

**EUSA Eleventh Biennial International Conference  
Los Angeles, CA - April 23-25, 2009  
Marriott Marina del Rey**

**Teaching EU Studies in EU Languages: Tricks, Tips and Traps  
Session 2J - Thursday 10:30-12:15 – Santa Monica**

**Chair and Discussant: Michel Gueldry  
Monterey Institute of International Studies  
460 Pierce Street  
Monterey, CA 93940  
[mgueldry@miis.edu](mailto:mgueldry@miis.edu)**

**Who are you?  
Where do you come from?**

- 1. What aspects of EU studies do you teach?**
- 2. In what kind of departmental and academic environment do you teach? (Balance between teaching and scholarship, etc.)**
- 3. Why are you taking this workshop?**
- 4. What deliverables do you expect at the end of this workshop?**

## **EU Studies, Languages, Pedagogy and You**

- 5. In your view, what is the role of pedagogy in EU teaching and EU scholarship?**
- 6. Teaching EU in EU languages: Why? In your view, what is the role of languages in EU teaching and EU scholarship?**
- 7. What is your experience with integrating languages with EU studies? What languages do you speak, read, and understand? At what level (on the ACTFL proficiency guidelines)?**
- 8. In your EU teaching in English, how you teach / how do your students learn EU concepts, terminology, and jargon? Please describe one pedagogical trick you use in your EU class/es.**

## 1. Planning Phase before Teaching

- Departmental and Programmatic Coordination and Support
  - Institutional support
  - Inter-departmental collaboration (identify partners)
  - Institutional constraints
  
- Course Format
  - Individual instructor with dual task?
  - Equalitarian team teaching?
  - Periodic guest instructor?
  - Limited import of outside (language, IR) expertise?
  - Pilot experiment?
  
- Local Resources
  - Financial support (College? Department? Grant?)
  - Content or language expert/s
  - Language assistants, native assistants, language lab, software
  - Curriculum and/or assessment experts
  
- Enrollment-related Issues
  - Honor Class?
  - Dual major track?
  - Student population and language distribution (which language? What level)
  
- Student Assessment and Language Assessment
  - Language Assessment
  - Class cohesiveness or spread
  
- Syllabus and Course Design
  - Syllabus supporting documents in target language
  - Course Description
  - Course Objectives. Weighting of 1) content acquisition 2) language acquisition 3) skills development (e.g. public speaking). For language acquisition goals: which skills?
  - Course Requirements
  - Course Materials and Sources
  - Performance Assessment and Grading
  
- Course Preparation
  - Select course material, web sites, on line glossaries, etc. in target language
  - Select balance between primary and secondary documents
  - Develop guided discussion questions on documents

