

COURSE OUTLINE: AB1601 Organizational Behavior and Design

Academic Year	2022/2023	Semester	2
Course Coordinator	Josephine Lang		
Course Code	AB1601		
Course Title	Organizational Behavior and Design		
Pre-requisites	Nil		
No of AUs	3 AUs		
Contact Hours	39		
Proposal Date	Dec 15, 2022		
A) Course Aims			
<p>Business is in the midst of a revolutionary transformation. Emerging technologies that combine AI, machine learning, cutting-edge visualization techniques, and social robots are fast revolutionizing the business workplace globally. Building a motivated workforce is a critical responsibility of managers. To do so, managers must know why people behave in organizations the way they do.</p> <p>Research in cognitive sciences, artificial intelligence and neuroscience has generated significant insights that can enrich our knowledge of people. This course focuses on processes and methods that can improve the attitudes and behaviors of organizational members. You will learn to know more about yourself and others. You will also learn how to influence and predict your own behaviours as well as those of others. Within the context of a world of social media, AI, and machine learning, you will learn various organizational behaviour theories and concepts, and then apply them appropriately to real-life situations to make sense of human behaviours and human-robot interactions at work. This course adopts a flipped classroom approach, which will give you many opportunities to share your knowledge with others and learn with them collaboratively.</p>			
B) Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO)/Objectives			
<p>By the end of this course, you should be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apply critical thinking to analyze diverse arguments and reconcile divergent viewpoints 2. Apply design thinking to explore the complexity of a problem, generate novel ideas and test-drive proposed solutions 3. Define and explain the theoretical frameworks and concepts of organizational behavior 4. Apply the appropriate theoretical frameworks and concepts to analyze real-world situations and generate possible solutions to problems identified 5. Engage others in a meaningful and supportive way to develop teamwork skills 6. Use inspirational assertive communication to share your knowledge 7. Describe how research is conducted to generate insights on human cognition, attitudes, and behavior 			
C) Course Content			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course Overview 2. Critical Thinking 3. Design Thinking 4. Individual Behavior, Personality, and Values 5. Perceiving Ourselves and Others in Organizations 			

- 6. Workplace Emotions, Attitudes, and Stress
- 7. Employee Motivation
- 8. Team Dynamics
- 9. Power and Influence in the Workplace
- 10. Conflict and Negotiation in the Workplace
- 11. Leadership in Organizational Settings
- 12. Organizational Culture
- 13. Organizational Change

D) Assessment (includes both continuous and summative assessment)

Component	ILO Tested	NBS Learning Goal	Weightage	Team/ Individual	Assessment Rubrics (attach rubrics in appendix)
1. Critical Thinking	ILO1	Critical Thinking	15%	Individual	Critical Thinking Rubric
2. Design Thinking	ILO2 ILO5	Design Thinking, Teamwork	18%	Team	Design Thinking Rubric, Teamwork Peer Evaluation (eUreka)
3. teamUP Assignment	ILO3 ILO4 ILO6 ILO5	Knowledge Acquisition & Sharing	18%	Team (Mandatory for all team members to be involved in the sharing)	Knowledge Acquisition and Sharing Rubric, Teamwork Peer Evaluation (eUreka)
4. My Reflective Learning Assessment	ILO3 ILO4	Knowledge Acquisition	15%	Individual	My Reflective Learning Rubric
5. lightUP Assignment	ILO6	Knowledge Sharing	15%	Individual	Inspirational Assertive Comm. Rubric
6. voiceUP	ILO6	Knowledge sharing	15%	Individual	Knowledge Sharing Rubric
7. Research Participation	ILO7	Knowledge Acquisition	4%	Individual	Not Applicable
Total			100%		

E) Formative feedback

You will be able to assess your own performance based on the results you get from in-class quizzes and experiential learning activities. Your seminar instructors will provide written feedback for some of the individual assignments and team-bases assignments submitted for grading.

