**Guidelines for paper discussion sessions**

Dear colleagues,

This memo is a guide to preparing for the core sessions of the workshop, each focusing on the papers of a trio of early career researchers.

*All participants are expected to have read all of the distributed papers beforehand.* The process outlined below assumes this and it will not work if the group has not read each other’s papers.

We have two-hour sessions for each trio of papers. We will spend half an hour on each of the three papers, followed by half an hour group discussion on all three collectively. Timing is important, and is outlined quite precisely.

The half-hour focus for each paper will be carefully structured in four stages: brief context from the author, a summary presentation of the key content by a peer early career researcher (other than the author, allocations in the attached agenda), responses by senior faculty, and whole group discussion. This is described in more detail below: please do follow these guidelines.

We are aiming to create close engagement with the papers from very early on in the workshop. Having someone else present the core message(s) of your paper can be very enlightening, to hear how it has come across to others. It is also challenging, and works best in an atmosphere of serious intellectual engagement with the writing, collegial responsibility in speaking about it and tact and generosity in the style of communication.

***Author Introduction* (3 minutes or less) -** describe the context/motivation of your paper:

a. Mode/Venue: Situate the paper  - give us a sense of why you have written it and what kind of longer piece you plan to develop it into (or how it relates to other work you are doing if that makes more sense of the context)

b. Genre: What is the literature with which it engages? To whom is it meant to speak? What is the intended audience?

c. Identify areas of difficulty where feedback might be most helpful.

***Peer Summary* (5 minutes or less) -** summarise the paper and its central arguments(s)/contribution(s); please each follow this format closely:

a. What appears to be the central issue/puzzle that the paper seeks to address?

b. How would you state the paper’s central argument(s) or thesis/theses?

c. How does the author develop the argument? (Offer a *brief* summary)

d. In what debates/discussions does it seek to intervene? Who is the author writing against? For?

e. How would the author complete the sentence: “Until now, everyone has thought \_\_\_\_\_ but now we should think \_\_\_\_\_\_.”

***Senior Faculty Feedback*****x 2** **(6 minutes or less each)** - constructive feedback, starting with the three questions below and continuing in a more open-ended way:

a. What evidence/methods does the author use to support the claims made?

b. How does (or could) the author explain the nature of her/his scholarly intervention?

c. How would you classify the type and mode of intervention? (see below for an incomplete list of suggestions - feel free to add more)

End with a suggestion of what might be helpful for the group to discuss to assist the author.

***Whole group discussion*** on the individual paper, including authors’ response, if desired **(10 minutes)**

**The final 30 minutes** will be open for discussion on all three papers collectively, including methodology, interdisciplinarity and the original call for abstracts.

**Allocation of peer summarisers for paper givers.**

The separate pdf (attached to the email) of the agenda has the ECR presenters’ names highlighted and a comment bubble next to each. If you click on it, it contains the name of the person who will summarise your paper – that person is one of the three who has already been asked to read your paper closely.

**Types of scholarly intervention**

Scholarly works “intervene” in ongoing scholarly or policy discussions in various ways. It is often helpful to try to specify just what kind of intervention is being made, into what ongoing discussion, using what mode of argumentation. Here are some possible types below. Please use the blank lines below to extend the list.

*An Incomplete List of Types of Scholarly Intervention*

1. Proposing a new take on a well‐established empirical claim, line of reasoning, or doctrine

2. Reorganizing or reinterpreting a doctrinal field

3. Critically mapping the consciousness of the establishment

4. Intervening in a broad debate about social policy on the basis of new evidence or a new approach

5. Intervening in a theoretical, jurisprudential or political debate on the basis of new evidence or a new approach

6. Interdisciplinary: advocating a new or renewed interdisciplinary project or intervening in two disciplines simultaneously in an original way

7. Comparison: intervening in two different national political or legal debates at the same time; using comparison to intervene in a policy or jurisprudential debate; using comparison to challenge accepted empirical claims

8. Retelling or unsettling a settled historical narrative: recovering possibilities that have beenoverlooked

9. Using historical retelling to challenge a discipline’s basic assumptions

11. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

12. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_[/=