**University of Manchester**

**Faculty of Humanities**

**GUIDANCE[[1]](#footnote-1) on GROUP WORK and ASSESSMENT**

*The University’s Teaching and Learning Support Office (TLSO) has produced “****Guidance for Student Group Working”*** *(June 2012,* [*http://www.tlso.manchester.ac.uk/map/teachinglearningassessment/learning/groupwork/*](http://www.tlso.manchester.ac.uk/map/teachinglearningassessment/learning/groupwork/)*), which sets out core expectations regarding group work activities, whilst allowing the flexibility for Schools and Faculties to set standards consistent with best practice within their own areas.*

*This document:*

* *expands on the University Guidance in a Humanities context*
* *signposts practical examples and resources to help support academics in the design, delivery and assessment of group work*

**Introduction**

**Why group work?**

* Group work enhances student learning: research shows that well-designed group work fosters deep learning - and thereby better retention of knowledge - as it allows students to rehearse, test, clarify and refine their understanding through discussion with peers.
* Group work also enhances employability by developing practical and transferable skills, e.g. skills of negotiation, communication, team-working, leadership, problem-solving, organisation and time-management.
* Working in culturally diverse groups has the potential to enhance students’ cross-cultural capability and increase students’ sense of belonging.
* Group work allows students to complete larger or more complex projects than they would be able to undertake individually.
* Group work can be a way of maximising resource (e.g. if there are limits to available equipment, or a limited number of “real” clients).

**Student concerns about group work:**

*(Comments made by Humanities students in the NSS Survey 2011).*

* Lack of confidence in the **rationale** for assessed group work – “staff admit they do it to mark less”.
* There is a perception that assessed group work is inherently **unfair** - “group work … in some cases resulted in ‘free riders’ getting a grade which they did not deserve”; “when group members don't contribute, very limited punishment available.”; “there are always people who choose to not work to their highest ability and leave it to other members of the group to do. Although there is an opportunity to speak to staff about this, when I have I've felt that it has been considered insignificant”.
* **Over-reliance** - on group work within a programme - “Far too much group work”; “Fourth year … has had loads of group work (nearly all units) and to think that your final year mark is very much based on this is truly frustrating”.
* **“High-stakes” consequences** -“Too much group work in final Year”; “Group work should not be used in final year! It's unfair to have your grade resting on the shoulders of an uncooperative colleague”.
* **Lack of control** over / understanding of group membership - “many people (including myself) were unhappy when allocated with the group by lecturer instead of choosing own group of people we already knew”; “more often than not I was placed with people who cared less than me. This hindered my chance at higher possible grades”.
* **Unsuitable learning environment** - “Lack of group study rooms.”
* **Individual learning styles and aptitudes** - “I did not enjoy the course’s focus on participation and group working”.

These anxieties are not without foundation, and expose potential pitfalls which can be mitigated by careful planning and design of the group work task, the preparation of the students, and an appropriate assessment scheme.

**1. The place of group work in the curriculum**

* From a programme perspective, it might be advisable to introduce all students to group work at Level 1, e.g. through a core course, where the assessment stakes are lower and where it supports students in making the transition to the University style of independent, enquiry-based learning. Students will thereby have acquired the skills for undertaking higher-stakes group work in later years.
* The rationale for using group work should be suited to the aims and learning outcomes of the course unit, e.g. the 10-cr Level 1 course unit, “Group Processes” (Education) aims “*to develop students’ understanding of theories of group behaviour, and to help students to recognise their personal strengths and weaknesses within a group setting”.* The Level 3 course unit, “Ethnic Minorities in Britain” (Religions and Theology) aims *“to challenge assumptions (your own and others’) about ethnic minorities and their identities”,* whilst the Master’s level course unit “Skills for Sustainability and Social Responsibility” requires students to *“Develop strategies to work more effectively with those from different disciplinary, national or cultural backgrounds”* and *“Demonstrate skills in debating, structuring and communicating ideas and proposals in writing, verbally in meetings, and also in presentation format.”*

