The Examined Life: life well played

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course Number:** IDS2935 | **Instructor:** Dr. Kyle Bohunicky |
| **Semester/Year:** FALL 2019 | **Office location/Hours:** NRG 118, M 2 – 4 / T 2 - 3 |
| **Credit Hours/Words:** 3.0 / 4000 | **Contact email:** kyle@digitalworlds.ufl.edu |
| **CLASS LOCATION:** NRG 205 | **CONTACT PHONE:** (352) 294-2000 |
| **Class meeting time(s):** T 8 – 9, R 9 | **COURSE WEBSITE:** elearning.ufl.edu |
| **Course Cost:** None | **QUEST 1 THEME:** The Examined Life |

Course Description

Play is a significant, yet superfluous, element of our academic and professional lives. Our spaces of play have become places for politics, economics, and warfare; yet conversely, we find that politics, business, and war have readily adopted the appearance of play. We create and circulate playful art such as memes and twitch streams, yet the content of such playful arts confronts and performs significant social and cultural work. We participate in digital game worlds as escape, only to take pleasure in interacting with and designing the very themes and topics that we seek refuge from. In short, play is an unassumingly complex and critical component of contemporary life, yet it is mired in numerous contradictions. “Life Well Played,” therefore, equips students to effectively explore and navigate play’s complicated manifestations in contemporary life.

In this course, we will examine play by applying a humanistic lens to the performances within digital games and arts. In doing so, we will seek answers to several key questions, including: Why do we play? Does everyone play the same? What makes play matter? What can we do with play? What might play tell us about our contemporary moment? To answer such questions, we will draw on humanities-based theories emerging from the fields of arts, education, computer sciences, storytelling, gender studies, and more to discuss how digital game play (and playing digital games well) has become an essential component of our lives, media, and discourse. In addition to reading and writing about play, students will be asked to engage with play through practices central to the arts such as performing, making, and exhibiting. In doing so, students will learn both the value of play and how to mobilize it in arts-based practice and their future careers.

**PREREQUISITE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS**

* N/A

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

Reflecting the curricular structures of Quest 1 and these Gen Ed designations, after taking Life Well Played students will be able to:

1. Explain the history, theories, and methodologies used by the humanities within game and play studies to understand how play is an essential avenue for self-exploration, self-expression, and critical thought. **(Content and Communication SLOs for Gen Ed Humanities and Q1)**
2. Identify and analyze the value of theories/methodologies within digital arts, computer sciences, narrative theory, critical theory, etc. to humanistic inquiry **(Critical Thinking SLOs for Gen Ed Humanities and Q1)**
3. Analyze rhetorical and political expression within play **(Critical Thinking SLO for Gen Ed Humanities)**
4. Analyze and evaluate the cultural and ethical issues surrounding play (including representation, labor, identity, etc.) **(Communication and Critical Thinking SLO for Gen Ed Humanities)**
5. Analyze, evaluate, and critically reflect on connections between course content and their intellectual, personal, and professional development at UF and beyond **(Communication and Critical Thinking SLO for Q1)**
6. Develop and present clear and effective responses to essential questions about play in multimodal forms appropriate to the relevant humanities disciplines incorporated into the course **(Communication SLO for Gen Ed Humanities and Q1).**

TO SEE HOW ASSIGNED WORK ADVANCES EACH SLO, GO TO PAGES 12 - 18

## **qUEST 1 sloS AND dESCRIPTION:**

**QUEST 1 DESCRIPTION**Quest 1 courses are multidisciplinary explorations of truly challenging questions about the human condition that are not easy to answer, but also not easy to ignore: What makes life worth living? What makes a society a fair one? How do we manage conflicts? Who are we in relation to other people or to the natural world? To grapple with the kinds of open-ended and complex intellectual challenges they will face as critical, creative, and self- reflective adults navigating a complex and interconnected world, Quest 1 students use the humanities approaches present in the course to mine texts for evidence, create arguments, and articulate ideas.

**QUEST 1 SLOS**

* Identify, describe, and explain the history, theories, and methodologies used to examine essential questions about the human condition within and across the arts and humanities disciplines incorporated into the course (Content).
* Analyze and evaluate essential questions about the human condition using established practices appropriate for the arts and humanities disciplines incorporated into the course (Critical Thinking).
* Connect course content with critical reflection on their intellectual, personal, and professional development at UF and beyond (Connection).
* Develop and present clear and effective responses to essential questions in oral and written forms as appropriate to the relevant humanities disciplines incorporated into the course (Communication).

**HUMANITIES DESCRIPTION**Humanities courses provide instruction in the history, key themes, principles, terminology, and theory or methodologies used within a humanities discipline or the humanities in general. Students will learn to identify and to analyze the key elements, biases and influences that shape thought. These courses emphasize clear and effective analysis and approach issues and problems from multiple perspectives.

**HUMANITIES SLOS**

* Identify, describe, and explain the history, underlying theory and methodologies used in the course (Content).
* Identify and analyze key elements, biases and influences that shape thought within the subject area. Approach issues and problems within the discipline from multiple perspectives (Critical Thinking).
* Communicate knowledge, thoughts and reasoning clearly and effectively (Communication).

## **wRITING rEQUIREMENT:**

**WRITING DESCRIPTION:**The Writing Requirement (WR) ensures students both maintain their fluency in writing and use writing as a tool to facilitate learning. The writing course grade assigned by the instructor has two components: the writing component and a course grade. **To receive writing credit a student must satisfactorily complete all the assigned written work and receive a minimum grade of C (2.0) for the course.** It is possible to not meet the writing requirement and still earn a minimum grade of C in a class, so students should review their degree audit after receiving their grade to verify receipt of credit for the writing component.

**WRITING EVALUATION:**This course carries 4000 words that count towards the UF Writing Requirement. You must turn in all written work counting towards the 4000 words in order to receive credit for those words.

The instructor will evaluate and provide feedback on the student’s written work with respect to content, organization and coherence, argument and support (when appropriate), style, clarity, grammar, punctuation, and other mechanics, using a published writing rubric (see syllabus pages 20 - 34).

More specific rubrics and guidelines for individual assignments may be provided during the course of the semester.

Feedback on the final paper will be provided electronically via canvas before the end of the semester. For more information on grading and evaluation of the final, please see the rubric (pages 20 – 34).

