Course Outline 2019
GLMI710: INNOVATION AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT
SEMESTER 2 (S2)

Course prescription
Examines the role of innovation and knowledge in business profitability and growth. Includes knowledge as a foundation for innovation, core knowledge processes in organisations, understanding innovation processes in uncertain and complex environments, and collaborative innovation.

Course advice
Restriction: MGMT 721

Goals of the course
Knowledge has been recognised as a key strategic resource for an organisation and effective learning and knowledge management as one of the key competencies of modern organisations. Yet, effective knowledge management remains a key challenge for most organisations. The challenges are even more important in the context of the emergence of new technologies (AI, Big Data, social media platforms) touted as potential saviours or disruptors to the existing approaches to our understanding of knowledge and any attempts to managing knowing and knowledge. In this course we will engage with some of the key issues related to knowledge in organisations.

This course aims to:
- provide you with the relevant frameworks to understand how organisational knowledge is conceptualised
- provide you with relevant frameworks to deepen your understanding of the dynamics of knowledge sharing within and across organisations
- provide you with an understanding of the contemporary issues related to organisational learning and knowledge management
- help you develop critical thinking and argument formation skills
- provide you with an opportunity to work on real-life knowledge management related issues
- provide you with an opportunity to play with and learn different forms of sharing your knowledge
Learning outcomes (LO)

By the end of the course, it is expected that students will be able to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Learning outcome</th>
<th>Graduate profile capability*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| L01| Demonstrate a critical understanding of the concepts of knowledge and knowledge sharing in an organisational context | 1. Disciplinary knowledge and practice  
2. Critical thinking  
4a. Communication (Oral)  
5. Independence and Integrity |
| LO2| Critically evaluate academic and managerial literature in the fields of knowledge management and innovation | 1. Disciplinary knowledge and practice  
2. Critical thinking  
4a. Communication (Oral)  
4b. Communication (Written) |
| LO3| Apply the theoretical foundations of this course and analytical tools to various organisational contexts | 1. Disciplinary knowledge and practice  
2. Critical thinking  
4. Communication and engagement |
| LO4| Utilise and assess the effectiveness of various knowledge sharing techniques | 1. Disciplinary knowledge and practice  
4. Communication and engagement |
| LO5| Demonstrate the ability to work collaboratively | 4. Communication and engagement |

* See the graduate profile this course belongs to at the end of this course outline.

Content outline

The course structure is based on 3 recurring blocks, each block consisting of 4 weeks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Block 1: Knowledge in organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>Block 2: Knowledge management in the innovation context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 10, 11, 12</td>
<td>Block 3: Knowledge management in the international context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each block we use a mix of mini-lectures, class discussions, guest speakers and assessed tasks. Each block shares the same structure.

The general structure for each block is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>1h</th>
<th>2h</th>
<th>3h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>Introduction to the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Engaging with the topic</td>
<td>A1: Explain those concepts (Group assignment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>Review of A1</td>
<td>A3: <em>The Forum</em> (individual assignment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>Guest speaker/case study</td>
<td>A2: <em>application of theory</em> (Group Assignment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note that some changes to the structure are possible to accommodate the speakers and the topic.

Learning and teaching

There is no exam or one big assignment: the course is internally assessed and assessment is spread over the 12 weeks of sessions.
Consequently, it is essential that you prepare for each session* as the class relies on active participation in in-class activities and discussions. In the class you will be encouraged to discuss examples from outside of the readings, your prior experiences or relevant current news. As we will discuss, learning is a social process and so you also will be encouraged and rewarded, to contribute to the learning environment.

One of the important learning outcomes is the development of critical thinking skills. Therefore, you are encouraged to approach the topics and engage in discussions in a critical manner.

We will also offer you numerous opportunities to seek feedback or to engage in additional learning opportunities.