## 2. **Teaching:**

- **Class Activities**

- 
- 
- 
- 

- **Students Activities**

- 
- 
- 
- 

- **Oral Participation**

- 
- 
- 
- 

- **Peer Teaching and Team Building**

- 
- 
- 
- 

- **Written deliverables**

- 
- 
- 
- 

- **Oral deliverables**

- 
- 
- 
- 

- **Technology and Teaching/Learning EU in EU Languages**

- 
- 
- 
-

# ANALYTICAL RUBRIC for ASSESSING ACADEMIC PRESENTATIONS - Michel Gueldry © 04.15.2009

OUTCOMES	UNACCEPTABLE, MARGINAL, or INEFFECTIVE	ACCEPTABLE, ADEQUATE, or SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXEMPLARY, OUTSTANDING	SCORE
<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	Arbitrariness. Sloppiness. Repetitiveness. Lack of direction, articulation, and transitions. No/ weak intro /conclusion	Focused, but some issues, e.g: not too transparent, gaps, mechanical, repetitions, end is abrupt or trails off	Clear, flexible, balanced. Visuals and IT are generally integrated. Few or minor gaps or useless repetitions. Speaker masters flow from A-Z with few glitches	Clearer. Not rote. Graceful. Immediately accessible and understandable. Effective use of repetitions to stress key points. Facilitates retention. Organization is systematic. Visuals clear + handouts well integrated w/topics	
<b>CONTENT</b>	Significant factual errors. Lack of chronology. Excessive chrono. Chatty. Too general. Hyper specialized. Unrelated to purpose.	Offers evidence, data that generally supports conclusions. Some data faulty or poorly connected. Uneven or limited sources. Some key blind spots or perspectives may be overlooked	Very clear evidence and data. Solid sources. Balanced mix of facts and analysis. Articulates various levels of analyses and complexities. Some small gaps or haziness may remain. Some angles may still unduly stressed, some small blind spot may remain	Able to integrate various levels of complexity. Able to show big picture and small, significant details and telling anecdotes. Impeccable scholarship and widest variety of sources. Thoroughly informed on contrasting, dissenting and minority views. No blind spots. Able to connect facts and interpretations across a wide range and/or from fresh perspectives	
<b>REASONING, ARGUMENT, EXPLAINING</b>	Black and white approach. Shallow, specious or abrupt arguments. Circular argumentation. Syllogisms. Emotional confusion	Juxtaposes facts and analysis, incomplete integration. Tends to list items rather than blend them. Few or weak examples. Little creativity	Integrates facts and analysis well. Uses high end sources, able to critique most. General emotional acumen. May exhibit bookish knowledge or unintentionally confuse arguments	Integrates complex facts and deep analysis. Able to use and critique all sources. Able to navigate from popular to high brow culture. Consistent intellectual and emotional distance. Creative and self critical. Widest intell. range	
<b>DELIVERY</b>	Anxiety, no interaction w/ audience, no eye contact, mumbling, many hesitations. Reads notes. Hides. Ignores cues. QA weak	Speaker generally relaxed and confident, occasional slips. May rely too much on notes or fossilized expressions or body language. QA session generally well mastered, with occasional vagueness or mistakes	Good general interaction with audience. Shows good spatial and relational responses. No undue reliance on notes. Able to answer well most questions. Few glitches in Q/A	Excellent stage presence w/out histrionics. Confident and natural performance. Improvises w/ grace and control. Attention getting, clear finish. Good use of props, space, IT, visuals, audience cues, Q/A session.	
<b>LANGUAGE</b> 1 Richness, precision of vocabulary 2 Grammar, syntax 3 Use of idioms and collocations 4 Flow, transitions 5 Nuances of expression 6 Accent	1. Narrow and mechanical 2. Structural issues 3. No or little feeling for naturalness. 4. Choppy. Hesitant. Strident. Abrupt. 5. Black and white wording. Stuck in one register of language or confused 6. Significantly impedes understanding	1, 2 Communication generally clear, some mistakes of form and substance. 3, 5. General awareness of natural expressions and idioms 4. May contain fossilization 6. Clearly present but overall not an obstacle to communication	1, 2 Vocabulary is generally rich and precise. Some or few mistakes of forms and hardly any of substance. 3. Appropriate use of many idioms, collocations. Occasional mistakes 4, 5. Generally smooth, occasional glitches or stiffness. Good general control of various language registers 6. Less present, in-and-out, but not an impediment	1, 2 Wide, precise, imaginative, technical, resourceful, exact 3. Natural, rich, appropriate, sense of nuance and effect 4. Smooth, diverse, flawless 5. Nuanced. Humor. Playfulness. Subtlety. Alternates registers of language (from academic to chatty and slang). Interactive 6. Slight, marginal or non-existent	

# ANALYTICAL RUBRIC for ASSESSING WRITTEN SKILLS for INT'L POLICY STUDIES

Last section on language esp. relevant for policy papers written in non native languages

