Team Project Guidelines

Due Date: March 25, 2015

http://wiki.ubc.ca/Course:FNH200/2014w2/TeamProjects

Team Project (25%)

The objectives of the team project are to enable students to delve deeper into a specific area of interest and to relate it to the topics explored in this course. Students will also gain experience working in an interdisciplinary team and examine the same topic from different perspectives.

Each team will select a traditional food commodity and a related aspect of food science and technology that is of interest to the team. Interactions among team members leading to selection of the topic and development of the project can be initiated by electronic communication through the Connect Discussion Tool. In this way, your teaching assistant and instructor may also monitor your progress and provide guidance to you.

You must have your project topic approved by **February 4, 2015**, but you are strongly encouraged to select a topic as soon as possible, since no more than two groups will be allowed to select the same topic for their project.

Each team project will be presented in three formats:
1. Wiki pages on http://wiki.ubc.ca, with supporting evidence, data, graphics and bibliography. It is recommended to aim for about 2000 to 3000 words in your main text body. Marks will not be deducted for not following the 'word limit'; however, projects that are too short are often lacking supporting evidence or missing well worded introduction and/or summary. Projects that are too long may be seen as not having a strong focus and missing key messages. The word limit is just a guideline.
2. A 5-minute educational video presentation, **highlighting** key, interesting, and /or controversial facts that will benefit other university students not enrolled in FNH 200. The video can be presented as live-action film, picture slide show, flash presentation, or other formats deem appropriate for your topic and audience. Mark will be assigned based on its **clarity,** educational value and creativity.
3. A potential final exam question as well as your recommended answer based on information presented in your project. Your TAs and instructor will select and announce qualified questions which may be included in the final examination.

All components must be completed by the last Wednesday in March at 5:00 pm. Further additions and editions will be disregarded during evaluation.

Evaluation of the team project**:** There are TWO components in the evaluation of the project:

Quality of the Project [A]:

> TA and instructor will evaluation each project based on content (75%), video presentation (20%), and a final exam question (5%).

Team Work [B]: Peer evaluations on iPeer.ubc.ca.

> Each student will provide a formative (mid-term, not for grading, in mid-February) and a summative (final, for grading, in late March) peer evaluation to each of their peers based on his/her contribution to the team. Your contributions as well as the mark you receive on the summative evaluation will be used to determine a multiplying factor that will be used to calculate your final project mark.

Determination of Your Own Multiplying Factor:

Contribution to iPeer	Summative Score Received from Peers	Multiplying Factor
Contributed to **BOTH** formative and summative peer evaluation	**More than 75%** Example 1: 76% Example 2: 90%	**= 1.0** = 1.0 = 1.0
	Less than 75% Example 3: 68% Example 4: 35%	**= 'Face Value'** = 0.68 = 0.35
Contributed to **only one or none** of the peer evaluation component	 Example 5: 95% Example 6: 80% Example 7: 40%	**= 'Face Value'** = 0.95 = 0.80 = 0.40

Calculation of Final Grade:

Overall Quality of the Project x Individual Multiplying Factor = [A] x [B]

Examples:

A team project earned a mark of 85% from the TAs and instructor.

Student A received 95% from the peer evaluation and completed both formative and summative evaluation. Student A will get a score of 85% (85% x 1.0).

Student B also received 95% from the peer evaluation, but forgot to contribute to the summative evaluation. Student B will get a score of 81% (85% x 0.95).

Student C received a score of 60% from the peers. Student C will get 51% (85% x 0.6).

Suggested Poster Topics:

Again, the objectives of the team project are to enable students to delve deeper into a specific area of interest and to relate it to the topics explored in this course, and to provide experience in teamwork.

Each team should first explore a traditional food or food topics that interest the whole team first. These include, but not are limited to:

- Allergen in…
- *Escherichia coli* in…
- HACCP of…

- Chocolate
- Cheese
- Smoke Salmon
- Kimchi
- SPAM
- Rice Wine
- *Etc.*

Suggestions: Please try to find a traditional food which will allow for more discussion of the material learned in class. Some thought should be given to the selection of your team project. Then, you can relate it to topics explored in FNH 200.

Using cheese as an example:

- Vegan 'cheese' (Lesson 3)
- Canadian and International cheese standards (Lesson 4)
- Preservation of cheese (Lessons 5 to 11)
- Foodborne diseases related to cheese (Lesson 12)
- Functional cheese (Lesson 13)
- Storage and packaging requirements of cheese
- Etc.

There are hundreds of possible topics. However, in general, nutrition related topics are discouraged as they can be explored in other FNH courses. Please consult your instructors before you finalize your topic. Also, no more than two teams will be allowed to select the same topic for their project.

Tentative project topics can be posted on team project wiki page:
http://wiki.ubc.ca/Course:FNH200/2014w2/TeamProjects

Evaluation by TAs and Instructor:

What will your teaching assistants and instructor look for in evaluating your group project (worth 20% of your total mark for this course)?

- Content (75%)
- Video Presentation (20%)
- Question Quality (5%)

Your instructor, teaching assistants and teammates will use the following rubrics to evaluate your project. These rubrics will be fine-tuned in consultancy with your teaching assistants near the end of the term to better reflect the performances of the whole class.

