

TITLE

The Learning Effectiveness of Cross-Discipline Collaboration within Media Production BA Projects.

AUTHOR

Mik Parsons. Senior Lecturer in Video and Interactive Media Production at The Media School, Bournemouth University.
mparsons@bournemouth.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This paper considers the learning potential released by teaching to groups across different disciplines within media production. A single six week unit was delivered to eighteen groups of students, each group comprising a mix from BA Television Production, BA Interactive Media Production and BA Scriptwriting for Film and Television, all at level C. Each group of approximately nine students was required to create a DVD programme with associated website on the topic of 'crime prevention'. The paper considers the logistics of organising and delivering the programme and the ways in which staff and students related to the cross-discipline nature of the unit. It also considers the approaches taken to assess the students and their project work. The investigation involved a mixture of questionnaires and interviews conducted after completion of the unit.

INTRODUCTION

“Collaboration may be defined as the collective discovery and acquisition of a body of knowledge. In a more restrictive definition, a collaborative project is one that reflects the cumulative contributions of a selected group of class members rather than a product of any one individual”.
(Garland et al, [1999])

Pedagogic context:

Established methods of teaching and learning have been largely based on traditional techniques of lectures, seminars and tutorials delivered to groups of students or individuals. Learning is usually measured through the assessment of an individually produced assignment.

Within media production courses there has always been a special place for project work which is completed by a group of students working together. Group production work takes place in all three of the BA media production courses at the Media School (MS) within Bournemouth University. The clearest example is BA Television Production (BATV) where production follows industry practice and requires a hierarchical team covering responsibilities from producer/director/writer to camera/sound/lighting, and then on to postproduction, design and editing. Specialist roles are divided between student teams normally comprising between four and six students.

Within BA Scriptwriting for Film and TV (BASW), most of the student work is done individually, i.e. writing scripts, but again students undertake at least one TV production project in order to experience the realization of a script and here again they work in collaborative groups. The trio of production courses at BMS is completed by BA Interactive Media Production (BAIMP). On this course students work on a combination of individually-based and group-based projects. The broad nature of the course requires a range of skills from graphics to programming and from writing to video production, and the course team encourages collaborations with students on other courses as well as from within the cohort.

Assessing group work requires special consideration since there are many factors which affect the quality of the final project and applying a single grade/mark to the artefact is never a satisfactory or fair solution. In order to include an element of individual weighting, one simple approach is to divide the project into two assessable components, the project itself and an essay in which each student reflects on the process and their contribution. The weighting of the marks can be adjusted to take more or less account of the individual contribution. 60% on the project, 40% on the essay is commonly used.

Again this model is limited and makes no useful measure of particularly weak or particularly talented students.

Peer assessment has been used with varying success on the BMS production courses, both paper based and online versions providing different approaches. The GWAMP (Group Work Assessment in Media Production) survey 2000 to 2004 (www.cemp.ac.uk/research/teaching/gwamp.html) has been a centre of debate and development for refining these processes. The aim of the survey was to find and disseminate good practice in group work and assessment and one of the outcomes has been the development of an online peer assessment tool, CASPAR.

Whilst a collaborative group-work approach within student projects is quite common, particularly in media production courses, it was not easy to find any examples of collaboration between students across different courses. An internet search revealed only two examples of institutions with cross-course collaborative projects in their curriculum – and both of these were outside the UK.

Stanford University runs a project called ‘Trails’ which is an interdisciplinary collaborative project between students from computer science, information science, education and the arts to design interactive educational tools.

More information can be found at <http://www.trails-project.org/> (Ref: 2) although this is of limited interest here since it is not media-based.

In Canada, Simon Fraser University has an online dance course that provides cross-course collaboration between arts and life sciences students. The project involves the 3D animation of the human figure. (Garland et al, [1999]).

The paper on this project provided some useful information and guidance but again this was of limited relevance since the project was based on dance rather than recorded media

The nearest example occurs at The Arts Institute, Bournemouth which runs a required collaborative project between the Directing for Film and Acting for Film students. It involves the making of a short film with the acting students doing the directing, and

the directing students doing the acting. Students work together to complete a project as an assessed part of their respective courses.

Whilst collaboration within production courses is commonplace, at the Media School collaboration across courses has only really taken place on an ad-hoc basis. For example level H BAIMP students are encouraged to choose team skills not only from within their cohort, but also to look beyond the course for specialists in computer animation, or sound/music design or TV directing. Similarly Level H BATV students will often link up with scriptwriters and use them as script-editors. This commissioning process is encouraged by staff but in reality driven by the students in their efforts to improve the quality of their final year productions. Contributors from other courses are not normally assessed on this work and so the benefit to them is purely on their learning experience and employability. Since there is no effective assessment model for cross-course collaboration, this area of work is ripe for development. It is axiomatic that a BATV production is dependent on the quality of its script and similarly it could be said that a BA Interactive Media project is dependent on the quality of its assets. BA Scriptwriters also need to be tempered by the knowledge and experience of the production processes occurring outside their own course.

