GLOBAL CHALLENGES, RESEARCH AND LEADERSHIP GCRL1000
ENSURING QUALITY

INTRODUCTION
GCRL1000 is a Category B broadening unit offered only to BPhil (Hons) students. This unit provides undergraduate research training at Level 1 and, thus, acts both as a foundation for the degree and as a platform for the research-intensive experiences in BPhil (Hons) (http://units.handbooks.uwa.edu.au/units/gcrl/gcrl1000).

The unit “is designed to provide you with a solid basis for your ongoing undergraduate studies and beyond by training you to think like a researcher” (Unit Outline) through integrating an interdisciplinary context, the basics of academic research and skills and ways of thinking that are transferable to discipline-specific contexts.

It facilitates access to leaders in research across a variety of fields, investigation into challenges with global dimensions and the opportunity of exploring the nature of research and the role of leadership.

The unit is designed around practicing and developing team-based and project management skills and self- and peer-assessment though undertaking to completion a research project involving planning, data collection and analysis, and reporting of findings in both written and oral formats.

These aims are implemented through the BPhil (Hons) Undergraduate Research Training model (BURT) developed by Professor Sally Sandover and Assistant Professor Lee Partridge from their innovative co-curricular program ULTRIS (http://www.student.uwa.edu.au/learning/resources/ultris).

TEACHING TEAM
Associate Professor Jenna Mead (Unit Co-ordinator)
Professor Sally Sandover, Academic Director, Educational Strategies Office
Assistant Professor Lee Partridge, Higher Education Development, CATL
Dr Wayne McGowan, Project Officer (ULTRIS - Undergraduate Learning and Teaching Research Internship Scheme), CATL

LEARNING OUTCOMES identified in the Unit Outline.

Broad Outcomes (These outcomes are not specifically assessed in this unit.)
As you work through the unit you will begin to develop an understanding of and the skills to:
1. identify and analyse trends in global challenges.
2. identify distinct disciplinary approaches to global challenges.
3. apply interdisciplinary perspectives to analyse global issues.
4. identify and assess distinct models of leadership practices.
5. work collaboratively to produce and present research in written and oral forms.
6. conduct and present independent research.
*Broad Outcomes 1-4 will mainly be derived from interaction and discussions with research leaders during the summer residence. Outcomes 5 and 6 will result from the BURT program.

**Specific Learning Outcomes** (These outcomes will be assessed in this unit.)

On completion of this unit, you should be able to:

1. apply knowledge gained to develop a well formulated research proposal.
2. acquire introductory knowledge about a range of research methodologies in order to select the most appropriate for their project.
3. use a range of research skills to successfully complete their project.
4. demonstrate a capacity to think at a deeper and more critical level when evaluating and using a diverse range of information resources.
5. work collaboratively with a research supervisor, other academics and your research group in the formulation and progression of the research project.
6. participate and contribute to a community of practice.
7. communicate the results of the research to a wider audience through the production of an academic paper.
8. orally present the results of your research to a wider audience of peers, academics and researchers
9. be able to identify and use a range of transferable research skills in your other undergraduate studies.

**BENCHMARKING AGAINST CURRICULUM (F28852)**

The Unit Outline identifies both formative and summative elements in the assessment mechanism (excerpted below). These elements are crossed-referenced to the learning outcomes (above).

### Summative Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Specific Learning Outcomes being assessed (see page 2)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research proposal</td>
<td>1,2,5,6,7,8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Wednesday 14th March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>4,6,7,8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Wednesday 18th April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice presentation</td>
<td>3,4,5,6,8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Wednesday 30th May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic paper</td>
<td>3,4,5,6,7</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Friday 1st June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Essay</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Friday 1st June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Presentations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Wednesday 30th May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>5,6,</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Ongoing TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formative Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Individual/Group Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Blog</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Draft Proposal</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Tuesday 28th Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Oral Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presentation of research proposal</td>
<td>G/I</td>
<td>Wednesday 14th March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presentation of literature review</td>
<td>G/I</td>
<td>Wednesday 18th April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sharing of research findings</td>
<td>G/I</td>
<td>Wednesday 23rd May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Practice Group Presentation</td>
<td>G/I</td>
<td>Wednesday 30th May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self assessment of group work written submissions</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Ongoing TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer assessment of group work written submissions</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ongoing TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Peer Assessments of oral presentations</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ongoing TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum (F28852) identifies learning outcomes for research-intensive and communications experiences across Levels 1-4 in BPhil (Hons). These outcomes, excerpted below, are cross-reference against the assessment mechanism in GCRL1000. Elsewhere, specific criteria and assessment rubrics from assessment within the unit are cited.