*Note that you are expected to spend around 150 hours on the course over a single semester - with 30 hours on preparatory readings and research (that is on average 2.5h per week on readings), 84 hours of self-assessed study and research and the remaining 36 hours of class!

### Teaching staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr Frank Siedlok</th>
<th>Dr Jose Brache</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:f.siedlok@auckland.ac.nz">f.siedlok@auckland.ac.nz</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jose.brache@auckland.ac.nz">Jose.brache@auckland.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGGB building, Room 439</td>
<td>OGGB building, Room 463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office hours: available on Canvas</td>
<td>Office hours: available on Canvas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Learning resources

The class relies on a range of journal articles, book chapters, movies, podcasts etc. Readings for each week are listed on Talis pages and usually include 3 Core and a number of Recommended readings for each block. However, it is expected that you will access and use other readings during the course and bring these to the discussions.

For the Forum discussion (third week of the block) we provide a list of what we consider a good ‘starting point readings’: but those are in no measure sufficient for a successful panel discussion! We expect that the panellists to engage with further readings on the topic while the rest of the class read the provided texts to be able to engage in discussions.

#### Recommended textbooks:

Although, in principle, we are not relying on a particular textbook, the following texts are important – and worth getting a copy:


Newell, S. Robertson, M. Scarbrough, H., ad Swan, J. 2009. Managing knowledge work and innovation. *Although leaning towards one particular perspective, the text offers a good overview of the topic.* Available as an eBook through the UoA Library (note: the system restrictions allow 1 user to be logged in at the time. Limited downloads available).


Assessment information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment task</th>
<th>Weight %</th>
<th>Group and/or individual</th>
<th>Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 1: Forum Discussion / role play</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>The second week of each block. 3-4 students will take part in a forum (or role play) debate on a given topic. Individually, each student will prepare a 'position statement' on the topic and then present the position during a debate (or role play)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 2: Group task: understanding &amp; explaining theory</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>The first week of each block, 10% each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 3: Group task: application of theory</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>The third week of each block, 10% each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 4: In-class and online contribution to learning</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>Most weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The course is internally assessed and there is no exam at the end. There are 3 main assessment forms:

1. **Forum discussion / Roleplay** (Assignment 1): this assignment is focused on engaging with particular theories or current affairs related to knowledge management. There are two formats that you can follow:
   a. A forum debate, in which 3-4 students (depending on final numbers) explore a given topic from different perspectives. These debates will cover a mix of contemporary (e.g. Huawei scandal), organisational (e.g. knowledge hoarding) or theoretical (e.g. knowledge sharing barriers) topics.
   b. A role play, in which each student assumes a particular role (e.g. an engineer, a top scientist, a customer, etc) to illustrate a particular perspective on the topic.

Prior to the debate/role play, each participant needs to research the topic and prepare a written summary that captures the perspective and position on the topic (50% of the mark). The position and your arguments must be informed and supported by relevant research.

Two key criteria apply to this assignment:
- The forum discussion/roleplay needs to cover a range of perspectives on the topic
- It has to engage the rest of the class to explore the topic further. This can be through discussion or some activities that you introduce as part of the session

Although this is an individual assignment, you are expected to coordinate on the topic and how the perspectives interact with each other. In a forum discussion, you might decide to present opposing or complementary views. A good example to follow would be BBC The Forum or The Inquiry:
https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/w3csytfy
https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/w3csqwvl
2. **Understanding & applying theory** (Assignment 2 & 3): This is a group assignment in which teams of 3-4 students will complete pre-assigned tasks. Assignment 2 tasks (second week of each block) are focused on **explaining** a particular concept(s) from the readings while Assignment 3 (fourth week of each block) is about **applying theoretical concepts to explain how things work in a particular company**. Essays or traditional reports are **not allowed** and teams are encouraged to experiment with different mediums and formats (e.g. podcasts, videos, web-based animations, posters, company newsletter, ...). You might pick one format (e.g. weekly podcast) to master it over the weeks – or you might choose to experiment with different approaches and pick one that best suit the particular task. Teams are **not fixed** and you can move between teams if you wish so.