The three media production courses (BAIMP, BATV, BASW) were all rewritten for the year commencing 2005/06 and since this was done simultaneously there was an opportunity to coordinate across the courses and prepare a production-based unit which emphasized collaboration across the three disciplines. The unit was called simply: “Summer Project”. The first iteration of this project occurred over six weeks from April 2006 and involved one hundred and forty eight students. The eighteen productions resulting from this project were well received by both students and the staff involved and it was retrospectively felt that further research into this area would be beneficial.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this paper are to use the ‘Summer Project’ case study to:

- evaluate the effectiveness of collaboration in cross-discipline media-production.
- evaluate the teaching and learning resources and processes.
- provide a critique of the assessment.

THE CASE STUDY

The Summer Project unit was provided as the last of four production units at level C. It was the only unit which was delivered simultaneously to BATV, BAIMP, and BASW course cohorts and required collaboration of students across all three of the courses. The unit lasted for six weeks starting with a briefing lecture and ended with a series of project screenings followed by assessment. (See Appendix 1 for a full Unit Guide).

The total number of students was a hundred and forty eight, comprising fifty seven Students from BATV, fifty from BAIMP and forty one from BASW. The students were divided into eighteen groups averaging eight students in each group (e.g. three

TV students, three IMP students and two SW students). The groups were predefined by staff and the students had no choice about who they worked with. Groupings were random - the only control applied was to monitor the male/female balance within the groups.

An extract from the unit guide shows the aims, learning outcomes and the assessment methods of the project:

Aim of Unit

To consolidate and communicate production skills and critical learning in a collaborative media project between Scriptwriting, Interactive Media and Television Production.

Intended Learning Outcomes

Having completed this unit the student is expected to demonstrate:

- O1 An understanding of image, narratives and audience needs in a collaboratively produced artefact;
- O2 An ability to evaluate and reflect on this production, including their own role;
- O3 An ability to work in groups as well as independently to produce a cross course project.

Assessment

Students will be required to submit three elements of assessment for this unit. ILO 1 and 3 will be assessed via a group production project (50% of the unit's weighting). ILO 2 will be assessed through an individual production analysis of 1,500 words (20% of the unit's weighting). ILO 3 will be assessed by peer assessment (30% of the unit's weighting).

The briefing lecture was accompanied by a briefing document specifying the requirements of the project (Appendix 2). The following extract gives an outline of the project:

CLIENT: The Police

The police have allocated funding to extend their Crime Awareness programme to include new media forms and in particular video and the internet.

BRIEF

Choose from the following crime topics:

Burglary

Car crime

Street crimes and muggings

Create an interactive programme-package which raises public awareness of crime and informs them of ways to avoid becoming victims. The package should be designed to engage and appeal to an audience of your definition, and provide encouragement to follow weblinks to relevant and more informative sites.

The programme should comprise a linear video component, with or without chapter headings, on DVD format, and also an associated website.

The Unit Guide (Appendix 1) gives full information about the teaching schedule and a week by week breakdown of the structure of the unit over the six weeks. Following the initial briefing the students were supervised by six academic staff – two from each course. Each tutor was responsible for overseeing three groups and providing them each with two production seminars. In addition, each member of staff took a ‘duty’ week on the online ‘hot-seat’. The hot-seat was aimed to facilitate discussion on a forum basis with staff offering different aspects of expertise from within scriptwriting and production.

Production workshops were also offered providing additional instruction in software and video hardware. Eighteen production groups meant that the resources needed to be scheduled and shared fairly. Video acquisition was a particular problem and the camera kits had to be allocated to the eighteen groups over a two week period so that each group had fair access.

Assessment of the project was done in three components according to the specifications in the Unit Guide. The project was given a group mark and this was arrived at in each case by assigning two staff markers to each project (each staff member was from a different discipline). Students were also required to write a 1500 word reflective essay and also complete a peer assessment (Appendix 3).

METHODOLOGY

The project was undertaken in April and May of 2006. The decision to analyse the production as a case study was taken retrospectively and data collection began in November 2006. Information was gathered using two methods. The first entailed interviews with the six staff, conducted in pairs according to their subject specialisms. These interviews were recorded as digital audio files. The second method involved the use of a questionnaire (Appendix 4). This was designed primarily for a focus group of participating students. Staff members were also asked to complete the questionnaires in order to provide comparative data.

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

The staff interviews resulted in a range of opinions, some at variance but the majority in agreement, and included several suggestions for improvement.

All were agreed that the overall concept of the Unit is very good and reflects industry practice and needs. One took the view that in industry, production teams would meet initially and then separate and work separately in their respective disciplines, only coming together at scheduled meetings. Another view was that continuous collaboration throughout reflected the experience of many graduates when first entering the industry via small budget productions. Either approach to the collaborative process is relevant and this was reflected in the ways in which the student groupings developed.

The final results of the project work were extremely encouraging and all the staff felt the Unit had been successful overall. Disadvantages were seen to be in the running of the unit and getting the students to collaborate more successfully. In particular it was felt by some that more consideration was needed in order to get the Scriptwriters to engage more fully with the production processes. The Scriptwriter staff and students

did not share this view however, and felt that their engagement had been very good except in a few isolated cases. The role of a Project Manager was seen to be very influential in the success of the collaborations. Groups were encouraged to appoint a Project Manager and avoid the 'decision by committee' approach. One member of staff suggested rotating this role within the group on a weekly basis.