Michel Gueldry© - April 15, 2009

OUTCOMES	UNACCEPTABLE, MARGINAL, or INEFFECTIVE (B- and less) Paper shows many of the following:	ACCEPTABLE, ADEQUATE, or SATISFACTORY (B, B+) Paper shows a fair amount of the following features ('fair' defined in reference with length of paper and difficulty of topic):	GOOD (B+, A-) Bulk of the paper shows the features outlined below:	EXEMPLARY, OUTSTANDING (A, A+) Most or all of the paper shows the following positive features:	SCORE
ORGANIZATION	Gaps and /or repetitiveness. Lack of direction, articulation, and transitions. Intro /conclusion lack clarity, vigor. Structure not appropriate for topic. e.g. chronological instead of a comparative perspective. Disconnections or repetitions between parts of paper.	Clear focus, but some gaps / repetitions may remain. Outline /structure may suffer from blind spots. Intro/conclusion are present but not creative or very convincing. Writer shows limits of composition skills. Paper may show awkward transitions.	Clear, flexible, balanced. No or very few gaps or useless repetitions. Writer masters flow in development of ideas. Few glitches, few poor transitions. Text comes across as integrated and not just juxtaposed. Clear general flow. Paper may show a few of the features listed to the left.	Clarity. Creativity. Ability to design clear outline/structure for complex topics. Structure is immediately accessible and understandable. Efficient use of smart repetitions and diversity. Facilitates retention. Absolute control of organization. Introduction clear and efficient. Paper concludes clearly and conclusion is in line with thrust of paper. Paper shows none of the features listed to the left.	

<p><b>CONTENT</b></p>	<p>Significant factual errors and/or blind spots. Important data lacking, incomplete or misinterpreted. Marginal information, data or perspective are prominent. Lack of chronology. Excessive chronology. Chaty, anecdotal, too general. Or hyper specialized. Unrelated to purpose. Over reliance on www, use of substandard www sources, uncritical use of sources.</p>	<p>Offers enough evidence and data that generally supports conclusions. Some data may be faulty and/or poorly connected or misunderstood. Sources may be uneven or too few. Some repetitions or variations of a number of limited themes. Some facts or data are poorly argued. May contain a few (few) key misunderstandings of facts, causes, chronology, consequences, sequence, etc. Still too much reliance on www. Academic sources not diversified /deep enough.</p>	<p>Very clear evidence and data. Balanced mix of facts and analysis. Articulates various levels of analyses and complexities. Some small gaps or haziness may remain. Factual mistakes are few, isolated and do not impede overall reasoning. Solid, diversified and nuanced sources. Paper shows awareness, discrimination and genuine research in use of sources.</p>	<p>Able to skillfully combine anecdotes, descriptions, analyses, theories and larger narratives. Able to show big picture and small, significant details. Sensitivity to nuances. Tiny or inconsequential mistakes. Impeccable scholarship and wide variety of sources. Able to critique sources and offer hierarchy of sources. Paper critically uses best www and vast array of academic sources. Shows breadth and depth of knowledge of specialized literature, including key authors, theories, trends, practices, etc.</p>
<p><b>REASONING ARGUMENT, EXPLAINING</b></p>	<p>Black and white approach. Shallow, specious or abrupt arguments. Circular argumentation. Emotional confusion. Clichés, stereotypes and such. Syllogisms. Unsubstantiated and/or devious contentions. Black or white approach. Inability to manage and explain contradictions and nuances.</p>	<p>Paper offers a generally good integration. May still juxtapose a few facts and analysis, but on small scale. May list some items rather than blend them. Paper may still have problem sorting out some important ideas and facts, and combining telling examples and various levels of reasoning. Evidence of bookishness. Some data not well explained, may be half digested. Isolated organizational weaknesses do not compromise key ideas conclusions.</p>	<p>Integrates facts and analysis well. Uses high end sources and is able to critique most. General emotional acumen. Some bookishness may remain but overall reasoning is personal, dynamic and nuanced. Exhibit very few of the features listed to the left and if so, they are few and inconsequential and do not hinder reasoning.</p>	<p>Integrate complex facts and deep analysis. Able to use and critique all sources. Able to navigate from popular to high brow culture. Consistent intellectual and emotional distance. Awareness of sources' and own limits and blind angles. Reader clearly notices writer's ease, grace and ability to argue, connect, nuance, offer counterarguments, etc. Paper evidence of widest intellectual range. Paper exhibits none of the features listed to the left. Reasoning shows solid connections, transitions, nuances, it integrates well opposing arguments and contending theories and balances perspectives.</p>