###### **course schedule:**

This schedule is only a guide and is subject to change. Unless otherwise indicated, assignments and readings are due the day they are listed on the syllabus, not the following day.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Class Discussion** | **SLOs** |
| **Aug 20** | **Topic**  Syllabus and Assignments Review | **N/A** |
| **Aug 22** | **Topic**  What is Art History?  **Assignment**  Read: Panofsky – “Art as a Humanistic Discipline”  Lavin – “The Art of Art History: A Professional Allegory” (https://publications.ias.edu/sites/default/files/Lavin\_ArtArtHistory\_1996.pdf) | **1, 2** |
| **Aug 27** | **Topic**  How to do Art History  **Assignment**  Read: Kleiner – Chapter 1  Panofsky – “Iconography and Iconology” | **1, 2** |
| **Aug 29** | **Topic**  Writing Instruction – Intro to Critical Writing Concepts  **Assignment**  Read: Bogost “How to Talk About Video Games” – Chapter 1 | **5, 6** |
| **Sept3** | **Topic**  Art History and Humanism in Games and Play  **Assignment**  Read: Polansky – “Towards and Art History for Videogames” (<https://rhizome.org/editorial/2016/aug/03/an-art-history-for-videogames/>)  “Reconciling Art History and Videogames” (<http://www.idmaajournal.org/2015/11/reconciling-art-history-and-video-games/>) | **1, 2, 5, 6** |
| **Sept 5** | **Topic**  Art History and Humanism in Games and Play Continued  **Assignment**  Read: Melissinos – “Art and Video Games” in *Thinking about Video Games*  Pearce – Games AS Art, The Aesthetics of Play | **1, 2, 5, 6** |
| **Sept 10** | **Topic**  Art, Games, and Humanism Conclusion / Writing Discussion  **Assignment**  Read: Pratt – “The Art History…of Games?” (<https://www.gamasutra.com/view/news/118076/The_Art_History_Of_Games_Games_As_Art_May_Be_A_Lost_Cause.php>)  Jenkins – “Games, The New Lively Art” | **1, 2, 5, 6** |
| **Sept 12** | **Topic**  Introduction to Critical Making / Critical Playing  **Assignment**  Read: Critical Making Wiki (<https://ipfs.io/ipfs/QmXoypizjW3WknFiJnKLwHCnL72vedxjQkDDP1mXWo6uco/wiki/Critical_making.html>)  Watch: Anthropometries for Quake 4 (<https://vimeo.com/4712450>), Noclip (https://noclip.website/) | **5, 6** |
| **Sept 17** | **Topic**  Critical Play Continued  **Assignment**  Read: Kunzelman “Kill the Pig”  Keogh “Towards Dawn”  Watch: Many-Worlds Mario (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pw3T9vxetAk>) and read <http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/but-not-simpler/2014/02/20/many-worlds-hypothesis-hardest-super-mario-level/#.Uw1zc9zbg5w>  Coding through Play: https://www.reddit.com/r/videos/comments/2t7sk1/super\_mario\_world\_speedrunner\_pulls\_off\_a\_glitch/ | **5, 6** |
| **Unit 2 – Defining Play and its Aesthetics** | | |
| **Sept 19** | **Topic**  Defining Play – Theory / Writing Discussion  **Assignment**  Read: Salen and Zimmerman Chapter 22 | **1, 2, 3, 4, 5** |
| **Sept 24** | **Topic**  Defining Play - Praxis  **Assignment**  Read: Adams Chapter 5 | **1, 2, 3, 4** |
| **Sept 26** | **Topic**  Defining the Aesthetics of Play  **Assignment**  Read: Caillois Chapters 1 and 2  **Due: Player Paper 1** | **1, 2, 3, 4** |
| **Oct 1** | **Topic**  Technology Demonstration for Capturing Critical Play  **Assignment**  Download: OBS Studio, Adobe Premiere | **5, 6** |
| **Oct 3** | **Topic**  Aesthetics of Play Continued / Writing Instruction  **Assignment**  Read: Sutton-Smith Chapter 1 | **1, 2, 3, 4** |
| **Unit 3 – The Aesthetics of Play** | | |
| **Oct 8** | **Topic**  Play as Escapism – The Magic Circle / Writing Discussion  **Assignment**  Read: Huizinga *Homo Ludens* Chapter 1 | **1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6** |
| **Oct 10** | **Topic**  Play as Escapism Continued – The Myth of the Magic Circle  **Assignment**  Read: Consalvo “There is No Magic Circle”  Zimmerman “Jerked Around by the Magic Circle” https://www.gamasutra.com/view/feature/135063/jerked\_around\_by\_the\_magic\_circle\_.php | **1, 2, 3, 4, 5** |
| **Oct 15** | **Topic**  Play as Socializing  **Assignment**  Read: Steinkuehler and Williams – “Where Everybody Knows Your Screen Name”  Lisi *World of Warcraft* | **1, 2, 3, 4** |
| **Oct 17** | **Topic**  Play as Socializing Continued  **Assignment**  Read: Williams “Gamers Don’t Bowl Alone”  Lisi *World of Warcraft* | **1, 2, 3, 4** |
| **Oct 22** | **Topic**  Play as Learning / Writing Discussion  **Assignment**  Read: Gee “Semiotic Domains: Is Playing Video Games a ‘Waste of Time?’” | **1, 2, 3, 4** |
| **Oct 24** | **Topic**  Play as Learning Continued  **Assignment**  Read: Squire Chapters 1 and 2 | **1, 2, 3, 4, 5** |
| **Oct 29** | **Topic**  Play as Expression  **Assignment**  Read: Wirman “On Productivity and Game Fandom” | **1, 2, 3, 4** |
| **Oct 31** | **Topic**  Play as Expression Continued  **Assignment**  Read: Flanagan and Nissenbaum Chapters 1 and 2  **Due: Player Paper 2** | **1, 2, 3, 4** |
| **Nov 5** | **Topic**  Play as Rhetoric  **Assignment**  Read: Bogost “The Rhetoric of Video Games” http://www.cogsci.rpi.edu/public\_html/ruiz/EGDFall2013/readings/RhetoricVideoGames\_Bogost.pdf | **1, 2, 3, 4** |
| **Nov 7** | **Topic**  Play as Rhetoric Continued  **Assignment**  Read: Flanagan Introduction and Chapter 3 | **1, 2, 3, 4** |
| **Nov 12** | **Topic**  Playing Identities  **Assignment**  Read: Penix-Tadsen *Cultural Code* Intro and Chapter 1 | **1, 2, 3, 4, 5** |
| **Nov 14** | **Topic**  Playing Identities Continued  **Assignment**  Read: *Rated M for Mature* Chapters 2, 3, and 6  **Due: Player Community Reflection** | **1, 2, 3, 4, 5** |
| **Nov 19** | **Topic**  Playing Identities Continued  **Assignment**  Read: Shaw Chapter 2 and 3  <https://medium.com/@Electronic_Arts/what-inclusion-means-to-players-db4522bdd8a0>​ | **1, 2, 3, 4, 5** |
| **Nov 21** | **Topic**  Play as Labor  **Assignment**  Read: Kucklich “Precarious Playbour” (http://five.fibreculturejournal.org/fcj-025-precarious-playbour-modders-and-the-digital-games-industry/) | **1, 2, 3, 4, 5** |
| **Nov 26** | **Topic**  In-class Channel Feedback  **Assignment**  Bring in Channel Drafts  **Due: Player Paper 3** | **1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6** |
| **Dec 3** | **Topic**  Channel Presentations | **1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6** |

