**C232 Queer Politics:**

1. **Article review podcast** (**30%)**

You will be required to produce a 20 minute ‘podcast’ in pairs or threes (25 minutes if a group of three) discussing the content and readings covered between **Weeks 1–5 in the Module Reader**. Aim for roughly 1000 words per student.

The podcast is an opportunity for you and your partner(s) to review the issues and questions explored in that week’s lecture and seminar and raised in the set and suggested readings. BBC Radio 4’s ‘In Our Time’ or BBC Radio 3’s ‘Free Thinking’ are good models for how discussions should be structured.

The podcast should have four key elements:

1. Introduction: Headlines or key take aways from the excerpts.

2. Summary and context

3. **Analysis and evaluation** (your goal here is not simply to provide a summary of the chapter, but an argumentative and critical engagement with its principal ideas. For this, you may need to do additional reading from the course material to understand the references and thesis statements of the authors. This should be the longest part of your discussion, and students should feel free to build on comments made by their peers)

4. Conclusion

Organization:

* The podcast should be recorded as a sound file (mp3, mp4, or m4a format) via your phone (e.g. Voice Memos on iPhone or Voice Recorder app on Android) or computer and uploaded on to QM+ (Instructions here: <https://elearning.qmul.ac.uk/guide/submitting-a-video-assignment/>). Any difficulties, feel free to upload to joanne.brueton@ulip.lon.ac.uk.
* Deadline 23rd February at 13h.
* The recording will made accessible to other students.
* You should start with a brief greeting, each person saying their name, and the title of the text you will be discussing.

Success Criteria:

1. Be brief, coherent, and concise: typically book reviews offer a succinct summary of the content of an article, a chapter, or a book, which includes a relevant description of the topic as well as its overall perspective, argument, or purpose.

2. Evaluate the authors’ comments using your own critical and creative judgements - what strikes you as noteworthy? How has it enhanced your understanding of queerness?

3. Explain the context in which the authors are writing and what their arguments hope to achieve.

4. Do your research and unpack key ideas/terms in your own words. Don’t fall foul of jargon!

Marking Criteria:

**Knowledge and Preparation**

• Demonstrate understanding of issues covered during lecture and seminar

• Demonstrate in-depth engagement with that week’s set reading

• Demonstrate broader engagement with further reading for that week

**Critical Thinking and Analysis**

• Demonstrate understanding of how content fits into broader themes of the module

• Show awareness of difference between primary and secondary sources if applicable

• Show critical distance from sources and develop your own views on issues covered

**Communication and Interaction**

• Communicate your views and interact with your group clearly and succinctly

• Justify your views through appropriate evidence and argument

• Formulate questions that are relevant to the topic and wider themes of the module

Marking criteria**\***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Excellent (1st)  | Good (2.1)  | Satisfactory (2.2)  | Weak (3rd)  | Poor (Fail)  |
| Knowledge and Preparation  |   |   |   |   |   |
| Critical Thinking and Analysis  |   |   |   |   |   |
| Communication and Interaction  |   |   |   |   |   |