Assessment was universally felt to be problematic. Three components to the assessment seemed to be too much particularly at such a busy time of the academic year. Some staff found it difficult to make assessments about other subject areas' contributions e.g. websites. A system of tick-box assessment for the essays had been introduced in order to make the process more efficient but some staff felt this did not work well and either needed more careful design or else dropping altogether. It was generally agreed that the peer assessment was of a high importance and should be given greater weighting in the assessment. There were mixed feelings about the usefulness of the essay. Staff felt that it was helpful for the students to be reflective but that this could be covered in another unit (Personal Development Planning) and that the peer assessment could then be given more weighting.

The hot-seat arrangement was hardly used during the project; some staff felt it unnecessary and that email could be used more effectively. Another view was that it needed better promotion and that all the staff should be available online throughout.

Fourteen responses to the questionnaire were collected (six staff and eight students). Results from the questionnaire can be found in Appendix 5 but a summary/analysis follows here:

Project Topic

The documentary/informational category was felt to be the best option (this also included the original Crime brief which fell into that category). There was more diversity in the student opinions some of whom would have preferred an open brief, an interactive story, or a game option.

Production Format

There was no clear agreement on this. A video-embedded website or a website with accompanying DVD were equally popular. One member of staff suggested interactive TV as an approach, with the possibility of distributing through other cross-platform media.

Unit duration

The majority of staff felt that 6 weeks was about right, but the student opinion suggested that 8 weeks would be more popular.

Seminars

All the staff thought two seminars were appropriate given the timescale. Student opinion generally agreed but there were a significant number who thought an extra seminar would be useful (one scriptwriting student suggested a seminar every week).

The online 'hot-seat'

Staff felt that the idea was ok but that email to the individual or to the whole cohort would be more accessible and effective. Students simply commented that they had not used the hot seat facility.

Facilities and workshops

These areas received broad support, although there were some misgivings about the quality of camera workshops, and the TV staff felt overburdened with kit sign-off tutorials.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Summer Project appears to be the only example of a student-collaboration project delivered across different courses within media production, and the apparent success of the project suggests that it is worth continuing and developing. The case study revealed a number of issues, but the most significant were connected with the logistics of delivery, the dynamics of collaboration and the adopted modes and tools of assessment.

The case study project was immediately a complex one to deliver because of the sheer size of the operation. A hundred and eighty four students divided into eighteen groups with each group requiring seminars, workshops and production resources. The required production resources and technical reliability were relatively demanding (DV cameras, tripods, microphones, monitors, computer editing workstations, DVD and website authoring software, screening room). Many of the complexities of delivery could be avoided by undertaking the project on a smaller scale and it would be interesting to consider situations where this might be possible – in a more dedicated but smaller course option perhaps, or by staggering a large group through the unit at different times of the year. A shorter variant of the project could also be used within a conference or residential setting with more emphasis on group dynamics than production skills.

The collaborative dynamics between the students was largely seen to be successful from both the student and the staff perspective and this was reflected in the final quality of the work presented. All were agreed though that this aspect was the most important to concentrate on, both in terms of setting the project assignment up properly and also in its assessment. For example, a suggestion that the Scriptwriters be required to write content for the website would be one way to increase and spread their involvement. Similarly, the essay-brief could require more to be written about the production areas beyond the students' specialism, e.g. Script writers would be credited for their understanding and engagement with the TV and IMP areas.

With regards to assessment, it was generally agreed that three components to the assessment was too many. During the Summer Term staff are very busy with marking of BA third year degree work and are looking for ways to reduce the assessment loading from earlier years of their courses. The most important components to assess were felt to be the project itself and the collaborative dynamics through peer assessment. The reflective essay was felt to be less appropriate since the issues expressed by students could either be picked up in another unit within each course (e.g. PDP (Personal Development Programme)), or expressed within the peer assessment assignment. Project assessment needed to be done by at least two and

preferably three staff members - one from each subject area. Although in the case study two assessors were used for each project, there was still some concern about confidence in marking areas outside the staff specialism.

The collaborative dynamics did require careful setting up but this was largely left to individual tutors to organise within their supervision groups. This needs a more common and informed approach and needs to be initiated early in the project – partly at the briefing but more certainly during the first seminar. The role of Project Manager was felt to be extremely important for example, and whether the role should be given to one person throughout or rotated on a weekly basis would have a significant impact on the overall group dynamic.

Ultimately, improving the collaborative dynamics may be an issue which could be solved through the assessment process. The CASPAR online assessment tool (see above) enables both formative and summative peer assessment to take place. Peer to peer formative assessment would enable students within a group to reflect back to each other about their respective performance during the project rather than relying on an essay reflection at the end. Using this tool, students would be able to modify their performance and engagement following comments and critique from members of their own group. Working within the CASPAR model, students could be required to complete the peer assessment with a reflective account of their own contribution and that of the others in their group. This would negate the need for an additional reflective essay as part of the assessment, and thereby reduce the number of assessed components to just two.

