

**THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
FNH 200 942- EXPLORING OUR FOOD
Team Project Guidelines**

Due Date: Thursday, August 13, 2020; 5:30 pm
20% of Course Grade

You will have a choice of two types of projects and choices of topics.

Option A: An information interview with a food professional; during the 2020 pandemic, it is preferred to interview someone already in your pandemic bubbles (a family member, a co-worker where you work part-time, etc)
[Grading Rubrics](#)

Option B: A traditional research based project to be shared on wiki.ubc.ca
[Grading Rubrics](#)

Teamwork Rubric: To be used for your peer evaluation

Option A: An information interview with a food professional; due to the pandemic in 2020, this person should be in the pandemic bubble (close family, co-worker, etc) of a team member. The team member would also be responsible for the interview (if a virtual interview cannot be arranged) and other in-person interactions, while the rest of the team may contribute in other ways.

By August 13, you are expected to produce and share:

- A team contract (1%)
 - Discuss, document, sign and submit on Canvas as a team
- A confirmed interview with a list of potential questions you plan to ask (1%)
 - You should also obtain full consent from the interviewee to share information (including photos and images), you may post all info on the UBC Wiki project page
 - If you don't have consent yet, you may report as a regular Word document
- An in-person information interview and find out a few food science puzzles/concerns that your interviewee may have
- Video or photos taken on location (if possible) capturing a few food science specific observations
- Identify five points-of-interests observed on site
 - Describe how these points-of-interests related to lessons learned in FNH 200
- A summary and a reflection (11%) of the interview making explicit connections to course materials and course objectives
 - See rubrics below
 - If you have consent, you may post your report on wiki.ubc.ca
 - If you don't have consent, you may email your report to Judy
- Responses (3%) to food science questions your interviewee may have
 - E-mail to me (I would actually like to see the communication, eg e-mails, thread) rather than a word document
- A 5-minute video or a photo gallery (2%) showing 5 points-of-interests observed on site with captions describing how the observations complement lessons learned in FNH 200 (Again, this is why it is quite important to interview someone in your pandemic bubble)
- A team reflection (1%)
 - Describes what you experienced and learned as a team at the beginning, development, and completion stages of the project; some prompting, reflective questions include, but not limited to:
 - Did you accomplish what you wanted to do at the beginning?
 - Is there something else that you wanted to learn, but hadn't?
 - How did the team function together?
 - What would you have done differently?
 - Reflection to be submitted on Canvas as a team
- A potential exam question for the final exam (1%); 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?
 - Include the question
 - Include the correct answers
 - An explanation why your question should be on the final exam
 - To be submitted on wiki.ubc.ca
 - Four to eight submitted questions will be chosen to be learned by everyone in class; then three to five of them will be included in the final exam

Rubrics for the Community Interview Project (worth 10 of the 20% of the overall project):

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Basic	Unacceptable
Quality of Interpretation 8 out of 11	Making clear connections and identifying gaps between responses from interviewee and the course materials	Connecting responses from the interviewee with course materials	Summarizes responses from the interviewee in a logical manner as guided by the structure of FNH 200	A general transcription of the interview
Reflection 2 out of 11	Positioning yourselves in the mix of professional expert knowledges gained from your interviewee and as a student in a science course learning about scientific facts and evidence, and as general consumers of food info. Identify your learnings, your confusions and make suggestions to advance the sharing of knowledge (Okay, teams, I must admit that I have some high and possibly unrealistic expectations here.)	Partially demonstrating qualities described in 'Excellent'	Begin to recognize personal roles as professional and/or consumers in food science and safety	Fail to recognize how one may impact food science and safety
Organization 1 out of 11	Explains all thoughts clearly and concisely in a logical sequence; clearly distinguishing ideas from your interviewee, yourselves, and facts presented in the course materials	Information are presented in a logical order, but not coherent	Responses and reflections are presented, but are hard to follow	Missing information; lack of coherence

