Industry and Communi Project

Food & Health – Project Outline

Intensive Project – International Exchange between University of Sydn and University of Padova

Contacts

Project supervisor	Mara Thiene – TESAF
Project co-supervisor	Martino Cassandro – DAFNAE
Project Committee	Caroline Clark, Francesca Gambino, Matilde Girolami, Alex Martucci, Marco Patruno, Max Barolo
Office location	TESAF department www.tesaf.unipd.it DAFNAE department www.dafnae.unipd.it Agripolis Campus Viale dell'Università, 16 35020 – Legnaro – PD – Italy
Email Addresses	mara.thiene@unipd.it martino.cassandro@unipd.it
Phone	+39 049 8272760 Mara Thiene +39 049 8272666 Martino Cassandro
Consultation Hours	By appointment
Class location	Orto Botanico June 24 University of Padova Language Centre June 25– 29 and July 8 – 9 Villa Bolasco, Castefranco Veneto (Padova) July 2– 3 – 5 See map in the info sheet
Class time	See program

About this Project Outline

This Project Outline contains information specific to your Industry and Community Project. It is part of the Unit of Study Outline. Policies relating to marking of assessments are in the Unit of Study Outline document.

Project Description

Food systems and human health are both pillars of a modern society based on close agreement with all actors of the food chain supported by world food policy. An integrated, multidisciplinary, systems approach to education, research and economic development in human health and food system, with due consideration to food production and environmental issues, offers great advantages over single-sector approaches. This needs to be achieved, irrespective of specific goals such as improved human health, improved nutrition, improved food systems, or sustainable management of the natural environment.

The realization of human potential and national economic development is constrained by nutritional problems, such as i) poverty-related food insecurity in a large portion of the population; ii) micronutrient deficiencies; iii) rapidly emerging problems of obesity and nutrition related chronic diseases (particularly in the urban areas of developing countries and in highly developed nations); iv) chronic and some acute malnutrition in young children.

The goal of this project, which covers a wide spectrum of related topics, follows the "*from gene to society*" approach. Training and research on this broad scope will be provided by a broad interdisciplinary approach from basic sciences in agriculture, food and social related topics up to clinical aspects. Inherent in this modern concept is an integrative approach, interfacing between disciplines and numerous specializations. Within the context of the "*from gene to society*" paradigm, the aim is to improve capacity in research and practice related to food and nutrition sciences, by providing and soliciting new perspectives and ideas in the related nutritional sciences.

This project is a unique opportunity for cultural exchange between students from the Universities of Sydney and Padova to explore the above issues from multiple and non-traditional disciplinary perspectives. An approach which is collaborative, interdisciplinary and intercultural is expected to reveal novel and innovative opportunities for the food and dairy industries, in terms of added value, improved efficiency, addressing environmental and animal welfare concerns and taking advantage of growing trends in food innovation such as 'smart food'. Smart food or food designed for health and wellness is the fastest growing food and beverage category resulting from a sharp rise in non-communicable chronic diseases.

Food and health in the 21st Century: what is the challenge?

The 'state of the art' suggests that food production, processing, packaging, transportation, marketing and food consumption are recognized as critical factors for human health. Over the past century, essential nutrient deficiencies have dramatically decreased, many infectious diseases have been defeated, and the vast majority of the world's population have a longer life expectancy. However, the rates of complex non-communicable diseases have increased (e.g. obesity, diabetes,

cardiovascular disease, stroke, hypertension, and some types of cancer) arising from inappropriate diet, poor quality of nutrition, lack of physical activity, and other behaviors that we know to be detrimental to health.

Food quality and food composition deeply influence the health of the population, which is substantially affected by dietary habits. A history of poor eating and physical activity patterns have a cumulative effect and have contributed to significant nutrition- and physical activity-related health challenges that now face the global population. Moreover, evidence that nutrition can strongly contribute to the prevention of chronic diseases is accumulating. Virtually all of these disorders are diet-related and, not surprisingly, do not responded well to the pharmaceutical model that characterizes today's health care paradigm. Prevention of these diseases will result in an improvement in the quality of life and improving the quality of our diet: promoting better nutrition is a major factor in achieving this goal.

The key should be an educational and research program about the influence of factors such as food composition, food quality, nutrition, genetic determinants, the environment, socioeconomic drivers and the level of knowledge that influences the general population. There is widespread evidence that Italian food and, in general, the Mediterranean tradition, with its combination of taste and health choices, including local foods and wines, could be of great benefit to our health. The Mediterranean diet is the realistic choice of the three types of diet which are widely reputed to be associated with good health and longevity: the Chinese, the Japanese, and the Mediterranean diet.

The food production, food quality and health sectors continue to grow thanks to research and progress made in the agro-food process, economics, nutrition and biomedical research. There is hence scope to inform the population about food production and processes, and the nutritional composition of foods in order to make consumers aware of repercussions on health and health concerns related to food consumption, as well as healthy diet programs and actions.

The University of Padova offers excellent knowledge and expertise, and, importantly, a strong link with food industries and excellent health centres. This allows students to progress by capturing synergies in specific fields in a global educational perspective.

Students will be exposed to the Italian food production system through visits to farms, food processors and manufacturers. Access to industry information including reports and datasets collected from enterprise in Italy will be provided by the Project Partners. Students will also have full access to online resources through the University library.

Project scope

1. Students will be placed in diverse, interdisciplinary groups and will be immersed in the Italian food industry through guest lectures, site visits and reading materials.
2. Students will attend training workshops on personal and professional reflection, collaboration and complex problem-solving.
3. Each group will define a problem or opportunity to explore through a facilitated and iterative process of idea filtering.
4. A problem statement, desired outcomes and a systems map of the issues will be presented at the end of week 1, both orally and in written form.
5. Ideas will be researched, tested and refined by consulting literature, analysing data, conducting surveys and interviews.
6. Final outcomes and recommendations will be delivered in an oral presentation and written final report.

Project partner

Brazzale s.p.a. – represents, since 8th generation family business continuously since 1784, one of the older italian enterprise reality in the milk sector and is characterized by its propensity towards internationalization and the opening towards new markets. New techniques and innovations in production, processing and conservation, as well as in the low environmental impact of applied technologies and waste.
The company has a laboratory of R & D and quality control to implement the diversification of products, the search for high quality and the maintenance of a "craft" type production, characteristics that can be an example of a model also in detail of the product.