In relation to some learning outcomes identified in the Curriculum, GCRL1000 has provided research and communications experiences and these are noted in the appropriate places.
Research-intensive experiences [F28852 p. 3] S = summative elements F = formative elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Level 1: Beginning</th>
<th>Level 2: Developing</th>
<th>Level 3: Advanced</th>
<th>Level 4: Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Research communication: Written presentation of research | BPHL1000 group written presentation  
F: Reflective blog  
S: Academic paper  
BPHL1000 individual essay | Brief reflective statements for the research mentor meetings  
F: Reflective blog  
S: Reflective essay | Written assessment of the BPHL3000 Research Project  
Extensive & sustained engagement with feedback & evaluation tools at project, unit & course levels: surveys, SURF, SPOT, SALG, focus group | Honours dissertation written work  
Abstract or poster presentation on their research thesis for the B.Phil (Hons) website |
| Research communication: Oral presentation of research | BPHL1000 group oral presentation  
F: Presentation of proposal, literature review  
F: Colloquium presentation | Discussions at the research mentor meetings  
Interaction with supervisor over semester-long project | Short presentation on the BPHL3000 Research Project to the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series  
F: Jigsaw comprised short presentation to members of other groups; F: Colloquium presentation | Detailed seminar presentation on the BPHL3000 Research Project to the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series |
| Research conduct: Individual research | BPHL1000 group and individual research work  
F: Reflective blog  
F: Self-assessment written work  
S: assessment via SPARKplus tool | Short research tasks as set by the research mentor  
Analysis & feedback on drafts of paper elements | Guided research undertaken for the BPHL3000 Research Project  
Negotiation with project supervisor | Independent research undertaken for the Honours dissertation project |
| Research conduct: Research in a collaborative environment | BPHL1000 group work F: Peer-assessment of written work S: Research paper elements produced by group S: Group work SPARKplus tool | Discussions with the research mentor sharing research practices Peer and supervisor feedback sessions on development & progress of research project | Attendance and posing appropriate questions at the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series High level Q & A at Summer Residence & F: Colloquium | Developed questions and ability to responses to seminar presentation at the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series |
## Communication-intensive experiences [F28852 p. 5] Specific assessment rubrics cited from unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Level 1: Beginning</th>
<th>Level 2: Developing</th>
<th>Level 3: Advanced</th>
<th>Level 4: Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students demonstrate **writing** that is clear, well structured and appropriate to audience and purpose | BPHL1000 group written Presentation  
Research paper of publishable standard; appropriate academic conventions; demonstrate critical thinking, rigorous research practices, valid and reliable findings, as well as recommendations for practice and/or future research. | Short reflective statement on Level 1 experience for B.Phil (Hons) website  
F: Reflective blog  
S: Reflective essay | Transcription and editing of interview with professional leader  
Preparation, collection, transcription, analysis & coding of quantitative data for research project  
Detailed understanding of Human Ethics Clearance process | Executive summary of Honours research for professional presentation |
| Students give **oral presentations** that are clear, well structured and appropriate to audience and purpose | BPHL1000 group oral Presentation  
See Oral Presentation Skills rubric (below)  
Foreign language unit  
See individual study plans | Public presentation to Year 12 cohort on the experience of the B.Phil (Hons)  
Group presentations; Colloquium (public) presentation | Interview with professional leader  
Collection of quantitative data for research project incl. interview with senior UWA staff | Brief appropriate professional audience on their honours research |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students demonstrate <strong>critical information literacy skills</strong> that are appropriate to context</th>
<th>BPHL1000 group and individual research work <strong>Criteria for research proposal</strong>: rationale for conducting this research; b) situates research in relation to scholarship; c) identifies sources of data; d) justifies selected data collection tools; e) considers limitations and d) considers the ethical implications of the research. Foreign language unit</th>
<th>Preparation of reflective statement and public speaking <strong>Group presentations; Colloquium (public) presentation</strong></th>
<th>Identification of and preparation of appropriate questions for interview <strong>Preparation, collection, transcription, analysis &amp; coding of quantitative data for research project</strong></th>
<th>Independent research undertaken for the Honours dissertation project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate <strong>interpersonal skills</strong> that are sensitive and appropriate to the context</td>
<td>BPHL1000 group work <strong>Self- and peer assessment via SPARKplus tool</strong> Foreign language unit</td>
<td>Public presentation and response to questions to Year 12 cohort on the experience of the B.Phil (Hons) <strong>Q + A at Colloquium</strong></td>
<td>Conduct of the interview <strong>Preparation, collection, transcription, analysis &amp; coding of quantitative data for research project</strong></td>
<td>Developed questions and ability to responses to seminar presentation at the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Oral presentation skills rubric — for assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students give <strong>presentations</strong> that are clear, well-structured and appropriate to audience and purpose</td>
<td>Demonstrate and reflect on a limited range of basic <strong>speaking and presenting</strong> concepts and skills with extensive structured guidance</td>
<td>Demonstrate and reflect on a moderate range of competent <strong>speaking and presenting</strong> concepts and skills with limited structured guidance</td>
<td>Demonstrate and reflect on an extensive range of advanced <strong>speaking and presenting</strong> concepts and with little or no structured guidance</td>
<td>Demonstrate and reflect on a comprehensive range of professional <strong>speaking and presenting</strong> concepts and with no structured guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate sound public speaking and presentation skills which demonstrate effective use of voice, body language, structure, word choice, presentation technologies, etc</td>
<td>1.1 Demonstrate basic use of voice, body language and language, with extensive structured guidance.</td>
<td>1.2 Prepare and present an oral presentation demonstrating effective use of voice, body language, structure, words and use of technologies to a class/tutorial group with limited structured guidance.</td>
<td>1.3 Prepare and present a compelling argument that demonstrates effective use of voice, body language, structure, word choice and presentation technology with little or no structured guidance.</td>
<td>1.4 Prepare and present an oral presentation demonstrating effective use of voice, appropriate language, body language, and use of technologies to an audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop and present a clear, well-structured message appropriate to audience and purpose</td>
<td>2.1 Demonstrate a basic ability to develop and present a clear, well-structured message that is appropriate to audience and purpose with extensive structured guidance.</td>
<td>2.2 Demonstrate a competent ability to develop and present a clear, well-structured message that is appropriate to audience and purpose with limited structured guidance.</td>
<td>2.3 Demonstrate an advanced ability to develop and present a clear, well-structured message that is appropriate to audience and purpose with little or no structured guidance.</td>
<td>2.4 Demonstrate the ability to develop and present a clear, well-structured message that is appropriate to audience and purpose with no structured guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide clear and accurate explanations of key concepts and</td>
<td>3.1 Provide basic clear and accurate explanations of key concepts and processes with</td>
<td>3.2 Provide competent clear and accurate explanations of key concepts and processes</td>
<td>3.3 Provide advanced clear and accurate explanations of key concepts and processes</td>
<td>3.4 Provide explanations of key concepts and processes that are clear and accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes</td>
<td>extensive structured guidance.</td>
<td>with limited structured guidance.</td>
<td>with little or no structured guidance.</td>
<td>with little or no structured guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use spoken and visual tools effectively to convey a message</td>
<td>4.1 Demonstrate a basic ability to use spoken and visual tools effectively to convey a message with extensive structured guidance.</td>
<td>4.2 Demonstrate a competent ability to use spoken and visual tools effectively to convey a message with limited structured guidance.</td>
<td>4.3 Demonstrate an advanced ability to use spoken and visual tools effectively to convey a message with little or no structured guidance.</td>
<td>4.4 Demonstrate skills to use spoken and visual tools effectively to convey a message with no structured guidance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Background

In 2012, as part of the new courses of study restructure, the University of Western Australia (UWA) instituted a Bachelor of Philosophy (BPhil) program. This program is intended to provide the opportunity for top performing students to excel in their studies and extend themselves.

Throughout Semester 1 the BPhil program coordinator, Associate Professor Jenna Mead, conducted a range of evaluation procedures including a SPOT survey. In June she requested that Elaine Lopes of the STUDY Smarter team conduct two focus group interviews with representatives of the BPhil cohort. The focus groups were conducted on Monday June 18th (Focus Group 1, FG1) and Tues June 19th (Focus Group 2, FG2). There were five participants in each group and each student represented the group that they worked with on their research project. There were 10 questions (see Appendix A) which guided the discussion and each interview lasted approximately 75 minutes. The focus groups were intended to provide rich detail about the experiences of the students and to provide more information about some aspects of the program which, based on feedback in the SPOT survey, the students were not entirely satisfied with.

