on a specific topic which can demonstrate their understanding of the issue(s) and concepts(s) discussed in this course. Also, at the end of the presentation there will be time for class discussion.* | 30% |
| **AT3** | Final written project*Students are to write a research paper which can demonstrate a solid grasp of issue(s) and concept(s) taught in the course. Students have to formulate a specific question and adopt a problem-solving approach which can demonstrate their ability of critical thinking and analysis.* | 50% |
|  | TOTAL | 100% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Alignment of Course Intended Learning Outcomes, Teaching and Learning Activities and Assessment Tasks**  |
| **Course Intended Learning Outcomes** | **Teaching and Learning Activities** | **Assessment Tasks** |
| ILO1 | TLA1,2 | AT1,2,3 |
| ILO2 | TLA4,5 | AT2,3 |
| ILO3 | TLA3,4 | AT2,3 |
| ILO4 | TLA3,4 | AT3 |

**Course Outline**

**Week 1 Interdisciplinarity**

Moran, Joe. (2010) *Interdisciplinarity*. London & New York: Routledge. pp. 148-181.

**Week 2 &3 Environmental Humanities**

Zapf, Hubert (2017) “Cultural Ecology, the Environmental Humanities, and the Transdisciplinary Knowledge of Literature.” *Environmental Humanities: Voices from the Anthropocene*. Edited by Serpil Oppermann and Serenella Iovino. London & New York: Rowman & Littlefield. pp. 61-79.

J. Baird Callicott. (2017) “Worldview Remediation in the First Century of the New Millennium.” *Environmental Humanities: Voices from the Anthropocene*. Edited by Serpil Oppermann and Serenella Iovino. London & New York: Rowman & Littlefield. pp.133-154.

Stefan Helmreich. (2017) “Nature/Culture/Seawater: Theory Machines, Anthropology, Oceanization” *Environmental Humanities: Voices from the Anthropocene*. pp. 217-235.

Matthew Calarco. (2017) “Revisiting the Anthropological Difference.” *Environmental Humanities: Voices from the Anthropocene*. Edited by Serpil Oppermann and Serenella Iovino. London & New York: Rowman & Littlefield. pp. 237-254.

**Week 4 & 5 Critical Digital Humanities**

David M. Berry and Anders Fagerjord. (2017) *Digital Humanities: Knowledge and Critique in a Digital Age*. Cambridge, Polity Press. pp. 1-39; 136-150.

Tai Neilson, lewis levenberg and David Rheams. (2018) “Introduction: Research Methods for the Digital Humanities.” *Research Methods For the Digital Humanities*. Edited by lewis levenberg, Tai Neilson and David Rheams. Cham: Palgrave. pp. 1-14.

**Week 6 Object-Oriented Ontology**

Morton, Timothy. (2013). “Intersubjectivity” in *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World*. Minneapolis; London: University of Minnesota Press.

pp.81-96.

Gratton, Peter. (2014). “Chapter 4: Object-oriented Ontology” and “Chapter 5: The Power of Things and the Nature of Politics” in *Speculative Realism: Problems and Prospects*. London: Bloomsbury Academic. pp.85-107, 109-133.

**Week 7 Reading Week**

**Week 8 Science and Humanities**

Harding, Sandra. (2008) “Co-evolving Science and Society,” and “Haunted Modernities, Gendered Traditions.” *Sciences from Below: Feminisms, Postcolonialities, and Modernities.* London: Duke University Press. pp.75-97, 191-213.

**Week 9 & 10 Science, Philosophy and Animals**

Donna J. Haraway. (2016) *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham & London: Duke University Press. pp. 30-57.

Ian Bogost. (2012) *Alien Phenomenology or What It’s Like to be a Thing*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press. pp. 1-34.

Lori Gruen. (2015) *Entangled Empathy: An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals.* New York: Lantern Books. pp. 61-80.

Alan Sponberg. (1999) “Green Buddhism and the Hierarchy of Compassion.” *Buddhism and Ecology: The Interconnection of Dharma and Deeds.* Edited by Mary Evelyn Tucker and Duncan Ryuken Williams. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. pp. 351-376.

**Week 11 & 12 Science and Art**

Grosz, Elizabeth. (2008) “Chaos, Cosmos, Territory, Architecture.” *Chaos, Territory, Art: Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth*. New York: Columbia University Press. pp. 1-24.

Simon O’Sullivan. (2006) “The Ethicoaesthetics of Affect and the Bloc of Sensations: Reaffirming the Specificity of Art (Against Representation)”, “From Geophilosophy to Geoaesthetics: The Virtual and the Plane of Immanence versus Mirror-Travel and the *Spiral Jetty*” & “From Possible Worlds to Future Folds: Abstracts, Situationist Cities and the Baroque in Art.” *Art Encounters Deleuze and Guattari*: *Thought Beyond Representation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 38-68; pp. 98-143.

William Scarlato. (2016) “Nature and Art: Seeing Beauty amidst the Ruins.” *Interdisciplinary Essays on Environment and Culture: One Planet, One Humanity, and the Media.* Edited by Luigi Manca and Jean-Marie Kauth. Lanham, New York & London: Lexington Books. pp. 305 320.