F) Learning and Teaching approach	
<p>This course adopts a flipped classroom approach. It strategically integrates different teaching strategies and instructional technologies to promote active participation and deeper student engagement. Experiential exercises and assignments are designed to demonstrate the relevance of various theoretical frameworks and concept in analyzing and solving management problems and issues.</p>	
Approach	How does this approach support you in achieving the learning outcomes?
Critical Thinking	<p>To do this assignment, you apply the critical thinking processes to critically evaluate the quality of a published article with regards to its truthfulness and the validity of its arguments.</p> <p>This assignment shows you how to examine any piece of written work critically.</p>
Design Thinking	<p>In this assignment, you apply the three main processes of design thinking, i.e., inspiration, ideation, and implementation, to explore the complexity of a problem and then generate a workable set of solutions.</p> <p>This assignment helps you develop non-linear, iterative thinking processes that help to identify and break down complex problems, challenge embedded assumptions, integrate multiple perspectives, and create workable innovative solutions through prototyping and testing.</p> <p>This assignment enables you to learn how to facilitate change in organizational behavior through the design of workplaces and work procedures.</p>
sizeUP	<p>At the start of each seminar, your instructor will conduct a quiz or give you a list of short-answer questions for you to answer individually.</p> <p>By doing this start-of-class activity, you get to size up the effectiveness of your pre-class preparation and your readiness to participate in the various seminar activities</p>
powerUP	<p>In each seminar, you participate in various powerUP experiential exercises. These exercises illustrate the relevance of OB theoretical frameworks and concepts in the analyzing of organizational situations.</p> <p>By taking an active role in various experiential exercises, you will experience, hands-on, how various OB theoretical frameworks and concepts can come alive in real-life situations.</p>
teamUP	<p>You will work in a team of 4 to 6 members to complete a team project in analyzing a real-world management issue.</p> <p>By analyzing an OB case collaboratively with your team members, you learn how to apply appropriately various theoretical frameworks to develop a better understanding of real-life problems and propose logical solutions. You will also</p>

	learn how to voice your opinions assertively and inspirationally when you present the team project with your team members.
lightUP	This lightUP segment of the seminar is for you to present OB insights that you acquire by reading a recent publication. This assignment will motivate you to explore knowledge frontiers by extracting OB insights from recent publications on artificial intelligence, neuroscience research, cross-cultural research, etc.
voiceUP	This voiceUP activity gives you the opportunity to voice your opinions. For this activity, you will practice voicing your opinions assertively in sharing your ideas with others.
checkUP	At the end of each seminar, your instructor may conduct a pop-quiz. By doing this end-of-seminar activity, you will assess how well you have learned the theories and concepts presented in the seminar.
My Reflective Learning	For this assignment, you apply two relevant theoretical frameworks to analyze a chosen event in your life to generate practical insights that will help you navigate a similar situation should you find yourself in one in the future. This assignment shows you how applying theoretical frameworks can enrich your understanding of your own life situations.
Research Participations	By participating in research experiments, you will learn how research is conducted to generate knowledge about human cognition and behavior in different settings

G) Reading and References

Textbook:
McShane, S. L. & Von Glinow, M. A. (2022). *Organizational Behavior* (5th ed.) International Student Edition, New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Education.

Please refer to eOBSeminarGuide for additional readings and references.

H) Course Policies and Student Responsibilities

(1) Seminar attendance

Seminar attendance, whether in-person or online, is very important as seminar exercises are designed to help you better understand course content and to develop four competencies, i.e., critical thinking, design thinking, knowledge sharing skills, as well as teamwork and interpersonal skills.

In order to facilitate your own learning as well as the learning of your course-mates, it is important for you to complete all pre-seminar assigned readings and participate actively in all seminar activities and discussions.

(2) Seminar absences

Absence from class will affect your learning effectiveness. You are required to provide valid reasons for your absence from class. If you are unwell, please provide a medical certificate from a registered medical practitioner. If you need to participate in an NBS- or NTU-approved activity, an excuse letter from the relevant body will be required. If you are going to miss a seminar, please inform the course instructor by email prior to start of class. If your absence has resulted in you missing an activity that is graded, your instructor will arrange for a replacement of that assessment.