<p><b>WRITTEN STYLE</b></p>	<p>Shows no, little awareness of idiomatic expressions Collocations not mastered. Run on sentences. Fossilized and/ or repetitive expressions. Incomplete grasp of synonyms and variations of meanings of same words. Variations underdeveloped or poor. Awkwardness in style and syntax. Fragments of sentences float. Incomplete sentences. Literal translations and Anglicisms. Numerous glitches significantly interrupt reading.</p>	<p>Exhibit a number of features listed to the left, but far fewer. Written style may be bookish, awkward, stiff or repetitive. Paper may show only one register of language or one kind of sources. Reading may still be interrupted by a number of vocabulary, stylistic, syntax issues.</p>	<p>May exhibit only some or few of the features listed to the left. Reading of paper is very seldom interrupted by vocabulary, stylistic, or syntax issues. Good mastery of specialized terminology, but occasional slips, repetitions, or lack of precision.</p>	<p>Consistent mastery of collocations, idioms and nuances of expression. Terminology is vast, diversified, nuanced, but not omnipresent or distracting Very few or no mistakes of the kind listed to the left. Complex ideas expressed clearly, directly and concisely.</p>
<p><b>LANGUAGE</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Richness, precision of vocabulary</li> <li>Grammar, syntax correctness</li> <li>Use of idioms and collocations</li> <li>Flow, transitions, delivery</li> <li>Nuances of expression</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrow and mechanical vocabulary</li> <li>Not idiomatic, literal transposition of source language</li> <li>No or little feeling for naturalness.</li> <li>Choppy. Tentative. Abrupt.</li> <li>Black and white phrasing. Significantly impedes understanding</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of some struggle with synonyms, antonyms, acronyms, homophony, prepositions, tenses, pronouns, and collocations.</li> <li>Shows awareness of natural expressions and ability to use some-many. Range in 1-3 is limited but communication is clear</li> <li>Uneven, may contain fossilization</li> <li>Capable of expressing nuance and complex ideas with general clarity and sense of purpose</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few mistakes of forms and hardly any of substance. Demonstrates mastery of wide and/or specialized vocabulary</li> <li>Uses easily idioms, collocations. Some mistakes are still present but they don't impede understanding or overall quality of expression</li> <li>Generally smooth, only occasional glitches (vagueness, repetitions, confusion of meaning, lack of synonyms/ antonyms, etc.).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wide, precise, creative, technical. Masters idioms, registers of languages, vast range of synonyms, all prepositions, compound tenses, all relative and demonstrative pronouns. At ease with nuanced expression of time, space and causality. Very few spelling mistakes (inconsequential)</li> <li>Natural, rich, appropriate, sense of nuance, purpose and effect</li> <li>Smooth, diverse, flawless</li> <li>Nuanced. Humor. Subtlety. Alternates language registers as needed by different topics or aspects of topic.</li> </ol>

## **Additional Sources**

The College of Wooster, Department of Political Science and International Relations Program [www.wooster.edu/ir/Active-TeachingIR](http://www.wooster.edu/ir/Active-TeachingIR)

<http://sites.google.com/site/brocktessman/>

International Studies Perspectives  
PS: Political Science & Politics

ISA - Active Learning in International Affairs (ALIAS) section  
<http://sitemaker.umich.edu/alias.isa/home>

APSA - Teaching and Learning Conference  
[http://www.apsanet.org/content\\_31632.cfm?navID=785](http://www.apsanet.org/content_31632.cfm?navID=785)

Merle Krueger and Frank Ryan, *Language and Content: Discipline- and Content-Based Approaches to language Study* (D.D. Heath, 1993)

Jeffrey S. Lantis, Lynn M. Kuzma and John Boehrer editors, *The New International Studies Classroom: Active Teaching, Active Learning* (Lynne Rienner, 2000)

Brock F. Tessman, *International Relations in Action: A World Politics Simulation* (Lynne Rienner, 2007)

Peter H. Loedel and John Occhipinti, 'Europe Matters. Teaching the EU in the US,' pp. 21-42, in *Politique Européenne*, Fall 2004, Vol. 14.