2 Focus Group Discussion

2.1 Sense of Improvement as a Researcher

Overall, the students had a very strong sense of development of themselves as researchers, however they felt they needed to learn more about the research process. They felt slightly hampered by the subject matter was not interesting, this was a point which was agreed upon by all of the participants in FG1. It was, however, acknowledged that one of the research groups had been able to specialize in their area of study. A number of participants in FG1 indicated that they felt that the program had provided them with a good start and that they were still keen to pursue further research, or even a career in academia. The students reported that at the beginning of the summer residence they had felt quite lost and that over the course of the program there had been a definite increase in their skills and an improvement in their ability to think as researchers. They added that they now have a better understanding of the breadth of research that is possible and now better understand how to identify and phenomenon which needs to be investigated. Previously they hadn’t understood the practicalities of research or the research process. In particular, they found working on the literature to be instructive – developing an understanding of where the boundaries lie. They also now know that research can be collaborative, that it doesn’t have to be a solitary process or task.

2.2 Group Skills

There was general agreement that the opportunity to work in a “functional group”, one in which all members were motivated to contribute to the work, made a “pleasant change”, although this was not true for all groups. It was also reported that in working with highly motivated students each person then felt responsibility for working harder to avoid letting the team down. The students felt that they had developed their skills in listening to others, working with others and learning from them. They reported that working in a group helped them to “stay on track”, to stay focused on the task at hand. Furthermore, when they were unsure of how to proceed with something other members of the groups often knew what to do. They received and gave realistic and honest feedback which was perceived to be a good learning experience. The students enjoyed the opportunity to work with others who they considered to be performing at a similar academic level to them, something which provided them with confidence in the ability of the group. They highlighted that they had learnt the importance of good organisation and communication skills for groups to function effectively. Comparing their experiences in GCRL1000 and other units the students recognised the value of having scheduled group meetings every week (in other units) and suggested that such a structure would be helpful in GCRL1000.
2.3 Course Structure

The students had a number of suggestions for improving the structure of the course, most related to the timing of information workshops and assignment deadlines. It was felt that there was time at the beginning and then too much stress at the end, this was particularly the case for the discussion of results where it was felt that there was too much time allocated to planning and then the writing up of the results was too rushed.

The students suggested that the deadlines created a degree of stress as they came up so quickly. In particular, it was felt that the literature review workshop and the deadline for submitting the literature review were too close together. The students suggested that the literature review workshop should have been held earlier, that they were all waiting for it and then the deadline was just a couple of days later. In regard to this it was considered that the feedback came too late (at the workshop). For example, the workshop on the literature review was held on the 16th of April and the students’ literature reviews were due on the 18th. There was general agreement that the literature review could be due earlier so that there would then be more time for the data gathering process, which the students found to be rather rushed. They suggested that there was time for this after the submission of the proposal and that there was a need for more guidance on how to select literature to read as it was an entirely new task for all of the students.

In regard to the literature review, the students also felt that they required more practical input as to what academic writing looked like. They suggested that they required a better understanding of where they were in terms of academic writing, that they needed to develop an understanding of academic writing before they could produce their literature reviews. It was further suggested that after the literature review the progress of the project felt very rushed. This was particularly the case for students whose study participants took time getting back to them. The students who chose option had a sense that “100% of the assessment was conducted almost in one week”, the practice presentation was on the 30th of May, the final paper was due on the 1st of June and the reflective essay was also due on the 1st of June and some students had work due in other units at the same time. Both focus groups commented that they would have preferred the literature review workshop to be held earlier and for the literature review itself to be due earlier which would then provide more time for the following aspects of the unit.

Overall, it was felt that the basic structure of the course was good. In relation to this, it was reported that the group sessions with Jenna and the supervisors were very helpful and that the students had a good rapport with both Jenna and their supervisors.

2.4 Assessment

2.4.1 Assessment Options

The groups had two options in regard to assessment and final marks. In Option 1 the students received marks for their research proposal, literature review and final paper whereas students who selected Option 2 received feedback on their research proposal and literature review and had all their marks allocated for their final paper. Overall, option 1 was approximately twice as popular as option 2. Having the choice was considered to be very stressful and in general the students indicated that they would rather not have a choice. This was particularly so as they felt that they didn’t really know what they were making a choice about, they felt that they didn’t know enough about research or working in groups or assessment at university. A number of the students indicated that they wasted time at the beginning of the program trying to decide what was the better option, others decided quickly, one group by “the toss of a coin” indicating the difficulty the students had in making a well-informed decision. For the groups which chose option 1, the decision was largely made based on a fear of “putting all [their] eggs in one basket”. The students who chose this option found the ongoing deadlines and the desire for good marks kept them very motivated. On the other hand, it was felt that option 2 enabled the students to focus on the process rather than the marks and that this provided them with an opportunity to concentrate on developing their skills. In general, it was considered that option 1 better supported the aims of the course but that there should be more weighting given to the final paper. As it was, students who chose option 1 felt that they received their marks when their work was at a less developed stage and when they were still developing their understanding of the standard of work which was expected and they felt that this worked against them. One suggestion was for the
marks to be calculated both ways and for the best mark to be awarded to compensate for having to make an uninformed decision.

FG1 considered that the reflective essay was worth too much and that what was required was not made clear. However, some students reported learning a lot from writing the reflective essay and considered it to be a helpful process. They suggested that it would perhaps be better to time this task so that it was due after everything else had been finished. In regard to this the students found the 1 week extension for the deadline for this task to be helpful.

Submitting drafts of the tasks was found to be useful as instructive feedback was provided, however FG1 thought that it would be more motivational if a tentative mark were provided. This would also indicate whether the students were on track or not.

2.4.2 SPARK

Both focus groups agreed that SPARK (Self and Peer Assessment Resource Kit) was not appropriate for the BPhil program. It is designed for a particular cohort and is designed to be motivational however the students suggested that it did not work in this way with this group of students. It was considered that SPARK "skewed the marks" and that it was an imprecise instrument, however it was also it was pointed out that the difference in rating was too small to make a significant difference to the marks. SPARK was considered to be a good learning tool but not ideal for ascertaining marks. Furthermore, it was considered that some of the questions were irrelevant to the BPhil program.

Some students enjoyed the peer feedback and suggested that the comments were useful. It was agreed that it would be good to have more feedback although it was noted that some students weren’t happy with their feedback and would in all probability not want more.

It was agreed that SPARK could be good for motivating students who weren’t contributing to group work but that is wasn’t useful in functional motivated groups such as those in the BPhil. It didn’t work well with such small groups providing an imprecise measurement. Generally not considered to be useful and that it should not be used for generating marks.