**Week 13 Language and Sexuality**

Cameron, Deborah & Kulick, Don. (2003) “Talking sex and thinking sex: the linguistic and discursive construction of sexuality,” and “What has gender go to do with sex? Language, heterosexuality and heteronormativity,” and *Language and Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 1-43; pp.44-73; pp.133-155.

Scott F. Kiesling. (2019) “Interaction, identity, and performativity.” *Language, Gender, and Sexuality: An Introduction*. London & New York: Routledge. pp. 84-102.

**Week 14 Theorizing Interdisciplinarity**

Wong Kin Yuen. “Theorizing Interdisciplinarity Through the Anthropocene.” Paper delivered at the 2018 Anthropocene Conference.

Chan Kit-sze Amy. (2018) “Classical Chinese Medicine and the New Humanities.” *Deleuze and the Humanities: East and West*. Edited by Rosi Braidotti, Kin Yuen Wong and Amy Kit-sze Chan. London & New York: Rowman and Littlefield. pp. 121-138.

**Week 15 Reading Week**

**Academic Honesty**

You are expected to do your own work. Dishonesty in fulfilling any assignment undermines the learning process and the integrity of your college degree. Engaging in dishonest or unethical behaviour is forbidden and will result in disciplinary action, specifically a failing grade on the assignment with no opportunity for resubmission. A second infraction will result in an F for the course and a report to College officials. Examples of prohibited behaviour are:

* Cheating – an act of deception by which a student misleadingly demonstrates that s/he has mastered information on an academic exercise. Examples include:
* Copying or allowing another to copy a test, quiz, paper, or project
* Submitting a paper or major portions of a paper that has been previously submitted for another class without permission of the current instructor
* Turning in written assignments that are not your own work (including homework)
* Plagiarism – the act of representing the work of another as one’s own without giving credit.
* Failing to give credit for ideas and material taken from others
* Representing another’s artistic or scholarly work as one’s own
* Fabrication – the intentional use of invented information or the falsification of research or other findings with the intent to deceive

**To comply with the University’s policy, the term paper has to be submitted to VeriGuide.**
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**Assessment Rubric for Class Participation and Discussion**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Exemplary** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Preparation** | Arrives fully prepared at every class session | Arrives mostly, if not fully, prepared (ongoing) | Preparation isinconsistent | Rarely or neverprepared |
| **Initiative** | Questions asked focus, clarify and summarize discussion | Occasionally ask good questions | Raise questions only when asked by lecturer | Demonstrates anoticeable lack of interest  |
| **Response** | Quality of response reflects knowledge, comprehension and application of readings | Quality of response reflects knowledge, and some comprehension of readings | Quality of response occasionally reflects knowledge of readings | Quality of response shows a lack of knowledge of readings |
| **Discussion** | Quality of response extends the discussion with peers and reflects analysis, synthesis and evaluation | Quality of response extends the discussion with peers  | Quality of response is poor | Unable to participate in discussion |
| **Group****Dynamics** | Group dynamic and level of discussion areoften better because of candidate’spresence | Group dynamic and level of discussion are occasionally better, but not worse, because of candidate’s presence | Group dynamic and level of discussion aresometimes disruptedby candidate’spresence | Group dynamic and level of discussion areoften disrupted by candidate’s presence |

**Assessment Rubric for Oral Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Exemplary** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Communication Skills** | Consistently speaks with appropriate volume, tone, and articulation. | Generally speaks with appropriate volume, tone, and articulation. | Has difficulty speaking with appropriate volume, tone, and articulation. | Does not speak with appropriate volume, tone, and articulation. |
| Consistently employs appropriate eye contact and posture. | Frequently employs appropriate eye contact and posture. | Employs infrequent eye contact and/or poor posture. | Makes no eye contact. |
| Consistently employs appropriate nonverbal communication techniques. | Adequately employs appropriate nonverbal communication techniques. | Employs limited nonverbal communication techniques. | Does not employ nonverbal communication techniques. |
| Consistently exhibits poise, enthusiasm, and confidence. | Generally exhibits poise, enthusiasm, and confidence. | Exhibits limited poise, enthusiasm, and confidence. | Lacks poise, enthusiasm, and confidence. |
| Adheres to prescribed time guidelines. | Adheres to prescribed time guidelines. | Violates prescribed time guidelines. | Violates prescribed time guidelines. |
| Employs creative use of visual aids that enrich or reinforce presentation. | Employs appropriate visual aids that relate to presentation. | Employs ineffective visual aids. | Uses no visual aids. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content and Coherence** | Effectively defines a main idea and clearly adheres to its purpose throughout presentation. | Adequately defines a main idea and adheres to its purpose throughout presentation. | Insufficiently defines a main idea and adheres to its purpose throughout presentation. | Does not define a main idea or adhere to its purpose. |
| Employs a logical and engaging sequence which the audience can follow. | Employs a logical sequence which the audience can follow. | Employs an ineffective sequence confusing to the audience. | Lacks an organizational sequence. |
| Demonstrates exceptional use of supporting details/ evidence. | Demonstrates sufficient use of supporting details/ evidence. | Demonstrates insufficient supporting details/ evidence. | Demonstrates no supporting details/evidence. |
| **Responses to questions** | Confidently, politely, and accurately responds to instructor’s or classmates’ questions and comments. | Politely and accurately responds to instructor’s or classmates’ questions and comments. | Ineffectively responds to instructor’s or classmates’ questions and comments. | Unacceptably responds/does not respond to instructor’s or classmates’ questions and comments. |