Rubrics for the Supporting the Interviewee (worth 3 of 20% of the overall projects)

Clearly and concisely answer questions your interviewee may have. (1.5 out of 3)

Provide additional and reliable sources of information. (1.5 out of 3)

Rubrics for the Video/Photo Gallery Production (worth 2 of 20% of the overall projects)

The five 'Points of Interest' are well selected:

- Pointing out to areas that a general consumer usually ignores or deems insignificant
- Making connections to course materials
- Associated text are short, concise and generates interests

Option B: A traditional research based project to be shared on wiki.ubc.ca

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. All team members should contribute to the selection of the topic, development of the project, research, write up, and posting on wiki.ubc.ca and work together as a team utilizing your individual strengths with goals to develop your weaknesses.

- Past project examples can be found here:
<http://wiki.ubc.ca/Course:FNH200/TeamProjectsShowcase>
- This year, I expect the projects to be shorter, more focused, and has no video component in comparison with those in previous years.

By August 13, you are expected to produce and share:

- A team contract (1%)
- A confirmed topic, a list of potential questions you plan to explore, a few reliable and neutral sources of information (1%), posted on your wiki.ubc.ca project page
- A summary (13%) of your research composed in encyclopedic style for the general public; see a [rubric](#) below
 - A note on length: Your total contribution should be about 800-1200 words in length. I will not judge the quality based on the word count. Again, please follow the rubric below.
- Images, internal and external links (3%) added to your articles with support from UBC librarians and open education resources specialists
- A team reflection (1%)
 - Describes what you experienced and learned as a team at the beginning, development and completion stages of the project; some prompting, reflective questions include, but not limited to:
 - Did you accomplish what you wanted to do at the beginning?
 - Is there something else that you wanted to learn, but hadn't?
 - How did the team function together?
 - What would you have done differently?
 - To be submitted on Canvas
- A potential exam question for the final exam (1%); 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?
 - Include the question
 - Include the correct answers
 - An explanation why your question should be on the final exam
 - To be submitted on your wiki.ubc.ca project page
 - Four to eight submitted questions will be chosen to be learned by everyone in class; then three to five of them will be included in the final exam

Grading Rubric for the Research and Wikipedia Project:

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Basic	Unacceptable
Quality of Information 11 out of 13	Different views should be covered with appropriate balance. Both positive and negative elements should be included, in proportion to their coverage in reliable sources. Good articles also use neutral language and emphasize facts. Articles should not read like persuasive essays, but instead like encyclopedia articles.	Different views were covered. Though positive and negative elements from reliable sources were included, they were not balanced. Reliable sources. Articles read like persuasive essays.	Different views were covered, but were not supported by reliable sources. Language used was personal and lacked facts. Articles read like persuasive essays.	Biased view was presented, but not supported by reliable sources. Articles read like persuasive essays with personal opinions.
Organization 1 out of 13	Explains all ideas clearly and concisely in a logical sequence; fits well with existing Wikipedia information or attempts to organize existing information	Explains most ideas clearly and concisely; some gaps in knowledge	Incompletely explains ideas with little use of supporting evidence	Fails to explain ideas
Citation 1 out of 13	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.

Evaluating Wikipedia.

https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/9/96/Evaluating_Wikipedia_brochure_%28Wiki_Education_Foundation%29.pdf Accessed January 8, 2016.

Peer Evaluation Component: There are TWO components in the evaluation of 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 July 31.
- Final evaluation, will be used for grading, mandatory: to be completed by August 13

All students receiving more than 70% as evaluated by their teammates will receive the same grade. Students who do not reach 70% for their peer evaluation will have their team project grade adjusted by the percentage awarded by the teammates.

Please note that, though rarely happened, a score of ZERO will be considered when the average peer evaluation score is less than 25% and I receive sufficient evidence throughout the term that the student had not contributed to the project.

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