3. **Participation**, or more aptly a contribution to the learning environment and the understanding of the topic(s). That is the things that you offer to the class or on Canvas that help in achieving the learning objectives. This can well be an answer to a question – or a good question, a comment or an additional piece of information. **Other forms of participation are available.**

Detailed information on each assignment is provided at the end of the document.

**Pass requirements**

The course is 100% internally assessed. 50% is the passing requirement.

Assignment 1 is a compulsory assessment. Failure to attempt Assignment 1 will incur a Did Not Complete (DNC) grade.

**Description of assessment tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment task</th>
<th>Learning outcome to be assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 1: Debate (Panel) Discussion</td>
<td>LO1; LO2; LO3; LO4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 2: Group task: understanding &amp; explaining theory</td>
<td>LO1; LO2; LO4; LO5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 3: Group task: application of theory</td>
<td>LO1; LO2; LO3; LO4; LO5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 4: In-class and online contribution to learning</td>
<td>LO1; LO2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusive learning**

Students are urged to discuss privately any impairment-related requirements face-to-face and/or in written form with the courses convenor/lecturer and/or tutor.

**Collegial atmosphere**

The class relies on open and inclusive discussions to encourage critical thinking and learning; both of which are best developed through discussions, sharing experiences and questioning. As we have a relatively small class, it is expected that everybody can take part in the discussions with the purpose of improving communication and argument skills.
Treat the classroom as a safe space to learn and to discuss your ideas: speak up – but be constructive; share your opinions – but do not disregard opinions of others; use theory and evidence to support your argument

**Academic integrity**

The University of Auckland will not tolerate cheating or assisting others to cheat, and views cheating in coursework as a serious academic offence. The work that a student submits for grading must be the student's own work, reflecting his or her learning. Where work from other sources is used, it must be properly acknowledged and referenced. This requirement also applies to sources on the world wide web. A student's assessed work may be reviewed against electronic source material using computerised detection to provide an electronic version of their work for computerised review.

**Student feedback**

You are encouraged to provide your feedback and discuss the class content and assessment on a regular basis. The teaching team takes your concerns seriously and will try to accommodate the necessary changes to maximise the learning of all students.

**In the event of an unexpected disruption**

We undertake to maintain the continuity and standard of teaching and learning in all your courses throughout the year. If there are unexpected disruptions, the University has contingency plans to ensure that access to your course continues and your assessment is fair, and not compromised. Some adjustments may need to be made in emergencies, In the event of a disruption, the University and your course coordinators will make every effort to provide you with up to date information via Canvas and the University website.

**Graduate profile for**

The following six themes represent the capabilities that the Business School seeks to foster in all of its graduates. The development of these capabilities does not come all at once, but rather is expected to build from year to year. Each course is not expected to contribute to all capabilities, but each course will have its own goals and learning outcomes that relate to the overall development of this profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Profile for Master of Commerce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disciplinary knowledge and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates will be able to apply highly specialised knowledge within the discipline to demonstrate an advanced awareness and understanding in a global context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates will be able to analyse and evaluate the relevant literature, and design and develop scholarly arguments that demonstrate advanced and diverse thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication and engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates will be able to engage, communicate, and collaborate with diverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Profile for Master of Commerce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>groups using multiple formats and effectively address a range of professional and academic audiences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Independence and integrity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates will be able to demonstrate advanced independent thought, self-reflection, ethics, and integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSIGNMENTS INFORMATION

Assignment 1: Forum discussion / role play (20%)

Forum discussion/roleplay (Assignment 1): this assignment is focused on engaging with particular theories or current affairs related to knowledge management. There are two formats that you can follow:

- A forum debate, in which 2-4 students (depending on final numbers) explore a given topic from different perspectives. These debates will cover a mix of contemporary (e.g. Huawei scandal), organisational (e.g. knowledge hoarding) or theoretical (e.g. knowledge sharing barriers) topics.
- A role play, in which each student assumes a particular role (e.g. an engineer, a top scientist, a customer, etc) to illustrate a particular perspective on the topic.