**2. Assessing group work**

* The assessment scheme will affect student behaviour and is therefore of fundamental importance to the success of group work.
* Remember that you can still realise some of the benefits of group working without having to assess on a group basis. This will allay student fears about “global” mark allocation to the group. However, this may undermine the purpose of group work by encouraging competition between individuals within groups rather than collaboration, and may also undermine the development of some key competencies that group work can deliver.
* There should normally be a balance of assessment types across a programme, suited to assessing a range of aims and intended learning outcomes. This means that one wouldn’t expect a Humanities programme to be dominated by assessed group work.
* As always, assessment tasks and marking criteria should focus on the intended learning outcomes for the programme and for the individual unit (See “Ethical Principles” in the UoM Assessment Framework).
* Determine to what extent you are assessing “product” i.e. output, and to what extent you are assessing “process”. Note that assessing product only may mask a lack of engagement by some students: “Where group work is marked solely on the basis of product, and not process, there can be inequities in individual grading that are unfair and unacceptable” (Devlin, Marcia (2002)). It is therefore advisable to assess both product (globally) and process (individually).
* Research has shown that best practice is to adopt a mixed assessment scheme that involves assessment of the group as a group, and yet allows individual contributions (or lack thereof) to be recognised accordingly in the overall mark for the unit. There are many examples of such mixed assessment schemes in the Faculty of Humanities, some of which are sketched out below in Appendix 1.
* Assessing “process” can provide a means of identifying the various individual contributions made to the group activity.
* Care needs to be taken that “The assessment process should not be biased according to gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion or belief, age, class or disability,” (See Principles of Assessment in the UoM Assessment Framework).
* When setting a task consider possible sensitivities of different members of the group, particularly culturally sensitive topics. Think about how to deal with these situations. This could be around adoption, sexuality, drug misuse etc.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Product** | **Process** |
| **Group Assignments** |  |  |
| Group presentation | X |  |
| Group web-page or wiki | X |  |
| Group poster | X |  |
| Group newsletter or brochure | X |  |
| **Individual Assignments** |  |  |
| Reflective log |  | X |
| Reflective essay (on self or the group, on process or on product) |  | X |
| Self Assessment Form |  | X |
| Peer Assessment Form |  | X |
| **Other** |  |  |
| Minutes of group meetings |  | X |

 **Individual Assignments**

|  |
| --- |
| Exam (unconnected with the group work) |
| Essay (unconnected with the group work) |

**Who is the assessor?**

* **Tutor Assessment**

Assessment of Product

* Should be similar to assessment of regular, individual assessment submissions (products) in other contexts.

Assessment of Process

* If group work happens within the classroom, the tutor may feel able to feed back on group dynamics and assess individual contributions to the task him/herself.
* However, most group work usually happens away from the tutor, so to enable the tutor to assess process s/he can: arrange to sit in on a group meeting (however, this may not be representative of the group’s process over time); ask for minutes of the group meetings at the end of the task (although this may divert students’ time away from the group task).
* To solve the problem of how to assess process, it is generally considered best practice to include some form of peer assessment.
* The tutor grades the group product. The mark may be then moderated by the tutor for individuals, depending on the information provided by peer assessment. For example, when the work is finished the group could decide between two options, and indicate their decision on a sheet to be submitted with the text, and signed by all members:

**Decision options**

1. *Agreement not to differentiate the mark.* ‘Contribution’ is difficult to measure and you may agree that despite small variations in contribution, everyone should get the group mark. If all the members of the Group want the mark to be the same for all of them, then there is nothing more to be said.
2. *Agreement to differentiate the mark.* If **even one** member of the group is not in agreement to follow option 1 then you default to option 2: differentiation by the module co-ordinator. Ultimately the decision on the marks is then at the course co-ordinator’s discretion, but the procedure is fixed: he/she takes account of (i) group meeting Minutes; (ii) Peer Review sheets; (iii) his/her own observations; (iv) interview (if appropriate).

