Philosopher Instagram Account Project

Format:

Individuals: Create a fake(offline) Instagram Account of **TWO** of the philosophers below. Consider using a Google Slides template or similar

Your account must communicate the following:

1. ONE POST FOR EACH Major Philosophical ideas:
	1. Interpretation of History
	2. Belief about Human Nature
	3. Belief about Society
	4. Visions for the Future

BIO INFORMATION:

1. A Quote
2. Influences - who or what influenced this philosopher?
3. Any Published Materials/Books they wrote (just pick one)
4. Birth and death date
5. Where were they born?
6. Universities attended (just pick one)
7. Any other interesting biographical information.

Accuracy, importance of facts chosen, and creativity will be part of your grade.

This can be communicated either through profile information or through the pictures that you ‘post.’ Feel free to get creative with hashtags, comments from other philosophers or world leaders, numbers of likes, etc.

**Choose from the following philosophers:**

Karl Marx

Thomas Hobbes

John Locke

Jean-Jacques Rousseau

Adam Smith

John Stuart Mill

Montesquieu (Social 30-1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Failed to Meet Standard** | **Limited** | **Satisfactory** | **Proficient** | **Excellent** |
| **Visual Product** |  | The student inconsistently applies principles of graphic design and layout to incompletely control the message, enhance meaning, and engage the audiences. | The student effectively applies principles of graphic design and layout to generally control the message, enhance meaning, and engage the audiences. | The student skillfully applies principles of graphic design and layout to carefully control the message, enhance meaning, and engage the audiences. | The student sophisticatedly applies principles of graphic design and layout to confidently control the message, enhance meaning, and engage the audiences. |
| **Understanding/Explanation of Philosopher’s Ideas (x2)*****(for partners, more emphasis will be placed on the back and forth between philosophers)*** |  | The analysis of the philosopher is incomplete or lacks depth. The understanding of the philosopher and their relationship to ideological perspective(s) is superficial. | The analysis of the philosopher is straightforward and conventional. The understanding of the philosopher and their relationship to the ideological perspective(s) is adequately demonstrated. | The analysis of the philosopher is sound and adept. The understanding of the philosopher and their relationship to the ideological perspective(s) is capably demonstrated. | The analysis of the philosopher is insightful and sophisticated. The understanding of the philosopher and their relationship to the ideological perspective(s) is comprehensively demonstrated. |
| **Evidence and implementation of Philosopher’s Ideas****(x2)*****(for partners, more emphasis will be placed on the back and forth between philosophers)*** |  | Evidence is potentially relevant but is unfocused and incompletely developed. The evidence contains inaccuracies and/or extraneous detail. The discussion reveals a superficial and/or confused understanding of social studies and its application to the assignment. | Evidence is conventional and straightforward. The evidence may contain minor errors and/or a mixture of relevant and extraneous information. A generalized and basic discussion reveals an acceptable understanding of social studies and its application to the assignment | Evidence is specific and purposeful. Evidence may contain some minor errors. A capable and adept discussion of evidence reveals a solid understanding of social studies and its application to the assignment. | Evidence is sophisticated and deliberately chosen. The relative absence of error is impressive. A thorough and comprehensive discussion of evidence reveals an insightful understanding of social studies and its application to the assignment. |
| **Communication** | The writing is unclear and disorganized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is lacking. Vocabulary is overgeneralized and inaccurate. Jarring errors impeded communication. | The writing is awkward and lacks organization. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is inconsistent. Vocabulary is imprecise, simplistic, and inappropriate. Errors obscure the clarity of communication. | The writing is straightforward and functionally organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is adequate. Vocabulary is conventional and generalized. The communication remains generally clear. | The writing is clear and purposefully organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is capable. Vocabulary is appropriate and specific. Minor errors in language do not impeded communication. | The writing is fluent, skillfully structured, and judiciously organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is sophisticated. Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen. The relative absence of error is impressive. |