## **Required textbooks aNd SOFTWARE:**

1. Course Reader (includes selections from the following books: *Rated M For Mature*, *Critical Play*, *Cultural Code*, *Values at Play*. *Homo Ludens*, *Man, Play, Games*, *Ambiguity of Play*, *Fundamentals of Game Design*, *The Game Design Reader*, *Gaming at the Edge*, *Thinking about Video Games*, *Works of Game*, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, *Art Through the Ages*)

## **Recommended textbooks aNd SOFTWARE:**

1. *A Short Guide to Writing about Art.* Barnet, Sylvan.
2. *Style: The Basics of Clarity and Grace*, Edition TBA, Williams and Bizup

## **Course Fees:**

Course fees are assessed for certain courses to offset the cost of materials or supply items consumed in the course of instruction. A list of [approved courses and fees](http://www.registrar.ufl.edu/soc/) is published in the Schedule of Courses each semester. (UF-3.0374 Regulations of the University of Florida).

Material and supply and equipment use fee information is available from the academic departments or from the schedule of courses (Florida Statutes 1009.24). The total course fee for this class is $0.0

The total course fee for each course is listed on the UF Schedule of Courses. (<https://registrar.ufl.edu/soc/>).

## **Course assignments**

### Participation and Attendance

**Total Points Possible: 100  
Participation will be worth 10% of students final grade**

Our class is considered “discussion-based,” which means that students are active collaborators presenting ideas, questions, and examples that help unpack and explain the course topics. In a discussion-based course, the course lives (or dies a slow, boring, and laborious death) on what students do (or do not) contribute to the class. Thus, I ask that all students regularly contribute to the course.

But what constitutes good participation in a discussion-based class? **I define participation as in-class, relevant, insightful, and applied discussion, and** I evaluate your contributions on three levels:

1. Relevance to the day's topic/the discussion at hand (35%)
2. Demonstrates outside preparation (you show you've read/watched/played the assigned media) (35%)
3. Moves beyond summary (you provide examples of application instead of simply repeating what we've already read) (35%)

Contributions will be noted every class, and your participation grade will be updated weekly via canvas gradebook to keep you informed of your progress.

Keep in mind that participation is not a freebie grade that you get just for saying words. It is not an invitation to share whatever happens to be on your mind. It is not staying after class to chat with your instructor.

These requirements are expected of all students.

**If You Feel Uncomfortable Participating in Class:**

If you feel uncomfortable speaking during class, we will have a course discord that you may contribute to in place of in-class conversation. Your responses should do one of the following:

* respond to something that was in the media assigned for class that day
* respond to a point or idea that was raised in class
* respond to one of the above that someone else posted on the discord

I expect your response to be grounded in the day's topic and our assigned media. This means that if a student mentions *Skyrim* in class, you WILL NOT receive participation credit if your discussion topic is merely a rant about how much you like/hate *Skyrim*.

To earn participation points, students must contribute once a week minimum.

Advances SLOs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

### Player Papers – Formal/Stylistic Analysis, Ludo-grapy, Theory and Criticism,

As a course emerging from the College of the Arts, students will gain familiarity with three common forms of written art history and analysis through monthly “Player Papers” (paper 1 = 500 words min., paper 2 = 500 words min., paper 3 = 1000 words min.) that will account for 2000 words. Player Papers invite students to go out and play or observe the playing of a game of their choosing. Whereas many written documentations focus on the plastic and object-based arts, these papers are designed for students to document the aesthetics of transient forms like play and performance. To accomplish this, students will produce the following: a formal and stylistic analysis of play, a “ludo”-nography of play, and a theory and criticism of play. Additionally, while playing or observing, students must take notes and observe how their or others’ performance connects to the themes and ideas in an already discussed unit. Notes might, for example, document the following:

* Who plays? Who doesn’t play?
* How do players play?
* Do players connect their play to things outside of the game?
* Does the play seem to comment on any social or cultural issues?
* What are the “aesthetics” of play?
* Does play become a space for discussing issues that are important to the players?
* How are players affected by their play?

Students must also cite at least **four** readings that we have already discussed during class. In addition to introducing key writing skills in the college of the arts, papers are meant to have students connect ideas in current units to previous units to encourage iterative thinking.

All papers must be typed, double-spaced with one-inch margins, 12 pt Times New Roman. You must include a word-count at the top of your first page. Please also include your name, the date you hand in the assignment, and title your essays.

Each paper is to be uploaded onto the course’s e-learning site in Canvas. You can log in and find the course web page here: elearning.ufl.edu. The papers will be graded electronically and returned to you electronically. We will consider allowing you to turn in a paper late without penalty only if you have a valid and documented reason for doing so. If you turn in a paper without a valid or documented reason, 1/3 of a letter grade will be deducted for each day it is late (including weekend days).

As a 4000-word writing credit course, papers must be well composed and edited. The rubric clearly identifies how point values are assigned to each of four levels of achievement (Excellent, Good, Needs Improvement, Unacceptable), according to what level you have reached with respect to each of six areas: the appropriateness of the play you have chosen, the presence and clarity of a thesis about its operation, the explanation of how you experienced or observed the play, the evaluation of what the thesis might mean for play on a larger scale, writing mechanics, and writing coherence. Please see the rubric for short papers included at the end of the syllabus for elaboration of these requirements.

**Formal and Stylistic Analysis**

**Total Points Possible: 100  
Worth 20% of your final grade**

This assignment asks for a detailed description of the “formal” and “stylistic” qualities of the observed play. Formal here means “related to the form,” not “fancy” or “elegant,” and “stylistic” refers to a specific type of performance style (exploratory, critical, competitive, etc.). In other words, you’re both looking at the individual design elements, such as composition (arrangement of parts of or in the work), movement, interaction, deviation, bodily gestures, environment, etc. as well as how the play fits into (or resists) a larger category of performances. Your primary concern in this assignment is to attempt to explain how the player arranges and uses these various elements to accomplish something *beyond* winning the game.

You will be required to produce a highly detailed description of the play, and you will most likely struggle with finding a way to translate action and performance into words. You are encouraged to re-play and watch others play more than once to help notice small details you may miss. You might also encourage a player to narrate their play.