**Assessment Rubric for Term Paper**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exemplary** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing/ Emerging** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Focus** | Presents an insightful and focused thesis statement. | Presents a thesis statement with adequate insight and focus. | Presents a thesis statement with minimal insight and focus. | Presents a thesis statement with no insight or focus. |
| Draws strong and clear connections between the thesis and significant related ideas. | Draws adequate connections between thesis and related ideas. | Draws insufficient connections between thesis and related ideas. | Shows no understanding of connections between thesis and related ideas. |
| **Organization** | Effectively provides a logical progression of related ideas and supporting information in the body of the paper. | Adequately provides a progression of ideas and supporting information in the body of the paper. | Provides a poorly organized progression of ideas and supporting information in the body of the paper.  | Does not provide a progression of ideas and supporting information in the body of the paper. |
| Effectively uses transitions to connect supporting information clearly. | Adequately uses transitions to connect supporting information. | Ineffectively uses transitions to connect supporting information. | Does not use transitions to connect supporting information. |
| Arrives at a well-documented, logical conclusion, involving critical thinking. | Arrives at an adequately-documented conclusion. | Arrives at an insufficiently documented conclusion. | Does not arrive at a documented conclusion. |
| **Support/ Elaboration** | Effectively synthesizes complex ideas from research sources. | Sufficiently synthesizes ideas from research sources. | Ineffectively synthesizes ideas from research sources. | No evidence of synthesizing ideas from research sources.  |
| Demonstrates exceptional selection of supporting information clearly relevant to the thesis and its related ideas. | Demonstrates sufficient selection of supporting information clearly relevant to the thesis and its related ideas. | Demonstrates insufficient selection of supporting information clearly relevant to the thesis and its related ideas. | Lacks supporting information clearly relevant to thesis and its related ideas. |
| Provides a meaningful presentation of multiple perspectives. | Provides an adequate presentation of multiple perspectives. | Provides a limited presentation of multiple perspectives. | Does not present multiple perspectives. |
| Effectively balances use of quotations and student paraphrasing. | Adequately balances use of quotations and student paraphrasing. | Insufficiently balances use of quotations and student paraphrasing. | Does not balance use of quotations and student paraphrasing. |
| **Style** | Exhibits skillful use of language, including effective word choice, clarity, and consistent voice. | Exhibits good use of language, including some mastery of word choice, clarity, and consistent voice. | Exhibits ineffective use of language, including weak word choice, limited clarity, and inconsistent voice. | Exhibits severely flawed use of language, including weak word choice, no clarity, and no voice.  |
| Demonstrates exceptional fluency through varied sentence structure, paragraphing, flow of ideas, and transitions. | Demonstrates sufficient fluency through sentence structure, paragraphing, flow of ideas, and transitions. | Demonstrates limited fluency through sentence structure, paragraphing, flow of ideas, and transitions. | Lacks fluency through sentence structure, paragraphing, flow of ideas, and transitions. |
| **Conventions** | Demonstrates a sophisticated use of the prescribed format (MLA or APA), including title page, pagination, and citations.  | Demonstrates adequate use of the prescribed format (MLA or APA), including title page, pagination, and citations. | Demonstrates limited use of the prescribed format (MLA or APA), including title page, pagination, and citations. | Demonstrates no use of the prescribed format (MLA or APA), including title page, pagination, and citations. |
| Consistently uses standard writing conventions in grammar, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and usage. | Generally uses standard writing conventions in grammar, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and usage. | Minimally uses standard writing conventions in grammar, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and usage. | Does not use standard writing conventions in grammar, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and usage. |
| **Information Literacy** | Conscientiously and consistently demonstrates integrity in citing practices. | Generally demonstrates integrity in citing practices. | Inconsistently demonstrates integrity in citing practices. | Does not demonstrate integrity in citing practices. |
| Effectively employs an extensive variety of primary and secondary sources, including a significant amount of current information.  | Adequately employs a sufficient variety of primary and secondary sources including a sufficient amount of current information.  | Employs a limited variety of primary and secondary sources including an insufficient amount of current information. | Does not employ a variety of primary and secondary sources and/or does not include current information. |
| Demonstrates strong evaluation skills in determining resource credibility and reliability. | Demonstrates sufficient evaluation skills in determining resource credibility and reliability. | Demonstrates limited evaluation skills in determining resource credibility and reliability. | Demonstrates no evaluation skills to determine resource credibility and reliability. |