2.4.3 Number of Assessments

Overall, the focus group participants agreed that there were not too many assessments in the program and that the range of assessment tasks was useful and that they introduced the students to the whole research process. It was, however, considered strange that no marks were allocated for the colloquium (the final presentation) and that no or limited feedback was received on the mock presentation. It was suggested that the students were more comfortable and better prepared for the colloquium and that they felt they did well in these presentations and as a result would have liked to have marks allocated for the task.

2.5 Learning Activities

2.5.1 Self and Peer Review of Literature Review and Proposal

In general, engaging in self and peer review of the literature review and proposal was thought to have provided opportunities to learn more about research and improve the quality of their work. The students didn’t think the self-review was particularly useful, especially for the proposal as they did not think they were knowledgeable enough. In general they considered that it was essentially editing. Others thought the self-review was useful in that it provided the students with an opportunity to compare their own work to that of others. Overall the students preferred reading and reviewing others’ papers as it helped them to get a sense of the standard of work that other groups were producing, however, they found it difficult to give useful feedback and didn’t feel they had appropriate experience to do so. It was however suggested that it made them look at their own work in a different way. They felt that it would be more useful to see others' final papers. They also commented that the self and
peer review process only required minimal time and effort. Overall, however, they agreed that they favoured the feedback provided by the supervisors.

2.5.2 Jigsaw Presentation

The students thought this was a good primer or practice run for the final presentation. They found it useful in clarifying their projects, refining their presentations and improving their comfort in presenting to an audience. However, they didn’t feel that it helped them to improve their presentation skills as it was too informal and they received little or no feedback on their presentations.

2.5.3 Colloquium/Group Presentation

The colloquium was not assessed and the students didn’t receive any feedback on their presentations and therefore they did not find it especially useful. They did say that they felt quite relaxed, that there was little pressure associated with the activity. This was not just because it wasn’t marked but also because there had been more time to prepare for it and this was useful as it provided the opportunity for the students to reflect on the content and structure of their presentations. In regard to this, the public speaking session/workshop was useful in preparing the students. The students liked being asked questions by academics as this helped them to further clarify their projects and they felt that this helped them to expand their understanding of the topic.

2.6 GCRL1000

It was generally agreed that the unit took more than 150 hours. This included the summer school, sessions, group meetings and research. FG1 suggested that GCRL1000 took up more time than their other units combined and that this was in part because they knew their supervisors and felt more connected to the unit and in part because they were trying to overachieve.

2.7 BURT

The students particularly enjoyed the summer residence component of the unit. The summer residence was generally considered to be very good but also very intense and perhaps too “packed”. Throughout the residence they felt sleep deprived and a bit overloaded. The students were focused on getting to know each other and found it to be a very fun and social time and a great opportunity for developing friendships. The sense of community and collaboration with like minded people were particularly valued.

The students also appreciated the strong relationships they formed with their supervisors. In particular, the students found the feedback provided by their supervisors to be of tremendous value and they appreciated the opportunity to draw on the experience of their supervisors.

On the guest lecturers the students commented that many were very interesting and inspirational but it was felt that others didn’t understand the BPhil and that their presentations weren’t relevant to the students and that they then lost focus. The students also noted that only two presentations at the summer residence were from the humanities yet the topic of their project was humanities based.

The students commented on feeling a sense of responsibility and independence in participating in the unit and that they felt privileged to be on the project. On completion of the final paper the students reported feeling extremely satisfied and had a real sense of achievement.

2.8 The Research Topic

Initially the students hated the topic. This was in part because they didn’t know much about the topic (sustainable education). They expected to be provided with more background information on the topic they would study. The topic was heavily grounded in the social sciences and was not considered relevant for some of the students, however they acknowledge that it was still helpful in developing their
knowledge and skills and that it helped them to understand an alternative ways of conducting research. The students felt hampered in that they always had to go through the supervisors and couldn’t take the initiative it directing their research focus but reported that over time it made more sense. FG2 commented that in the end they thought it was a clever topic as they were themselves getting a sustainable education and so it actually was relevant to them and this enabled them to find the topic interesting. It was also noted that there was limited scope for impact as they couldn’t see implement their findings (gender and Engineering).

Initially the students said that they found it difficult to find literature on the topic but that in the end this was beneficial as it helped them hone their literature research skills. The representative of one group commented that it wasn’t until the literature review that they really knew what it was that they wanted to do in the project.

It was acknowledged in FG2 that it was good that the topic had limits, as without these the students would have been tempted to overreach and may have struggled with the project.

One group found it annoying that their topic was stolen by one of the supervisors to give to another group which was struggling to come up with a focus.

2.9 Provision of Feedback

In the SPOT report one aspect which received a relatively low rating was the provision of timely feedback (only 37% of students agreed that they had received timely feedback while 39% disagreed resulting in a mean of 2.92). The facilitators were surprised about this as they felt that there had been ongoing feedback provided throughout the course and wanted to find out why the students had responded to this question in the way they had. During the focus group discussions the students commented that the sufficiency of the feedback was not the problem but rather the timeliness of it. At a number of points during the unit the students felt that there was not enough time between the feedback and the submission date for completed tasks, for example, in the case of the literature review there was not enough time to act on the feedback before submitting the final paper – feedback was given on one day and the paper was due the next. The students thought that there needed to be more of a gap. Although the students thought the whole unit was fast paced they commented that this was particularly the case at the end (the last week) and there was no time to improve on prior tasks.

On the whole the students commented that the supervisors provided very good feedback and that they were always available, however, at times there was little opportunity to implement suggested improvements. Some students also suggested that the feedback from their supervisor was “a bit vague, especially about conceptual issues”. It was also noted that the groups received feedback from their supervisors which they addressed and then after submitting their work they received more feedback and the students felt frustrated by this as they thought they had made all necessary improvements to their work. This perhaps points to a misunderstanding of the research and academic writing process.

In regard to the draft paper the students commented that the feedback from their supervisors was helpful but the feedback from their peers was more critical and they found this very worrying.

The one area where the students felt that feedback wasn’t provided was after the colloquium and they commented that this would have been valuable, however, they did receive informal feedback in the form of comments and questions from academics.

2.10 SPOT Ratings

Another item on the SPOT is ‘The teachers are well prepared’. 53% of students agreed and 21% disagreed. When asked to provide other feedback on the SPOT ratings the students commented a perceived lack of preparedness on the part of the presenters at times. FG2 suggested that some of the workshops could have been presented in a more efficient and focused manner. They did, however, comment that the teachers were “good”, “motivated” and “keen”.
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The participants in FG1 suggested the SPOT was conducted at a particularly bad time as it was extremely busy for them and they were tired and that this may have impacted on the feedback provided.

They also pointed out the problem of the very small sample which (n 38) completed the SPOT and that it is a fairly blunt instrument which is not necessarily designed for the particular cohort or unit and is perhaps not relevant.