Piercristiano Brazzale, 53, is CEO of the Brazzale di Zanè group and Brazzale Moravia. Recenlty, Piercristiano Brazzale was elected vice-president of the International Fil-Idf Milk Federation, to which 60 countries belong, with 1,200 experts and all the stakeholders in the supply chain: farmers, processors, cooperatives, industries, universities, research centers and numerous organizations . The nomination took place during the 103rd edition of the World Milk Summit, which was held in Daejion, in South Korea. He was also appointed president of the Scientific Programming and Coordination Committee (SPCC, Science programming and coordinating committee), the technical council of the federation composed of nine experts, each by subject area.

Project Schedule

Food and Health – 24 June – 9 July 2019

Date	Time	Activities	Assessment
Week 1			
Monday June 24 **Auditorium Botanic Garden – Via Orto Botanico, 15**	9.00 9.45 9.45– 10.30	• Opening (Rector, Richard Miles, Alessandro Paccagnella) • The Australian Ambassador Greg French Introduction to the unit, expectations, assessment	
	10.30– 11.00	Coffee-break	
	11.00– 1.00	• UniPD & Global mobility presentation • Assign students to groups • General introductions, Introduction to the unit, expectations, assessment (30 min) • Overview of content, industry, some general issues etc. (30 min) • Ways of thinking exercise	
	12.30– 2.00	Lunch *(Botanical Garden)*	
	2 – 3.30	• Meeting with Brazzale Industry to present the challenge (1.5 hours) https://www.brazzale.com/en/	
	3.30–4.00	Coffee-break	
	4.00–4.45	• Student exercise – identifying opportunities and threats in the industry	
	4.45–5.30	Botanic Garden guided tour http://www.ortobotanicopd.it/en/	
	5.30–6.30	Cocktail on the Rooftop (Botanic Garden)	

Tuesday June 25 Language Centre (CLA) – Room 1L 1st floor	9.00– 12.30	• Niuko to teach softskills • Writing a problem/opportunity statement (30' video)	
	12.30– 2.00	Lunch (*Aula Catullo – Geosciences*)	
	2.00 – 5.30	• Martano S. (NAS, Antiadulteration Carabinieri Military Unit) Fighting food crime: how can we guarantee food safeness and authenticity? (45'+45') • Sandri M. (UniPd) Food and Physical Activity in Longevity (45') • Trocino A. (UniPd) Poultry meat quality and emerging issues (45')	
Wednesday June 26 Language Centre (CLA) – Room 1L 1st floor	9.00– 12.30	• Niuko to teach softskills • Identifying problems (video 30')	
	12.30– 2.00	Lunch (*Aula Catullo – Geosciences*)	
	2.00 – 4.30	• Terzi L. (Washington) Minister Counselor for Health and Food Safety in the Delegation of the European Union to the United States (45') • Ideas filtering exercise (45 min) • Presentation – planning your research • Presentation and group exercise – Stakeholder analysis (45 min)	
	4.30–5.30	• Transfer to Palazzo Bo (30' walk) • Guided tour of Palazzo Bo (5.00 pm)	

Thursday June 27 **Meeting point: Autostazione Busitalia, Viale della Pace, 1**	8.00 6.00	• Field trip to: • Prosciuttificio Fontana http://www.fontanaprosciutti.it/ • Amarone Winery (Trabucchi) http://www.trabucchidillasi.it/en/	
Friday June 28 **Language Centre (CLA) – Room 1L 1st floor**	9.00–1.00	• Paoli A. (UniPd) Fasting and ketogenic diet for health and sport performance (45') • Battisti A. (UniPd) Insects and public health (45') • Ideas filtering exercise – students to pitch their ideas to each other (45 min) • Group exercise to identify problem statement and describe problem using systems mapping • Presentation: Writing surveys and letters to stakeholders, conduction interviews (20)	
	1.00–2.00	Lunch (*Aula Catullo – Geosciences*)	
	2.00 – 5.30	• Koulouris S. (European Food Safety Authority, EFSA), Trusted science for safe food (45') http://www.efsa.europa.eu/ • Groups to write SMART project objectives	
	5.30–6.30	Guided visit to the Museum of History of Medicine (MUSME) Via San Francesco, 94, 35121 Padova https://www.musme.it/en/	
	7.30–10.00	Gala Dinner at the Museum of History of Medicine (MUSME) https://www.musme.it/en/	
Saturday June 29 **Language Centre**	9.00–12.30	• Presentation of group plan (5 min per group) – presentation of problem/opportunity statement, background information, project aim and	

(CLA) – Room 1L 1st floor		objectives, approach and desired outcomes	9
	12.30–2.00	Lunch (*Aula Catullo – Geosciences*)	
	2.00 – 4.00	• Work on Group plan – incorporate feedback	Submit Group Plan 11.59pm
	5.00 – 9.00	• Social activities (CUS outdoor campus): • Volley and basketball at the CUS gym • Barbecue at CUS	

Week 2			
Monday July 1 Meeting point: Autostazione Busitalia, Viale della Pace, 1	9.00 5.00	• Field trip to Brazzale Industry to visit and stakeholder interviews https://www.brazzale.com/en/	
Tuesday July 2 Villa Bolasco Castelfranco Veneto (TV)	9.30 – 12.30	• Presentation – groupwork survey structure and function • Group health check – team members to review group charter, essence and form • Students to write letters, design surveys for stakeholders, consumers etc.	
	2.00–4.00	• Collect and analyse data from primary and secondary sources	
Wednesday July 3 Villa Bolasco Castelfranco Veneto	9.30 – 12.30	• Presentation – presenting for impact • Prepare draft outline of presentation • Continue to collect and analyse data	

(TV)			
	2.00–4.00	• Presentation – preparing the report • Prepare draft outline of report • Continue to collect and analyse data	
Thursday July 4 Meeting point: Autostazione Busitalia, Viale della Pace, 1	8.30 6.00 (probably longer)	• Field trip to Conegliano: • Grappa distillery (Castagner) https://www.grappacastagner.it/en/ • Prosecco Winery (Giustiniani L.)	

