



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SYDNEY

Industry and Community Project

UAC - *Uni Admission Centre - Reimagining University Admissions*

Project Outline

Contacts

Project supervisor	Dr Jinqi Xu FHEA
Office location	Room 407, Level 4, H04, Merewether Building
Email Address	Jinqi.xu@sydney.edu.au
Phone	+61 2 862 78766
Consultation Hours	By appointment
Class location	HyFlex: Online via Zoom and Face-to-Face (TBA) ABS Learning Studio 3100
Class time	Thursdays 9:00 – 12:00

About this Project Outline

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

Project Description

Background

UAC is a not-for-profit private company that is owned by the NSW and the ACT universities. UAC is the largest tertiary admissions centre in Australia; processing applications for 26 institutions based mainly in NSW and ACT. We process over 80,000 applications for 2000+ undergraduate courses each year, approximately 50,000 of whom are current Year 12 applicants.

UAC also leads the production of the Australian Tertiary Admission Rank (ATAR) for students in NSW. Equity of access to education is a core component of UAC's mission. To meet this we also process applications for schemes designed to improve access to education:

- Educational Access Schemes (EAS) – for applicants that have experienced significant education disadvantage in year 11 and 12
- Schools Recommendation Schemes (SRS) – for institutions to make early offers to current year 12s based on criteria other than (or in addition to) the ATAR

UAC also processes applications for university's Equity Scholarships (ES).

UAC doesn't set the admissions criteria for the courses we process; these are set by each of our institutions, but UAC has a key role in understanding the changing admissions landscape in Australia to ensure that we can respond appropriately to these changes.

Current situation

Currently university admission is predominantly a numbers game and the personal attributes of an applicant – critical thinking, digital literacy, problem solving etc are generally inferred from academic qualifications rather than specifically assessed as part of admissions. For a significant number of Year 12s whether they are offered their preferred course is determined by their ATAR.

For many years concerns have been raised on the focus of the ATAR by senior secondary students to the detriment of a broader education. Educators are voicing their frustrations at the focus on a single number and feel it is narrowing their ability to serve the best interests of all students. They perceive that their role as educators, career guides and pastoral carers is being narrowed and distorted by a ranking score.

There is now a strong push for universities to admit students on broader criteria, while still ensuring that students are well prepared academically for university study. It remains incumbent on universities to admit students who are likely to succeed.

Although it is predicted that the ATAR will continue to play a role in university selection processes, providers are wanting to assess a broader set of skills, capabilities and experience that a student has gained by the time they leave school. Current sector trends is for ATAR+ admissions.

Project Scope

UAC is seeking to broaden admissions so that the personal attributes of current Year 12 applicants can be considered alongside the ATAR to:

- improve access for students from disadvantaged backgrounds
- improve access for students whose ATAR may not be indicative of their true potential
- decrease the focus on a single rank.

Key questions to be addressed include:

- How the current ATAR-based admission system works and how the key characteristics and attributes can be improved?
- Are there any Australian providers who have successfully implemented ATAR+ admissions and can their system be scaled for the numbers processed by UAC?
- How do the admissions systems of other similar countries work and are there lessons for Australia in those systems, including:
 - which aspects of our current system are worth retaining?
 - which aspects of international systems should not be considered and why?
 - which aspects of international systems may work in the Australian context?
- What global trends may be relevant for consideration in an Australian context?
- How will this be impacted by the growing interest in microcredentials?

Students are encouraged to propose new models including whether any new technologies can be leveraged to improve outcomes.

Students must consider the implications of any recommended changes to the equitable allocation of university places, ensuring no group is significantly advantaged or disadvantaged.

Students must also consider the workload implications of any recommended changes for UAC, and whether there are any technologies that UAC can use to streamline processing.