Content (75%):

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Basic	Unacceptable
Introduction 5 out of 75%	Poses thoughtful, creative questions that contribute to knowledge in a specific area	Poses focused questions that yield relevant information in a specific area; minimal bias presented	Relies on teacher-generated questions or posed questions with little creativity; some bias presented	Provides no original ideas; bias is obvious
Quality of Information 40 out of 75%	Information clearly relates to questions posed in the introduction; 3 or 4 unique arguments/examples with sufficient supporting details; examples are used which add interest to reader	Information clearly relates to questions posed in the introduction; 1 to 2 unique arguments/examples with sufficient supporting details; examples are used which add interest to reader	Information relates to the questions posed in the introduction with limited supporting detail and/or example provided	Information has little to do with the questions posed in the introduction no supporting details and/or examples provided
Graphics, Multimedia and hyperlinks 10 out of 75%	Images, multimedia sources and hyperlinks enhance quality of information; all acknowledged with captions or annotations	Images, multimedia sources and hyperlinks support quality of information; all acknowledged with captions or annotations	Insufficient number of images, multimedia sources and hyperlinks were used to support information	Images and graphics has little to do with the questions
Organization 5 out of 75%	Explains all ideas clearly and concisely in a logical sequence	Explains most ideas clearly and concisely; some gaps in knowledge	Incompletely explains ideas with little use of supporting evidence	Fails to explain ideas
Reflection 10 out of 75%	Provides comprehensive insight, understanding, and reflective thought from the team	Provides a moderate amount of insight, understanding, and reflective thought from the team	Provides only minimal understanding, or reflective thought	Provides no understanding or reflective thought about the topic
Citation 5 out of 75%	Accurately cites all sources of information to support the credibility and authority of the information presented; uses consistent bibliographic format	Most sources are cited using consistent bibliographic format	Few sources are cited; inconsistent bibliographic format	Insufficient citation

Rubric adapted from:
Franker, K. 2011. Wiki Rubric.http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/profdev/rubrics/wikirubric.html Accessed January 21, 2013.
Regina Public Schools. Research Project Rubric. http://assessment.rbe.sk.ca/Rubrics/index.html. Accessed January 21, 2013.

Video Presentation (20%): This is a five minute video presentation focusing on key findings.

	Excellent	**Good**	**Basic**	**Are you sure you are presenting this?**
Clarity (1/4)	Tells an exciting 'story' with a stimulating introduction; highlights clear key points with sufficient evidence; team members demonstrate intimate knowledge of the subject; presents thoughtful insight	Presents a project with key findings in logical order; team members appear to be knowledgeable of the subject; presents a good conclusion	Presents key findings in random order team members know enough to present	Presents no key points; poor transition; inconsistent information among team members
Educational Value (2/4)	Stimulates interest in selected topic with evidence from different perspectives	Provides well-rounded evidence on selected topic to enhance understanding of selected topic	Provides basic scientific information that could be of interest to general university students	Information was insufficient and may be presented in random order
Creativity (1/4)	All shots, graphics and/or animation explain and reinforce key points and conveys a high impact message; overall appealing to audience	All shots, graphics and/or animation explain and reinforce key points and assist audience in understanding the flow of information or content	Information was presented.	Presentation appears to be bland, disconnects audience

Exam Question; Take Home Message (5%):

Think about what you did not know before starting this project and what you know at the end. What surprises you? What are you going to tell your friends? What do you think the rest of FNH 200 students should know. Frame your findings in a question and answer format and post it along your project on UBC wiki.

A good question and associated answer is relevant to FNH 200, enhancing the learning of FNH 200 students. The question and associated answer should be concise and informative, highlighting only key information presented in the project.

Peer Evaluation:

Peer Evaluation will be conducted on-line at http://ipeer.elearning.ubc.ca
- Formative evaluation, not for grade, voluntary: highly recommended to be completed by February 13.
- Final evaluation, will be used for grading, mandatory: to be completed by April 8, 2015

Category	Excellent	Good	Basic	Unacceptable
Respect and Attitude (1/6)	Always listen to and respects other team members' opinions; has an extremely positive attitude about the project and working in team	Listens to other team members' opinions; has a positive attitude about the project and working in team	Does not always listen to other team members' opinions; has an okay attitude about the project and working in team	Is often publicly critical of the project or the work of other members of the team; Is often negative about the project and working in team
Contributions (1/6)	Routinely provides useful ideas, inspires others, clearly communicates desires, ideas, personal needs and feelings, a leader who contributes a lot of effort	Participates in discussion, supports efforts of others, shares feelings and thoughts	Listens mainly, makes occasionally suggestions, appreciates efforts of others	Rarely provides useful ideas, may refuse to participate
Organization (1/6)	Takes the initiative proposing meeting time and getting group organized, completes assigned work ahead of time	Works agreeably with teammates concerning times and places to meet, completes assigned work	Requires reminders from teammates, but work is done without affecting quality of the project	Ignores organizational details agreed by the team; work was uncompleted and affected quality
Workload (1/6)	Does a full share of the work-or more; knows what needs to be done and does it; volunteers to help others	Does an equal share of the work; does work when asked; works hard most of the time	Does almost as much work as other; does what is required	Does less work than others, does not get caught up after absence; does not ask to help
Providing Feedback (1/6)	Offers timely, respectful and constructive feedback to fellow teammates	Offers feedback that does not offend	Provides some feedback that sometimes hurt feelings of others or makes irrelevant comments	Gives rude feedback
Receiving Feedback (1/6)	Willingly accepts and responds to feedback from teammates	Accepts feedback and attempts to respond to feedback from teammates	Accepts feedback	Refuses to listen to feedback