Friday July 5
 	
Villa Bolasco Castelfranco Veneto (TV)
	9.30 – 12.30	• Group consultation – Shark Tank
		• Industry participation:
		  – Brazzale Industry stakeholder
		  – https://www.brazzale.com/en/
		  – Linda Masello (SALIX, Nutraceutical Thinking)
		  – Elisabetta Pasqualotto (ARC)
		  – http://www.arc-projects.it/index.html
		  – Donatella Bernini (Boehringer Ingelheim)
		  – https://www.boehringer-ingelheim.com/
		  – Luca Bovolato (Cadoro)
		  https://www.cadoro.it/
		  (TBC)
		  – Pierantonio Facco (UniPD)
		  – Paolo Gubitta (UniPD)
		  – Massimo De Marchi (UniPD)
		  – Luca Fasolato (UniPD)	

	2.00–4.00	• Groups continue to collect and analyse data	

Week 3			
Monday July 8 **Language Centre (CLA)** **Rooms 2C, 2D** **2nd floor**	9.00 – 12.30	• Groups to work on presentation and report	
	2.00–4.00	• Groups to work on presentation and report	Submit Group Presentation 11.59pm

Tuesday July 9
 	
Language Centre (CLA)
 	
Room 1L
 	
1st floor
	9.00 – 13.00	Group presentations (10 min each group + 5 min questions)
		
		• Industry participation:
		  – Brazzale Industry stakeholder
		  – https://www.brazzale.com/en/
		  – Linda Masello (SALIX, Nutraceutical Thinking)
		  – Elisabetta Pasqualotto (ARC)
		  – http://www.arc-projects.it/index.html
		  – Mario Ubiali (Thimus Inc)
		    http://www.thimus.com/en/
		  – Luca Bovolato (Cadoro)
		    https://www.cadoro.it/
		    (TBC)
		
		Researchers/academics might participate as well
			Live group presentation

	Students back on home campus	• Students will work remotely writing-up the group and individual assessment tasks	Individual Statement (due Monday/Group Project

			Report (Due Sunday)

Assessments

Insert assessment descriptions and rubrics. You may use the model assessments, descriptions and rubrics in the ICPU Handbook.

Assessment	Type	Weighting	GQ/LO	Assessor	Due
Group Plan 2500 words	Group	20%	1, 2, 4,	Project Supervisor	Week 1 (Saturday 11.59pm)
Group Presentation Up to 20 min	Group	20%	2, 4,	Project Supervisor	Week 3 (Tuesday in class)
Individual Statement 1500 words	Individual	20%	1, 3, 4, 5	Project Supervisor	Week 4 (Sunday, 11.59pm)
Group Project Report 5000 words (or equivalent) This assessment includes an individual contribution mark worth 10/40 marks.*	Group	40%	1, 2, 4, 6	Project Supervisor	Week 4 (Sunday, 11.59pm)

*Individual contribution to group work mark

The Group Project Report is worth 50 marks. Ten of the 50 marks is an individual mark awarded for a students' individual contribution to the group's work, culminating in the Report. Individual contribution is assessed by the Project Supervisor. Ordinarily it is assumed that all members of a group contribute equally to group work, and that the same overall grade and mark out of 50, should be received for the Group Project Report, by each group member. In the ordinary case then, the grade given for the individual contribution mark would be the same as the grade given for the group report mark. So if the grade for the group report was to be a DI (80% = 40/50 = 32/40 = 8/10), all students would receive 40/50 (32+8) (DI).

In some cases however, there may be evidence that a member of a group has significantly under-contributed to groupwork, or has substantially contributed to the work contributed on behalf of group, where other members have failed to adequately contribute. In those cases the student may merit a higher or lower mark out of 50 than other group members. In these cases, the individual contribution mark out of 10, can be used to make this adjustment.

The students' contribution is assessed by the Project Supervisor.

1. Group Plan (2500 words or equivalent) 20%

Assessment	Type	Weighting	GQ/LO	Assessor	Due
Group Plan 2500 words	Group	20%	1, 2, 4,	Project Supervisor	Week 1 (11.59pm Saturday)

GQ	1 Disciplinary depth	2 Broader skills	4 Interdisciplinary effectiveness
LO	Students should be able to apply disciplinary knowledge and skills to solve complex and/or authentic real-world problems.	Students should be able to: a. identify and respond to complexity and uncertainty in real-world problems through development of inventive and novel solutions; and b. develop interpersonal, oral, written and multi-media communication skills.	Students should be able to: communicate and work productively in interdisciplinary teams.
Mode*	Students will identify the knowledge and skills they bring from their educational background and describe how these will be applied to particular aspects of the problem defined by the project brief.	Students will identify a problem defined in the brief and describe its complexity and real-world significance. They will articulate a novel and inventive approach to solving the problem based on the unique mix of knowledge and skills of the students in their group.	Students will describe their specific roles and responsibilities in the group and how they will interact to address the problem defined by the project brief.

*Indicates how this task assesses the GQs and LOs listed for this item in the UoS Outline.

Description

 A Project Plan is essential to help you articulate: 1) the problem/s your team will solve, 2) the overall approach you will take, 3) the tasks and roles the team members will identify and manage, and 4) the timeline required for the completion of this project.

The plan should have the following structure (word counts are *indicative* of relative proportions only and are not mandatory):

1. Introduction (500 words)
2. Aims (150 words)
3. Group profile (team – 100 words per member or total of 500 words; roles and responsibilities of each team members – 100 words per member or total of 500 words)
4. Approach (700 words)
5. Expected outcomes (150 words)
6. Timeline for achievement (not included in word count)
7. References (not included in word count)

Introduction
- The Project Plan should start with a brief but well supported review of the available published information on the topic and draw out global, social, environmental, economic and industry contexts.
- Your review should identify gaps in knowledge, problems or opportunities that could be pursued.

Aims
- Problem or opportunity statement – which specific problem or opportunity will your group focus on?
- What specific aims and objectives will your group pursue in order to address the problem or opportunity?

Group profile
- You should describe your team. What is the background of each team member and what do they bring to the Project? This could include information about their discipline/major or broader field of study as well as any other experiences a team member may feel has given them particularly applicable skills.

- There should also be a clear description of the roles each team member will have and contributions they will be expected to make.

Approach

- How will you engage in and conduct your project? What is the overall approach you will undertake (e.g., project management, problem solving, research methodology, etc.) and what methods will you use and why?
- Your approach and selection of methods should be supported with evidence and highlight how these methods will 1) help you solve your problem; and 2) support your final argument and conclusion.
- Examples of methods you may include are data analysis, data base search, consulting experts, interviews, observations, document analysis, literature review, meta-analysis, SWOT analysis, idea evaluation, feasibility of solution, and other disciplinary methods or techniques.

Expected outcomes

- What do you expect to find? Expected outcomes may be specific, directly relating to what you are analysing, measuring, testing, and researching but may also lead to broader or more global outcomes.