(3) Penalty for late submission

You are given a grace period of three hours. When you submit an assignment after the grace period without giving a sufficiently good reason, there shall be a penalty. If you submit your assignment within 24 hours after the deadline, you will be assessed a 10% reduction in your marks, so that if your work would have been assessed a mark of 65%, say, you will get 55% instead. In the same manner, if you submit your assignment within 48 hours after the deadline, you will receive a mark of 45% in this example, and so on.

(4) Teamwork Peer Evaluation

Your team members will evaluate the quality of your teamwork and your interpersonal skills. It is difficult for your instructor to assess the contribution of each member to various team-based activities. Hence, it is critical for you to rate the contribution of your team members objectively and impartially. All evaluations are held in confidence. Your instructor will reserve the right to review ratings under doubtful circumstances where there might be discrimination, bias, malice, etc.

1) Academic Integrity

Good academic work depends on honesty and ethical behaviour. The quality of your work as a student relies on adhering to the principles of academic integrity and to the NTU Honour Code, a set of values shared by the whole university community. Truth, Trust and Justice are at the core of NTU's shared values.

As a student, it is important that you recognize your responsibilities in understanding and applying the principles of academic integrity in all the work you do at NTU. Not knowing what is involved in maintaining academic integrity does not excuse academic dishonesty. You need to actively equip yourself with strategies to avoid all forms of academic dishonesty, including plagiarism, academic fraud, collusion and cheating. If you are uncertain of the definitions of any of these terms, you should go to the [academic integrity website](#) for more information. Consult your instructor(s) if you need any clarification about the requirements of academic integrity in the course.

J) Course Instructors				
Instructor	Office Location	Phone	Email	Consultation Hours
Dr. Naina Gupta	S3-B1B-76	6790 5702	naina@ntu.edu.sg	By appointment
Assoc. Prof. Ivy Kwan	S3-01B-43	6592 1749	ivy.kwan@ntu.edu.sg	By appointment
Dr. Daniel Siew	S3-B1C-110	6790 4812	hoikok@ntu.edu.sg	By appointment
Dr. Chong Chee Leong	--	--	Cheeleong.chong@ntu.edu.sg	By appointment
Mr. Tan Kin Hock	--	--	tan.kh@ntu.edu.sg	By appointment
Dr. Kenneth Tan	--	--	Kenneth.tan@ntu.edu.sg	By appointment
Asst. Prof. Jack Zhang	S3-B2b-66	--	Jack.Zhang@ntu.edu.sg	By appointment
Asst. Prof. Liu Haiyang	B2C-113	--	Haiyang.liu@ntu.edu.sg	By appointment
Mr. Shota Kawasaki	--	--	Kawa0002@e.ntu.edu.sg	By appointment
Ms. Huang Yi	--	--	Y1002@e.ntu.edu.sg	By appointment
Assoc. Prof. Josephine Lang (course coordinator)	S3-B2B-65	6790 4669	acylang@ntu.edu.sg	By appointment