On a positive note, it was noted that this was the first time the unit had been run and that this was done so to a high level overall.

2.11 Final Comments

The students noted that they enjoyed the unit much more than it would seem from the feedback. They attributed this to the fact that their feedback is focused on improving the unit/program rather than highlighting the existing strengths. Overall they found the unit to be very satisfying to complete and added that they are very happy now that it is done.

One suggestion was that it was important to find a way to keep the group going and to keep the strong connections with peers that had been built over the course of the program.

It was also suggested that the students would like the opportunity to submit their papers to a journal as this would contribute to their sense of academic achievement.
3 Appendix 1

In addressing the following questions please give specific examples where possible.

1. Thinking like a researcher-
   Think back to day 1 of the summer residence. How would you rate yourself in ‘thinking like a researcher’ now compared to then.

2. Collaboration-
   What group skills have you learned

3. Course structure-
   What worked well and suggestions for change

4. Assessment-
   • Which assessment option did your group choose? Why did you choose that option and do you think it assisted the way you approached your learning.
   • Is there too much assessment?
   • Did you think the range of assessments was useful?
   • Is SPARK useful in terms of managing group dynamics? Do group work and the SPARK tool have a place in generating a mark?

5. Did the following activities assist your learning (If “yes” in what way?: If “no” please elaborate)
   • Self and Peer review of the proposal
   • Self and peer review of the Lit review
   • Jigsaw presentation (when each of you had to individually speak to a small group about your project)
   • Group presentation

6. Did GCRL1000 take more than 150 hours to complete?

7. What were the best things about the research training unit (BURT)?

8. Did you feel restricted with what you were able to do in the research training unit? Please elaborate.

9. At the end of the colloquium on June 5 Jenna addressed the SPOT feedback provided by the BPhil cohort. Of particular surprise was the low rating given to the timely provision of feedback in the BURT unit. Considering how much feedback was provided (supervisor and peer) throughout the unit can you elaborate or explain why students may have perceived this as being insufficient?

10. Is there anything else that you can add to better explain the SPOT ratings?
Bachelor of Philosophy (Hons)

UNIVERSITY TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE

Report on Contribution to Global Challenges, Research and Leadership (GCRL1000)
Semester 1 2012

Grant
In 2012 the Teaching and Learning Committee contributed $5 000 to resourcing teaching in the Level 1 unit in the Bachelor of Philosophy (Hons) unit Global Challenges, Research and Leadership (GCRL1000). This is a 6-pt unit and is classified as a Category B broadening unit. GCRL1000 is open only to BPhil (Hons) students; usually students enrol in their first year of study (http://units.handbooks.uwa.edu.au/units/gcurl/gcurl1000). Group 2 students, selected to enter BPhil (Hons) after completing 48 points and achieving a Weighted Average Mark of 80+, will be given the opportunity to complete this unit (6.7)

Project
GCRL1000 commenced with a Summer Residence in the week before Orientation Week (14-19 Feb 2012) (http://www.unistart.uwa.edu.au/crawley/summer-residence-online-registration-form) and ran through semester 1 with students meeting for a weekly seminar (Wed 11:00-12:45), participating in a 2-day Writing Workshop (14-15 April) and a 1-day Colloquium (5 Jun).

The Unit Outline addresses students directly and describes the content as providing students "with a solid basis for your [sic] ongoing undergraduate studies and beyond by training you to think like a researcher." Further,

[i]n an interdisciplinary context, GCRL1000 will introduce you to the basics of academic research and help you to develop skills and ways of thinking that are transferable to discipline-specific contexts. You will have access to leaders in research across a variety of fields that will benefit you as you start to think about challenges with global dimensions, the nature of research and the role of leadership. With your peers, you will practice and develop team-based and project management skills as you carry out and complete a research project involving the vital steps of planning, data collection and analysis, and reporting of your findings in both written and oral formats.

Undergraduate research training in GCRL1000 is provided through a model developed from ULTRIS by Assistant Professor Lee Partridge and Professor Sally Sandover and delivered in collaboration with Dr Wayne McGowan and Associate Professor Jenna Mead acting as Unit Coordinator. ULTRIS is recognized internationally as a successful model for undergraduate research training (http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol7/iss2/4/). The challenge was to develop what had been a co-curricular program into one suitable for a mainstream undergraduate unit in UWA’s New Courses 2012 structure: ULTRIS became BURT (BPhil Undergraduate Research Training model).

Particular features included the use of SPARKPlus to facilitate self and peer assessment and a purpose-built Moodle site to support teaching and learning in the unit through a wide range of
tools (project led by Assistant Professor Shannon Johnston, CATL) and provide a virtual home for a degree that has no Faculty.

**Evaluation**

GCRL1000 was evaluated through SURF and Dr Greg Marie (IRU) advises that this is a blunt instrument to survey this particular cohort, chiefly on the grounds that GCRL1000 is a research unit in the context of predominantly content-based Level 1 units, delivered to a homogeneous cohort rather than the broad-based cohorts in mainstream Level 1 units; this is also a new unit, with a new cohort, in a new degree.

The unit was also evaluated through SALG (quantitative online survey; [http://www.salgsite.org/](http://www.salgsite.org/ open until 25 Jun) and focus groups (2 x 5 students, 1 student nominated by each research group) for qualitative data, facilitated by Dr Elaine Lopes (Student Support Services, Mon 18, Tues 19 Jun). Results are pending. Two reviewers, external to the unit, Winthrop Professors Grady Venville and Helen Wildy, agreed to attend the Colloquium (Tues 5 Jun) and provide feedback.

**Research outcomes**

Presentations/unpublished papers

BPhil (Hons) Colloquium, Sustainable Education, 5 Jun 2012

- Tania Loke, William McKelvie, Liam O'Shea, Lucy Sharpe, Simon Thuijs: *A shared sustainable vision: Staff and student perceptions of UWA as a sustainable institution*

- Adarsh Das, Alexander Khor, Michelle Larg, Zaccary Molloy Mencshelyi: *Sustaining Indigenous Culture at UWA: Indigenous Studies at UWA as a means of affecting Student perceptions towards Indigenous Culture*

- Thea Lendich, Rachel McCormick, Andrew Pham, Mark Shelton: *Bridging the gender gap: The institutionalisation of the deficit and structural models in improving the participation and retention of female engineering students at UWA*

- David Kuster, Annabel Price, Adam Tynas, Pearl Wong: *Leadership development in UWA's Faculty clubs and societies: A study of intra-Faculty clubs and Societies at UWA*

- Arash Arabshahi, Wesley Cox, Lucy Davidson, Xin Zheng Tan: *Individualism collectivism and community-mindedness at UWA*