Timeline

- It is important to manage your time well as you have a limited time to work on the problem and produce a Report for your Partner.
- You will be relying on each other to gather relevant information and so it is important to be well organised and very clear about the roles and responsibilities of each team member and expected timeframe for the different stages of the Project.
- There are several different tools available to organise your time. A common approach is to construct a Gantt chart (http://www.gantt.com/).

References

All statements or claims should be supported with evidence by citing published literature, relevant industry or community reports, personal communications etc. A reference list should be included at the end of the plan and the style should be consistent with one of the published referencing and citation styles listed on the University of Sydney Library website
http://libguides.library.usyd.edu.au/citation.
You may be advised to use a particular style by your Project Supervisor.

2. Individual Statement (1500 words) 20%

Assessment	Type	Weighting	GQ/LO	Assessor	Due
Individual Statement 1500 words	Individual	20%	1, 3, 4, 5	Project Supervisor	Week 4 (11.59pm Sunday)

GQ	1 Disciplinary depth	3 Cultural competence	4 Interdisciplinary effectiveness	5 Integrated professional, ethical and personal identity
LO	Students should be able to apply disciplinary knowledge and skills to solve complex and/or authentic real-world problems.	Students should be able to identify and develop solutions for social, political and cultural factors in their own work groups and in the dimensions of authentic problems.	Students should be able to: a. recognise the role of different forms of disciplinary or professional expertise; and b. communicate and work productively in interdisciplinary teams.	Students should be able to: articulate and analyse their professional and personal attributes as a contributor to group work.
Mode*	Students are asked to analyse the ways of thinking they bring from their educational background (disciplinary skills) as a contribution to solving a complex problem.	Analysis of personal attributes (which may be shaped by educational, cultural and social factors) is used to assist the dynamics of group collaboration.	Students analyse different ways of thinking (disciplinary skills) in order to understand how these ways of thinking can best work in collaboration to solve a complex problem.	In analysing their approaches to problem solving, students are able to reflect on their developing professional, ethical and personal identity.

*Indicates how this task assesses the GQs and LOs listed for this item in the UoS Outline.

Description

Drawing on concepts from the project unit and your experiences in the Project, address the following:

1. Giving examples from the Project, analyse the ways of thinking that you brought from your educational background.
2. Evaluate how your ways of thinking contributed to the Project in comparison to other ways of thinking.
3. What potential or actual problems did arise from working on the Project with collaborators whose ways of thinking are similar or different to your own? What strategies did you use to avoid or resolve those problems?

In your answers, support your arguments with concepts from the academic literature.

3. Group Project Report (5000 words or equivalent) 40%

Assessment	Type	Weighting	GQ/LO	Assessor	Due
Group Project Report 5000 words (or equivalent) (Includes an individual contribution mark worth10/40 marks*)	Group	40%	1, 2, 4, 6	Project Supervisor	Week 4 (11.59pm Sunday)

*Details on how individual contribution mark is to be awarded are given below.

Model assessment: Report to the Partner

GQ	1 Disciplinary depth	2 Broader skills	4 Interdisciplinary effectiveness	5 Influence
LO	Students should be able to apply disciplinary knowledge and skills to solve complex and/or authentic real-world problems.	Students should be able to: a. identify and respond to complexity and uncertainty in real-world problems through development of inventive and novel solutions; and b. develop interpersonal, oral, written and multi-media	Students should be able to: communicate and work productively in interdisciplinary teams.	Students should be able to: a. provide leadership in an aspect of a project; b. identify and communicate professional and social values in problem solving; and c. demonstrate a commitment to the role of a professional

		communication skills.		contributor to community and industry activities.
Mode*	Students contribute their disciplinary knowledge and other skills to analysing the project problem and synthesising disciplinary contributions.	Students will describe their approach to solving the complex problem and the novelty and limitations of their solution for application in a real-world context. They will demonstrate the ability to express in writing a synthesis of contributions from potentially diverse perspectives of group members.	Students will articulate the solution to the complex problem as an integration of contributions from different group members.	In their critical analysis of the approach and solution to the problem, students will identify the contributions of team members and third parties to the direction of the group, articulate the rationale for particular decisions and demonstrate the significance of their solution in terms relevant to the Partner.

*Indicates how this task assesses the GQs and LOs listed for this item in the UoS Outline.

Description

This is a Report to the Partner that is submitted for assessment to your Project Supervisor. The Report will draw together all the work on your study for the Partner. When preparing your Report, you should bear three audiences in mind: your Project Partner; an academic (Project Supervisor); and an intelligent, interested adult (like yourselves) who is not an expert in the subject of your Project.

You could choose to write your report in the style described in the guidelines below, or you could explore other formats in consultation with your Project Supervisor. If you wish to choose an alternative format for the Group Report (e.g., an audio recording, artwork, performance, website, app, board paper, detailed business plan, or a prototype), this should be discussed and agreed with your Project Supervisor in order that clear marking criteria can be developed. In all cases, no matter what format you choose, the Report should clearly communicate the Project background, method, results, analysis, conclusions and recommendations and references. Grading will be based on the same criteria described for the Report and must demonstrate a scope and depth of research equivalent to 5000 words collated through group inputs.

All reports should have a clear and concise but comprehensive **Executive Summary** (at the front) and **Conclusions and Recommendations** (at the end, before references and appendices). These should serve as brief 'stand-alone' documents that give the reader an 'overview' of the project and its outcomes.

If a standard report is the preferred form, the following guidelines provide a description of the main components required. While there may be some variation in structure, the information in your report should clearly address the points below and be organised into the relevant sections (please also consult the rubric). Word counts are provided as a guide only to highlight relative weighting of the sections.

Executive Summary (200 words)
An Executive Summary is a clear, succinct statement of the outcomes of the project. It briefly describes the aims, approach, results and recommendations of the Report. It also includes some discussion of the usefulness of the outcome and possible future work that may be required as a result of your recommendations.

Introduction and Project Aims (800 words)
- Problem statement – what problem or opportunity has your group focused on?

- Context of the problem – this should include a well supported review of the available published information on your group's specific topic drawing out global, social, environmental, economic and industry contexts. Why is this a problem that requires a solution or an opportunity worth pursuing?
- Your introduction should also describe the complexity of the problem or opportunity and why it will benefit from an interdisciplinary solution.
- Aims – what were the specific steps taken to address the problem(s) or opportunities tackled by group.

Approach and Group Profile (800 words)

- Describe the overall approach taken in the execution of this project and details of methodologies used.
- Project scope – what does the report cover and who is the information in the report intended for (e.g. company executive, consumers, suppliers, investors, peak industry body, government authority etc.)?
- Team identity – Did the team take on a particular identity (e.g. consultancy, media group, consumer group, start up etc.)? What were the roles and contributions of team members?

