Paper #1

<u>Overview</u>:

This 3-page paper will summarize the main ideas from a selected chapter/section of The Flaw of Averages and connect it with material from a published scholarly journal, news article, or personal experience.

<u>Available Chapters/Topics</u>:

- Investing/finance topics (more technical):
    - Chapters 22-24 – Financial planning, risk, and covariance
    - Chapters 25-26 – Options and option theory
    - Chapter 27 – Prices, probabilities, and predictions
- Investing/finance topics (less technical):
    - Chapter 19 – Revenue fallacies
- More general topics
    - Chapters 14-15 – Information and decision trees
    - Chapter 20 – Chance occurrences
    - Chapters 32-34 – Supply chains
    - Chapter 35 – Statistical research and WWII
    - Chapter 36 – Probability and the war on terror
    - Chapter 37 – Climate change
    - Chapter 38 – Health care

<u>Notes</u>:

1. Some chapters/topics are shorter and simpler than others. For these you should devote more of your paper towards making a strong connection with material from another source, and I'd highly encourage you to garner this material from a journal or a news article rather than personal experience.
2. At most two people can sign-up for the same topic.
3. You will use the same topic for Oral Presentation #3

<u>Details</u>:

- While your paper involves summarizing your selected chapter(s) and topic, you do not need to exhaustively address every detail and nuance of the material.
- You should organize your paper to clearly present a central claim or thesis within the first paragraph. This claim might be your own paraphrasing of the main idea of the chapter(s) you selected. Be aware that you are not arguing for or against Sam Savage's claims in your paper, you are merely summarizing them and connecting them to another area or source.

- At some point your paper should transition from summarizing/explaining the material in the chapter to your own connection. It is up to you how to navigate this transition, but your paper should flow coherently and should not include separate headings/sections.

Grading:

The rubric on the following page will be used to guide a holistic grade of your work. For example, if you are in the A/A- level in 4 of 5 categories and at the B+/B/B- level in another you could expect anywhere from a B+ to an A depending upon the relative importance of each category to the overall effectiveness of your writing. You will receive specific feedback on these categories rather than line-item feedback.

Intermediate Steps:

You will be expected to have an outline of your paper completed by Thursday, October 26th (the first Thursday after Fall break). We will work with your outline during class on that date.

You will be expected to have a draft version of your paper ready by Thursday, November 2nd. We will spend time workshopping your draft in class and you will have approximately 1-week to revise your draft before a final version of the paper is due.

Rubric:

	A/A-	B+/B/B-	C+/C	D or lower
Central claim or thesis.	Easily identifiable and clearly stated central claim.	Promising but perhaps somewhat unclear central claim.	Difficult to identify or vaguely stated central claim.	Unable to identify the central claim in the first 1-2 paragraphs.
Structure	Effectively transitions from point to point in a way that relates to the central claim. Paragraphs begin with a topic sentence and flow accordingly.	Generally clear, occasionally wanders or strays off-topic, occasionally lacking appropriate transitions.	Largely unclear with multiple off-topic digressions. Transitions are consistently lacking.	Consistently unclear or off-topic. Transitions are confusing and paragraphs seem disconnected.
Summarization	Clearly describes the core concept in the chapter(s) with sufficient detail at a level that is appropriate for an audience of peers.	Gets the core point(s) of the chapter(s) across, but with some misconceptions or mis-calibrated communication.	Largely misses the main idea of the chapter(s) but still communicates worthwhile information in a manner appropriate for an audience of peers.	Misses the main idea of the chapter and communicates in a style that is ineffective (too technical or too basic) for an audience of peers.
Analysis	Clear relationship between chapter(s) and identified source. Insights are fresh, exciting, and thought-provoking.	Appropriate relationship between chapter(s) and identified source. Ideas might be somewhat commonplace, but are largely reasonable	Weak connection between the chapter(s) and identified source. Ideas are overly simplistic and lacking in depth	Lacking a reasonable connection between the chapter(s) and identified source. No effort is made to expand upon the claimed connection.
Mechanics	Excellent sentence structure, grammar/spelling, and use of citation	Occasional minor errors in sentence structure, grammar/spelling, and use citation.	Major or persistent minor errors in sentence structure, grammar/spelling, and use citation.	Significant errors that make it difficult or impossible to understand the author or identify their sources.