Interested stakeholders

UAC
UAC participating institutions
Australian schools
Year 12 and other senior secondary students
Parents of those students

Key perspectives that would add value

Education
Social Science
Business
Information Technology

References:

- UAC website www.uac.edu.au
- UAC submissions and reports:
<https://www.uac.edu.au/media-centre/submissions-and-reports>

- *Looking to the future: report of the review of senior secondary pathways into work, further education and training*
<https://uploadstorage.blob.core.windows.net/public-assets/education-au/pathways/Final%20report%20-%2018%20June.pdf>
- *Nurturing wonder and igniting passion: NSW Curriculum Review*
https://nswcurriculumreview.nesa.nsw.edu.au/pdfs/phase-3/final-report/NSW_Curriculum_Review_Final_Report.pdf [mreview.nesa.nsw.edu.au/pdfs/phase-3/final-report/NSW_Curriculum_Review_Final_Report.pdf](https://nswcurriculumreview.nesa.nsw.edu.au/pdfs/phase-3/final-report/NSW_Curriculum_Review_Final_Report.pdf)
- Human Capability Standards
<https://www.workingfutures.com.au/human-capability/>
- Assessment of general capabilities
<https://www.acer.org/au/cari/projects/new-metric-projects/assessment-of-general-capabilities>

Project Schedule

Key to colour coded activities

	Assessments due – submitted assessment tasks for grading
	Training
	Partner attendance

Phase	Week	Theme	Standard item	Assessment/ Homework
Preparation	1	Welcome and unit overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of ICPU and semester program Introduction of project Expectations and challenges Get to know each other 'Mapping ways of thinking' Interdisciplinary groups 	
	2	Introducing the Partner and the problem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group formation Partner attendance 	
	3	Understanding the brief	Develop workable problem statement Librarian visit	
	4	Different ways of doing	Research Design & Methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determining where answers are Determining ways to gather the answers How to make sense of the answers 	
Working the brief	5	Building ethical fitness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner attendance 5 mins pitch and feedback Refining the group's focus with the industry partner 	Group Plan (20%)
	<i>Semester Break</i>			
	6	The importance of different perspective	Refine the group plan	
	7	Value of reflection Individual statement activities	<p><i>PS must submit student research application to the EEE Ethics Officer by the end of this week.</i></p> <p>Levels of reflection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What happened? Why it happened? How I felt about it happening? <p>Sharing with group members what was most educative in terms of project, working with others, working with yourself</p>	Individual Statement (20%)

Finishing	8	Group Project time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner attendance 5 mins pitch and feedback Refining the group's focus with the industry partner 	
	9	Group Project time	Individual thinking time	
	10	Group Project time	Report writing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report structure Sketch the outline Writing purposefully Tone and style 	
	11	Group project time Writing for impact	Presentation skills and influencing for impact. Developing and delivering your presentation	
	12	Group project time Presenting for impact	Group Project Report Preparing for presentation	
Presenting	13	Completing project Employment readiness	Booking a Presentation Rehearsal with Project Supervisor by appointment (feedback from PS) Group Final Presentations (feedback from partners) Finalization of Group Project Report (Editing, formatting, etc.) Transferrable skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory of project, soft, and personal skills How those skills can be highlighted in your interview, CV and job application How to make the skills work for you 	Group Presentation (10%) Group Project Report (50%)

Note: The arrangements and the teaching materials could be changed and updated, please be advised by your Project Supervisor.

Assessments*

Assessment	Type	Weighting	LOs	Assessor	Due Week and Date
Group Plan 2500 words	Group	20%	LO1,LO2,LO3, LO5,LO6	Project Supervisor	Week 5 (01/04/2021, 11.59pm Thursday)
Individual Statement 1500 words	Individual	20%	LO1,LO4,LO5,LO6, LO7,LO8,LO9	Project Supervisor	Week 7 (25/04/2021, 11.59pm Sunday)
Group Project Report 5000 words (or equivalent) This assessment includes an individual contribution mark worth 10%.**	Group	50%	LO1,LO2,LO3,LO4, LO5,LO6,LO8, LO10,LO11,LO12	Project Supervisor	Week 13 (06/06/2021, 11.59pm Sunday)
Group Presentation (≤ 20 mins)	Group	10%	LO2,LO3,LO5,LO6	Project Supervisor	Week 13

* LAWS3508/5208

In addition to those assessment tasks, law students enrolled in an ICPU through LAWS3508 and LAWS5208 are required to submit a 1000 word Discipline reflection at the end of the semester. This is an unreferenced personal reflection, and is assessed on a pass/fail basis; a student is able to resubmit a 'fail' paper until it achieves a pass grade. Students will receive announcements through Canvas with detailed instructions from the Unit of Study Coordinator in Law, Professor Simon Rice <<mailto:simon.rice@sydney.edu.au>>.

