

Updated grading Scheme for Electronic Discussion:

Most of the discussion posts have tended to be summaries of the papers. For the most part these have been fairly accurate summaries of the goals, methods, results and conclusions.

From this week on, I'm going to look for more analysis / synthesis and less description of the papers. For example, instead of saying that paper X looked at Y by doing Z and found Q, instead post a comment about the paper. For example, you might wonder whether the Lorenze and Enberg finding of density-dependent growth might be different for schooling versus more wide ranging species, and comment on why you think it may be different between the two. You may speculate as to how the results obtained in one system might apply to a different system that has different physical / biological properties. These are just a few examples of the type of analysis and synthesis that I'll be looking for.

Also, don't forget that you can respond to other people's post. Just make sure you make some comment before 5:00 pm on Friday, and I'll give you until 8:00 am on the following Monday to comment on other postings. Those will count (positively) towards your grade.

Happy posting!

Approximate Grading Scheme

10 points: Identified key elements of papers that contributed to the understanding of the topic. Topics are synthetic, integrating themes over multiple papers. Contributed to discussion thread by responding to other posts, provided alternative viewpoints or interpretations.

8 Points: Identified important contributions / findings of at least some of the papers, but little integration / synthesis of the papers. Some commentary regarding each finding is present.

6 Points: At least three findings from papers are listed, but interpretation is not wholly correct or there is little commentary on the findings.

4 Points: Gross misinterpretation of the papers, reported findings were trivial or incorrect.

0 Points: did not indicate and / or comment upon at least 3 findings