- Georgina Carson, Ashwin D'Cruz, Samuel Fleming, Ni Xiangyang: *Community in education: Investigating the effectiveness of UWA's extracurricular and co-curricular programs*

- Thomas Drake-Brockman, Nguyet Minh Duong, James Panaretos, Rajiv Venkatraman: *The effects of Faculty societies on postgraduate research perspectives*

- Calum Braham, Luke Frewer, Jordan King, Ben Luo: *"Being excellent in all areas:“ the impact of UWA’s educational principles in providing a sustainable education*

- Ken Foo, Kaylin Hooper, Rohan Mehra, Emily Twigger: *Student perceptions of education for sustainability and student voice*
Patrick Davis, Ryan Huynh, Daniel Ortlepp, Gaeleen Perrone, Tanuj Ruhal: UWA student perceptions of the role of non-Faculty student-led societies in developing sustainable leadership skills


Jenna Mead, “BPhil (Hons) Powered by Moodle,” eLearning Expo, 11 May, UWA


Concluding remarks
On behalf of BPhil (Hons) students, the BURT team and colleagues who contributed to GCRL1000, I would like to thank the Teaching and Learning Committee for their support. I am confident that BPhil (Hons) students have a secure platform on which to develop their “thinking like a researcher” in whatever disciplines they will focus their attention. As Unit Co-ordinator, I am now in the position to take GCRL1000 onto the next stage of its development.

Associate Professor Jenna Mead
18 June 2012
Global Challenges, Research & Leadership GCRL1000

6 Credit points

Semester 1, 2013

Unit Co-ordinator Assoc. Prof. Jenna Mead

www.lms.uwa.edu.au
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CONTACT DETAILS

Unit Co-ordinator

name: Associate Professor Jenna Mead
email: jenna.mead@uwa.edu.au
phone: Ext. 1869
consultation hours: Mon 2:00 – 4:00 pm
If you need another time, please make an appointment through Reception 6488 2423
location: Rm 1226 Student Services, first floor

Lecturer

name: Ms Iva Glišić
email: iva.glisic@uwa.edu.au
phone: Ext. 1869
consultation hours: Wed 3:00-5:00 pm
Also by arrangement
location: Rm 1226 Student Services, first floor

Alert

Information in this Unit Outline is correct at time of publication but students should be aware that changes may become necessary. Please ensure that you check LMS and your email regularly.
UNIT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This unit is designed to provide you with a basis for your experiences in the Bachelor of Philosophy (Hons) course by training you to think like a researcher.

Research produces new knowledge in any field and socialises it by sharing with the broader community. UWA is a research-intensive university with a strong collaborative research culture that contributes to local and global communities.

— W/Prof. Robyn Owens, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), UWA

Learning to be a researcher is a long process and this unit is just the beginning. We aim to give you some exposure to the complex interaction between the questions that drive research, the processes available to pursue those questions and the ways in which new knowledge can be shared. You’ve already made a start: you all come with ideas about research from your own experience; you’ve all competed the Summer Residence where researchers talked about their work and their experience.

Research is always specific to a discipline but increasingly researchers are being are to consider the new knowledge they are producing in the context of global challenges that necessitate the interaction of more than one discipline and the sharing of more than one kind of knowledge.

One of the challenges of research is to accept that knowledge may be without limits; that there may be no final answer, only partial solutions and contingent responses; that knowledge is dynamic and changes; that new questions demand new approaches.

It’s important too to understand, at the outset, that research is an iterative process. Whatever the discipline, your research will necessitate that you reread, revise, re-check, re-draft: in some circumstances, collecting data will depend on repetition.

Your journey as a researcher is one of ambition and hope, frustration and disappointment. It’s a journey that will require your concentration and commitment but one that’s always a shared journey. And so here, at the outset, we need to be clear about our expectations.

Unit content

This unit has three topics that interact in different ways in different contexts: the phenomenon of global challenges, the nature of research, the aspect of leadership. We will be thinking about these topics interrogatively, that is as questions: What is a ‘global challenge?’ What is the nature of research and, specifically, in the context of global challenges? What is leadership and how does it make a difference? We will
investigate these questions from different perspectives with the expectation that our analyses will enable us to develop an understanding, if only provisional, of these topics.

We will investigate global challenge, research and leadership through the following portals; some will be familiar from the Summer Residence tours and others will be new:

**Shaping Tomorrow’s World** is ‘a platform for re-examining some of the assumptions we make about our technological, social and economic systems . . . generate informed and constructive debate’ and maintained by a collaboration between UWA, Curtin and Murdoch Universities. [http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/](http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/)

**ICRAR** International Centre for Radio Astronomy Research, a collaborative research centre with research, industry and Federal and State government partners based in Perth, and aimed at ‘achieving research excellence in astronomical science and engineering . . . On Friday the 25th of May it was announced that Australia-New Zealand, together with South Africa, would share hosting of the SKA.’ [http://www.icrar.org/](http://www.icrar.org/)

**SymbioticA** ‘is the first research laboratory of its kind, enabling artists and researchers to engage in wet biology practices in a biological science department . . . With an emphasis on experiential practice, SymbioticA encourages better understanding and articulation of cultural ideas around scientific knowledge and informed critique of the ethical and cultural issues of life manipulation.’ [http://www.symbiotica.uwa.edu.au/](http://www.symbiotica.uwa.edu.au/)

**Journal for Artistic Research** ‘an international, online, Open Access and peer-reviewed journal for the identification, publication and dissemination of artistic research and its methodologies, from all arts disciplines.’ [http://jar-online.net/](http://jar-online.net/)


**Oceans Institute** ‘brings together the strength of UWA’s marine researchers into a multidisciplinary, integrated research focus. The goal is to capitalise on UWA’s existing research strengths – in areas such as oceanography, ecology, engineering, resource management, and governance – and utilise them to deliver Ocean Solutions for Humanity’s Grand Challenges.’ [http://www.oceans.uwa.edu.au/](http://www.oceans.uwa.edu.au/)
**Plant Energy Biology** Strategic priorities

- ‘To generate new knowledge through research and ultimately, rationally design plants for the benefit of Australian agriculture.
- To engage Australia with plant science and create dialogue between scientists, growers and the general public through education, training and outreach activities . . .’

http://www.plantenergy.uwa.edu.au/

These portals are all multi-disciplinary but in different ways; each draws together and disseminates ‘research’ in a range of formats; each identifies and responds to ‘global challenges’ of different kinds and dimensions; each depends upon and exemplifies modes of ‘leadership’ that shape and direct the new knowledge they socialize by sharing it with local and global communities.