In art history, translating something from a visual and performative language to a textual language is a vital task, and in this assignment I will be reading to see how successfully you have accomplished this. Additionally, I will be reading for how well you can scrutinize performance; in other words, can you look—and look carefully? Think of the play as a series of decisions that an artist made. Your job is to figure out and describe, explain, and interpret those decisions and why the artist/player may have made them.

In writing this assignment, focus on creating a logical order so that your reader doesn’t get lost. Don’t ever assume that because your instructor has seen the work, he or she knows what you are talking about. **Here are a couple of options:**

* summarize the overall appearance, then describe the details of the play
* describe the composition and then move on to a description of the materials used (hardware, pieces, boards, environments, costumes, bodies, etc.)
* begin discussing one repeated performance that you see and then use that base-line to build into more complex performances
* describe things in the order in which they draw your eye around the play (and draw it towards other ideas/concepts), starting with the first thing you notice and moving to the next
* describe how the play fits a stylistic category
* describe how the play does not fit a category
* describe how two plays with the same type of content look totally different from each other, because of the style (for example, both plays are competitions, but they show different approaches to other participants, etc.)

This assignment consists of pure description with little or no interpretation, so focus on describing your object.

**Ludo-graphy**

**Total Points Possible: 100  
Worth 20% of your final grade**

Here you will look for a particular element that occurs in the play (an object, action, gesture, pose) and explain either:

* when that same element occurs in other plays through digital play history and how this performance’s representation is unique

or

* what that element means generally in game studies or to game studies scholars—in other words, the traditional association a game scholar might make between that performance and some other thing

For example, there have been thousands of performances of asking players to defeat a villain and rescue someone. Let’s say you are assigned one Let’s Player’s performance of this, (e.g. Ashley’s brief sequence rescuing Leon in *Resident Evil 4*), and you are asked to find out what is unique about it. You would go look at other versions, like another player’s recording/performance or a similar scenario (Claire rescuing Leon in *Resident Evil 2*), and compare how they both show players OR characters OR both making their choices. Unlike the formal/stylistic analysis, you do not have to focus on the actual construction of the performance; instead you should focus on the way the performance is represented: one player has Ashley walk backwards through the sequence, while another player has her focus on being chased. Then, you will need to hypothesize about what that means/what value it expresses.

**Theory and Criticism**

**Total Points Possible: 100  
Worth 20% of your final grade**

Whereas the previous assignment types focus on the performance itself, this assignment asks you to look beyond or through the object toward theoretical, historical, or social contexts of the play, player, or time period. Specifically, you will consider the play’s relationship to ideas about gender, class, artistic creation, culture, or politics associated with that time. Alternatively, you connect performances with the theories and beliefs of a particular player.

Consider this in the realm of visual arts. Jackson Pollock’s abstract expressionist paintings have been discussed as all of the following (to list just a few):

* stemming from and/or helping to create an American post-war culture of masculinity and superiority
* exploring the relationship between American culture and its “Native American roots”
* portraying a stylistic progression from a more realistic/naturalistic representation to a more abstract representation that emphasizes the flatness of the canvas and the paint over content or narrative
* pointing out the cowardice and malleability of wealthy American patrons.

As these examples demonstrate, be sure that your paper contains a strong argument, but keep in mind that the play should be at the forefront of your discussion. The theory or criticism should arise out of the play, rather than be superimposed on it. A good way to keep your focus on the play is to write a formal analysis before getting into the theory; you may not include this analysis in your final paper, but writing it will give you insight into the play you are discussing.

Advances SLOs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6

**See Rubric Below for Total Points and Percentage of Grade**

### player community reflection

**Total Points Possible: 100  
Community Paper will be worth 10% of your final grade**

Students will be asked to attend a local gaming event hosted by the community and write a 1000 word paper reflecting on the experience. While the paper is similar in nature to the Player Papers, the goal here is to document how the event circulates through and affects the local community. These reflections should address how play and players at such gatherings interface with the broader Gainesville community and beyond. Your reflection will describe the possible motivations for the event, where you learned of the event, what possible benefits the event holds for the community, and how the event did or did not achieve those benefits while still addressing the main themes of the course. Please see the Player Community Reflection rubric included at the end of this syllabus for a description of requirements and assessment.

Advances SLOs: 1, 3, 4, 5

**See Rubric Below for Total Points and Percentage of Grade**

### watch me play capstone project

**Total Points Possible: 100  
Watch Me Play Capstone will be worth 20% of your final grade**

The capstone project for the course, “Watch Me Play,” asks students to adopt and circulate a style of digital performance we have explored in the class on a digital platform like Twitch or YouTube to address some issue of personal, cultural, or ethical relevance. Students may produce many types of play-based media including “Machinima,” “Streams,” “Let’s Plays,” etc. to demonstrate fluency in the play-based practices we have explored in the class (information literacy). The purpose of this play-based media must be grounded in, and show thinking about, some kind of need (examined life), as well as an attempt to address and respond to that need (thinking and acting ethically). Needs can range from a social cause, to archival work, to community building, and more.

The grade for the capstone project will be based on 100 points and will involve two parts: a channel with performed and exhibited content (YouTube or Twitch) and a 1000 word reflection paper.

Part 1: Channel and Content (70/100 points: 35 for individual presentation and 45 for poster) The channel may be completed individually, or in groups of up to 3 people who are working within the same performative genre and with similar goals. The final two classes will be reserved for exploring the various channels that students have created, demoing their materials and explaining how it connects to the goals and objectives in the course. Every student will be responsible for presenting to the class, even if the work on the channel was done collaboratively. The work of presenting should be divided evenly between group members, if applicable. Please see the Capstone Rubric included at the end of this syllabus for a breakdown of requirements and assessment.

Advances SLOs: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Part 2: Reflection paper (30/100 points for individual paper)

Each student must write a 1000 word reflection paper on their experience identifying, evaluating, and considering how their performance connects to the class topics and their goals. Students will also be asked to reflect on the ways in which the themes of this course are relevant to their own intellectual, personal, and professional development at UF and beyond. These papers will be more informal than the monthly Player Papers, but they must be clearly written, thoughtful, and reveal an understanding of the main themes of the course. Please see the Capstone Rubric included at the end of this syllabus for a description of requirements and assessment.