K) Planned Weekly Schedule

Week	Topic	ILO	Readings/ Activities
Week 1 (Jan 09 to 13) Seminar 1	Introduction to the Field of Organizational Behavior	ILO3	Chapter 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formation of Teams • sizeUP: Self-learning
Week 2 (Jan 16 to 20) Seminar 2	Critical Thinking Design Thinking Inspirational Assertive Communication	ILO1 ILO2 ILO7	Experiential Exercises: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical thinking • Design thinking • Inspirational Assertive Comm.
Week 3 (Jan 23 to 27) Seminar 3	Individual Behavior, Personality, and Values	ILO3 ILO4 ILO5 ILO6	Chapter 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sizeUP: Self-learning • powerUP: OB Experience • teamUP: OB Lens • lightUP: OB Insights • checkUP: Learning Effectiveness
Week 4 (Jan 30 to Feb 03) Seminar 4	Perceiving Ourselves and Others in Organizations	ILO3 ILO4 ILO5 ILO6	Chapter 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sizeUP: Self-learning • powerUP: OB Experience • teamUP: OB Lens • lightUP: OB Insights • checkUP: Learning Effectiveness
Week 5 (Feb 06 to 10) Seminar 5	Workplace Emotions, Attitudes, and Stress	ILO3 ILO4 ILO5 ILO6	Chapter 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sizeUP: Self-learning • powerUP: OB Experience • teamUP: OB Lens • lightUP: OB Insights • checkUP: Learning Effectiveness
Week 6 (Feb 13 to 17) Seminar 6	Employee Motivation	ILO3 ILO4 ILO5 ILO6	Chapter 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sizeUP: Self-learning • powerUP: OB Experience • teamUP: OB Lens • lightUP: OB Insights • checkUP: Learning Effectiveness
Week 7 (Feb 20 to 24) Seminar 7	Team Dynamics	ILO3 ILO4 ILO5 ILO6	Chapter 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sizeUP: Self-learning • powerUP: OB Experience

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teamUP: OB Lens • lightUP: OB Insights • checkUP: Learning Effectiveness <p>* Critical Thinking Assignment due on Feb. 24 (Friday), 9.00 pm</p>
Recess Week (Feb 27 to Mar 03)			
Week 8 (Mar 06 to 10) Seminar 8	Power and Influence in the Workplace	ILO3 ILO4 ILO5 ILO6	Chapter 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sizeUP: Self-learning • powerUP: OB Experience • teamUP: OB Lens • lightUP: OB Insights • checkUP: Learning Effectiveness <p>Design Thinking Assignment due on Mar. 10 (Friday), 9.00 pm</p>
Week 9 (Mar 13 to 17) Seminar 9	Conflict and Negotiation in the Workplace	ILO3 ILO4 ILO5 ILO6	Chapter 10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sizeUP: Self-learning • powerUP: OB Experience • teamUP: OB Lens • lightUP: OB Insights • checkUP: Learning Effectiveness
Week 10 (Mar 20 to 24) Seminar 10	Leadership in Organizational Settings	ILO3 ILO4 ILO5 ILO6	Chapter 11 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sizeUP: Self-learning • powerUP: OB Experience • teamUP: OB Lens • lightUP: OB Insights • checkUP: Learning Effectiveness
Week 11 (Mar 27 to 31) Seminar 11	Organizational Culture	ILO3 ILO4 ILO5 ILO6	Chapter 13 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sizeUP: Self-learning • powerUP: OB Experience • teamUP: OB Lens • lightUP: OB Insights • checkUP: Learning Effectiveness
Week 12 (Apr 03 to 07) Seminar 12	Organizational Change	ILO3 ILO4 ILO5 ILO6	Chapter 14 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sizeUP: Self-learning • powerUP: OB Experience • teamUP: OB Lens • lightUP: OB Insights
Week 13 (Apr 10 to 14) Seminar 13	Course Revision & Wrap UP	ILO3 ILO4	My Reflective Learning Assignment – You are required

			to submit this assignment by the end of this seminar. Research participation due on Apr. 14, 2023, 5 p.m.
--	--	--	---

L) Research Participation

Frequently, managers need to verify their assumptions through research before making decisions. However, not many managers know how to conduct such research systematically and scientifically. The goal of this Research Participation is to expose students to the process of doing research in management.

You are required to complete 2 research requirements, each of which will correspond to 2% of your final grade. You may choose any one of the three options below:

- To participate in two (2) hours of research experiments, or
- To write two (2) reviews of articles, or
- To participate in one (1) hour of research PLUS write one (1) review of an article.