For option 2, each member of the group, individually, should submit a Peer Review Sheet.

 (Source: Paul Dewick, MBS, protocol for “Group Working on MSc Innovation, Management and Entrepreneurship”)

* **Peer Assessment**
* The University’s Policy on feedback to Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Students states that “Peer assessment (assessment of students’ work by other students) should be used, especially formatively, to provide rapid feedback and promote understanding of assessment criteria and marking scales”. Group work naturally lends itself to peer assessment, and peer assessment is a very useful way of tackling the need to balance assessment of the global group task with assessment of individuals’ performance. For example, when assessing skills outcomes such as “*Work collaboratively as a member of a diverse team, contributing to the development of effective team dynamics and project management processes*“, this is probably best evaluated by other members of a student’s team, perhaps with a facilitator observing to verify the accuracy of the peer-feedback reporting.
* Gibbs’ (2010) study notes that it’s best to base peer-assessment on a single, behaviour-based score informed by a set of measurable criteria that students “own” and understand, e.g. “attended all group meetings”, “completed tasks assigned to him/her on time”, rather than vague or personal criteria such as “helpfulness to the group”.
* You can get students to generate their own assessment criteria (limited to a maximum of 4). This ensures that they have reflected on the group working process and feel ownership of the task. Research indicates that this improves the reliability of students’ judgements. (Gibbs, ibid. p9)
* The grading of members is usually done in confidence, i.e. not discussed by the group as a whole, and Peer Review Sheets should be handed in individually. Lejk & Wyvill, (2001), cited in Gibbs (ibid. p9), found that this results in a broader spread of marks.
* **Self-Assessment**
* “Published studies offer a very mixed answer to whether students are over-generous in the marks they give themselves. Seventeen studies report students grading themselves higher than their teachers do, while 12 studies report the opposite (see Boud and Falachikov, 1989) cited in Gibbs (2010). This is likely to vary between cultures.
* You can ask students to complete a “Peer Assessment Form” for themselves as well as for their peers.
* Self-assessment is a useful learning process in itself, but should not count for a high proportion of the final overall mark for the unit, or should be used as part of formative rather feedback.
* Students should be reminded that they are awarding marks not for “effort” but for the standards they have achieved and have evidence for.

**3. Preparing students for group work**

* + Preparation is important. Explain why you are using group work, and whether you are assessing the product, the process, or both.
	+ If appropriate it is also useful to explain why groups have been allocated by the tutor, i.e. to ensure a mixture of talents, ideas, experiences, gender and cultures to focus on “process” as well as “product” etc. (see Section 5, FAQ 1.)
	+ You should ensure the assessments only test skills that students have actually been enabled to develop, either in a previous unit or as part of this unit, e.g. a final presentation may require training in how to design slides or present. Similarly, if you are assessing students on a reflective journal or essay, they may need guidance on this particular skill and form of writing.

The following are other ideas to cover:

* You should try to allocate time in class for group members to get to know each other. This could be an ice breaker that explores background and expertise of group members. Enough time should be given to ensure everyone understands the purpose of the group activity.
* introduce your basic ground rules and outline what is expected of them specifically around treating others with dignity and respect.[[2]](#footnote-2)
	+ Get students to think about any experience they’ve had of group work or team work in the past, and to reflect on it.
	+ Outline essential teamwork characteristics.
	+ Describe common stages in team development (e.g. Bruce Tuckman’s “Forming, Storming, Norming and Performing”).
	+ Ensure individual students have designated responsibility for clearly-defined sub-components. This can be done by the tutor or by the students, but students will need guidance to ensure the tasks give all students the opportunity to achieve the intended learning outcomes.
	+ Establish group work protocols/ground rules. Remind students that “All staff and students have a responsibility to ensure a working and studying environment where everyone is treated with equal respect and dignity ,“(University’s Policy on “Dignity at Work and Study” See: <http://www.studentnet.manchester.ac.uk/equality-and-diversity/policies-and-guidance/>
	+ Make it clear what groups should do if there is conflict and observe/monitor group activity
	+ Also note that Cultural sensitivity is one of the Purposes of a Manchester Education (“6. To prepare graduates for citizenship and leadership in diverse, global environments.” ibid.)

 “Bennett (1993:7) developed a model examining the progression made from ethnocentricism (all cultures are like mine) to ethnorelativism (cultures are relative to each other), in which he proposed the following six steps:

1. Denial: Does not recognise cultural differences; inability to construe difference

2. Defence: Recognises some differences, but sees them as negative

3. Minimisation: Unaware of projection of own cultural values; sees own values as superior, focuses on superficial differences usually insisting people are basically the same;

4. Acceptance: shifts perspectives to understand that the same "ordinary" behaviour can have different meanings in different cultures - beginning of ability to interpret cultural phenomena, contextually

5. Adaptation: Can evaluate other's behaviour from own frame of reference and can adapt behaviour to fit the norms of a different culture. This marks the beginning of ability to communicate interculturally, and there is an effective use of empathy to understand difference;

6. Integration: Can shift frame of reference and deal with resulting identity issues so that bicultural or multicultural values develop.”

“Cross-cultural studies examining beliefs about talk and the role of silence indicate that silence is viewed differently by different cultures and different social values and norms govern the amount of talk and silence in communication contexts. Scallon (1985) and Giles et al., (1992) have shown that silence is associated with the negative values in Western culture (lack of interest; unwillingness to communicate, rejection; interpersonal incompatibility; shyness).” *(Source: Dr Michael Davidson, Academic Development Advisor, for PESL)*

* + Be aware of that group work may entail extra support for students with disabilities – contact the DSO for guidance. Email: dso@manchester.ac.uk or telephone: 0161 275 7512

**4. Supporting students in group work**

* Will the group work take place in-seminar or separately? If group working sessions take place separately, will group working sessions be timetabled and rooms booked for the students? The logistics of group work shouldn’t be underestimated, and if you want students to do some of the organisational tasks as part of learning about group processes, then this must be taken into account in the workload – you should decide how much time you expect them to spend on process and how much on product and evaluation.
* Those with caring responsibilities or religious observance commitments might be restricted to what times they are available to meet outside of timetabled hours.
* In terms of venue, a student’s religion may prevent them from meeting at a location that serves alcohol or a building might be inaccessible for a student with a disability. A student with a disability may require an adjustment to help them participate.
* Blackboard (the University’s VLE) provides online communication tools that can help support groupwork and enable them to meet “virtually”:

BbIM (Blackboard Instant Messenger): enables instantaneous communication between users. Because it’s synchronised with Blackboard staff and students are automatically connected with other BbIM users on the same course. It enables video and audio chat, screen sharing and online office hours.

Wikis: collaborative websites where students can edit their own and others’ content to build up a body of knowledge.

Discussion Boards: a means of asynchronous communication between course members. Each board contains one or more ‘forums’ – an area where a particular topic is discussed. Within each forum there may be multiple ‘threads’ – an initial post, plus the comments or ‘posts’ made in response to it.

Email: In a Blackboard Learn course you can send email messages to individuals, groups or “roles” e.g. course leaders, TAs, student reps. etc

Journals: a self-reflective tool for a student and his/her instructor. However, an Instructor can make a journal ‘public’ by the Instructor, so all enrolled users can make entries to a journal topic that will be read by all group members.

Blog: an open, chronological collection of text, image and/or media-based entries by an individual. Enrolled course members can post comments to the blog entries.

* The tutor must have a means of monitoring how the groups are functioning.

**5. FAQs**

1. **How should students be grouped?**
* Where the emphasis of the group work is on the product, it may be fine to allow students to self-select, although you should take care that students are not marginalised in the process. However, if learning about the process of group work is a significant part of the unit, then it is better for the tutor to assign students into groups.
* Creating groups of mixed ability has better outcomes for those with lower ability (even in subsequent individual assessments), and shouldn’t disadvantage those of higher ability, provided that there is some way of acknowledging their input and performance with an element of individual marking, (Gibbs, ibid).
* If English is a second language group members may have trouble with non-standard English i.e. accents and local references.
* If you intend to use Peer Assessment, research into gender differences in marking is inconclusive, but “It does seem that males and females value different criteria to different extents (Bean and Kidder, 1982, cited by Graham Gibbs), with females valuing process-related “group maintenance” tasks more highly than their male counterparts. It is therefore all the more important to ensure that students understand peer marking criteria and how to apply them.
* A survey of 2,300 international students in the UK concluded, *‘[they] preferred to choose their own groups and would often choose people with the same ethnic background because they felt comfortable and able to communicate well’* (Osmund & Roed, 2010, p. 114). Students need time and encouragement to move beyond their social ‘comfort zones’ and to discover fellow students’ strengths and practice intercultural skills. It’s necessary for teachers to organise chances to do this early on in a course, without assessment ‘strings’ attached.
1. **What is the recommended group size?**
* Of course, it depends on the scale of the group task and how it’s devised, but an ideal group size seems to be 4-6, and ideally no more than 8, (Gibbs, ibid). Students are less likely to feel individually needed or able to contribute in groups of more than 6.
* Bear in mind that the smaller the group the more severe the impact of illness/absence is likely to be on the group.
1. **What happens if genuine illness affects participation –**
	* For the individual?
* The student has to demonstrate achievement of all the ILOs of the unit, so a simple re-assessment in a different format (e.g. exam, essay) may not be sufficient. If individual students are required to keep a learning log or reflective journal, or to submit individual pieces of work that contribute towards the group assignment, then these can be used to determine a mark.
	+ For the rest of the group?
* Group protocols/preparation should have covered potential problems and how to deal with them. If a student is ill early on in the process, the students should reassign the tasks and the tutor can make a judgement as to how the group dealt with the set-back as part of the assessment of process. A similar approach can be taken if a student is ill on, say, the day of a group presentation.
* If a student’s illness significantly affects the group product, e.g. a report that the group was dependent on is not forthcoming, then the tutor will have to make allowances in the mark allocated for the product.
1. **What happens if groups encounter problems?**
* This should be established at the beginning of the unit, e.g. in the preparatory session for students, or in the group protocol. Any concerns that any member may have about another’s contribution should be raised openly with the whole group at the earliest possible stage. If conflict within groups is proving difficult to resolve, the case should be brought to the attention of the course tutor/convenor.
1. **What about students who want to work alone, perhaps because of concern that their marks will be brought down, or because of personal preferences?**
* Assessment methods are not normally negotiable[[3]](#footnote-3). If the course is optional, students should already be aware of what they are signing up for via the course description, and choose accordingly. If compulsory, it will be especially important to explain the rationale for and discuss group work with the class. If individual students are still concerned, they will need extra support through the tutor explaining the rationale for and benefits of group work and pinpointing the source of the student’s concerns.
* Group work develops skills that are especially valuable to such students, (as long as it’s part of a balanced curriculum that caters for different learning styles and aptitudes).
1. **Does the need for verbal communication in group work have the potential to unfairly disadvantage international students and advantage home students?**
* Home students tend to have stereotypes of students of different nationalities, assuming that some are too loud and rude, whilst others are too quiet. A forthcoming report from the Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) suggests that people with an accent are more likely to be judged as having lower competence and/or intelligence, irrespective of their actual competence, intelligence or language skills. It is vital that the course leader is aware of this and organises the group work accordingly, from preparation and induction of the students, through the group work task, the assessment scheme etc.
1. **How do you give feedback on group work?**
* The tutor should be keeping an eye on how groups are progressing, so arranging to attend one of their meetings with a view to giving verbal feedback may be helpful.
* Alternatively, you can ask groups to submit a piece of work, such as a project plan, early on in the unit, for formative written feedback.
* The University’s Policy on feedback to Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Students requires that “An opportunity must exist in all units for formative feedback.” Peer Assessment is a useful means of providing individual students with formative feedback during the unit, which also serves the purpose of keeping the group on track and the individual members on their toes.
1. **Are there any handouts or online resources I could give my students to help them with group work?**
* Faculty of Humanities Study Skills Website: **Working in Groups**

http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/studyskills/develop\_learner/groups/index.html

* LearnHigher: **Group Work - Resources for Students**

**Includes useful Group work online booklet, “Making Groupwork Work”**

<http://www.learnhigher.ac.uk/Students/Group-work.html>

* Reading University: **Effective Group Work**

**Includes a printable booklet, “Effective Group Work”**

<http://www.reading.ac.uk/internal/studyadvice/StudyResources/Seminars/sta-groupwork.aspx>

* University of Kent: **Teamworking Skills**

 <http://www.kent.ac.uk/careers/sk/teamwork.htm>

1. **Where can I find more information and resources for teaching staff?**
* There is a very interesting article by John Shute (Criminology, School of Law) on his experience of piloting **Assessed Group Essays (AGEs)** in the May 2011 edition of Humanities Teaching and Learning News – see “What doesn’t kill you….” <http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/tandl/news/bulletin/May2011.pdf>
* For advice about **Blackboard**, contact the Faculty eLearning team Service Desk on 0161 306 5544, email elearning@manchester.ac.uk, or see the Teaching and Learning Office website: <http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/tandl/elearning/>

There is a wealth of literature, guidance and templates on group work available online. These are a few examples:

* University of Aberdeen **Centre for Learning and Teaching: Groupwork** –

Guidance, case studies and practical examples…

<http://www.abdn.ac.uk/clt/good-practice/resources/groupwork/>

* LearnHigher: **Group Work – Resources for Staff**

<http://learnhigher.ac.uk/Staff/Group-work.html>

* University of Sussex **Teaching and Learning Development Unit: Assessing Groupwork** <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/tldu/ideas/assessment/grp>
* The Higher Education Academy (HEA) has resources on group work as part of the **Teaching International Students** project:

<http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/internationalisation/ISL_Group_Work>

Resources include pedagogical techniques on mixing groups, how to make sure all students understand what needs to be done (including the issue of language skills) and how to encourage people to work together and diversify and mix the groups.

* University of Lancashire PALATINE (Performing Arts Learning and Teaching Innovation Network) was the Higher Education Academy Subject Centre for Dance, Drama and Music (2000-2011)

<http://www.lancs.ac.uk/palatine/AGP/resources.htm>

Scallon, R. (1995) *“The machine stops: Silence in the metaphor of malfunction"*. In D Tannen and M Saville-Troike (eds) *Perspectives on Silence* (pp21-31). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

* Giles, H., Coupland, N. and Wienmann, J.M. (1992) *" 'Talk is cheap' but 'my word is my bond': Beliefs about talk"*. In K Bolton and H Kwok (eds) *Sociolinguistics Today: Eastern and Western Perspectives*. (pp 218-243).  London: Routledge.
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**APPENDIX 1**

**EXAMPLES OF MIXED ASSESSMENT SCHEMES for the ASSESSMENT OF GROUP WORK**

**Level 1 unit (10 credits) “Group Processes” (Education) Dr. Charlotte Woods**

*Assessment Scheme: 100% course work comprising:*

**Poster (30%) (shared mark)**

i. individual contributions submitted via Blackboard (week 3)

ii. final group poster submitted via Blackboard (week 4)

**Presentation (20**%: 12% from overall quality of presentation (shared mark), 8% from individual delivery (individual mark)

10-minute group presentation with individual contributions, plus Q&A, based on the group poster (week 5)

**Reflective Commentary Report (50%)** (week 7) **(individual mark)**

Informed by individual online journal using the Blackboard journal tool. The online journal itself is not marked, but students must complete at least 5 x 500-word journal entries on which to base their reflective commentary report.

**Level 2 unit (20 credits) “Performance Practices 1” (Drama) Dr. Alison Jeffers**

**Preparation/Group Work/Outcome (60%)**

- 5-10 minute storytelling performance on a given theme, demonstrating understanding of form

- short reflective piece on the aims and experience of their performance, up to 1,000 words

- attendance + evidence of full preparation for each session

**Reflection (40%)**

Critical essay on a question set or approved by the tutor, up to 2,500 words. The aim is to help students reflect on their experiences by placing their work in a professional and theoretical context.

Students are encouraged to keep a log book recording each session, reflecting on tasks, reading and other research. These are not formally assessed.

**Level 3 unit (20 credits) “Ethnic Minorities in Britain” (Religions & Theology) Dr. John Zavos**

**Group Presentation (10%)**

15 minutes, on a topic associated with the students’ chosen key concept, using primary sources and assessed by peers (A/B/C/D) according to a maximum of 4 criteria developed by the group. The final mark is decided by the tutor, based on peer assessment + evidence presented in the portfolios.

**Individual Portfolio (40%)** consisting of:

i. key concept analysis of up to 1,000 words (formative)

ii. personal reflection on key concept analysis, up to 500 words (10%)

iii. individual report and reflection on group presentation, up to 1,500 words (20%)

iv. written assessment of peer group presentation on the basis of criteria developed by the group, up to 500 words (10%)

**Individual Essay (50%)**

3,000 words on a topic unrelated to the key concept, from a list of questions set by the tutor.

**Masters’ Level unit (15 credits) “Skills for Sustainability and Social Responsibility” (Manchester Enterprise Centre) Helen Dobson and Dr. Kurt Allman**

**Formative assessment**

**Team Project 1 (Training exercise)**

1,000-2,000 words in week 4 (with feedback in week 5)

**Draft Reflective Report**

300-600 words in week 5 (with feedback in week 8)

**Team Project 2 (Training exercise)** in week 6 (with feedback in week 8)

- presentation slides suitable for a 15 min. presentation plus notes pages

**Formative Peer Assessment**

in week 6/7 (with feedback in week 8)

**Summative assessment**

**Team Project 3\* (15%)**

2,000 words in week 9 (with feedback in week 10)

**Team Project 4\* (45%)**

- 10-15 minute presentation plus notes pages in week 11

**Individual reflective report (40%)**

2,000 words in week 12, consisting of: (A) Introduction, (B) Sustainability and Change, (C) Collaborative Team-working, (D) Information Literacy and Self-directed Learning, (E) Conclusion

Plus:

**Electronic peer assessment exercise\***

Thismodifies the team mark to calculate individual marks, accounting for individual contributions to teamwork. Students are required to assess the contributions of others to the work produced, rather than attempting to evaluate others’ levels of skills or competences.

*\*Coursework – all team marks are modified by the summative peer-feedback results*

Devlin tabulates of all sorts of peer and tutor assessments of product and process, with pros and cons, in her paper *Assessing group work*, Marcia Devlin (Excerpt from Assessing Learning in Australian Universities, James, R., McInnis, C. and Devlin, M.)

See: <http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/assessinglearning/docs/Group.pdf>
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1. Within the University’s Policy Framework, ‘A **Guidance Note** ... is an advisory document that indicates a course of action that will usually be followed unless there is a good reason for not doing so.  They provide protocols, practice and guidance to ensure that staff and others can comply with specific Policies and Procedures’ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. University’s Dignity at Work and Study Policy [www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/services/equality-and-diversity/policies-and-guidance/dignity-at-work-and-study](http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/services/equality-and-diversity/policies-and-guidance/dignity-at-work-and-study) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Where reluctance to get involved in group work is acknowledged by the DSO as associated with a specific disability, reasonable adjustment should be made to provide an alternative assessment for the student [↑](#footnote-ref-3)