**Individual contribution to group work mark

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

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

The students' contribution is assessed by the Project Supervisor, taking into account contributions during synchronous and asynchronous tasks and peer evaluations. This includes

- Completion of homework tasks (instructions will be provided by the Project Supervisor);
- Attendance record;
- Project Supervisor's observations of students' participation in group work during class time;
- Peer evaluations of students' contributions to the group work, collected via peer evaluation surveys.

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

Assessment	Type	Weighting	LO	Assessor	Due
Group Plan 2500 words	Group	20%	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	Project Supervisor	Week 5 (11.59pm Sunday)

Description

The purpose of this assessment is to help your group demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the brief and create an achievable plan for your group's work across the semester. You will articulate:

- 1) the problem/s your group will solve
- 2) your group's overall approach to the project work
- 3) the tasks and roles the group members will undertake
- 4) the expected impact of the project
- 5) the timeline required for the completion of the project

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

Introduction (700 words)

In this section, you demonstrate your comprehensive understanding of the different themes and perspectives relating to the complex problem described in the project brief.

- Drawing on a range of academic literature and other reliable sources, provide a brief but compelling overview of key themes related to the topic. Consider the topic through the lens of various disciplinary perspectives, contexts, and issues relevant to the industry partner's sector (e.g., political, economic, social, technological, environmental, legal, etc.).
- Identify gaps in current knowledge, or opportunities that could be pursued.
- Articulate a problem or opportunity statement derived from your overview of the complex problem (i.e., a clear and concise description of a significant issue(s) that your group will address).

Aims (200 words)

In this section, you identify an aim(s) that will guide the development of your group's work in this project.

- Specify the aim(s) for your project. This should express the main theme or 'unknown' that your group will focus on and may be expressed as a research question. Note: this is not a statement of the expected outcomes or outputs that you aspire to.
- Break your overall aim(s) into a series of project objectives. As a subset of the aim(s), objectives should define specific research tasks or steps, from which you will build your approach and methods.

Approach and Methods (700 words)

In this section, you formulate an integrated work plan.

- Select particular methods or techniques (for research or problem-solving) and sources of evidence that you plan to use. Explain how your chosen methods or techniques are relevant to your problem statement, aim(s), and objectives, including their limitations.
- Explain and justify how your selected methods and techniques combine into an overall approach appropriate to a complex problem. Examples of interdisciplinary approaches include complex problem-solving, design thinking, agile methodology, or you can propose your own approach.

Note: you may need to adjust your approach and methods as your project progresses.

Group Profile (700 words)

In this section, you specify the skills and knowledge that each group member brings to the project, and how these contribute to an integrated work plan.

- Explain how the disciplinary perspectives or ways of thinking in your group shape your shared approach to the problem. What other skills (e.g., transferrable skills) and experience do they offer?
- Specify each group member's expected contributions to the project work.

Impact and Significance (200 words)

In this section, you envision the potential significance or contribution of your project in relation to the problem or opportunity statement.

- Outline the anticipated impacts of your project for the Partner and/or other stakeholders, and why these are significant.
- You may include any wider contributions of your project (e.g., scholarly, social, commercial, environmental, etc.).

Timeline (not included in word count)

In this section, you develop a feasible project schedule for the duration of the project (i.e., across the remainder of semester).

- Organise the activities that are needed to accomplish the project aims and assign them to group members according to their knowledge and skills. You need to take into account all the requirements of your project and lead times for the preparation of key deliverables. A common and useful approach is to construct a Gantt chart (<http://www.gantt.com/>).