Two key criteria apply to this assignment:

- The forum discussion/roleplay needs to cover a range of perspectives on the topic
- Each perspective needs to be informed by relevant research
- It has to engage the rest of the class to explore the topic further. This can be through discussion or some activities that you introduce as part of the session.

Such debates work best when you either have opposing views (agree/disagree) or clearly distinct, yet complementary, perspectives (e.g. two explanations that highlight different aspects of the topic – for example, how IT and HR can be utilised together for better knowledge management outcomes). You might also assume particular roles for the debate (e.g. a manager, a customer etc) or structure it as a fully-fledged in situ role-play where you re-create a particular scenario (e.g. in previous years teams enacted an onboarding programme development for an airline). Other formats are possible – please consult with either Frank or Jose.

Please note that although this is an individual assignment, you are expected to coordinate on the topic and how the perspectives interact with each other. In a forum discussion, you might decide to present opposing or complementary views.

Written statement
Prior to the debate/role play, each participant needs to research the topic and prepare a written summary statement that captures the perspective and position on the topic (50% of the mark). The position and your arguments must be informed and supported by relevant research. These should be around 800 words (+/-10%, excluding reference list or any appendices) and must be submitted no later than Sunday 6pm preceding your session on Tuesday the latest.

We are more than happy to provide you with fast feedback. If you email us your position statement in advance we will provide you with short feedback - even better, we happy to do so a number of times. You need to email us your draft by Friday 9am before your session.

All position statements will be made available on Canvas on Monday and everybody is expected to read all the statements in preparation for the class. Hence, when preparing the session, panellists should assume that everybody has read the statements and is prepared to take part in the discussion/exercises. As a panellist, you should avoid to simply summarise your statement during the session.

Starting point
The Reading List provides a list of suggested readings to start with and these give you some potential perspectives on the topic. Note, these readings are neither sufficient nor
required: you are not bound in any way to use these and you are expected to engage with additional literature to inform your position on the topic.

For some inspiration, you should check The Forum

**Coordinated effort**

Although this is an individual assignment – and you are required to do own research and deliver your perspective, the task requires some level of coordination among the team:

- you should ensure that the session does not come across as three disjointed mini-presentations. It is important that the perspectives and ideas are integrated into a cohesive session
- you might need to rehearse your role play
- you might need to consider assigning a moderator (see below)

**Class involvement**

Your forum discussion should be engaging and you are required to make the rest of the class involved. Hence, you should consider how you engage and leverage the rest of the class in your session. You might consider various activities such as polling to get the class involved. There needs to be an opportunity for the class to ask further questions. Remember that the rest of the class can gain their participation marks during the session.

Remember that it is important to engage with and moderate the answers: ‘static’ questions at the end of the session lead to little engagement. Also, soliciting answers from the class as an endless list and not integrating these into the discussion is a poor approach.

**How to get it right?**

There are a few tips and mechanisms to make it right.

1. coordinate and discuss the topic and your perspectives in advance
2. discuss what format would suit the best for the topic
3. think how to engage the audience
4. do NOT present a simple summary of the position statements
5. avoid the session becoming 3 separate monologues
6. do you need a moderator?
7. Assume that the rest of the class read all the position statement AND some of the recommended readings
8. come and talk through your ideas with us
9. practice!