Advances SLOs: 1, 5, 6

**See Rubric Below for Total Points and Percentage of Grade**

## **EVALUATION of grades**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assignment | Total Points | Percentage of Grade | Total Words |
| **Formal and Stylistic Analysis** | 100 | 20% | 500 |
| **Ludo-graphy Analysis** | 100 | 20% | 500 |
| **Theory and Criticism Analysis** | 100 | 20% | 1000 |
| **Community Event Paper** | 100 | 10% | 1000 |
| **Watch Me Play Capstone** | 100 | 20% | 1000 |
| **Participation** | 100 | 10% | N/A |

## **Grading scale:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Letter Grade** | **% Equivalency** | **GPA Equivalency** |
| A | 94 – 100% | 4.0 |
| A- | 90 – 93% | 3.67 |
| B+ | 87 – 89% | 3.33 |
| B | 84 – 86% | 3.00 |
| B- | 80 – 83% | 2.67 |
| C+ | 77 – 79% | 2.33 |
| C | 74 – 76% | 2.00 |
| C- | 70 – 73% | 1.67 |
| D+ | 67 – 69% | 1.33 |
| D | 64 – 66% | 1.00 |
| D- | 60 – 63% | .67 |
| E, I, NG, S-U, WF | 0 – 59% | 0.00 |

More information on grades and grading policies is here: <https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/grades.aspx>

## **Grading Rubric**

# Formal and Stylistic Analysis Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Needs Improvement** | **Unacceptable** |  |
| **Play** | Excellent papers in this category will perform the following:  -Clearly identifies and explains the form of play they’re observing / participating in  -Explains the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -Connects the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  -Is a “measurable” form of play (100-hour RPG play will be too much)  35 – 32 points | Good papers in this category will perform the following:  -Clearly identifies and explains the form of play they’re observing / participating in  -Explains the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -May not directly connect the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  -May not be a realistically measurable form of play  31 – 29 points | Needs Improvement papers in this category will perform the following:  -May not clearly identify and/or explain the form of play they’re observing / participating in  -May neglect to explain the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -May not connect the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  -Is not a realistic or measurable form of play    28 – 26 points | Unacceptable papers in this category will perform the following:  -Does not address a form of play (focuses on game over play)  -Does not connect the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  25 - 0 points | 35 points |
| **Explanation** | The paper contains accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of game play.  35 – 32 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the following game play, but it overlooks minor aspects.  31 – 29 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of gameplay is lacking several significant aspects.  28 – 26 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of gameplay is missing major aspects.  25 – 0 points | 35 points |
| **Writing: Mechanics** | -All sentences are complete and grammatical.  -Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, no rhetorical questions, and no slang  10 – 9 points | -All sentences are complete and grammatical.  -Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, no rhetorical questions, and no slang.  8 – 7 points | -A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical.  -Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions, and/or slang.  6 – 5 points | -Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical.  -Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions, and/or uses of slang.  4 – 0 points | 15 points |
| **Writing: Cohesion and Coherence** | -All words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content is relevant to the study and documentation of play; no extraneous material  -Ideas are developed in a coherent order, parts of paper fit together, and it is easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are defined  -Information is accurate (names, facts, rules, etc.)  10 – 9 points | -Most words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content is mostly relevant to the study and documentation of play; few extraneous materials  -Ideas are mostly developed in a coherent order, parts of paper mostly fit together, and it is somewhat easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -Most new or unusual terms are defined  -Most information is accurate (names, facts, rules, etc.)  8 – 7 points | -Words are not chosen for their precise meanings and are used inconsistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content contains extraneous materials  -Ideas are not developed in a coherent order, parts of paper do not fit together, and it is not easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are ill-defined  -Much inaccurate information  6 – 5 points | -Words are not chosen for their precise meanings and are used inconsistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Much extraneous materials  -Ideas are incoherent, cannot identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are not defined  -All inaccurate information  4 – 0 points | 15 points |

# Ludo-graphy Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Needs Improvement** | **Unacceptable** |  |
| **Play** | Excellent papers in this category will perform the following:  -Clearly identifies and explains the form of play they’re observing / participating in  -Explains the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -Connects the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  -Is a “measurable” form of play (100-hour RPG play will be too much)  5 points | Good papers in this category will perform the following:  -Clearly identifies and explains the form of play they’re observing / participating in  -Explains the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -May not directly connect the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  -May not be a realistically measurable form of play  4 points | Needs Improvement papers in this category will perform the following:  -May not clearly identify and/or explain the form of play they’re observing / participating in  -May neglect to explain the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -May not connect the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  -Is not a realistic or measurable form of play    3 – 1 points | Unacceptable papers in this category will perform the following:  -Does not address a form of play (focuses on game over play)  -Does not connect the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  0 points | 10 points |
| **Explanation** | The paper contains accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of game play.  35 – 32 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the following game play, but it overlooks minor aspects.  31 – 29 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of gameplay is lacking several significant aspects.  28 – 26 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of gameplay is missing major aspects.  25 – 0 points | 35 points |
| **Evaluation** | The paper presents a thoughtful reading of play by supporting its explanation section with the following:  -Multiple documented events, actions, conversations, etc.  -Re-playing with other players/watching other players’ experience  -Considering how the game might afford other play possibilities not readily observed/experienced by the players  35 – 32 points | The paper presents a reading of play by supporting its explanation section with the following:  -One or two documented events, actions, conversations, etc.  -Partially re-playing with other players/watching other players’ experience  -Considering other play possibilities, but not thoroughly explaining those possibilities  31 – 29 points | The paper supports its explanation, but it does so in a weak or superficial way because it commits one of the following:  -No documented events, actions, conversations, etc.  -No re-play/observation of other players  -No consideration of other forms of play  28 – 26 points | The paper does not support its explanation.  25 – 0 points | 35 points |
| **Writing: Mechanics** | -All sentences are complete and grammatical.  -Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, no rhetorical questions, and no slang  10 – 9 points | -All sentences are complete and grammatical.  -Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, no rhetorical questions, and no slang.  8 – 7 points | -A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical.  -Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions, and/or slang.  6 – 5 points | -Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical.  -Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions, and/or uses of slang.  4 – 0 points | 10 points |
| **Writing: Cohesion and Coherence** | -All words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content is relevant to the study and documentation of play; no extraneous material  -Ideas are developed in a coherent order, parts of paper fit together, and it is easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are defined  -Information is accurate (names, facts, rules, etc.)  10 – 9 points | -Most words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content is mostly relevant to the study and documentation of play; few extraneous materials  -Ideas are mostly developed in a coherent order, parts of paper mostly fit together, and it is somewhat easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -Most new or unusual terms are defined  -Most information is accurate (names, facts, rules, etc.)  8 – 7 points | -Words are not chosen for their precise meanings and are used inconsistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content contains extraneous materials  -Ideas are not developed in a coherent order, parts of paper do not fit together, and it is not easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are ill-defined  -Much inaccurate information  6 – 5 points | -Words are not chosen for their precise meanings and are used inconsistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Much extraneous materials  -Ideas are incoherent, cannot identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are not defined  -All inaccurate information  4 – 0 points | 10 points |