On a final note, students pointed out that having completed the summer project they would be more inspired to seek out specialist collaborators when planning their final year projects, and that they now had a better awareness of who and what to look for. Several staff also commented that following the success of the Summer Project, the idea of student collaborative projects should be planned to continue in level I units.

Further research could be based on the second iteration of this project with data collection and analysis based on the use of the CASPAR peer assessment tool which was not used in the first iteration. The initial research for this paper also brought to light a learning technique used in the Arts Institute at Bournemouth whereby collaboration takes place across the year groups within a single course. For example on the BA Animation course, students at level C are required to work as in-between artists for students at level I. More research could be conducted into the viability of this ‘cross-year’ approach in relation to the Bournemouth Media courses.

REFERENCES

1. GWAMP <http://www.cemp.ac.uk/research/teaching/gwamp.html>
2. Stanford University project ‘Trails’. (2005). <http://www.trails-project.org/>
3. Garland I., Teles L., Wang X., (1999). Fostering Creativity through Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration in an Online Dance Course. Conference on Computer Support for Collaborative Learning. (1999). Simon Fraser University.

FURTHER READING

Downie, N., (2001), Assessing Group Work in Higher Education. Oxford Brookes University

Gibbs, G., (1995), Assessing Student Centred Courses. Oxford Centre for Staff Development.

Mercier E., Booker A., Goldman S. (2005), Bringing Collaboration Front and Center in a Cross-disciplinary Design Course. Paper presented at ED-MEDIA 2005, World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia & Telecommunications, Montreal, Canada.

Race, P., (2001) A Briefing on Self, Peer, and Group Assessment. LTSN Generic Centre.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1
A full Unit Guide



BOURNEMOUTH MEDIA SCHOOL

BA (Hons) Television Production
BA (Hons) Interactive Media Production
BA (Hons) Scriptwriting for Film and Television

Summer Projects

Unit Guide

Level C

2005 - 06

BATV, BASW, BAIMP

Level C

Aim of Unit

To consolidate and communicate production skills and critical learning in a collaborative media project between Scriptwriting, Interactive Media and Television Production.

Intended Learning Outcomes

Having completed this unit the student is expected to demonstrate:

- 01** An understanding of image, narratives and audience needs in a collaboratively produced artefact;
- 02** An ability to evaluate and reflect on this production, including their own role;
- 03** An ability to work in groups as well as independently to produce a cross course project.

Assessment

Students will be required to submit three elements of assessment for this unit. ILO 1 and 3 will be assessed via a group production project (50% of the unit's weighting). ILO 2 will be assessed through an individual production analysis of 1,500 words (20% of the unit's weighting). ILO 3 will be assessed by peer assessment (30% of the unit's weighting).

INDICATIVE CONTENT

Managing cross-course collaboration. Project management. Group work skills and peer assessment. Students working in groups to develop their projects, each with individual responsibilities.

Teaching and learning

You will be working in groups across the three programmes for this project. The project seeks to equip you with skills of group working and collaboration, allowing you to contribute to a multidisciplinary piece of work.

Your group will be allocated a tutor who will meet you and provide you with guidance about planning the project and working as a team to a deadline. Your tutor will **not** be the source of production input for your work. You will have the opportunity to attend production clinics which will be focussed on problem solving and will be led by interactive media, television production and scriptwriting academics. You should attend the appropriate clinic to address your specific problem, for example, if you are having problems crafting the script then representatives from your group can attend a scriptwriting production clinic. In addition, there will be technical clinics in which you will have support, again on a problem solving basis, from demonstrators.

The Schedule

The summer project is a six week project. Much of the time you will be working independently as a team with specific individual responsibilities to ensure the project will be completed on time and be of high quality.

The schedule for the six weeks is as follows

Week one	briefing, initial tutorials
Week two	group tutorials
Week three	production clinics, shoots, technical clinics
Week four	production clinics, shoots, technical clinics
Week five	production clinics , shoots, technical clinics, group tutorials,
Week six	technical clinics ,
Week seven	screening and exhibition of work, submission of production analysis and peer assessment

Your work will be submitted (x 2 DVD) on Monday 29th of May. The screenings and exhibition of the work will be on the following day, Tuesday 30th May. Your production analysis and peer assessment submissions will be on Friday 2 June .

The Briefing (Marconi Lecture Theatre, 11-12, Tuesday 18th April)

You will be briefed alongside the whole of the BASW, BATV and BAIMP cohorts. Your briefing will cover:

- Intended learning outcomes of the summer project
- Assessment including peer assessment
- Working in a group
- The brief
- Timetable for the summer project
- The brief for first group tutorial

There will be an opportunity for an initial meeting with your group and tutor soon after the briefing lecture. Your tutor will give you a time for your first group tutorial.

Group Tutorials

Your first group tutorial will be scheduled for week two of the project. For this tutorial you should bring:

- A draft treatment for the project, and be prepared to present this to your tutor. (A template you can follow will be available from Media2)
- An allocation of proposed roles to members of the group
- A draft production plan for the project

Your final tutorial is scheduled for the fifth week of the project, and the focus for this tutorial is :

- A report on progress
- Any final questions
- Preparation for presentation , screening and peer assessment

Please be aware that the first group tutorial is on a Tuesday, and the second is on a Monday.