**Comments from 2017&2018 cohort on what makes a good debate/forum discussion:**

- There is a clear topic and focus for the session
- Discussants represent different viewpoints and each adds something to the discussion
- Perspectives can be complementary or opposite: it does not matter!
- Positions are made clear in the opening and closing of the panels
- Good debates often highlight tensions, causing the audience to want to take sides
- Debates need to be informative: use examples, illustrations, exercises, games, ...
- Use readings, research and theory as support: avoid empty statements/opinions (aka Donald Trump)
- Be critical to your own argument – address its limitations and assumptions
- Discussions should be constructive and build on each other: listen, offer, accept and build
- LISTEN to comments and others!
- Involving the audience is a good way to highlight tensions and differences in the topic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the research: breadth and depth of background research; quality of the sources; synthesis of the findings;</th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>8-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...your statement lacks research support</td>
<td>...your statement is supported (mostly) by relevant research, with some exceptions</td>
<td>...your statement is supported by very relevant readings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the engagement with relevant literature lacks breadth / depth</td>
<td>...there is sufficient depth / breadth of research with some scope for further research</td>
<td>...there is great balance between the depth and breadth of your readings into the topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...research is based on inappropriate sources: untrustworthy, unreliable</td>
<td>...most sources are well chosen</td>
<td>...all your sources are very well selected and used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the engagement with relevant literature / data lacks breadth / depth</td>
<td>...the engagement with relevant literature / data had sufficient breadth / depth</td>
<td>...you approached all / most of the sources critically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the choice of sources is uncritical and/or you did not acknowledge the key assumptions</td>
<td>...findings are mostly integrated, with scope for further synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...findings are not integrated and are presented as simple summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the argument: convincingness of the argument; logical / internal consistency of the argument; precision and focus of the argument in presenting the perspective;</th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>8-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...there is no clear argument / position in your statement</td>
<td>...the argument is mostly clear and coherent overall</td>
<td>...clear and focused argument throughout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the argument is largely incoherent</td>
<td>...your argument is mostly convincing</td>
<td>...the argument you make is very convincing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...your statement is largely unconvincing</td>
<td>...your position on the issue is clear</td>
<td>...the flow of your argument is very good / exemplary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the argument suffers from logical flaws and/or is inconsistent</td>
<td>...there are no major inconsistencies or logical flaws in your argument</td>
<td>...your position on the issue is clearly argued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...it is not clear what your position on the issue is</td>
<td>...the argument clearly shows your position on the issue</td>
<td>...the argument is precise and very focused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...you contradict yourself</td>
<td>...the argument is mostly focused throughout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the argument is unfocused and difficult to follow</td>
<td>...in places the argument is not as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Written statement presentation style:** grammar, style, structure (including sections), referencing, overall flow of the text, presentation.

- ...there is no clear structure to the statement
- ...lacks references to the used sources
- ...many grammatical / stylistic mistakes
- ...(most) sections remain disconnected
- ...the statement is lacking coherence
- ...lacks your name / title / clear paragraphs

- ...overall good structure, with relevant sections, that could be further improved in places
- ...all sources are appropriately referenced
- ...mostly free from grammatical / stylistic mistakes
- ...most parts of the statement are logically connected
- ...overall it reads well
- ...all elements are in as expected

- ...great structure, with relevant titles, paragraphs and/or sections
- ...all sources are appropriately referenced
- ...free from grammatical / stylistic mistakes
- ...all parts of the statement are logically connected and there is a good logical flow
- ...makes you want to read more

**Your performance during the debate:** clarity of your argument / contribution; engagement with other perspectives; confidence; ability to respond to questions and comments; etc.  
*Please note that in some cases you might work as a team, and some of the above criteria might be irrelevant. But we expect all members to make an individual contribution during the session.*

- ...there was no visible / relevant contribution from you during the debate
- ...you made some points that had no relation to the topic
- ...you made some points that were incorrect / unsupported by relevant readings / lacked necessary detail to make sense
- ...you tried to ‘wing it’ most of the time
- ...you were unable to respond to the comments / questions
- ...your response to the comments / questions was very limited and lacked substance