**The projects**

GCRL1000 also initiates your training as researcher by offering you two research experiences: first, that of conducting a (small scale) research project as a member of a *collaborative research group* and then sharing the outcomes of your research through a Colloquium.

As a member of a research group, you will practice and develop team-based and project management skills as your group designs and carries out its research project. Your group will need to decide on the kind of project you want to conduct, choose an area, develop a research question, complete Human Ethics Clearance, carry out your research and then report your findings in both written (research paper) and oral (presentation at a Colloquium) formats. Your first step will be to agree on your expectations.

This project will be an investigative one using research protocols from the Humanities and Social Sciences that you will find transferrable whatever the discipline of your major. For example, this project will require a literature review: a standard element of research papers in the Sciences as well as the Social Sciences. You’ll be asked to conduct an interview: qualitative data is common in the Social Sciences, the Humanities and disciplines like Psychology. This project is designed to offer your group the opportunity to investigate multi-disciplinary research to facilitate an appreciation of the connections between disciplines focused on complex problems.

The experience of working in a group — as many of you already know — requires organizational as well as inter-personal skills and you’ll be asked to evaluate your own performance as a collaborator as well as that of your peers in in the group.

Second, you’ll be invited to write a critical essay on an aspect of leadership. The essay— like the research paper or the report — is a standard format for recording, analyzing and disseminating research. The essay is an *individual research project* and you’ll find that it requires you to conceptualize and conduct research in different ways compared with your work in the collaborative group. Research, of course, usually
combines both collaborative and individual modes.

**Collaborative project rubric: Investigating the nature of research**

Select one of the research portals listed above (linked on LMS): identify one project and investigate the nature of research disseminated through this portal.

Your group’s investigation should consider (but not be limited to) to following aspects:

- What is the research question or questions of this project?
- In what ways, if at all, does this research address a global challenge?
- In what ways and to what effect, if at all, does this research draw on multi-disciplinary expertise?
- What is the evidence for collaboration in this research?
- What evidence is there for the impact or effectiveness of this research?

Conduct an interview with a member of the research team under investigation: what can be learned about this research project from your informant? How does your informant contribute to your understanding of the research project?

**Individual research project rubric: Investigating leadership**

We will offer you some topics to focus your research for this essay in Week 3; please check LMS.

**Learning outcomes**

On completion of this unit, we hope you will:

- Be able to identify and respond to questions formulated around the three topics of global challenge, research and leadership in both oral and written formats.

- Have an understanding of some key terms in the research areas (discipline, discourse, globalization, critique, leadership, model), research practice (methodologies, ethics clearance, qualitative and quantitative data), in forms of reporting (paper, report, essay, citation style) and the elements of research formats (abstract, literature review, discussion, bibliography).

- Have devised, developed, undertaken and completed a research project as a member of a collaborative group.

- Be able to present your research, in collaboration with your peers, in a public forum that includes a question and answer session.

- Be able to formulate, reflect on and communicate your experience of different aspects of the production of new knowledge and its socialization.
Use of student feedback

UWA takes student feedback on and evaluation of teaching and learning seriously. We pay particular attention to your feedback because BPhil (Hons) and the GCRL1000 unit are still very new in the undergraduate program and thus under development.

For example, last year’s student evaluation targeted particular activities (such as producing posters) as over-used and feedback being provided too late for incorporation in subsequent work. So, this semester, while your research group may choose to produce a poster to disseminate research data or findings, posters won’t feature in summative assessment. Similarly, feedback has been simplified and rescheduled to ensure sufficient time for its usefulness.

We will ask for feedback in various forms including through the University’s formal evaluations: SPOT and SURF (http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/evaluation/student-teaching/surf). But there are other less formal means of giving feedback such as in your research journal (blog), the Conversation tool in LMS, in seminars, by email, by consultation.

Remember too that when you give feedback to your peers, your comments are also relevant to the context in which you’re responding to work. So GCRL1000 may be important to the kind of feedback you give to peers.

Class times & locations

- Seminars are held on Wednesday 11:00-12:50 and Friday 2:00-3:50 pm in Arts Lecture Room 8.
- Research Group Meetings may be scheduled for Friday 2:00-3:50, also in Arts Lecture Room 8, when this time is not required for seminars.

Unit resources

- www.lms.uwa.edu.au is the primary resource for this unit.
- For assistance with the LMS select the ‘LMS Help: STUDENTS’ link at www.lms.uwa.edu.au or contact SISO at support@student.uwa.edu.au or 6488 3814 or in person at the Reid Library and the Science Library.
- Or, browse answers online anytime or ask a question through askUWA available at: http://ipoint.uwa.edu.au
Expectations

- You’re expected to maintain UWA’s standards of ethical scholarship and academic literacy and avoid academic misconduct. See below for details.
- If you’re not able to attend either a seminar and/or a group meeting please notify your group members and a member of staff.
- Please come to classes prepared. Readings and other resources will be uploaded to LMS.
- You’re also expected to maintain your research blog: it’s where you keep track of your research and you’ll find it an invaluable resource. You and your group will be expected to generate your own research resources as part of your project.
- Announcements about the unit will be made through LMS. Check the text block on the home page; an email will also go to your student account. **This is important: you’re all in different Faculties and so there’s no one noticeboard we can use for this unit.**
## CLASS SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week # seminars</th>
<th>Wed Seminar &amp; presenter</th>
<th>Fri Seminar &amp; meeting time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wk 1</td>
<td>27 Feb 1 Mar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction to the unit</td>
<td>Group meeting: confirm membership identifying an area; organizational matters; post rules for your group; managing your research journals; stating your expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jenna Mead &amp; Iva Glišić</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unit outline, research portals &amp; projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of Summer Residence presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 2</td>
<td>6 Mar 8 Mar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Globalization &amp; its meanings: lecture 1 Ms Kelly Gerard Readings</td>
<td>Managing the scholarship (bibliography) Managing expectations Drafting a proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 3</td>
<td>13 Mar 15 Mar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Globalization &amp; its meanings: lecture 2 Ms Kelly Gerard Readings</td>
<td>Questions &amp; Creative thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Dirty Business: How mining made Australia</em> Screening <em>tbc</em> Readings on leadership</td>
<td>SymbioticA seminar <em>tbc</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical essay topics uploaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 4</td>
<td>20 Mar 22 Mar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research and ethics Prof. Mark Israel Readings</td>
<td>Giving &amp; receiving feedback How to use SPARKPLUS W/Prof. Phil Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Case study dingoes &amp; ethics Mr Michael Wysong</td>
<td>Group meeting: Developing questions &amp; drafting a proposal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 5</td>
<td>27 Mar 29 Mar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing, narrative, language: research formats &amp; genres Readings</td>
<td>GOOD FRIDAY UWA closed Group meeting <em>tbc</em>: Working through an ethics case study 1. Proposal due at 4:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-teaching Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S) Critical essay on leadership due 4:00 pm Mon 8 Apr (40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Wk 6** | 10 Apr - 12 Apr | • Qualitative research (1)  
Dr Wayne McGowan [2:00-2:50 pm]  
Readings  
  2. Peer assessment exercise due 4:00 pm | • Qualitative research (2)  
Dr Wayne McGowan [2:00 – 3:50 pm] |
| **Wk 7** | 17 Apr - 19 Apr | RESEARCH  
No classes  
(S) Ethics clearance due before interviews; groups to nominate date  
Group meeting  
Proposals returned |  |
| **Wk 8** | 24 Apr - 26 Apr | RESEARCH  
No classes  
3. Draft literature review due 4:00 pm  
Critical essay returned  
Group meeting |  |
| **Wk 9** | 1 May - 3 May | RESEARCH  
Check in & give brief report on progress  
Draft literature review returned  
Group meeting |  |
| **Wk 10** | 8 May - 10 May | RESEARCH  
No classes  
4. Draft research paper due 4:00 pm  
Group meeting |  |
| **Wk 11** | 15 May - 17 May | No class on Wed  
Class for feedback  
Draft papers returned  
5. Peer assessment of papers due 4:00 pm |  |
| **Wk 12** | 22 May - 24 May | Revise paper this week  
Presenting an academic paper  
Jigsaw activity  
Practice Presentation  
5 min per paper as a group  
Provide feedback |  |
| **Wk 13** | 30 May - 1 Jun | (S) Deliver paper at Colloquium (combined 60%)  
(S) Written paper due  
360° feedback on semester’s work  
Evaluations |  |
ASSESSMENT