Delivery

Group tutorials : 30 mins between 10-12 Tuesday 25 April. and 10-12 Monday 15 May

Tuesday 25th April -

Andrew Ireland Groups : CG11
Lizzie Sykes Groups : CG17
Mik Parsons Groups CG18
James Jordan Groups DG02
Jan Weddup Groups C205
Phil Mathews Groups W402

Monday 15th May

Andrew Ireland Groups : Room TBA
Lizzie Sykes Groups : Room TBA
Mik Parsons Groups: Room TBA
James Jordan Groups : Room TBA
Jan Weddup Groups : Room TBA
Phil Mathews Groups : Room TBA

Production Clinics

In addition to these group tutorials, academics from the three different discipline areas will offer 'clinics' to answer and discuss queries relating to your projects as they are developed. These will operate on a sign-up basis, as follows:

Production Clinics: 20 min sessions, available Tuesdays 2 May, 9 May, 16 May between 2-4pm in academics' rooms.

Academics : Mik Parsons, Interactive Media Production, room W208
 James Jordan, Interactive Media Production, room W209
 Jan Weddup, Scriptwriting, room W214
 Phil Mathews, Scriptwriting, room W214
 Andrew Ireland, Television Production, room W202
 Lizzie Sykes, Television Production, room W211

Technical Clinics

We are also offering demonstrator-led technical clinics which are designed to help you with specific technical queries as your project develops. These clinics operate with the same structure as the Production Clinics outlined above:

Technical Clinics : 20 mins sessions, available Tuesdays 2 May, 9 May, 16 May, 23 May between 2-4pm in demonstrators' rooms. All camera / editing / interactive media enquiries of a technical nature should be directed here.

On-line support

In addition to face to face contact with your group, tutors and demonstrators we will provide the opportunity for you to use our on-line environment to gain extra support.

We will operate a series of **hot seats** during the project. Each week one tutor will prompt discussion on-line regarding aspects of the project, its production and management, and group working. These will take place as follows:

Hot seats

Week	Leader	Topic
------	--------	-------

Week one	Mik Parsons	Interpreting the brief
Week two	Phil Mathews	Defining your audience and writing the Script for your audience
Week three	Lizzie Sykes	Preparing for the shoot, allocating roles in the shoot to Scriptwriting and Interactive Media students
Week four	Jan Weddup	Script into production/ working as a group
Week five	Andrew Ireland	Editing
Week six	James Jordan	Preparing for exhibition

Hot seats are available on Media2, through the Summer Project page accessed through your respective programme page (BATV, BASW, BAIMP).

Team discussion forum

In addition to the **hot seats** to help problem-solving as you progress through your work, we have set up a virtual space for you to discuss ideas within your group and with two other groups (all led by the same tutor). Therefore if for example you are working in a group with Lizzie Sykes, you will be able to discuss project ideas with the remainder of your group and with the members of the other two groups that Lizzie supervises. The purpose of these groups is to encourage you to work together across groups to solve problems collaboratively.

These are also available on media2 through the Summer Project page.

Assessment

Your group's production work (50% of the unit mark) will be assessed using the following criteria:

- Demonstration of understanding images, narratives and audience;
- Appropriateness of work to the brief's specific requirements;
- Coherence of package of production work
- Production values

Your individual production analyses (20% of the unit mark) will be assessed using the following criteria:

- Evaluation of the development of the production
- Assessment of your role within the production process
- Demonstration of understanding of the process involved within collaborative work

Finally, you will be asked to engage in peer assessment which is outlined in the peer assessment form provided within this guide. This will contribute 30% of the unit mark.

You must pass all three elements of assessment.

INDICATIVE KEY LEARNING RESOURCES

Key Texts: Production

Gloman, C., and Letourneau U, T., 2005. *Placing Shadows. Lighting Techniques for Video Production*, Focal Press
Hughes B, 1999, *Dust and Magic*, Addison Wesley
Kindem, G., and Musburger, R., 2005. *Introduction to Media Production*, Focal Press
Koren and Meckler, 2001, *Graphic Design Cookbook*, Chronicle Books
Millerson, G., 1993. *Video Production*, Focal Press
Persidsky A, 2004, *DirectorMX*, Peachpit
Rabiger, M., 2003. *Directing: Techniques & Aesthetics*, Focal Press
Rabiger, M., 2004. *Directing the Documentary*, Focal Press
Rush, M., 1999. *New Media in Late 20th Century Art*. Thames & Hudson.
Seiter, E., 1999. *Television and New Media Audiences*. Clarendon Press.
Towers T, 2005, *DreamWeaver*, Peachpit
Ulrich K, 2005, *FlashMX*, Peachpit
VITmedia, *Successful Video Production* (8 programmes)
Weinneman L, 2002, *Designing Web Graphics*, New Riders

Key resources: Group Working

WEBSITE

CASPAR website: www.gwamp.bournemouth.ac.uk/caspar
GWAMP Resources: www.gwamp.bournemouth.ac.uk

BOUD, D., COHEN, R. & SAMPSON, J., 1999. Peer learning and assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 24 (4), 413 - 426

BOURNER, J., HUGHES, M. & BOURNER, T., 2001, First-year undergraduate experiences of group project work. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 26 (1), 19 - 39

BROWN, S., RUST, C. & GIBBS, G., 1994. Involving students in the assessment process, in *Strategies for Diversifying Assessments in Higher Education*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff Development

CONWAY, R., KEMBER, D., SIVIAN, A. & WU, M., 1993. Peer assessment of an individual's contribution to a group project. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18 (1)

GARVIN, J. W. & BUTCHER, A. C., 1995. Group Projects for First-year University Students: An Evaluation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 20 (3), 273 - 289

GATFIELD, T., 1999. Examining Student Satisfaction with Group Projects and Peer Assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 24 (4), 365 - 377

JACQUES, D., 1984. *Learning in Groups*. London: Croom Helm

KOLB, D.A., 1984. *Experiential Learning. Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

LIVINGSTONE, D., 2000. Group Project Work and Student-Centred Active Learning: two different approaches. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25 (3), 325 - 344

MILLS, P. & WOODALL, P., 2004. A comparison of the responses of first and second year veterinary science students to group project work. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 9 (4), 477 - 538

OLDFIELD, K.A. & MacALPINE, M.K., 1995. Peer and self assessment at tertiary level - an experiential report. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 20 (1), 125 - 132

TUCKMAN, B.W., 1965. Development sequence in small groups, *Psychological Bulletin*, 63, 384 - 399

WHEELAN, S. A., DAVIDSON, B. & TILIN, F., 2003, Group Development Across Time - Reality or Illusion? *Small group Research*, 34 (2), 223 - 245

WHEELAN, S.A., 1990. *Facilitating training groups: A guide to leadership and verbal intervention skills*. New York: Praeger

CONFIDENTIAL

Bournemouth Media School

Summer Projects

Peer Assessment Sheet

Name of student being assessed:

Please put a tick in the box that best describes your view

	Agree			Disagree		
	A	B	C	D	E	
Makes an excellent contribution to group discussions						Does not contribute much to discussions
Can be relied upon totally to carry out allocated roles / tasks						Needs supervision to complete tasks
Has developed high quality project management / skills for role						Needs considerable support to carry out role well
Very effective member of the team						Does not work easily in a team
Accepts and acts upon advice and criticism						Not very willing to accept advice and criticism
Is always punctual and reliable						Often late and / or unreliable

Supporting evidence:

Mark proposed: % [next page for grade equivalents]

Your name:.....Your group:..... Date:.....

Signature:.....

Marking Scheme for Peer Assessment

70+% First Mainly As

This mark applies only to students who have consistently made a full and exemplary contribution to group work.

They have been fully involved in group discussions and decision making, and can always be relied upon to carry out all the allocated roles and tasks within the group work. They have shown highly-developed technical abilities that allow them to perform their roles effectively, and / or they have consistently demonstrated good project management skills by planning and delivering key tasks in an exemplary manner. They have shown a willingness to accept and act upon advice and criticism made by their colleagues in the group as well as the tutor. They have demonstrated an excellent professional attitude and are always present, on time, and fully involved.

60-69% II i Mainly As and Bs

These students have made a good range of contributions to group discussions, and have shown themselves to be reliable in carrying out their allocated roles and tasks. They have developed good technical abilities and understandings to allow them to perform their role effectively, and / or they have good time management and project management skills that enable them to plan and deliver their part of the group work. They have shown an ability to act upon advice and criticism made by their colleagues, and their good professional attitude is evidenced by their commitment and punctuality for group meetings and activities.

50-59% II ii Mainly Cs or a mixture of grades.

Students in this category have made a fair contribution to group discussions. They may have needed to be supervised to ensure completion of their tasks, and may have required some technical or project management support. They may have sometimes been late to group meetings or activities or have been unreliable in meeting deadlines. Their work is competent but lacks flair.

40-49% III Mainly Ds

These students have not contributed much to group discussions and have proved to be unreliable in completing tasks without supervision and technical support. They do not work easily in a team and are not willing to accept advice and criticism.

Under 40% Fail Mainly Es

Students in this category have performed unsatisfactorily in the group activity. This mark is awarded exceptionally and you should discuss with your tutor before submitting the form.

Such students have not made an acceptable contribution to the group work and have consistently shown themselves to be unreliable in meeting deadlines and completing allocated tasks. They do not accept advice or criticism and have not demonstrated a competent level of technical skills.

APPENDIX 1

DRAFT LETTER

(Sheila Daubeney has copies of this letter if you need them)

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

_____ is a first year degree student at the Bournemouth Media School at Bournemouth University.

Part of the Degree submission requires that he/she produces a video interactive project. This letter certifies that he/she is a bone fide student at the Bournemouth University.

Students rely heavily upon the generosity and support of many individuals and institutions for the completion of these projects, and I appreciate any assistance you are able to offer.

I confirm that the University carries a Public Liability Insurance to a maximum indemnity of £10,000,000, of which further details can be obtained from the Chief Accountant.

Supervising Tutor

Date

Appendix 2

Full briefing document specifying the requirements of the project

The Summer Project Brief.
BAIMP1 BASW1 BATV1

CLIENT: The Police

The police have allocated funding to extend their Crime Awareness programme to include new media forms and in particular video and the internet.

BRIEF

Choose from the following crime topics:

Burglary
Car crime
Street crimes and muggings

Create an interactive programme-package which raises public awareness of crime and informs them of ways to avoid becoming victims.

The package should be designed to engage and appeal to an audience of your definition, and provide encouragement to follow weblinks to relevant and more informative sites.

The programme should comprise a linear video component, with or without chapter headings, on DVD format, and also an associated website. The linear video should be between 5 – 7 minutes in length and planned in such a way that it is symbiotically* related to the website. Likewise the website should be related to the video. The website should be made in html (DreamWeaver) but in addition to text and photographs and links, it must also contain a Shockwave Director file which has interactive elements and includes some video and audio. The shockwave video content may be up to two minutes in total and may or may not be extracted from the linear video programme.

*symbiotic -A relationship of mutual benefit or dependence

SUBMISSION DETAILS

The finished programme should be in the form of:

A freestanding video on DVD and a symbiotically related html website (on CD-ROM) which contains images and text and a Director Shockwave file with interactive content. Video maximum 5-7 minutes linear video and max 2 minutes shockwave video

Submission: Produce 2 copies of each disc (ie 4 discs in total, CD-R and DVD). The Group Number must be labelled on each disc surface using a permanent marker pen (One set to hand in, one to bring to the exhibition)

Hand in by noon on Monday 29th

Screening on Tuesday 30th

PROCESS (Concept, Development and Realisation)

Brainstorm collate and choose an idea

Research the idea for information and viability
Develop the idea into a tightly focussed and coherent plan
Refine the plan and produce:

An outline synopsis
A script of the video
A visual design and flowchart of the website
A Production plan
A draft interface design including the Director file
An allocation of main production roles

You should aim to bring drafts of these documents to the first production tutorial on the Tuesday of week 2

Acquire the required media and content assets
Produce the site and interface
Complete media post production
Assemble the programme
Test the programme
Submit and showcase

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Your production work will be assessed using the following criteria:

- Demonstration of understanding images, narratives and audience;
- Appropriateness of work to the brief's specific requirements;
- Coherence of package of production work
- Production values

Refs (also see Unit Guide)

www.bbc.co.uk/crime/prevention/index.shtml
www.mcgruff.org/sitemap.htm
www.bbc.co.uk/crime/news/funandgames.shtml
www.theaa.com/allaboutcars/security
www.dvla.gov.uk
www.secureyourmotor.gov.uk
www.saferparking.com
www.crimereduction.gov.uk
www.neighbourhoodwatch.net
www.safercommunity.net
www.crimereduction.gov.uk
www.securedbydesign.com
www.cre.gov.uk
www.rainbownetwork.com
www.kidscape.org.uk
www.dfes.gov.uk

www.childline.org.uk
www.suzylamplugh.org

Appendix 3
Peer Assessment Form



Bournemouth Media School

BA IMP/TV/SW Year One – Summer Project

Assessment date: May 2006

Name of Group being assessed: _____

Please put a tick in the box that best describes your view - 0 = lowest 5 = highest

	0	1	2	3	4	5
Demonstration of understanding images, narratives and audience						
Appropriateness of work to the brief's specific requirements						
Coherence of package of production work						
Production values						

Comments:

Conversion from points to percentages:

20 - 16 = 75%	15 - 12 = 66%	11 - 8 = 55%	7 - 4 = 45%	3 - 0 = 35%
------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------	----------------

Final grade: %

Markers Signature

Signature: _____ Date: May 2006

Appendix 4

Questionnaire

Questionnaire Summer Project

TOPIC

The topic for 2006-07 was : CRIME

Which would you have preferred :

Interactive narrative story
Interactive game
Interactive documentary
Interactive informational
Art/ experimental concept
The Crime brief was fine
Totally open brief

Would you have liked the submission format to have been:

separate DVD and website
website with embedded video
interactive DVD
other (state)

UNIT STRUCTURE

Was six weeks right for the project?

2weeks 4 weeks 6 weeks 8weeks 10 weeks

Your opinion of the briefing lecture

Very good reasonable indifferent below expectation Poor

Comment:

Two seminars were arranged. Was this about right?

0 seminars 1 seminar 2 seminars 3 seminars 4 seminars

Comment:

An online 'hot seat' was available for consultation. How useful was this?

Not at all Quite Very

Comment:

Production facilities provision

Video/audio

Very good reasonable indifferent below expectation Poor

Comment:

Computing and software

Very good reasonable indifferent below expectation Poor

Comment:

Workshop provision and advice

Very good reasonable indifferent below expectation Poor

Comment:

COLLABORATION

Did your group have a single leader/producer

Yes No

Which applies best:

We had regular meetings but the subject groups tended to work independently

We had regular meetings and very good communications throughout but mostly stuck to our subject skills

Everything worked really well, we all communicated and shared ideas and helped in all aspects of production

As a BAIMP / BATV/ BASW student, I felt more able to collaborate with BAIMP / BATV/ BASW based work than with BAIMP / BATV/ BASW based work

We had an initial meeting together but quickly fell back into our subject groups

Communication was poor and the collaborative aspect was not successful

There were personality clashes in our group which badly affected both morale and the work

None of the above

Comment or alternative:

What was the greatest strength of the module?