- ...you made some (limited) contribution to the discussion
- ...you made some valid points, but these lacked necessary depth / detail
- ...some of the points you made were unclear
- ...overall you were prepared but the contribution could be stronger
- ...you responded to the comments / questions but you should have built on these a bit better
- ...you missed on the opportunity to build an argument based on the comments / questions

- ...overall (very) good contribution to the debate
- ...you made some very good / valid points during the session
- ...your points were well supported by relevant evidence, readings, examples, ...
- ...you made clear and distinctive points
- ...you handled the comments and questions very well
- ...you showed an ability to adapt and build on the comments and questions
Assignment 2 and 3
Assignment 2 and 3 each contribute 30% to your total course mark (3 sessions per assignment x 10% each).
Assignment 2 and 3 are similar in their format and focus: Assignment 2 is focused on explaining theoretical concepts and Assignment 3 is about applying these concepts in practice. In a nutshell:
- this is a team assignment with teams of 2-4 students
- you can switch teams – and we encourage you to do so!
- the task is related to readings and we will provide the task a day before the session so you can start thinking how to tackle it
- we will devote some of the class time to the tasks
- no essays or traditional reports: experiment with different formats and mediums (see notes on the format below)
- innovative, suitable and well-executed formats can earn you some extra points
- all submissions need to be made by Friday 8am. These can be as a link or file, depending on the format

For Assignment 3:
- all tasks will be related to a guest speaker and you are required to research the speaker/organisation in preparation for the session
- task instructions will be published ahead of the session so make sure you utilise the Q&A session

Different formats
Knowledge sharing often depends on the medium used. Essays and reports are not necessarily the most effective mediums to share your ideas or explain theoretical concepts. For the Group Tasks we encourage you to engage with different mediums and formats – no essays, Powerpoints or traditional reports.
When deciding on the format, you should think of the task and ensure you settle on a medium and format that can best serve the purpose.
Alternatively, you can decide to settle on 1 format and keep improving week by week and modifying some of the features to better tackle the task. For example, two best teams last year had a very different approach: one group went through a whole range of formats (video, podcast, Magazine article, animation) while the second one settled on a ‘sock puppet show’.

Some examples from previous years include:
- Sock Puppets
- Videos with role play
- Interactive media platform - PowToon and VideoScribe
- Podcasts series
- Comic strips
- Interactive website
- A game
- Mini-movie / series

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Y3D_XwSI87w4KYM52g9WN57nlCGxVfrf/view?usp=sharing
https://youtu.be/eLkZ0tu1WnY
https://youtu.be/yx7-E9r7NeQ

While we encourage creativity and experimentation with the format, you should make sure the format is suitable for the task

What’s the difference between Assignment 2 & 3?
When engaging with Assignment 2 and Assignment 3 you need to consider how you engage with the readings and examples. In this assignment you should draw on other readings and concepts to strengthen the explanation.

For assignment 2 – your task is to explain a particular concept and if you use some examples – these should be used to illustrate the point you make. Here you use the theory as an explanation.