Results (1400 words)

- Clear and objective description of the data, product, model, conceptual framework etc. presented in the report including trends, observations, statistical analysis and interpretation where relevant.
- Data or findings may also be illustrated by visual elements. This includes images, text, figures, tables, illustrations and diagrams.
- Note – Transcripts of interviews and raw data for surveys should be included in an appendix and will not be assessed.

Discussion (1400 words)

- How does your solution address the problem/opportunity statement?
- Critical evaluation – can your solution be explained/supported/strengthened by published literature, available information or supplementary data?
- What was the value of a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach to solving the problem? Were you able to synthesize individual contributions into a new product, model or conceptual framework? Does the outcome improve understanding, suggest a novel or innovative approach/product, or have potential to transform current practice?
- Were there any limitations to your research? What else could be considered in order to address the problem or take advantage of the opportunity? For example:

- o Would the project have benefitted from a different approach or were the methodologies limited?
- o Would it have been useful to have a different skill set or disciplinary mix within your group?
- o What could have been done in a longer timeframe?

[Note: Depending on the project, it may be more appropriate to merge the Results and Discussion sections. This may be a decision taken by the supervisor or left to the discretion of students after consultation with their supervisor.]

Conclusions and Recommendations (400 words)

- Conclusions – What were the solutions? How do these solutions address the aims listed in the report? Were all aims addressed?
- Recommendations – How could the solutions be applied or implemented in practical or theoretical ways? How can the partner or industry make use of your findings? What future work should be done to address unanswered or new questions arising from the exercise, as appropriate? What more needs to be done before implementation, adoption or a full understanding of the issue?

Referencing

- All statements or claims should be supported with evidence by citing published literature, relevant industry or community reports, personal communications etc.
- A reference list should be included at the end of the plan and the style should be consistent with one of the published referencing and citation styles listed on the University of Sydney Library website http://libguides.library.usyd.edu.au/citation.
- You may be advised to use a particular style by your Project Supervisor.

Individual contribution mark

The Group Project Report is worth 40 marks. Ten of the 40 marks is an individual mark awarded for a students' individual contribution to the group's work, culminating in the Report. Individual contribution is assessed by the Project Supervisor. Ordinarily it is assumed that all members of a group contribute equally. In these cases, the grade given for the individual contribution mark would be the same as the grade given for the group report mark. So if the grade for the group report was to be a DI (80% = 32/40 = 24/30 = 8/10), all students who perform equally in the group would receive 32/40 (24+8) (DI).

In some cases however, there may be evidence that a member of a group has significantly under-contributed to groupwork, or has substantially contributed to the work contributed on behalf of group, where other members have failed to adequately contribute.   In those cases the student may receive a lower or higher grade for the individual contribution component than is received for the group work.

NB: Project supervisors must specify the information that will be taken into account in assessing group contribution.

4. Group Presentation 20%

Assessment	Type	Weighting	GQ/LO	Assessor	Due
Group Presentation ≤20 min	Group	20%	2, 4,	Project Supervisor	Week 3 (11.59pm Monday)

GQ	2 Broader skills	4 Interdisciplinary effectiveness	5 Influence
LO	Students should be able to: a. identify and respond to complexity and uncertainty in real-world problems through development of inventive and novel solutions. b. develop interpersonal, oral, written and multi-media communication skills.	Students should be able to communicate and work productively in interdisciplinary teams.	Students should be able to: a. provide leadership in an aspect of a project; b. identify and communicate professional and social values in problem solving; and c. demonstrate a commitment to the role of a professional contributor to community and industry activities.
Mode*	Students use oral, and multi-media communication skills to effectively present outcomes of addressing the project problem. Students will provide a compelling account of their solution to the complex problem, highlighting the novelty and limitations of their solution for application in a real-world context.	Students will present the group's solution to the complex problem as the integration of contributions from different group members.	Students adopt a professional approach to communicating the outcomes of the project. Students will explain the rationale for their decisions and demonstrate the significance of their solution in in terms relevant to the Partner.

| | They will demonstrate their development of expertise and agility by answering questions from an informed audience. | | | 29 |

*Indicates how this task assesses the GQs and LOs listed for this item in the UoS Outline.

Description

A pitch-style presentation with the Partner is scheduled in Week 3, where groups selected by the Project Supervisor present their work to the Partner. The presentation is to be no more than 7 minutes.

It is expected that all students in a group will present or answer questions. Assessment will take the contribution of all students into account.

Presentation content and context should be appropriate for the audience (including Partners) and should clearly articulate and contextualise the problem(s), describe approach and justify validity, present results in clear and illustrative manner, discuss significance, opportunities, limitations.

Where appropriate, presentations (e.g., Powerpoints, PDFs) must be submitted via Moodle platform.

Rubrics for assessment items

Project Plan

Section	Marks*	High Distinction 85% – 100%	Distinction 75% – 84%	Credit 65% – 74%	Pass 50% – 64%	Fail 0% – 49%
Introduction Description of brief, context and identification of problem	/20	– A comprehensive review of key areas of contention in current practice relating to the topic. – Relevant gaps, problems, or opportunities identified following the review.	– A clear review of most areas of contention in current practice relating to the topic. – Most relevant gaps, problems, or opportunities identified following the review.	– A sound review of most areas of contention in current practice relating to the topic. – Some relevant gaps, problems, or opportunities identified following the review.	– A basic review of a few areas of contention in current practice relating to the topic. – A few relevant gaps, problems, or opportunities identified following the review.	– Unclear review, without background or areas irrelevant to the topic. – Unclear gaps, problems, or opportunities identified following the review.
Aims Problems your group will tackle	/10	– Comprehensive problem or opportunity statement articulating why the problem or opportunity needs to be addressed. – Comprehensive aims and objectives to address the	– Clear problem or opportunity statement articulating why the problem needs to be addressed. – Clear aims and objectives to address the problem or opportunity.	– Sound problem statement with some justification for why it should be addressed. – Sound aims and objectives to address the problem or opportunity.	– Basic problem statement with vague justification for why it should be solved. – Basic aims and objectives to address the problem or opportunity.	– Unclear or no problem or opportunity stated. – Unclear or no aims and objectives stated.

		problem or opportunity.				
Group profile	/20	– Description of group members highlighting similarities and differences and roles/ tasks assigned demonstrating link to member qualities/skills.	– Description of group members and roles/ tasks assigned demonstrating link to member qualities/skills.	– List/description of group members and roles/ tasks assigned.	– List/description of group members but no roles/ tasks assigned.	– Unclear or no description of group members or roles.
Approach	/25	– Proposed plan describes relevant approach and methods and groupwork processes well-articulated. – Comprehensive plan with relevant detail of design and analysis to achieve the aims.	– Proposed plan describes most relevant approach and methods methodology and groupwork processes. – Clear plan with most relevant design and analysis to achieve the aims.	– Proposed plan describes some relevant approach and methods and has adequate groupwork practices in place. – Sound plan with some relevant design and analysis to achieve the aims.	– Proposed plan describes basic approach and methods and groupwork processes. – Basic plan with vague design or analysis mostly irrelevant to achieve aims.	– Proposed plan is not adequate to achieve aims, or uses an inappropriate approach and methods.