1. Participate in research experiments

Research studies conducted by NBS management professors will be conducted from Week 3 to Week 13 of the semester. Notices regarding the times and locations of studies will be posted on <https://ntu-nbs.sona-systems.com/default.aspx>. We will automatically create an account for you on this website, and you will receive your password by email.

2. Write reviews of articles

For each article review, you are required to submit a two-page critical review (from 850 to 1000 words) on any of the following empirical research articles:

- Raetze, S., Duchek, S., Maynard, M. T., & Wohlgemuth, M. (2022). Resilience in organization-related research: An integrative conceptual review across disciplines and levels of analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(6), 867.
- Lanaj, K., Jennings, R. E., Ashford, S. J., & Krishnan, S. (2021). When leader self-care begets other care: Leader role self-compassion and helping at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Miron-Spektor, E., Emich, K. J., Argote, L., & Smith, W. K. (2022). Conceiving opposites together: Cultivating paradoxical frames and epistemic motivation fosters team creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 171, 104153.
- Burris, E. R., Martins, L. D., & Kimmons, Y. (2022). Mixed Messages: why managers (do not) endorse employee voice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 172, 104185.

You are required to read the article of your choice, and then write a review of that article to address the five (5) questions below:

1. What is the main research question addressed in this article?

2. What methodology was used to test the research question? That is, what were the characteristics of the sample? Were data collected from surveys, experiments, etc.? Was the study longitudinal or were data collected at a single point in time?
3. What were the results of this study? What was the answer to the research question?
4. What are your suggestions for future research on this topic?
5. What did you learn from this study?

To satisfy the research requirement, your review should be thorough, accurate, and answer each of the five (5) questions. You should expect to spend approximately 1 to 2 hours to complete each article review. The research coordinator will determine whether your written research review meets the requirements. Reviews will receive a Pass or a Fail grade.

Should you choose to write a review of a research article, please do NOT turn it in to your instructor. Instead, please submit an electronic copy to **Turnitin Assignment Folder located at the MAIN course site**. Written research reviews are due by 5:00 pm on **April 14, 2023**. You may submit research reviews at any time before this deadline. Make sure to include your name, class seminar number, and email address on the reviews themselves.

If you have any questions about this research requirement, you should not ask your instructor. Instead, you should email the Leadership, Management, and Organization Division, Research Coordinator at LMOSubjectPool@ntu.edu.sg

M) Important Deadlines

1. Critical Thinking Assignment due on **February 24 (Friday), 9.00 pm.**
2. Design Thinking team video due on **March 10 (Friday), 9.00 pm.**
3. teamUP project analysis to be submitted 48 hours before the assigned seminar.
4. lightUP PowerPoint slides to be submitted 48 hours before the assigned seminar.
5. Teamwork Peer Evaluation due within 24 hours after your teamUP sharing.
6. Teamwork Peer Evaluation due within 24 hours after the submission of your design thinking videos.
7. "My Reflective Learning" to be submitted by the end of your scheduled Seminar 13.
8. Research Participation to be completed by **5 p.m. on April 14, 2023.**

ANNEX A: ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**Critical Thinking Rubric**

Observable traits	Weightage (%)	1-4 Poor	5-7 Average	8-10 Good
1. Defines the subject matter, identifies key concepts, and maps their relationships	20%	Does not define the subject matter, or identify the key concepts; fails to map the concepts in a logical manner	Defines the subject matter well, identifies nearly all the key concepts, and maps their relationships with one another somewhat logically	Defines the subject matter very well; identifies all the key concepts, and maps their relationships with one another logically
2. Identifies and considers OTHER theoretical perspectives that are important to the analysis of the issue	20%	Deals only with a single perspective and fails to discuss other possible perspectives, especially those salient to the issue	Develops a better understanding of the issue by discussing other perspectives drawn from external sources	Develops a comprehensive understanding of the issue by discussing other perspectives drawn from external sources
3. Identifies and assesses the quality of supporting data/evidence and provides additional data/evidence related to the issue	20%	Fails to examine validity of the information provided or provide justification for rejecting arguments provided. Confuses associations and correlations with cause and effect	Examines some of the evidence and source of evidence; questions its accuracy, precision, relevance, and completeness. Observes cause and effect, and addresses existing or potential consequences	Examines the evidence and source of evidence; questions its accuracy, precision, relevance, and completeness. Observes cause and effect, and addresses existing or potential consequences

4. Identifies and considers key assumptions and the influence of context on the issue	20%	Does not consider authors' assumptions, and does not examine contexts	Identifies and questions the validity of some assumptions made by the authors, and analyzes the issue with some sense of scope and context	Identifies and questions the validity of assumptions made by the authors, and analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and context
5. Provides a conclusion that discusses implications of the article and gives an informed, overall evaluation	20%	Fails to provide a conclusion, or provides a conclusion that is inconsistently tied to earlier discussion	Provides a conclusion that discusses some implications of the article and gives a good synthesis of the main points discussed	Provides a conclusion that logically discusses implications of the article, and gives an informed and well-thought-out overall evaluation

Design Thinking Rubric

Observable traits	(%)	1-4 Poor	5-7 Average	8-10 Good
1. Generates curiosity and interest with a succinct description of the project	25%	Description of the project does not arouse any a sense of curiosity, interest or excitement	Description of the project generates some sense of curiosity, interest, and excitement	Description of the project provokes a heightened sense of curiosity, interest, and enthusiasm
2. Seeks inspiration from a diversity of sources by observing current situational constraints, identifying possible changes, searching for opportunities, and paying special attention to “extreme” users	25%	Seeks inspiration from only one or two sources of information	Seeks inspiration from a few sources of information	Seeks inspiration from a broad diversity of sources
3. Generates many ideas, scenarios, and sketches; applies integrative thinking in ideation	25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generates only two or three ideas, scenarios, or sketches • Does not apply integrative thinking in ideation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generates a number of ideas, scenarios, and sketches • Applies some integrative thinking in ideation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generates a plethora of ideas, scenarios, and sketches • Applies integrative thinking in ideation
4. Test-drives a proposed solution with prototypes and tests; convinces others by telling a compelling story; influences others to view your proposed solution favourably.	25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducts only one or two tests of the proposed solution • Tells an unconvincing story • Applies weak influence strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducts a number of tests of the proposed solution • Tells a rather convincing story • Applies good influence strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tests the robustness of the proposed solution very well • Tells a credible & convincing story • Applies excellent influence strategies

Inspirational Assertive Communication Rubric for lightUP

Observable traits	Weightage (%)	1-4 Poor	5-7 Average	8-10 Good
1. Shares valuable knowledge and insights	25%	Shares some useful information	Shares valuable knowledge that enriches audience understanding of the matter	Creates “aha” moments in sharing interesting insights
2. Speaks in a conversational style; speaks assertively	25%	Speaks monotonously in a monologue; presents ideas vaguely	Speaks in a two-way conversational style with good intonation to capture attention and generate interest; displays confidence rather well	Speaks very well in a two-way conversational style with strategic use of intonation to sustain interest and enthusiasm; displays confidence positively
3. Aligns verbal with nonverbal communication; uses props and visual aids	25%	Does not align verbal with nonverbal communication; does not use any props or visual aids	Occasionally aligns verbal with nonverbal communication in delivering the message; uses props and visual aids quite effectively	Aligns verbal with nonverbal communication very well in reinforcing the message; uses props and visual aids strategically to make the sharing special and memorable
4. Connects insights to the relevant OB concepts or frameworks	25%	Does not logically connect insights with relevant OB concept(s) or/and framework(s)	Provides a logical connection between insights shared with relevant OB concept(s) or/and framework(s)	Provides an enriching discussion on the connection between insights shared with relevant OB concept(s) or/and framework(s)

(Note: Ames, D. R., & Flynn, F. J. (2007). What breaks a leader: The curvilinear relation between assertiveness and leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(2): 307-324.-- In contrast to prior work that focused on linear effects, the authors argue that individuals seen either as markedly low in assertiveness or as high in assertiveness are generally appraised as less effective leaders. The authors linked the curvilinear effects of assertiveness to underlying trade-offs between social outcomes (a high level of assertiveness worsens relationships) and instrumental outcomes (a low level of assertiveness limits goal achievement).

Knowledge Acquisition and Sharing Rubric for teamUP

Observable traits	%	1-4 Poor	5-7 Average	8-10 Good
1. Demonstrates a proper understanding of relevant concepts and theoretical frameworks; appropriately applies these to analyse a situation	18%	Does not fully understand or apply appropriately relevant concepts and theoretical framework	Provides good explanations and applies some concepts and theoretical frameworks appropriately	Provides an excellent analysis with proper application of many relevant concepts and theoretical frameworks
2. Considers contextual and temporal properties of the information when providing an interpretation	18%	Does not consider the impact of context or timing of information in making sense of information provided	Addresses some possible influences of contexts and timing of information in interpreting information provided	Addresses many possible influences of contexts and timing of information in interpreting information provided
3. Considers the influence of gaps in information, or lack of information, or presence of ambiguity in the information provided; explores the Internet for additional information	18%	Does not consider influence of gaps in information, or possible lack of information, or presence of ambiguity inherent in the information provided; does not search the Internet for additional information	Deliberates about some of the possible impacts of gaps in information, or lack of information, or ambiguity inherent in the information provided; enriches somewhat the understanding or interpretation of the situation with additional information	Deliberates very well about the possible impacts of gaps in information, or lack of information, or ambiguity inherent in the information provided; greatly enriches the understanding or interpretation of the situation with additional information
4. Gives an informed, overall evaluation	18%	Provides a conclusion that is inconsistently tied to earlier discussion	Gives a good synthesis of the main points discussed	Gives an informed and well thought out overall evaluation
5. Uses an effective delivery format to present team case analysis with equal participation by each member	28%	Uses a formalistic, or lukewarm, unengaging, unenthusiastic, and ineffective delivery format to present team case analysis in a read-out, non-interactive manner, without equal participation of each member	Uses a somewhat engaging, quite enthusiastic, and moderately effective delivery format to present team case analysis in a sufficiently interactive manner, with some but unequal participation of each member.	Uses a warm, engaging, enthusiastic and effective delivery format to present team case analysis interactively with equal participation of each member.

“My Reflective Learning” rubric

Observable traits	Weightage (%)	1 – 4 Poor	5 – 7 Average	8 – 10 Good
1. Reporting and relating Recalls what happened and observes the connection between a chosen life event and one’s own personality, values, knowledge, skills, and abilities	20%	Does not provide adequate details of the life event; does not elaborate on the connection between said life event and one’s own characteristics.	Provides adequate details of the life event; elaborates well on the connection between said life event and one’s own characteristics.	Provides insightful details of the life event and elaborates very well on the connection between said life event and one’s own characteristics.
2 Reasoning Applies the appropriate theoretical concepts and frameworks to analyse a real-life event	60%	Does not provide a logical analysis of the situation when applying chosen theoretical frameworks	Provides a logical analysis of the situation when applying chosen theoretical frameworks appropriately	Provides a comprehensive and insightful analysis of the situation when applying chosen theoretical frameworks appropriately
3. Reconstructing Reframes future actions for handling similar situations and explains what might work and why.	20%	Does not explain possible future actions well and why they might work	Discusses possible future actions well, and explains why they might work	Discusses very well possible future actions and why they might work

References:

- Bain, J.D., Ballantyne, R., Mills, C., & Lester, N.C. (2002). *Reflecting on practice: Student teachers’ perspectives*. Flaxton, QLD: Post Pressed.
- Ryan, M. & Ryan, M. (2012). Theorising a model for teaching and assessing reflective learning in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development - HIGH EDUC RES DEV*. 32. 1-14. 10.1080/07294360.2012.661704.