In the Assignment 3 you are applying theory to explain what the guest speaker covered: here, you should use a range of readings and ideas to provide a solid argument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1 of each Block</th>
<th>Weak 4 of each Block (guest speaker)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPLAIN</strong></td>
<td><strong>APPLY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate your understanding of the framework/theory</td>
<td>Apply relevant frameworks/theories to explain the case study (e.g. a guest speaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use examples to illustrate how the framework works</td>
<td>Use other examples to compare/contrast how the theory helps to explain the case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to other readings/papers on the specific framework (e.g. follow-up studies or critique); recommended readings are often a good start</td>
<td>Use a range of theories - from across the weeks and beyond - to explain the phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can link to other theories/readings if this helps to clarify the framework/theory or the key points you are trying to convey. But be cautious of overdoing it!</td>
<td>Should link to other theories/readings to develop a better explanation of the case study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Marking criteria for group tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>8-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Engagement with and understanding of relevant theories and frameworks** | ...underdeveloped / no links to theory / readings  
...demonstrates limited or no understanding of the topic/readings/concepts  
...superficial application of theory or frameworks  
...provides simple repetition or description of the reading | ...there is good engagement and understanding of relevant theory/frameworks  
...frameworks are applied in a meaningful way, though in places need some more detail  
...goes beyond simple description or repetition of what is said in the readings  
...some levels of integration  
...some levels of criticality | ...excellent grasp of the topic with links to additional frameworks or readings  
...theory is well integrated into the overall argument  
...approached the concepts in a critical manner |
| **Quality of the argument (i.e. how well you present your ideas): clear and convincing argument; focus; logical consistency;** | ...there is no clear argument in your output or the argument is incoherent and hard to understand  
...the argument suffers from logical flaws and/or is internally inconsistent (e.g. contradictions)  
...the argument is unfocused / too broad | ...the argument is clear and coherent overall and it is relatively easy to understand your ideas  
...your argument is sensible/convincing  
...overall consistent argument / might have some minor issues in logic  
...the argument is mostly focused throughout  
...in places the argument is not as precise as it could be  
...overall sufficiently developed but may need some extra development in places | ...the argument is clear and focused throughout  
...the argument you make is very convincing  
...the flow of your argument is exemplary  
...the argument is precise and very focused  
...your argument helps others to understand the concepts |
| Presentation style: | ... inappropriate communication form  
...lack of or underdeveloped presentation structure (e.g. on problem outline, no conclusion, etc)  
...poor execution (grammar mistakes, style, unintelligible, etc) | ...interesting and appropriate communication form  
...good structure and flow  
...technically well executed | ...very appropriate format // appropriate adaptations of the format for the task  
...exciting experimental communication form  
...technically excellent |
| Assignment 3: Application to practice and engagement with the case organisation/guest lecture | ...shows lack of understanding of the case organisation  
...shows you did not research the case and came unprepared to the session  
...does not attempt to apply frameworks / applies frameworks inappropriately  
...fails to link the task to relevant frameworks | ...shows good understanding of the case organisation  
...shows you researched the case and prepared your questions  
...the chosen frameworks are well fitting the case/task | ...shows great understanding of the case organisation  
...shows you put some serious effort into researching the company  
...frameworks are well chosen and amended to fit the case |
Assignment 4: Participation (20%)

20% of your final grade is based on your contribution to the class activities and learning environment: the things that you offer to the class that help you and others to achieve the learning objectives. Learning is not an individual activity and often depends on interactions and sensemaking within a community.

Although most of the contribution should take place in the class, I am aware that not all of you are confident to speak in front of others. For that reason, there is a range of ways you can contribute and demonstrate your understanding of the topic.

A range of activities and contributions are counting towards the participation mark:

- **Contribution during the class**: this can be in many forms, ranging from partaking or leading on a discussion; an answer to a question; a critical point about a theory to make everyone reconsider it; a simple yet good question; an illuminating example – anything that helped you and others to understand the concept and led to further discussion. Contributions should also be embedded in relevant literature/theories/ readings: in other words, quality over quantity.

- **Online participation**: participating in and moderating online discussions, sharing relevant materials, providing constructive comments on the topic we covered, offering additional analysis and critique on readings.

- **Session Summary**: there is an opportunity to sign up to provide a summary of the session, which can lead to up to 10 points towards your final participation score (yes, 10 out of 20). See information below what is expected. First come – first serve.

- **Session presentation**: the best way to learn is to teach. There is an opportunity to prepare and run a session related to one of the key themes/readings. Can be undertaken in pairs. Up to 10 points towards participation can be scooped in one week! The session should be around an hour (including discussions, exercises etc). It does not need to include a traditional presentation. It can be undertaken in pairs. Topic and format need to be agreed in advance (minimum 1 week). First come – first serve.

- **Moderating debate discussion**: you can gain up to 8 points for acting as a moderator for one of the debates. For the maximum points, you should have a good understanding of the topic and perspectives and add to the discussion by providing summarising comments, moderating discussion or highlighting relevant/interesting points made during the session, draw conclusions, reframe and integrate comments etc.

Please, be aware that just being present does NOT count as participation and that we assess QUALITY rather than QUANTITY. Outspoken and confident personalities might not necessarily get the highest points for participation. Bringing up an example with little or unclear relevance is not counted as a contribution. Simply summarising/restating what the readings said is not a great contribution unless you are making a clear argument. Most of the time asking a 'simple' question that helps to clarify the concepts is a better contribution - especially if it helps others to understand the ideas.

**Guidelines for providing a Session Synthesis**

Each week a volunteer can develop a focused, concise synthesis of the session. You can gain up to 10 points towards your participation mark for a really good session summary. What do we mean? This is a synthesis of the class discussion, readings and perhaps some additional research. The main goal is to produce a well-written summary of the topic for the week, highlighting and expanding the main points.
This should be focused on:

- concisely synthesise the key points from the class discussions and the readings
- expand on the key points by engaging with additional readings
- provide some further interpretation of the session and the topic: what did really matter?

The synthesis needs to have a good structure and narrative so it is informative to anyone who was not in a class. Each synthesis would be shared via Canvas with the rest of the class. It needs to be submitted a day before the next session at the latest. The lengths will depend on the topic, but usually 2-4 pages.

Please note, this is NOT a summary of what was said in the class: we can use Otter.ai for that. Note that a list of bullet points / disconnected paragraphs or a ‘simple’ summary of what was said without any integration would only gain you 0-2 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Comes across as a simple list of bullet points or mostly disconnected paragraphs that describe what we did in the class. It fails to add any value beyond simple session notes; does not draw on the readings and fails to provide a synthesis/conclusion. If read by somebody who missed the class it would be of no or little help to get an idea what the session was about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>The submission captures the main points made during the session in a clear way and it makes (some) links to the readings. Overall, it is helpful as a standalone reading and would help somebody who missed the class, but completed the readings, to make sense of what we focused on and how the readings are making sense together. It still contains some gaps and did not expand on the topic(s) beyond the class discussion and the readings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>The submission offers a good/great synthesis of the session, capturing all the main points in a logical and clear manner. You made some effort to dig deeper into the topics and clarify/expand on any points that we missed. You integrated the readings well and further expanded on the topics by engaging with additional readings. Those who were in the class would benefit from the reading as it clearly adds value to the session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidelines for Session Presentation**

In the second week of each block there is an opportunity to prepare and run an *engaging presentation* based on the topic/readings. You can get **up to 10 points** towards your participation mark. The presentation should aim to introduce the topic in an engaging way that ensures learning and understanding. You might consider various structured tasks and different formats (role play, quiz, infographics).

The session should be designed for around 1 hour in total (including discussion/exercises). The focus is on ensuring understanding and engaging with the reading(s) / topic so you should think of ways to get the class involved. As everybody should have read the papers already, you should avoid simply SUMMARISING the reading(s). Though, to make sure everybody has the same understanding, you still should do a short introduction to the topic and the main argument of the reading(s): note, this is not the same as making 20 minutes PowerPoint that just summarises the reading!
Note that this needs to be *agreed at least 1 week prior to the session*. You should also get in touch to discuss the focus and the format so I can weave the presentation into the session.

The assessment will be based on the following 5 dimensions:

1. the session clearly introduced the key points in the topic/reading(s) (rather than just summarise the whole reading).
2. the session demonstrated your understanding of the topic/reading(s)
3. you have engaged the class - whether through discussion or exercises - with the topic
4. the session clearly helped the class to understand the concept(s) / topic
5. you expanded on the topic/reading(s) and introduce other relevant angles in the session