Expected outcomes	/10	– Comprehensive list of expected outcomes which are explicitly linked with the proposed work.	– Expected outcomes are clearly articulated and related to the proposed work.	– Expected outcomes are sound, but some are missing or not related to the rest of the proposal.	– States a few expected outcomes but these are vague, not linked to the body of the proposal, or unrealistic.
Timeline Appropriate timeline	/5	– Comprehensive and appropriate timeline with all detailed steps and outputs included.	– Clear and appropriate timeline with most detailed steps included.	– Sound timeline with some steps missing or not identified by outputs.	– Basic timeline with vague or mostly irrelevant steps or outputs.
References Appropriate references	/5	– Comprehensive reference list (both recent and seminal publications) – All references cited, all arguments supported with citation, no overuse of any individual publication.	– All references cited, all arguments supported with citation, no overuse of any individual publication.	– References cited/formatted correctly. – Some references missing/arguments lacking supporting evidence (citations) – Five or more references but imbalanced representation	– Most references included and cited/formatted correctly. – Several references missing/arguments lacking supporting evidence (citations). – Less than five references used
Overall presentation	/5	– Conforms to all specifications. – Coherent logical	– Conforms to all specifications. – Coherent logical	– Conforms to all specifications. – Text flows reasonably	– Conforms to some of the required specifications, some

Note: The rightmost column continues:
Expected outcomes	Timeline	References	Overall presentation
– Unclear or no expected outcomes given.	– Unclear or inappropriate timeline – hard to comprehend.	– References not included or not cited correctly.	– Does not conform to the required specifications, text

and style		argument flowing through the document. - Negligible grammatical and other errors.	argument flowing through the document. - Few grammatical and other errors.	well. - Some grammatical and other errors.	flow in text but vague. - Significant grammatical and other errors.	does not flow. - Poor grammar, numerous errors.
Other comments						
TOTAL MARK	/ 100					

Individual Statement

Criteria	Marks	High Distinction 85%–100%	Distinction 75%–84%	Credit 65%–74%	Pass 50%–64%	Fail 0%–49%
1. Analysing ways of thinking	/ 20	You presented a sophisticated analysis of your ways of thinking. You illustrated your ways of thinking with relevant examples from the Project that connected to your analysis. Your analysis is very well supported with relevant concepts from the project unit.	You presented a clear analysis of your ways of thinking You used clear examples from the Project to explain your ways of thinking. Your analysis is clearly supported using concepts from the project unit.	You presented a sound analysis of your ways of thinking You used some examples from the Project but they do not clearly explain or analyse your ways of thinking. Your analysis is somewhat supported using concepts from the project unit.	You presented a basic analysis of your ways of thinking You used basic examples from the Project of your ways of thinking, but they are not clearly related to your analysis. Your analysis did not sufficiently use concepts from the project unit.	You did not attempt an analysis of your ways of thinking or it is unclear and incomplete. You did not use examples from the Project to analyse your ways of thinking. Your analysis did not use concepts from the project unit.
2. Evaluate contribution of ways of thinking to Project	/ 35	You evaluated strengths and limitations for the Project of your ways of thinking in a sophisticated way. You illustrated contributions of ways of thinking using	You clearly evaluated strengths and limitations for the Project of your ways of thinking. You gave clear examples from the Project to support the contribution of your	You identified and discussed some strengths and limitations for the Project of your ways of thinking. You gave some examples of how your contributions but did	You identified but did not sufficiently discuss strengths and limitations for the Project of your ways of thinking You gave basic examples of how your ways of thinking	You did not identify or discuss both strengths and limitations for the Project of your ways of thinking. You did not give examples of how your ways of thinking contributed to the

	relevant examples from the Project. You compared the contribution of other ways of thinking by discussing relevant strengths and limitations in a sophisticated way.	ways of thinking. You clearly discussed strengths and limitations of other ways of thinking.	not relate these to your ways of thinking. You demonstrated some understanding of strengths and limitations of other ways of thinking.	contributed to the Project. You compared to other ways of thinking but did not show an understanding of their strengths and limitations.	Project. You did not include comparisons, or you may have included comparisons, but they are not clear or do not relate to the strengths and limitations of different ways of thinking.
3. Problems and solutions in collaborating with other ways of thinking	/ 40	You presented a sophisticated analysis of problems in collaborations among ways of thinking. Your solutions showed a sophisticated understanding of how ways of thinking can be articulated. You gave relevant examples from the Project that support very well your discussion of	You presented a clear analysis of problems in collaborations among ways of thinking. Your solutions showed a clear understanding of interactions among ways of thinking. You gave clear examples from the Project that support your discussion of problems and solutions	You presented a sound analysis of problems in collaborations among ways of thinking, that is incomplete or need development. Your solutions showed sound understanding of interactions among ways of thinking. You mentioned some examples from the Project to support your discussion.	You presented a basic analysis of problems in collaborations among ways of thinking that is superficial or needs significant development. You provided basic solutions which may or may not reflect understanding of ways of thinking. You provided basic examples from the Project to support your discussion but they are not connected to ways	You did not attempt an analysis of problems in collaborations different ways of thinking, or it is unclear and incomplete. You did not provide solutions that are appropriate to collaborations among ways of thinking. You did not provide examples from the Project to support your discussion or the examples were not relevant.

		problems and solutions.			of thinking.
4. Clarity of writing , referencing and formatting	/ 5	Conforms to all specifications, references cited/formatted correctly. Coherent logical argument presented. Negligible grammatical and referencing errors.	Conforms to all specifications, references cited/formatted correctly. Coherent logical argument presented. Few grammatical and other errors.	Conforms to all specifications, references cited/formatted correctly, and development of a logical argument. Some grammatical and other errors.	Conforms to some of the required specifications, most references cited/ formatted correctly, and little development of a logical argument. Significant grammatical and other errors.	Does not conform to the required specifications, references not cited correctly, unacceptable structure and illogical argument. Poor grammar, numerous errors.
Other comments					
TOTAL MARK	/ 100				

