**WDI Writing TA Training Session 2**

Please respond to the following questions and send a copy to Michael (Michael.kaler@utoronto.ca) **at least an hour before your training**. Please don’t worry too much about writing style (no one is grading this!), but please do answer in sentences and paragraphs.

Please budget around 90 minutes for this.

This is an example of a kind of “flipped classroom” approach questions are designed to get you thinking about the topics that we will be discussing in the training.

**I: Working 1-1 with Students**

Please discuss your practice and/or experience with working 1-1 with students, particularly with regard to their writing—this can involve students coming to office hours, talking with students about their upcoming assignments, discussing assignments they’ve submitted and your feedback, etc.

Please answer the following questions:

1. Have you done this sort of work?
2. If so, what are the situations in which you’ve done it (e.g., office hours or special drop-in times or talking after tutorial, etc.)?
3. Please describe your approach to doing this kind of work (or, if you haven’t done it, think back to when you’ve met with professors or TAs when you were an undergrad). What do you do in these meetings? What practices were/weren’t effective?
4. Please identify a few things that you think would be part of “best practices” for these sorts of meetings.
5. Please identify some of the challenges that you think these meetings might involve, or have involved for you.
6. How do you think the current online learning environment impacts this type of work with students? What are some things that need to be adjusted, what are some things that stay the same, and are there any ways in which the online situation makes this work better or more effective?

**2: Supporting ELL (English Language Learner) students**

Please answer the question below:

Q1: What are some of the different types of backgrounds that your ELL students might come from? In other words, are they all international students, or could there be other types of students who might fit into the category of ELL?

Q2: Are all ELL students coming from the same level of familiarity with English? If not, can you give some examples of ELL students who might have different levels of familiarity, and how that might affect your teaching?

Q3: What do you think are some of the biggest writing and reading challenges that ELL students face?

Q4: What is the difference between *equality* and *equity* and how does it factor into supporting ELL students?

Q5: What can you do in the coming term to support your ELL students?

Thought exercise:

If you have recently come to Canada, and specifically Mississauga, take a look back at your experience in coming here and write a paragraph or two discussing it. How did the change affect you as a person and as a student? How might the online learning environment have changed your experience?

or

If you have been in Canada, and specifically Mississauga, for a while, try putting yourself in the shoes of someone who has just arrived from a very different context (Nigeria? Ukraine? Lebanon? Beijing? La Tuque, Quebec?) to attend UTM.

What are some factors about the Anglophone Canadian university experience that might make them stressed? How might these stresses affect how they interact with you? How might the current online learning environment add to that stress?

**3: Promoting Academic Integrity**

Please answer the questions below.

Q1: What does the phrase “academic integrity” mean to you?

Q2: What academic integrity challenges do you foresee arising in your work in this course?

Q3: How can you help students understand and avoid academic integrity issues?

Q5: Why do you think students commit these offenses? (Please give a few possible reasons and discuss each reason a little bit.)

**4: Feedback (or rather, feedforward)**

1. Please check out this blog post: <https://www.cultofpedagogy.com/feedforward/>

Then, in your own words, please define “feedforward” and how it differs from feedback. Please also discuss the degree to which you think about feedforward when you are assessing student writing.

1. Please read through the article by Jonsson, “Faciliating Feedback”, and note the following:
2. What are the most important takeaways from this article for you?
3. How could the insights that Jonsson presents affect your own work this term?
4. Was there anything here that you didn’t agree with, based on your own experience?
5. Next, please read through the sample of student writing, which is below, along with the assignment instructions (also below), and do the following:
6. Provide written feedback on a sample of student writing. Imagine that you have 15 minutes to read it and give feedback. You do not have to give a grade, but the grading categories might be useful in terms of planning out your feedback.
7. Explain why you chose to give the feedback that you did (and perhaps why you chose not to give feedback on other matters)

**JGE378H5S Winter 2017 Natural Hazards CASE STUDY PROPOSAL**

For this assignment you are asked to write a Proposal specifying the topic that you have chosen as the focus for your Case Study, and outlining the specific focus and basic structure of the Term Paper component of your Case Study.

# The Proposal:

* Must be one to two pages in length (approximately 400 to 800 words), typed in a “normal” font size with “normal” margins.
* Must begin with one to two paragraphs summarizing the factual basis of the major disaster, catastrophic event, or hazardous process that you have chosen as your Case Study focus. Please see additional criteria and suggestions for choosing your topic, posted on our course Blackboard site.
* Must include an indication of how you plan to organize the Term Paper, and must indicate what specific focus or perspective you plan to take on the topic. The organizational plan can take the form of a description, or a bulleted list of topics, or a preliminary outline, but it has to demonstrate organizational thought.
* Must reflect the fact that the Term Paper is meant to be an analytical work, rather than just a descriptive work. In other words, you can’t just describe this event and its aftermath or management, you have to choose a specific aspect of the event to analyze in greater depth.
* Must include at least some full-sentence prose (because we would like to detect any major problems with writing mechanics early).
* Must include a correctly formatted list (APA style) of at least five references that are relevant to your topic and that you have read. Four of the references should be from scholarly, peer-reviewed sources; one can be from another, non-scholarly source that is still reliable.