Assessment in GCRL1000 can be divided into two categories although there’s also some overlap between them since you’ll receive feedback on both types.

Formative assessment assists in the formation of knowledge. It’s oriented around learning and allows you to develop and practice skills. It’s usually accompanied by feedback showing you how to improve. Formative assessment is required to complete the unit but won’t be assigned a mark or grade.

Summative assessment is about certifying learning and generally takes place at the end of a period of instruction. Summative assessment will be assigned both a mark and a grade.

Submitting assessment

Assessment will usually be submitted online, through LMS. Make sure that you check the rubric or instruction to see what’s required and that you attach a signed cover sheet.

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative assessment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research proposal</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 29 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer assessment</td>
<td>Students to give feedback JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 12 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer assessment of research papers</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG Students to give feedback</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 26 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft literature review</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 10 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft research paper</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 17 May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summative assessment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical essay 40% 2000 words ±10%</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Mon 8 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ethics Clearance 10%</td>
<td>UWA HREO</td>
<td>Must be submitted before interview or data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group presentation [5 mins + 3 mins Q &amp; A] at Colloquium 25%</td>
<td>Invited panel of assessors</td>
<td>Colloquium Wed 30 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written research paper 25% 3000 words ± 10%</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 1 Jun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHING AND LEARNING RESPONSIBILITIES

Charter of student rights and responsibilities

This Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities upholds the fundamental rights of students who undertake their education at the University of Western Australia.

It recognises that excellence in teaching and learning requires students to be active participants in their educational experience. It upholds the ethos that in addition to the University's role of awarding formal academic qualifications to students, the University must strive to instil in all students independent scholarly learning, critical judgement, academic integrity and ethical sensitivity.

Please refer to the website the full charter of student rights and responsibilities, located at http://www.secretariat.uwa.edu.au/home/policies/charter

Student Guild contact details

The University of Western Australia Student Guild
35 Stirling Highway
Crawley WA 6009
Phone: (+61 8) 6488 2295
Facsimile: (+61 8) 6488 1041
E-mail: enquiries@guild.uwa.edu.au
Website: http://www.guild.uwa.edu.au

Ethical Scholarship, Academic Literacy and Academic Misconduct

Ethical scholarship is the pursuit of scholarly enquiry marked by honesty and integrity.

Academic Literacy is the capacity to undertake study and research, and to communicate findings and knowledge, in a manner appropriate to the particular disciplinary conventions and scholarly standards expected at university level.

Academic misconduct is any activity or practice engaged in by a student that breaches explicit guidelines relating to the production of work for assessment, in a manner that compromises or defeats the purpose of that assessment. Students must not engage in academic misconduct. Any such activity undermines an ethos of ethical scholarship. Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to cheating, or attempting to cheat, through:

• Collusion
• Inappropriate collaboration
• Plagiarism
• Misrepresenting or fabricating data or results or other assessable work
• Inappropriate electronic data sourcing/collection
• Breaching rules specified for the conduct of examinations in a way that may compromise or defeat the purposes of assessment.
Penalties for academic misconduct vary according to seriousness of the case, and may include the requirement to do further work or repeat work; deduction of marks; the award of zero marks for the assessment; failure of one or more units; suspension from a course of study; exclusion from the University, non-conferral of a degree, diploma or other award to which the student would otherwise have been entitled. Refer to the Ethical Scholarship, Academic Literacy and Academic Misconduct policy.

**Appeals against academic assessment**

If students feel they have been unfairly assessed, they have the right to appeal their mark by submitting an Appeal Against Academic Assessment form to the Head of School and Faculty Office. The form must be submitted within twenty working days of the release of the formal result. It is recommended that students contact the Guild Education Officers to aid them in the appeals process. They can be contacted on +61 8 6488 2295 or education@guild.uwa.edu.au. Full regulations governing appeals procedures are available from Academic Policy Services, available online at http://www.aps.uwa.edu.au/home/policies/appeals

**Unit Rules**

http://units.handbooks.uwa.edu.au/units/gcrl/gcrl1000

**Educational Principles**

In this unit, you will be encouraged and facilitated to develop the ability and desire to:

1. to develop disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge and skills through study and research-based enquiry, at internationally recognised levels of excellence
   - to think, reason and analyse logically and creatively
   - to question accepted wisdom and be open to innovation
   - to acquire the skills needed to embrace rapidly changing technologies.

2. to further develop the skills required to learn, and to continue through life to learn, from a variety of sources and experiences
   - to develop attitudes which value learning
   - to acquire skills in information literacy.

3. to develop personal, social, and ethical awareness in an international context
   - to acquire cultural literacy [1]
   - to respect Indigenous knowledge, values and culture
   - to develop ethical approaches and mature judgement in practical and academic matters
   - to develop the capacity for effective citizenship, leadership and teamwork.

4. to communicate clearly, effectively and appropriately in a range of contexts
   - to develop spoken and written English communication skills at high levels
   - to acquire skills in critical literacy and interpersonal communication.