Report to the Partner

Section	Mark*	High Distinction *85% – 100%*	Distinction *75% – 84%*	Credit *65% – 74%*	Pass *50% – 64%*	Fail *0% – 49%*
Executive summary	/10	– A succinct summary of the problem identified, aims, approach, outcomes, main interpretations, and recommendations including an attempt to identify the usefulness of the outcome and future work. – Contains enough information for other readers to understand and evaluate the usefulness of the work.	– A succinct summary of the problem identified, the aims, approach, outcomes, main interpretations, and recommendations including an attempt to identify the usefulness of the outcome and future work.	– Presented as a summary stating the problem identified, the aims, approach, outcomes, main interpretations and recommendations.	– An attempt is made to sum up the problem and results. – The major interpretations are summarised, but not the recommendations of the work, including its usefulness or future value.	– Does not present a concise summary of the work. – No explicit statement of the problem identified, methods or results. – No summary of the interpretations or recommendations of the work.
Introduction and Project Aims Identification of problem and aims of group	/10	– Comprehensive, persuasive rationale for the problem is clearly presented and integrated into the literature and other research. – Clear and principled account of the context of the problem. – Sophisticated synthesis of	– The rationale for the problem is clearly defined and is integrated into the relevant literature and other research. – Clear summary of the context of the problem. – Disciplinary	– Rationale for the problem is clearly presented and accompanied with clearly defined aims/objectives. – Summary of the context of the problem. – Disciplinary	– The problem reasonably defined, but some shortcomings in the clarity of the aims/objectives developed – Some attempt to contextualise the problem	– The problem is not clearly defined. Associated objectives/aims not articulated – No attempt to contextualise the problem. – No attempt to synthesise or

		disciplinary perspectives and complexity of problem addressed effectively. – Coherently and concisely written with clearly defined aims.	perspectives synthesised and complexity of problem addressed coherently. – Concisely written with clearly defined aims/objectives.	perspectives synthesised or integrated, and complexity of problem discussed. – Cited literature relates the research to a wider context.	– Some attempt to synthesise or integrate disciplinary perspectives and some attempt to discuss complexity. – Literature discussed is valid and relevant.	integrate of disciplinary perspectives or discuss complexity of problem. – Literature introduced is largely invalid and of little relevance.

Approach and Group Profile	/10	– Appropriate selection and description of approach and clear rationale for selection. – Description and justification of report scope, team identity and contributions and roles of team members clearly and appropriately linked to solving different aspects of the problem. – Coherently and concisely explained.	– Appropriate selection and description of approach and rationale for selection. – Description of report scope, team identity, contributions and roles of team members clearly linked to solving different aspects of the problem. – Lacking some coherence	– Appropriate selection and description of approach with some rationale offered. – Description of of scope and team identity and contributions and roles of team members with adequate reflection on solving different aspects of the problem.	– Appropriate selection of approach, but given merely as a list without rationale. – Brief description of scope, team identity and/or contributions from team members that are poorly linked to solving different aspects of the problem.	– Inappropriate selection of methods, no appreciation of their usefulness. – Little or no description of contributions from group members.
Results Description and visual presentation of results	/25	– Important trends in the results coherently and concisely explained. – Interrelationship of different contributions clearly highlighted, concepts fully integrated or synthesised to form something new eg. new conceptual framework or model – Visual presentation elements are well	– Important trends in the results indicated – Results comprehensively described and clearly related to problem. – Integration or interrelationships of different contributions clearly described – some integration/synthesis of concepts	– Important trends in the results indicated with some relationship to the defined problem. – Some integration or interrelationships of different contributions – Visual presentation elements are well constructed, clearly labelled and mostly relevant to the	– Some description of the major results. – Some integration or interrelationships of different contributions – Visual presentation elements are well constructed and clearly labelled and have some relevance to the research investigation. – Little or inaccurate	– No, little or inaccurate description of the results. – No integration of different contributions – Visual presentation elements are not relevant and are poorly labelled and constructed. – No analysis to

		constructed, clearly labelled and relevant to the research investigation – Comprehensive analysis to allow interpretation of data eg. errors, distributions and other rudimentary statistics, answers to interview questions etc.	– Visual presentation elements are well constructed, clearly labelled and relevant to the research investigation – Some analysis to allow interpretation of data eg. errors, distributions and other rudimentary statistics, answers to interview questions etc.	research investigation. – Some reflection to allow interpretation of data e.g. errors, distributions and other rudimentary statistics, answers to interview questions etc.	analysis to allow interpretation of data e.g. errors, distributions and other rudimentary statistics, answers to interview questions etc.	allow interpretation of data.
Discussion	/20	– Conclusions drawn from results and related to the problem. – Clear evidence of critical evaluation of the work in relation to the problem and relevant literature/ evidence demonstrating a degree of originality – Comprehensively analyses the significance of integrated or interrelated	– Conclusions drawn from results and related to the problem. – Clear evidence of critical evaluation of the work in relation to the problem and relevant literature/ evidence. – Evaluation of the significance of the	– Conclusions drawn from results and related to the problem. – Discussion linked to problem and relevant literature. – Some justification of the methods and design. – Some evidence of critical evaluation of	– Some discussion of results linked to problem with little discussion of literature. – Little evidence of the ability to critically evaluate the work or describe how contributions have been combined or synthesised.	– Only restates the results and does not link this discussion to the problem or relevant literature/evidence. – No evaluation of proportional representation of contributions or any synthesis of concepts.

41

		contributions. – Approach and design fully justified. Limitations identified in relation to approach, discipline mix and time frame. – Clearly articulates innovation of new concepts or frameworks resulting from the research and identifies novel or innovative approaches and future directions.	Interrelationship or integration of contributions. – Approach and design fully justified. Limitations identified in relation to approach, discipline mix and time frame.	the work, interrelationship, integration or synthesis of contributions.	– Comment on the method and implementation.	– No comment about the method or implementation.
Conclusions and recommendations	/15	– Conclusions clearly and comprehensively addressing all aims, effectively supported by results and discussion. – Comprehensive list of recommendations for implementation/application and future work with clear and well supported justification.	– Conclusions addressing aims and supported by results and discussion. – Recommendations for implementation/application and future work clearly justified.	– Conclusions related to aims, supported by some results and discussion, not all aims addressed. – Some recommendations for implementation and/or future work with some justification.	– Conclusions related to aims but not well supported by results or discussion. – Some recommendations for future work, implementation or application of outcomes but not well justified.	– Conclusions not related to aims. – No recommendations for future work, implementation or application of outcomes.