# Proposal Evaluation Criteria

On the basis of the Proposal assignment, here are the evaluation criteria:

Factual basis of the topic is adequately explained and understood 5 points

At least five appropriate, relevant, scholarly references are provided 5 points

Proposal demonstrates evidence of organizational thought 5 points

Discussion demonstrates an analytical focus 5 points

Full-sentence prose demonstrates scholarly tone and quality 5 points

# TOTAL (will be converted into 5% of the course mark): 25 points

**STUDENT SAMPLE:**

**Case Study Proposal: Kobe, the Earthquake in Japan, 1995**

In January 17, 1995, 7.3 magnitude of earthquake hit Kobe, Japan, at 5:46 a.m. (The City of Kobe, 2009). The epicenter of the earthquake was recorded from the northern part of Awaji Island and the focus was 16 kilometers below the earth’s surface (The City of Kobe, 2009). According to the statistics by the City of Kobe (2009), 4,571 people were dead, 2 people were missing, and 14,678 people got injured. About 59 percent of the death toll were the elders, who were 60 years old or older, and 70% of total death toll were pressed or suffocated death (The City of Kobe, 2009). Numbers of important public facilities were entirely collapsed or partially damaged to be properly operated (The City of Kobe, 2009). 236,899 people were evacuated to shelters as of January 24, 1995 (The City of Kobe, 2009). Schools, old libraries, museums, sports centre, as well as sake breweries got damaged or collapsed (The City of Kobe, 2009). As of November 20, 1995, total of 122,566 buildings were fully or partially collapsed and 6,965 structures were completely destroyed by fire (The City of Kobe, 2009). Moreover, both Kobe Route and Wangan Route were initially collapsed and affected other roads below (Chang & Nojima, 2001). Railways and roads to a few islands were damaged as well, so that it was harder to rescue isolated people (Chang & Nojima, 2001). Electricity, water and industrial water was not supplied to the entire city, 25 percent of phone was not working (Menoni, 2001). In addition, 80 percent of gas supply was failed, as well as sewage system (Menoni, 2001). Parks, rivers, and mountains were also damaged that about 68 areas were need for immediate reconstruction (Chang & Nojima, 2001). Total damage from Kobe earthquake was estimated roughly 6.9 trillion yen (The City of Kobe, 2009).

According to Daniel P. Aldrich’s research (2011), damages from earthquake was bigger than expected since Kobe is one of the well-known densely populated city, which is located in southern main island of Japan. Initial tremor caused desolation with uncontrollable fires, which is related to the time of occurrence: at 5:46 a.m. (Okuyama, 2014). Damages on buildings or structures were varied across the City of Kobe, due to historical and geographical reasons (Okuyama, 2014). Some areas across the city had fewer houses, which were built for decades to centuries by woods, and had less damages due to a lot of bedrock under those historical houses (Takeda, Tamura, & Tatsuki, 2003). The emergency team from police and fire department reacted slowly, which caused more damage than the Japanese government estimated, however, the government strategized quickly that a lot of emergency shelters were closed down within seven months and build public or private houses for the victims (Aldrich, 2011). The speed of reconstruction was varied by location but the recovery rate was not directly related to the amount of damage at each location (Aldrich, 2011). Some locations had 104 percent of recovery rate, on the other hand, other regions, such as Nagata Ward, was rated only 44 percent (Aldrich, 2011). After 12 years of the earthquake in Kobe, the total population of the city has increased, however, some wards remain with less population than statistics from pre-quake period (Okuyama, 2014).

Menoni (2001) stated that the recovery speed and rate is related to the amount of physical damages from the disaster. In addition to Menoni’s research, Okuyama (2014) also evaluated the connection between the recovery rate and population density in the affected areas. Due to difficulty in providing temporary and permanent housing after disaster, high population density areas turn to expect longer time to fully recovered (Okuyama, 2014). Takeda, Tamura and Tatsuki (2003) analyzed the Japanese government’s strategy and progress of life recovery of earthquake survivors based on the Total-Quality-Management-Based Assessment, and they claimed that the role of socioeconomic status affected the recovery rate. One of the main reasons why the recovery or reconstruction speed was different in the Kobe city was due to the economic inequality in the city (Takeda et al., 2003). Welfare recipients died or got injured five times more than the rich (Takeda et al., 2003). Moreover, the poor in the city of Kobe had higher depression rate after the earthquake than the others (Takeda et al., 2003). In order to accelerate the rate of recovery, many people started to make non-profit organizations to provide temporary and permanent houses (Takeda et al., 2003). Thus, these NPOs are focusing on supporting individual victims of natural hazards at the neighbourhood level (Takeda et al., 2003). Even though the City of Kobe took only seven months to get rid of shelters, victims still needed houses to survive but some people were homeless for years to start their new lives as pre-quake period (The City of Kobe, 2009). Moreover, some people are still struggling after twenty years to get settled down in the city (Okuyama, 2014).

The 7.3 magnitude of earthquake swept Kobe in 1995 (The City of Kobe, 2009). The disastrous earthquake brought 6.9 trillion yen of damages across the city of Kobe and both government and NPOs suffered to restore the whole city. After 1995 Kobe earthquake, due to the government’s discriminated city restoration, higher population density neighborhoods recovered more quickly, but recovery process with socioeconomic inequality brought hatred from the residents towards the government (Takeda et al., 2003). If the government had unbiased and solid strategies to recover after natural disasters, affected residents could have taken shorter amount of time to establish themselves and less percentage of depression or trauma from natural disasters.
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