Meetings: Mondays 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Instructor: Thomas Faist
E-mail: thomas.faist@utoronto.ca
Tel. 416-946-8967
Office: Munk Centre for International Studies, N219
Office Hours: Mondays 1:00-2:00 p.m. and by appointment

COURSE OUTLINE

Items marked with an asterisk (*) are required readings all students should read. Other items are recommended readings and may be helpful for writing research papers.

WEEK ONE 1/10
Theoretical Perspectives on Citizenship


WEEK TWO 1/17
Citizenship Rules and Immigrant Integration

* Rainer Bauböck, 1994: *The Integration of Immigrants*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Chapter 1
(http://www.coe.int/T/E/Social%5FCohesion/Migration/Documentation/Publications_and_reports/Reports_and_proceedings/1994_Cdmg(94)25E.asp#TopOfPage)

WEEK THREE 1/24
Citizenship in ‘Classical’ Countries of Immigration


WEEK FOUR 1/31
Ethnic Citizenship? Israel and Japan


WEEK FIVE 2/7
From Ethnic to Civil Citizenship? Germany in Comparative Perspective

WEEK SIX 2/21
Citizenship quo vadis (1): Multiculturalism


WEEK SEVEN 2/28
Citizenship quo vadis (2): Postnational Citizenship


WEEK EIGHT 3/7
Transnational Citizenship: Mexican Migrants in the USA


WEEK NINE 3/14
Dual Citizenship: Institutions and Discourses in Europe

* Thomas Faist, “The Boundaries of Dual Citizenship” and “The Reconfiguration of Citizenship” (work in progress, the texts will be e-mailed one week before the meeting)
WEEK TEN 3/21
Supranational Citizenship: The European Union (EU)


WEEK ELEVEN 3/28
Citizenship, Political Transformations and National Minorities


WEEK TWELVE 4/4
Towards Global Citizenship?

Seminar Presentation – Feedback against Assessment Criteria

Student Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Lack of preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well organised</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poorly organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Illogical structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoherent structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Irrelevant content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Content too shallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Content lacks analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence pertinent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Illuminating</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion Focused</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion lacks focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion thought-provoking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion unimaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lively</td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good visual aids</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where relevant, Good Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence of co-Teamwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excellent ......................................................... Poor

Provisional Grade:

Advice: How this Seminar Presentation could be improved:

Date:
Signature: