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LIMINALITY

[Image of a person falling between two railings, against a night sky backdrop]
GROUP BUSINESS PROJECT (GBP) - MAP

- Business Project 1 - Yr 1
- Business Project 2 - Yr 2
- 30 credits, double terms

- Group Work:
  Yr 1 + Yr 2
  6 students
  8 - 15 groups

- External Client:
  4 - 8 project's

GROUPING

Yr 2 (seniors)
Allocation of by merit / nomination: CEO, CFO, CCO, COO.

Yr 1 (juniors)
Allocation through competitive interview with Yr 2 (roles vary).
Student companies select candidates based on hard and interpersonal skills. Candidates choose companies based on their post-interview comparative preference. Both parties submit their ranking sheets and matches are married, others are allocated by the use of psychometric data [see Ref 3].
PEER REVIEW IN GBP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Year 1 students</th>
<th>Year 2 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Attendance at the Company meetings. i.e. if they attended all meeting score them 100, if they attended only few score them 20, etc.</td>
<td>Contribution to Presentation: ability to complete allocated tasks to good quality standard and on time, their participation in slide and speech preparation and attendance at rehearsal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Contribution to Presentation: ability to complete allocated tasks to good quality standard and on time, their participation in slide and speech preparation and attendance at rehearsal.</td>
<td>Contribution to Presentation: task allocation, fair workload distribution, group work organisation, group time management, information gathering and organisation, information analysis, slide and speech preparation, presentation rehearsal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Contribution to Report: their ability to complete allocated tasks to good quality standard and on time, general contribution and enthusiasm to be involved in the work as well as attendance at meetings.</td>
<td>Contribution to Report: task allocation, fair workload distribution, group work organisation, group time management, information gathering and organisation, information analysis, material preparation for the report and write-up process organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>Consider their ability to work as part of the team, define their best practise approaches, their ability to apply learned knowledge and complete set tasks, mention the elements they have to improve for the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PEER REVIEW PERCEPTION

**Lecturer**
(i) This is an authentic way to help students assess critically their performance and that of others that leads towards Continuous Professional Development (CPD);
(ii) This method helps to identify poor or non-engaging student’s, and thus helps to allocate marks correctly.

**Student**
(i) This is a way to complain about poor-performing students / undermine outcast students / manipulate marks;
(ii) Excel personal contribution and performance;
(iii) An exercise that carries extra burden with little, no, or negative marginal utility.
(CRITICAL INCIDENT) NARRATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Students.</td>
<td>Time, Place, Project.</td>
<td>Series of events or actions.</td>
<td>Critical incident.</td>
<td>Outcome for the group and individual students (Lecturer’s Perspective).</td>
<td>Individual feelings and evaluation of oneself and others (Student’s Perspective).</td>
<td>Recap of GBP and Peer Review aim’s. Link to lecture topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NARRATIVE – CASE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>A group of students, 5 males and 1 female, just like yourself.</td>
<td>Took part in a GBP few years back working on XYZ project.</td>
<td>Group males have decided that they do not want to include female in their work, stopped communicating with her and effectively took a vote to exclude her from the group.</td>
<td>When the matter was raised and questioned, males claimed that she was 3 months pregnant, they don’t want anything to do with her and that she could not possibly be an asset to the group.</td>
<td>Male students have been referred to University’s Policy, Government’s Employability Law’s and Counselling Service. An offer of an interview with Student Experience Leader to discuss the following an offer an apology to the female.</td>
<td>Male, given their power of majority, felt they would achieve better results working without the ‘burden’ student. Female felt outcast, anxious and depressed.</td>
<td>Team work SWOT Employability law Equality Ethics Professional behaviour Management Motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE STUDIES

Ignoring – ‘You can say what you want but it won’t change my mind’

Inappropriate communication – ‘Hey Britney..’

Professionalism – Where are your manners?

Professional wardrobe – ‘Caps & Swagger’

Relaxed Approach – ‘LastMinute.com’

Bullying – ‘I said, do it now!’

[REF: 5]

PEER REVIEW (QUALITY) CHANGEOVER
RESULTS

Students are more aware of ‘Pit Falls’

Students know behaviour is re-occurring

‘They know we know’ how they may feel and how to deal with it

Bypass ‘storming & norming’ and go straight in to ‘performing’

Students are more able to listen, evaluate and provide critical reviews

Students include quotes from their peer review into their personal statements

I overcome peer review liminality by letting student know how failure looks like – which for them is minor and they can learn to avoid it.
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