

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

Due Date: Thursday, August 13, 2026; 6:00 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, who works with foods. They could be a chef, a manager at a food retail outlet, a food wholesale distributor, a farmer, a food packager, etc. Due to the time sensitive nature of this summer course, you should interview someone you already know to minimize scheduling and other logistical challenges.

[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: a chef, a farmer, a food store manager, an importer, etc, someone who handles foods. An in-person interview at the person's workplace would be ideal. Your interviewee should also grant your permission to take video or photos to demonstrate your learning. You should discuss with your interviewee how you may prepare and share the report and use the photos and videos.

Ideally, due to the fast-paced nature of this summer course, one of your teammates should know this professional well: a relative, a former employer, etc. Your interviewee should be knowledgeable and open to sharing. I really do not want you to get stuck with a friend's friend's cousin who may not even remember to show up for the interview.

A proposed timeline:

- ☐ **A team contract (1%)**, by July 10, 6 pm
  - ☐ Discuss, document, sign, and submit on Canvas as a team
- ☐ **A confirmed interview** with a list of potential questions you plan to ask **(1%)**, July 17, 6 pm
  - ☐ Include a quick introduction of the interviewee (job title, company)
  - ☐ A list of potential questions you like to ask
  - ☐ 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 complete your report as a regular Word document, and submit as via Canvas
- ☐ An in-person and/or virtual information interview and find out a few food science puzzles/concerns that your interviewee may have so that you can use your newly formed knowledge from FNH 200 to help your interviewee back
- ☐ 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
- ☐ **Before the BC Day long weekend**, please at least, to the minimum, have a firm interview date/time with your interviewee
- ☐ **Submit everything below by August 13, 6 pm**
- ☐ **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](http://wiki.ubc.ca)
  - ☐ If you don't have consent, you may post your report on Canvas or email it to Judy
- ☐ **Responses (2%) to food science questions** your interviewee may have
  - ☐ Include your correspondence, such as e-mails, text.
- ☐ **A 5-minute video (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 you already know)
- ☐ **A team reflection (2%)**
  - ☐ 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:
    - ☐ As a team, have you accomplished what you wanted to do at the beginning?
    - ☐ How has the team hindered, supported, and/or stimulated your learning about foods?
    - ☐ How did the team function together? What worked well? What didn't?

- ☐ What would you have done differently as a team?
- ☐ What were some ways that each of you may have done differently individually?
- ☐ Other reflections?
- ☐ Reflection to be submitted on Canvas as a team
- ☐ A potential exam question for the final exam (1%) on the project page on [wiki.ubc.ca](http://wiki.ubc.ca): 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](http://wiki.ubc.ca)
  - ☐ Four to eight submitted questions from different teams 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 11 of the 20% of the overall project):

| Criteria                                        | Excellent                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Good                                                            | Basic                                                                                               | Unacceptable                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Quality of Interpretation</b><br>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                     |
| <b>Reflection</b><br>2 out of 11                | Positions yourselves in the mix of professional experts. Demonstrates knowledge 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 |
| <b>Organization</b><br>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 Supporting the Interviewee** (worth 2 of 20% of the overall projects)

Clearly and concisely answer questions your interviewee may have. (1 out of 2)

Provide additional and reliable sources of information. (1 out of 2)

**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.

Project Topics, in 2026, you must choose one of the two options below:

**Option B1:** Update, modify, refine, rewrite one of the past projects completed by past FNH 200 students:

- <http://wiki.ubc.ca/Course:FNH200/TeamProjectsShowcase> (There are over 300 projects to choose from)
- You may rewrite the entire page (I do hope that there is something worthwhile to keep 😊); you may add subtopics as you see fit.
- The version control feature on Wiki allows our TAs to identify what information was there before and what you contribute

**Option B2:** You may contribute endangered foods as inspired by *Eating to Extinction* by Dan Saladino, I like to bring our attention to some of our endangered foods with cultural and/or historic significance. Your chosen foods must not have been explored by FNH 200 students in the past.

- See examples in the Ark of Taste:
  - <https://www.fondazione Slow Food.com/en/>
  - <https://www.fondazione Slow Food.com/en/nazioni-arca/canada-en/>
- Examples from: Saladino, D. (2022). *Eating to Extinction: The World's Rarest Foods and Why We Need to Save Them*. United States: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
  - Bear Root
  - Geechee Red Pea
  - O-Higu Soybean
  - Skerpikjot
  - Bison
  - Flat Oyster
  - Vanilla Orange
  - Perry
  - Pu-Erh Tea
  - Halawet el Jibn

A proposed timeline:

- ☐ A team contract (1%), by July 10, 6:00 pm
- ☐ A confirmed plan (1%), by July 17, 6:00 pm
  - ☐ Your food, either [1] an existing wiki page you like to enhance, or [2] an endangered food
  - ☐ A list of potential revisions or subtopics you plan to explore
  - ☐ A few reliable and neutral sources of information, posted on your wiki.ubc.ca project
  - ☐ You may post this directly on your Wiki pages, linked on the sign-up table on Wiki

- ☐ Due to an unusual high number of poorly drafted outlines I received last year, I will likely be asking each teams more questions and conversing more before I award the 1% to each team
- ☐ **A summary (15%)** 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.
  - ☐ Adding links: I like to take advantage of the Wiki, online nature of this projects and ask you to add direct links to resources (as you often see on Wikipeda)
- ☐ **A team reflection, to be submitted on Canvas (2%)**
  - ☐ 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:
    - ☐ As a team, have you accomplished what you wanted to do at the beginning?
    - ☐ How has the team hindered, supported, and/or stimulated your learning about foods?
    - ☐ How did the team function together? What worked well? What didn't?
    - ☐ What would you have done differently as a team?
    - ☐ What were some ways that each of you may have done differently individually?
    - ☐ Other reflections?
  - ☐ 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](http://wiki.ubc.ca) project page
  - ☐ Four to eight submitted questions from all teams 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** (worth 15 of the 20% of the overall project):

| Criteria                                                    | Excellent                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Good                                                                                                                                                                                     | Basic                                                                                                                                                        | Unacceptable                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Quality of Information</b><br>11 out of 15               | 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. |
| <b>Links to Images, External Information</b><br>2 out of 15 | Links are reliable, current, and directly related to the information presented. They lead to the specific source, work correctly, and are placed clearly beside the relevant ideas.                                                                                                                                            | Most links are reliable and relevant. They generally work and are placed near the related information.<br><br>Some links do not work.                                                    | Some links are reliable and relevant, but others may be weak, outdated, too general, broken, or unclear.                                                     | Few or no useful links are provided. Many links are unreliable, unrelated, broken, or misleading.                              |
| <b>Organization</b><br>1 out of 15                          | 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                                                                                                         |
| <b>Citation</b><br>1 out of 15                              | 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](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 24.
- Final evaluation, will be used for grading, mandatory: to be completed by August 11

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 happens, 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                                                                                                                                |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Respect and Attitude (1/6)</b> | Always listens 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 |
| <b>Contributions (1/6)</b>        | 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                                                                                     |
| <b>Organization (1/6)</b>         | 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                                                |
| <b>Workload (1/6)</b>             | 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                                                      |

|                                     |                                                                         |                                                                     |                                                                                            |                               |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Providing Feedback<br/>(1/6)</b> | 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           |
| <b>Receiving Feedback<br/>(1/6)</b> | 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 |