Knowledge Sharing Rubric for voiceUP

Observable Traits	Weightage (%)	1-4 Poor	5-7 Average	8-10 Good
<p>Contributes to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review, powerUP, & Seminar Summary – provides insights that enrich understanding of certain concepts or frameworks • teamUP – provides probing questions that promote critical thinking, or provides logical answers to questions posted by others • lightUP – provides feedback that is insightful and encouraging 	<p>100%</p>	<p>Contributes to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Review, powerUP, & Seminar Summary” – provides ideas that barely or hardly enrich understanding of certain concepts or frameworks • teamUP – provides barely probing questions that barely or hardly promote critical thinking, or provides answers that are not well-argued • lightUP – provides feedback that is barely insightful and hardly encouraging 	<p>Contributes to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Review, powerUP, & Seminar Summary” – provides ideas that somewhat enrich understanding of certain concepts or frameworks • teamUP – provides somewhat probing questions that promote critical thinking to some degree, or provides logical answers • lightUP –provides feedback that is somewhat insightful and quite encouraging to some degree 	<p>Contributes to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Review, powerUP & Seminar Summary” – provides insights that definitely enrich understanding of certain concepts or frameworks • teamUP – provides obviously probing questions that unquestionably promote critical thinking, or provides excellent, well-argued answers • lightUP – provides feedback that is remarkably insightful and definitely encouraging

Teamwork Peer Evaluation Rubric

It is difficult for your instructor to assess the contribution of each member to various team-based activities. Hence, it is critical for you to rate the contribution of your team members objectively and impartially. **It is mandatory for you to submit your peer evaluation at the end of each team project for you to get marks for your team-based assignments.**

To factor peer evaluations into the final grades of various team-based assignments, the following computation will be used:

- If, on average, you receive a rating of 80 or more, you will receive 100% of the team's grade.
- If, on average, you receive a rating of less than 80, you will receive a specific percentage of the team's grade as determined by the formulae below:

An average rating of 70 to < 80 = $90 + (\text{average rating obtained} - 70)$

An average rating of 60 to < 70 = $80 + (\text{average rating obtained} - 60)$

An average rating of 50 to < 60 = $70 + (\text{average rating obtained} - 50)$

An average rating of 40 to < 50 = $60 + (\text{average rating obtained} - 40)$

An average rating of 30 to < 40 = $50 + (\text{average rating obtained} - 30)$

An average rating of 20 to < 30 = $40 + (\text{average rating obtained} - 20)$

Your instructor will investigate an average rating of < 20 and the student may receive **0%** of group grades.

Example:

Assume the overall team assignment is 60 marks. If you got an average rating of 89, you get 100% of 60 marks, i.e., 60 marks. If you got an average rating of 62.9, you get 49.74%, i.e., $[80 + (62.9 - 60)] / 100 * 60$ marks.

All evaluations are confidential. Your instructor reserves the right to review ratings if circumstances suggest that discrimination, bias, malice, etc. may have been in play with regard to your peer assessment. The teamwork peer evaluation form is shown below.

Please rate each member in your group (excluding yourself) on four dimensions by using the 1 to 10 evaluation scale shown below. Input a whole number (no decimals) from 1 to 10 for each dimension.

Names of group members	Effort put into the project: The amount of work put into the project, such as coming to meetings on time; contributing ideas; performing assigned duties comprehensively; helping to organize meetings.	Merit of contribution: The strength of contribution, such as the effectiveness of contributions in terms of quality of outputs; creativity of ideas.	Constructive team behaviors: Listens attentively to and seeks inputs from others; helps smooth functioning of the group; respect for others; fosters group camaraderie.	Commitment to the team: Behaves ethically by accepting full responsibility for assigned duties; exhibits group citizenship behavior, such as helping others when needed; places priority on group meetings.	For any rating that is below 8, please provide a brief explanation.
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					