What was the greatest weakness of the module?

ASSESSMENT

Which assessment would best suit the unit:

Project

Theory/Reflective Essay

Peer Review

Project

Peer Review

No Essay

Project

Theory/Reflective Essay

No Peer Review

Other (state)

In order to improve collaboration, an approach to the essay topic could be:

A reflective account of the project but only in relation to the other two subject areas. ie if you are a BATV student you only write about BASW and BAIMP issues.

Do you: AGREE INDIFFERENT DISAGREE
Comment:

Appendix 5

Results from the questionnaire

Data results and analysis

Questionnaire Responses:

Staff:

James Jordan BAIMP

Mik Parsons BAIMP

Phil Mathews BASW

Jan Weddup BASW

Andrew Ireland BATV

Lizzie Sykes BATV

Students:

	STAFF							STUDENTS							
	JJ	M P	P M	JW	LS	AI		C	C C	OH	PE	S	T	J	B
	im p	im p	sw	sw	tv	tv		im p	im p	imp	im p	tv	sw	tv	sw
Topic	DI	DI	DI	C	Oth er	S		C	DI	SG D	SG	ope n	C	D I	C
Format	itv	W	W	W D	W D	W D		D	W	W	W D	D	W D	W	W D
Unit length	8	6	6	6	6	6		6	6	8	8	8	8	6	8
Seminars	2	2	2	2	2	2		3	2	3	3	2	4	2	2
Hot seat	em	em	e m	nu	nu	nu		nu	nu	nu	nu	nu	nu	n u	nu
Facilities and workshops	vg	vg	vg	-	-	r		r	r	r	vg	r	r	r	r

Terms used

D - documentary

I - informational

C - crime brief ok

S - story

G - game

W - website with embedded video

D - interactive dvd

em - email

nu – not used

vg -very good

r - reasonable

Topic

The documentary/informational category was felt to be the best option (this also included the original Crime brief which fell into that category)

There was more diversity in the student opinions which also included open brief , interactive story, and game

Format

No clear agreement on this – embedded website or website with accompanying DVD were equally popular. One member of staff suggested interactive TV as an approach

Unit length

The majority of staff felt that 6 weeks was about right, but the student opinion suggested that 8 weeks would be more popular

Seminars

All the staff thought 2 weeks was the right duration. Student opinion generally agreed but there were a significant number who thought an extra seminar would be useful (one student suggested a seminar every week)

The online ‘hot’ seat

Staff felt that the idea was ok but that email to the individual or to the whole cohort would be more accessible and effective. Students simply commented that they hadn’t used the hot seat facility

Facilities and workshops

These areas received broad support, although there were some misgivings about the quality of camera workshops, and the tv staff felt overburdened with kit sign-off tutorials

Appendix 6

Essay assessment form (tick-box)

BOURNEMOUTH MEDIA SCHOOL COURSEWORK REPORT

Course:		Year: 1
Name:		
Marking Lecturer:	Mik Parsons	
Name of Unit:	SUMMER PROJECTS	
Date Submitted:	May 2006-06-07	
Assignment Title:	Individual Production Analysis	

Evaluation of the development of the project

Analysis	Strong debate with rationale for decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Descriptive and muddled arguments, hard to follow
Examples	Clear examples providing detail and understanding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Too broad and lacking in depth. Little or no use of examples
Prioritisation	Evidence of prioritising key decisions to discuss	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Little or no sense of prioritising of issues during evaluation
Reflection	Clearly expressed. Areas for improvement articulated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No personal viewpoint offered, or areas for development highlighted

Assessment of own role within the process

Analysis	Strong debate with rationale for decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Descriptive and muddled arguments, hard to follow
Examples	Clear examples providing detail and understanding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Too broad and lacking in depth. Little or no use of examples
Prioritisation	Evidence of prioritising key decisions to discuss	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Little or no sense of prioritising of issues during evaluation
Reflection	Clearly expressed. Areas for improvement articulated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No personal viewpoint offered, or areas for development highlighted

Demonstration of the process involved with collaborative work

Analysis	Strong debate with rationale for decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Descriptive and muddled arguments, hard to follow
Examples	Clear examples providing detail and understanding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Too broad and lacking in depth. Little or no use of examples
Prioritisation	Evidence of prioritising key decisions to discuss	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Little or no sense of prioritising of issues during evaluation
Reflection	Clearly expressed. Areas for improvement articulated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No personal viewpoint offered, or areas for development highlighted

Presentation

Structure	Clear, logical structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Confused list
Other sources	Relevant, properly referenced / contextualised	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Incorrect, arbitrary use

Grammar / Spelling	Correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Many errors
Percentage Mark	%						
Lecturer Signature:						Date Marked: June 2006	