# Theory and Criticism Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Needs Improvement** | **Unacceptable** |  |
| **Play** | Excellent papers in this category will perform the following:  -Clearly identifies and explains the form of play they’re observing / participating in  -Explains the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -Connects the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  -Is a “measurable” form of play (100-hour RPG play will be too much)  5 points | Good papers in this category will perform the following:  -Clearly identifies and explains the form of play they’re observing / participating in  -Explains the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -May not directly connect the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  -May not be a realistically measurable form of play  4 points | Needs Improvement papers in this category will perform the following:  -May not clearly identify and/or explain the form of play they’re observing / participating in  -May neglect to explain the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -May not connect the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  -Is not a realistic or measurable form of play    3 – 1 points | Unacceptable papers in this category will perform the following:  -Does not address a form of play (focuses on game over play)  -Does not connect the form of play to the genre(s) discussed in the course  0 points | 5 points |
| **Thesis** | A clear statement about the form of play’s value/meaning to the players or larger community  5 points | The value of the play to the players / larger community is obvious, but there is no single clear statement of it.    4 points | The value of play to players / larger community is present but must be uncovered or reconstructed from the text of the paper.    3 – 1 points | There is no value to players / larger community.    0 points | 5 points |
| **Explanation** | The paper contains accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of game play by addressing the following:  -Explains whether the form of play is player-produced or enforced by the rules of the game  -Explains what themes, ideas, or beliefs might be channeled from the game through the play or vice versa  -Explains what meanings the players make of their play and how that meaning is made  -Explains what meanings, beliefs, ideas players bring into their play and how these things influence their play  -Identifies any expressions players make through their play  35 – 32 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the following game play is only missing ONE of the following aspects:  -Explains whether the form of play is player-produced or enforced by the rules of the game  -Explains what themes, ideas, or beliefs might be channeled from the game through the play or vice versa  -Explains what meanings the players make of their play and how that meaning is made  -Explains what meanings, beliefs, ideas players bring into their play and how these things influence their play  -Identifies any expressions players make through their play  31 – 29 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of gameplay is lacking more than one of the following aspects:  -Explains whether the form of play is player-produced or enforced by the rules of the game  -Explains what themes, ideas, or beliefs might be channeled from the game through the play or vice versa  -Explains what meanings the players make of their play and how that meaning is made  -Explains what meanings, beliefs, ideas players bring into their play and how these things influence their play  -Identifies any expressions players make through their play  28 – 26 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of gameplay is missing most, if not all, of the following aspects:  -Explains whether the form of play is player-produced or enforced by the rules of the game  -Explains what themes, ideas, or beliefs might be channeled from the game through the play or vice versa  -Explains what meanings the players make of their play and how that meaning is made  -Explains what meanings, beliefs, ideas players bring into their play and how these things influence their play  -Identifies any expressions players make through their play    25 – 0 points | 35 points |
| **Evaluation** | The paper presents a thoughtful reading of play by supporting its explanation section with the following:  -Multiple documented events, actions, conversations, etc.  -Re-playing with other players/watching other players’ experience  -Considering how the game might afford other play possibilities not readily observed/experienced by the players  35 – 32 points | The paper presents a reading of play by supporting its explanation section with the following:  -One or two documented events, actions, conversations, etc.  -Partially re-playing with other players/watching other players’ experience  -Considering other play possibilities, but not thoroughly explaining those possibilities  31 – 29 points | The paper supports its explanation, but it does so in a weak or superficial way because it commits one of the following:  -No documented events, actions, conversations, etc.  -No re-play/observation of other players  -No consideration of other forms of play  28 – 26 points | The paper does not support its explanation.  25 – 0 points | 35 points |
| **Writing: Mechanics** | -All sentences are complete and grammatical.  -Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, no rhetorical questions, and no slang  10 – 9 points | -All sentences are complete and grammatical.  -Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, no rhetorical questions, and no slang.  8 – 7 points | -A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical.  -Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions, and/or slang.  6 – 5 points | -Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical.  -Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions, and/or uses of slang.  4 – 0 points | 10 points |
| **Writing: Cohesion and Coherence** | -All words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content is relevant to the study and documentation of play; no extraneous material  -Ideas are developed in a coherent order, parts of paper fit together, and it is easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are defined  -Information is accurate (names, facts, rules, etc.)  10 – 9 points | -Most words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content is mostly relevant to the study and documentation of play; few extraneous materials  -Ideas are mostly developed in a coherent order, parts of paper mostly fit together, and it is somewhat easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -Most new or unusual terms are defined  -Most information is accurate (names, facts, rules, etc.)  8 – 7 points | -Words are not chosen for their precise meanings and are used inconsistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content contains extraneous materials  -Ideas are not developed in a coherent order, parts of paper do not fit together, and it is not easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are ill-defined  -Much inaccurate information  6 – 5 points | -Words are not chosen for their precise meanings and are used inconsistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Much extraneous materials  -Ideas are incoherent, cannot identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are not defined  -All inaccurate information  4 – 0 points | 10 points |

