TOK Knowledge Framework Assignment

**Directions:** A TOK knowledge Framework is a graphic organizer that will help you to distinguish the Areas of Knowledge and compare and contrast how we gain and use knowledge within each of the academic disciplines. Up till now, we have been working on the various Ways of Knowing; however, we can only be sure that we have gained knowledge if we justify it with through the AOKs.

In small groups (3-4 students) you will make a Knowledge Framework about your assigned Areas of Knowledge. Each group will have a support package including articles, videos, images etc. set to help you determine the different categories of the KF. You will be responsible for reading the various support material, discussing in your groups and compiling the information onto your graphic organizer. Use the questions below to help guide you through the support material. In addition to the support package, you are encouraged to speak to your subject teachers—they are the experts in their fields.

These KF’s will be shared via googledocs with our class so each student has a copy. The final product should be a tightly-crafted fifteen to twenty-minute presentation. You will be given class time to prepare your presentation. There are not any delivery/presentation style stipulations, but you should aim to inform and entertain your audience.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **AOK’s** | **Criteria** |
| **Natural Science****Mathematics****Human Sciences****History****Arts****Religious Knowledge System****Ethics** | * **Nature of AOK** (What is the nature of your selected AOK? What does it seek to understand?—This will be your main description of your AOK)
* **Knowledge Framework** (see below)
* **Knowledge Claims** (What knowledge claims are considered fundamental to the AOK?)
* **Knowledge Questions** (What KQs are raised concerning the AOK (i.e., regarding its nature, methodologies, and claims)
* **Activity/Lessons** (Examine art, do a historical inquiry, do a psychology experiment etc. and dissect with the class for perspective, potential bias in methodology, validity of conclusion etc.)
 |

Rubric for KF Presentation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** |
| **Knowledge and understanding***(i.e., scope of AOK, KF, history + nature of AOK, methodologies, and knowledge claims).* | Limited understanding of the selected AOK. | Adequate understanding of the selected AOK. | Considerable understanding of the selected AOK. | Highly perceptive understanding of the selected AOK. |
| **Thinking***(i.e. acknowledging limitations, assumption, clichés of the AOK)* | Limited thought put into limitations and assumptions. Many gaps in knowledge | Adequate thought put into the limitation of the AOK, but not really addressed assumptions or limitations critically | Considerable thought put into limitations of the AOK; some assumptions are looked at critically | Sophisticated insight into the limitations of the AOK; student is able to break assumptions and look at both sides critically |
| **Communication***(i.e., style and structure of presentation).* | Limited sense of audience and purpose. Heavy reliance on notes impedes good communication. | Adequate sense of audience and purpose. Reliance on notes. | Strong sense of audience and purpose. Occasionally consults notes. | Superb sense of audience and purpose. Rarely consults notes. |
| **Application****(***creation of class activity takes into consideration the KF and is able to explain and troubleshoot)* | Limited personal engagement with presentation material and knowledge questions. | Adequate personal engagement with presentation material and knowledge questions. | Considerable personal engagement with presentation material and knowledge questions. | Highly-relevant personal engagement with presentation material and knowledge questions. |

|  |
| --- |
| Knowledge Questions |
| If Mathematics is an abstract intellectual game (like chess) then why is it so good at describing the world? | What elements of universal significance may we discern in indigenous knowledge systems? | Is Faith irrational? |

There are links and interactions between shared and personal knowledge. Individuals contribute to shared knowledge. Their contributions have to go through whatever validation procedures are required by a particular discipline in order to be counted as “common” knowledge in that area. But shared knowledge also contributes to an individual’s own understanding of the world. It is important because it addresses the question “so what does this mean for me?” What impact do these AOKs have on our individual lives and the way in which we view the world? How does this area form or change our perspective?

AOKs are dynamic entities that change over time as conceptual developments and advances are made in methodology. This need not be seen as a problem but rather an advantage—our systems are flexible and capable of responding to developments. Knowledge can, therefore, be considered provisional.

One of the most striking differences between the AOKs is the methods that they use. Examining and comparing the methodologies of the different AOKs begins with the identification of the specific methods or procedures used in an AOK.

This element explores the way in which language is used in the production of knowledge in each AOK. The key idea is that language does not just communicate pre-existing “non-verbal” knowledge but that, in many cases, the language used actually constitutes knowledge. Take language away and there is nothing left. One of the reasons for this is that the language names concepts—these are the building blocks for knowledge. An AOK is a system of relationships between its key concepts. Different building blocks build quite different AOKs and produce different ways of thinking about the world.

This component attempts to explore the range of the specific AOK within the totality of human knowledge and how that knowledge is used. Scope refers to the definition of the AOK in terms of subject matter, and the form that an AOK takes depends critically upon the nature of the problems it is trying to answer.