Clarity of writing, referencing and formatting	/10	– Conforms to all specifications, references cited/formatted correctly – Coherent logical argument presented. – Negligible grammatical and referencing errors.	– Conforms to all specifications, references cited/formatted correctly – Coherent logical argument presented. – Few grammatical and other errors.	– Conforms to all specifications, references cited/formatted correctly, and development of a logical argument. – Some grammatical and other errors.	– Conforms to some of the required specifications, most references cited/ formatted correctly, and little development of a logical argument. – Some grammatical and other errors.	– Does not conform to the required specifications, references not cited correctly, unacceptable structure and illogical argument. – Poor grammar, numerous errors.
Other comments						
TOTAL MARK	/ 100					

Live Presentation

Different Projects will require different types and lengths of student presentations. Below are rubrics for a detailed 20 min presentation and a 3–5 min pitch. Project Supervisors may use either of these rubrics, according to their Project's needs.

Pitch presentation (3–5 min) (suitable for innovative solutions)

Performance Criteria	Score	High Distinction 85%–100%	Distinction 75%–84%	Credit 65%–74%	Pass 50%–64%	Fail 0%–49%
Content (40%)	Originality /10	The idea/ solution demonstrates originality and creativity; fully aligned to the problem and	The idea/ solution has aspects of originality and creativity; aligned to the problem and	The idea/ solution has some originality and creativity but it looks mostly like things that have	The idea/ solution has little originality or creativity; little alignment to the problem and aims.	Already known idea or solution.

		aims.	aims.	been seen before; some alignment to the problem and aims.		
	Desirability /10	Comprehensive and relevant problem statement aligned to project aims and supported with well researched evidence.	Clear and relevant problem statement aligned to the project aims and supported with clear evidence.	Sound problem statement with some alignment to the projects aims. Some evidence presented.	Basic problem statement with little alignment to the project aims and limited supporting evidence.	Unclear problem statement and evidence.
	Viability /10	Comprehensive discussion of all the benefits for all stakeholders supported with concrete evidence.	Clear discussion of the key benefits for the key stakeholders supported with clear evidence.	Sound discussion of most of the benefits for some stakeholders supported with some evidence.	Basic discussion with few benefits for limited group of stakeholders supported with little evidence.	Unclear or no discussion of benefits.
	Feasibility /10	Comprehensive discussion of difficulties and risks arising during solution implementation. Very well-articulated mitigation actions addressed.	Clear discussion of most of the difficulties and risks arising during solution implementation. Relevant mitigation actions addressed.	Sound discussion of some difficulties and risks arising during solution implementation. Some mitigation actions addressed.	Basic discussion of few difficulties and risks arising during solution implementation. Basic or limited mitigation actions addressed.	Unclear or no difficulties or risks identified. No mitigation actions addressed.
Organisation & Delivery	/30	All material presented in a comprehensive manner and very well organised. Delivery techniques	All material presented in a clear manner and well organised. Delivery techniques	All or some material presented in a sound manner and generally organised. Delivery techniques	Material presented in a basic manner with little organisation.	Material presented does not flow and lacks organisation. Delivery techniques do not engage the

(30%)		display high level of enthusiasm and engage fully the audience. Keeps to time limit and equitable contributions and flow.	display enthusiasm and engage audience for most of the time. Keeps to time limit and equitable contributions and flow.	display some enthusiasm and hold audience attention for some time. Keeps to time limit and equitable contributions or flow.	Delivery techniques display little enthusiasm and/ or ability to maintain audience's attention. Some difficulty keeping to time limit or some inequity in contributions or flow.	audience. Does not keep to time limit and inequitable contributions and flow.
Ability to answer questions (30%)	/30	Comprehensive interpretation of all questions. Provides relevant and succinct answers.	Clear interpretation of all questions. Provides appropriate answers.	Sound interpretation of questions. Provides some relevant answers.	Basic interpretation of questions and attempts some answers.	Does not demonstrate the ability to interpret questions or provide answers.
Other comments						
TOTAL MARKS	/ 100					

Marking sheet for ICPU Group Presentation

Name of marker –

_____

Group

Performance Criteria		Ranking				
Content (40%)	Originality	1	2	3	4	5
	Desirability	1	2	3	4	5
	Viability	1	2	3	4	5
	Feasibility	1	2	3	4	5
Organisation & Delivery (30%)		1	2	3	4	5
Ability to answer questions (30%)		1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

Group

Performance Criteria		Ranking				
Content (40%)	Originality	1	2	3	4	5
	Desirability	1	2	3	4	5
	Viability	1	2	3	4	5
	Feasibility	1	2	3	4	5
Organisation & Delivery (30%)		1	2	3	4	5
Ability to answer questions (30%)		1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

Group work Survey – to be conducted in week 4

(For self and peer assessment of individual contribution to group work)

Please <u>write the name of the person</u> for whom completion of this survey pertains to:

Yourself: ……………………………………………………   **OR**   Peer: ………………………………………………………….

Please give a ranking for each of the Statements by typing your score, corresponding to the scales below, in the box on the right.

Proficiency: extent to which an individual fulfils the prescribed requirements of the role

1. I/my peer completed all assigned tasks.

1	2	3	4	5	
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	

2. I/my peer attended all meetings.

1	2	3	4	5	
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	

3. I/my peer met all deadlines set by the team.

1	2	3	4	5	
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	

4. I/my peer communicated effectively with team members.

1	2	3	4	5	
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	

Adaptivity: extent to which you/your peer copes with, responds to, and supports change

1. I/my peer considered other points of view in team discussions.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

2. I/my peer was able to accept advice from other team members.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

3. I/my peer adapted to changes affecting the team.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

Proactivity: extent to which you/your peer initiates change, is self-starting and future-directed

1. I/my peer used initiative to improve team performance.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Occasionally	A moderate amount	A great deal

2. I/my peer demonstrated an active role in assigning tasks and offering advice or solutions.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Occasionally	A moderate amount	A great deal

3. I/my peer suggested ways to make the team function more effectively.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Occasionally	A moderate amount	A great deal

Performance assessment categories from Griffin, Neal and Parker (2007) and Neal *et al.*, (2012)