# Player Community Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Needs Improvement** | **Unacceptable** |  |
| **Event** | Excellent papers in this category will perform the following:  -Clearly identifies and explains the Community Event they’re observing / participating in  -Explains the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -Describes stated motivations for the event (why is this event happening?)  -Is an actual public-facing event  5 points | Good papers in this category will perform the following:  -Clearly identifies and explains the Community Event they’re observing / participating in  -Explains the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -Explain stated motivations for event  -May not be a completely public-facing event  4 points | Needs Improvement papers in this category will perform the following:  -May not clearly identify and/or explain the Community Event  -May neglect to explain the writer’s position (participant, observer, rule-keeper/DM, etc.)  -May not explain stated motivations for event  -Is not a public-facing event    3 – 1 points | Unacceptable papers in this category will perform the following:  -Does not address a Community Event  -Does not explain motivation for event  0 points | 5 points |
| **Exhibition Thesis** | A clear statement about how the event exhibits play and asks the public to interact with this exhibition  5 points | How the event exhibits play and asks the public to interact with this exhibition is obvious, but there is no single clear statement of it.    4 points | How the event exhibits play and asks the public to interact with this exhibition is present but must be uncovered or reconstructed from the text of the paper.    3 – 1 points | There is no thesis on how the event exhibits play and asks the public to interact with this exhibition.  0 points | 5 points |
| **Explanation** | The paper contains accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the event by addressing the following:  -Explains how the performance is affected by its surroundings (environment, people, games, etc.)  -Explains how the motivations for the event affect the types of play on display  -Explains any implied literacies necessary for reading and understanding the value of the performances on display  -Explains who performs and who does not perform as well as why this matters to the possible reception from the community  -Identifies any larger expressions that this collective play makes about Gainesville or society at large  35 – 32 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the following game play is only missing ONE of the following aspects:  -Explains how the performance is affected by its surroundings (environment, people, games, etc.)  -Explains how the motivations for the event affect the types of play on display  -Explains any implied literacies necessary for reading and understanding the value of the performances on display  -Explains who performs and who does not perform as well as why this matters to the possible reception from the community  -Identifies any larger expressions that this collective play makes about Gainesville or society at large  31 – 29 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of gameplay is lacking more than one of the following aspects:  -Explains how the performance is affected by its surroundings (environment, people, games, etc.)  -Explains how the motivations for the event affect the types of play on display  -Explains any implied literacies necessary for reading and understanding the value of the performances on display  -Explains who performs and who does not perform as well as why this matters to the possible reception from the community  -Identifies any larger expressions that this collective play makes about Gainesville or society at large  28 – 26 points | The paper’s summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of gameplay is missing most, if not all, of the following aspects:  -Explains how the performance is affected by its surroundings (environment, people, games, etc.)  -Explains how the motivations for the event affect the types of play on display  -Explains any implied literacies necessary for reading and understanding the value of the performances on display  -Explains who performs and who does not perform as well as why this matters to the possible reception from the community  -Identifies any larger expressions that this collective play makes about Gainesville or society at large    25 – 0 points | 35 points |
| **Evaluation** | The paper presents a thoughtful reading of the Community Event by supporting its explanation section with the following:  -Multiple documented actions, conversations, performances, etc.  -Conversations with a variety of attendees  -Considering play possibilities not featured at the event and why  35 – 32 points | The paper presents a reading of the Community Event by supporting its explanation section with the following:  -One or two documented actions, conversations, performances, etc.  -Only conversing with small number of attendees  -Considering other play possibilities, but not thoroughly explaining those possibilities  31 – 29 points | The paper supports its explanation, but it does so in a weak or superficial way because it commits one of the following:  -No documented actions, conversations, performances, etc.  -No conversation with other attendees  -No consideration of other forms of play  28 – 26 points | The paper does not support its explanation.  25 – 0 points | 35 points |
| **Writing: Mechanics** | -All sentences are complete and grammatical.  -Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, no rhetorical questions, and no slang  10 – 9 points | -All sentences are complete and grammatical.  -Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, no rhetorical questions, and no slang.  8 – 7 points | -A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical.  -Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions, and/or slang.  6 – 5 points | -Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical.  -Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions, and/or uses of slang.  4 – 0 points | 10 points |
| **Writing: Cohesion and Coherence** | -All words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content is relevant to the study and documentation of play; no extraneous material  -Ideas are developed in a coherent order, parts of paper fit together, and it is easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are defined  -Information is accurate (names, facts, rules, etc.)  10 – 9 points | -Most words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content is mostly relevant to the study and documentation of play; few extraneous materials  -Ideas are mostly developed in a coherent order, parts of paper mostly fit together, and it is somewhat easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -Most new or unusual terms are defined  -Most information is accurate (names, facts, rules, etc.)  8 – 7 points | -Words are not chosen for their precise meanings and are used inconsistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Paper content contains extraneous materials  -Ideas are not developed in a coherent order, parts of paper do not fit together, and it is not easy to identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are ill-defined  -Much inaccurate information  6 – 5 points | -Words are not chosen for their precise meanings and are used inconsistently (i.e. “player” vs “gamer)  -Much extraneous materials  -Ideas are incoherent, cannot identify how the initial thesis informs the entire paper.  -New or unusual terms are not defined  -All inaccurate information  4 – 0 points | 10 points |

# watch me play Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Needs Improvement** | **Unacceptable** |  |
| **Channel: Subject Matter and Content** | -The channel focuses on a specific type of performance with an identifiable goal  -The channel features a style of play that critically enacts the theories and ideas discussed within the course  -The style of play responds to a specific audience and their concerns  -Forms of play are significant and appropriate to the genre and expectations of the course.  -Enacts critical digital- and play-based literacies by referencing inspirations, ideas, and genre tropes within the performance  -Uses play to express some idea, belief, or theory  -Provides at least five different examples  25 - 23 points | -The channel focuses on a specific type of performance with an identifiable goal  -The channel features a style of play that critically enacts the theories and ideas discussed within the course  -The style of play loosely responds to a specific audience and their concerns  -Forms of play vaguely fit within the genre and expectations of the course.  -May or may not enact critical digital- and play-based literacies by referencing inspirations, ideas, and genre tropes within the performance  -Uses play to express some idea, belief, or theory  -Provides at least four different examples  22 - 20 points | -The channel provides an unfocused range of performances with no goal  -The channel does not critically enacts the theories and ideas discussed within the course  -The style of play does not respond to a specific audience and their concerns  -Forms of play do not fit the genre and expectations of the course.  -No critical digital literacy present  -Uses play to express some idea, belief, or theory  -Provides at least two different examples  19 - 17 points | -The channel does not focus on a specific type of performance with an identifiable goal  -Does not critically enact the theories and ideas discussed within the course  -Does not reflect digital- and play-based literacies  -Does not use play to express some idea, belief, or theory  -Provides less than two different examples    16 – 0 points | 50 points |
| **Presentation: Individual Student’s Contribution** | -The presentation contains accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing  -Presentation is succinct and clear  -Key concepts and theories are accurately and completely explained  -When appropriate, good, clear examples are used  -Appropriate use of sources  -Response to questions demonstrates substantive knowledge of subject matter and project  35 – 32 points | -Summarization, description and/or paraphrasing in the presentation is fairly accurate and precise  -Presentation is relatively succinct and clear  -Key concepts and theories are explained.  -Examples are clear but may not be well chosen.  -Appropriate use of sources  -Response to questions demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and project. Student is able to have a brief  conversation about what has been presented.  31 – 29 points | -The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing is fairly accurate, but not precise.  -Presentation is not always clear and easy to follow. Not succinct.  -Key concepts and theories are not explained.  -Examples are not clear and may not be well chosen or appropriate.  -Sources are not properly used to support the presentation  -Responses to questions reveals that the student does not understand the subject matter or project enough to  converse about them in a clear or effective manner  28 – 26 points | -The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the issue is inaccurate.  -Presentation cannot be followed  -Key concepts and theories may be identified but are not explained.  -Examples are not clear, are inappropriate, and/or do not illuminate concepts and issues.  -Student does not use sources or uses them improperly.  -Responses to questions reveals that the student does not understand the subject matter or project.  25 – 0 points | 35 points |
| **Individual Student Reflection Paper** | -Paper considers how the project brings together the themes of the course: digital- and play-based literacy, player engagement with social issues and beliefs, community building, and play as expression  -Paper is clearly and well-written (see rubric for Player Papers on Writing Mechanics and Cohesion/Coherence criteria)  -Paper demonstrates critical reflection  15 – 13 points | -Paper considers how the project brings together the themes of the course: digital- and play-based literacy, player engagement with social issues and beliefs, community building, and play as expression  -Paper is clear, but may not be well-written as explained in Mechanics and Cohesion/Coherence criteria  -Paper demonstrates critical reflection  12 – 10 points | -Paper considers how the project brings together the themes of the course: digital- and play-based literacy, player engagement with social issues and beliefs, community building, and play as expression  -Paper is not clear  -Paper does not demonstrate critical reflection  9 – 5 points | -Paper does not considers how the project brings together the themes of the course  -Paper is difficult to follow and unclear  -Paper demonstrates superficial and empty reflection  5 – 0 points | 15 points |

## **Course Policies:**

Attendance  
Attendance is mandatory. Students are allowed **three unexcused absences**. If you miss more than **three classes** during the semester, each additional absence will lower your overall grade by **100 points**. If you miss more than **six classes**, you will fail the course. Exempt from this policy are only those absences involving university-sponsored events, such as athletics and band, and religious holidays, family emergencies, and health issues for which **you must provide appropriate documentation in advance of the absence**.

Additionally, tardiness will not be tolerated. If you are tardy for three class periods, you will receive an unexcused absence.

Make-up Policy

Unless discussed at least 72 hours in advance of the deadline, late assignments will not be accepted. Excluded from this policy are any assignments missed due to medical emergencies.

Requirements for class attendance and make-up exams, assignments, and other work in this course are consistent with university policies that can be found at: <https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/attendance.aspx>

Course Technology

The students will be required to have access to and use a personal computer with the access to the Internet. Word editing software will be required for written assignments. Students will also be required to use video editing software and computer cameras, all of which are available free of charge in the Digital Worlds Institute.

Course Communications

Students can communicate directly with the Instructor regarding the course material through the course management system (CANVAS). Electronic communication must demonstrate a formal tone and style and, unless absolutely urgent, will be responded to M-F from 9 AM to 5 PM.

## **Course Technology Support:**

The [Technology Support Center](http://digitalworlds.ufl.edu/institute-information/student-support/tsc/) provides computer support for students who access Visimeet, lecture recordings, student equipment, facilities and other technology-based resources.

For computer assistance related to Visimeet, lecture recordings, student equipment, and facilities request please [Submit a Help Ticket](http://digitalworlds.ufl.edu/academics/digital-worlds-institute/forms/student-support/submit-a-help-ticket/) or email [support@digitalworlds.ufl.edu](http://digitalworlds.ufl.edu/institute-information/student-support/tsc/support@digitalworlds.ufl.edu).

For support related to account services, technical consulting, mobile device services, software services, administrative support, application support center, and learning support services, please contact the [UF Computer Help Desk](http://helpdesk.ufl.edu) available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week at 352-392-4357 or [helpdesk@ufl.edu](mailto:helpdesk@ufl.edu).

## **UF Policies:**

### University honesty Policy

UF students are bound by The Honor Pledge that states, “We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honor and integrity by abiding by the Honor Code. On all work submitted for credit by students at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied: “On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment.” The [Honor Code](https://sccr.dso.ufl.edu/policies/student-honor-code-student-conduct-code/) specifies a number of behaviors that are in violation of this code and the possible sanctions. Furthermore, you are obligated to report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct to appropriate personnel. If you have any questions or concerns, please consult with the instructor or TAs in this class.

### CLASS DEMEANOR

Students are expected to arrive to class on time and behave in a manner that is respectful to the instructor and to fellow students. Please avoid the use of cell phones and restrict eating to outside of the classroom. Opinions held by other students should be respected in discussion, and conversations that do not contribute to the discussion should be held at minimum, if at all.

### Students requiring accommodations

Students with disabilities requesting accommodations should first register with the [Disability Resource Center](http://www.dso.ufl.edu/drc/) (352-392-8565) by providing appropriate documentation. Once registered, students will receive an accommodation letter which must be presented to the instructor when requesting accommodation. Students with disabilities should follow this procedure as early as possible in the semester.

### Netiquette Communication Courtesy

All members of the class are expected to follow rules of common courtesy in all email messages, threaded discussions and chats, more information can be found at: <http://teach.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/NetiquetteGuideforOnlineCourses.pdf>

### Online course evaluations

Students are expected to provide professional and respectful feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing course evaluations online via GatorEvals. Guidance on how to give feedback in a professional and respectful manner is available at <https://gatorevals.aa.ufl.edu/students/>. Students will be notified when the evaluation period opens. They can complete evaluations through the email they receive from GatorEvals, in their Canvas course menu under GatorEvals, or via <https://ufl.bluera.com/ufl/>. Summaries of course evaluation results are available to students at <https://gatorevals.aa.ufl.edu/public-results/>.

## **CAMPUS RESOURCES**

Health and Wellness

**U Matter, We Care**

If you or a friend is in distress, please contact [umatter@ufl.edu](mailto:umatter@ufl.edu) or 352 392- 1575 so that a team member can reach out to the student.

Counseling and Wellness Center

<http://www.counseling.ufl.edu/cwc/Default.aspx>, 392-1575; and the University Police Department: 392-1111 or 9-1-1 for emergencies.

Sexual Assault Recovery Services (SARS)

Student Health Care Center, 392-1161.

University Police Department, 392-1111 (or 9-1-1 for emergencies). <http://www.police.ufl.edu/>

Academic Resources

E-learning technical support, 352-392-4357 (select option 2) or e-mail to Learning- [support@ufl.edu](mailto:support@ufl.edu). <https://lss.at.ufl.edu/help.shtml>.

Career Resource Center, Reitz Union, 392-1601. Career assistance and counseling. <http://www.crc.ufl.edu/>

Library Support, <http://cms.uflib.ufl.edu/ask>. Various ways to receive assistance with respect to using the libraries or finding resources.

Teaching Center, Broward Hall, 392-2010 or 392-6420. General study skills and tutoring. <http://teachingcenter.ufl.edu/>

Writing Studio, 2215 Turlington Hall, 846-1138. Help brainstorming, formatting, and writing papers. <http://writing.ufl.edu/writing-studio/>

Student Complaints Campus:

<https://www.dso.ufl.edu/documents/UF_Complaints_policy.pdf>

On-Line Students Complaints:

<http://www.distance.ufl.edu/student-complaint-process>

Disclaimer: This syllabus represents the instructor’s current plans and objectives.  As we go through the semester, those plans may need to change to enhance the class learning opportunity.  Such changes, communicated clearly, are not unusual and should be expected.