References (not included in word count)

- All statements or claims should be supported with evidence by citing a wide range of published literature, relevant industry or community reports, etc.
- A reference list should be included at the end of the Group Plan and the style should be consistent with the APA 6th Referencing Style:
<http://libguides.library.usyd.edu.au/c.php?g=508212&p=3476096>

Format for the document: Font: 12, Line spacing: 1.5 times.

Rubric

The rubric for this model assessment is available on Canvas.

1. Individual statement (1500 words)

Assessment	Type	Weighting	LO	Assessor	Due
Individual Statement 1500 words	Individual	20%	1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	Project Supervisor	Week 7 (25/04/2021, 11.59pm Sunday)

Description

Part one: Participation in individual and group reflection (not assessable)

This task requires students to provide a critical reflection of their individual approach to and contribution to the project brief as part of a diverse and interdisciplinary team as well as the achievement of interdisciplinary learning by their Project Group. This task requires a process of *ongoing reflection* on your individual and group-based learning and as such has two stages:

Reflection is an essential part of the curriculum for this project unit. Drawing on concepts from the project unit and your experiences in the Project, students are encouraged to make regular entries into an individual journal (online or paper), as well as to contribute to an online discussion board for their Project Group:

Week 3-4: Describe the ways of thinking that you bring from your educational background (you may also draw on your professional and personal background if you wish) including how this is influencing your initial approach to the project brief. This may include discussion of discipline/s, worldviews, key concepts and methodologies across two posts and should cite relevant literature:

- (1) You need to write a first post explaining your ways of thinking and how this informs your approach to the brief, including potential contributions you could make (200 words max)
- (2) You need to respond briefly to the post of a group member, wherein you explore differences and/or similarities with the ways of thinking expressed by another student (100 words max)

Part 2: (Assessable)

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

1. Giving examples from the Project, reflect on how your ways of thinking and working are contributing to the Project in comparison to other ways of thinking. This should include a critical reflection of the strengths and limitations of your approach relative to others.
2. What potential or actual problems are arising from working on the Project with collaborators whose ways of thinking are similar or different to your own? What strategies are you using to avoid or resolve those problems?
3. To what extent did your group achieve interdisciplinary learning? You may wish to discuss barriers your team identified and/or experienced as well as strategies for overcoming these and your learning from this process.

In answering all the questions, support your arguments with concepts from the academic literature.

This is not a research task. However, in your answers, you will need to support your arguments with concepts from the academic literature (i.e. core readings from this project) as well as specific examples from your project experience and interactions with your group.

Students will need to engage the following texts in their assessment and include a reference list consistent with the APA 6th Referencing Style:

<http://libguides.library.usyd.edu.au/c.php?g=508212&p=3476096>

The following list is recommended to help you to prepare for this assessment, however, you are encouraged to use other resources from your disciplinary backgrounds.

- Augsborg, T., and Chitewere, C. (2013); Starting with worldviews: A five-step preparatory approach to integrative interdisciplinary learning. *Issues in Interdisciplinary Studies* 31, 163-180.
- Ashby, I. & Exter, M. (2019) 'Designing for Interdisciplinarity in Higher Education: Considerations for Instructional Designers', *TechTrends*, 63: pp. 202-208.
- Ghanizadeh, A (2017). *The interplay between reflective thinking, critical thinking, self-monitoring, and academic achievement in higher education*, *High Educ* (2017) 74:101–114
- Lew, M & Schmidt, H. Self-Reflection and Academic Performance: Is There a Relationship? *Adv in Health Sci Educ* (2011) 16:529–545
- Kestra, M. M., & S. (2017). Complexity: The Main Driving Force Behind Interdisciplinarity. *In An Introduction to Interdisciplinary Research: Theory and Practice* (pp. 34–40). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press
- Klein J. (2005). Interdisciplinary Teamwork: the Dynamics of Collaboration and Integration. Chapter 2 in *Interdisciplinary Collaboration: An Emerging Cognitive Science* edited by Derry, S. J., Schunn, C. D., & M.A. Gernsbacher. New York & Hove: Psychology Press
- Molander, B. (2008), "Have I kept inquiry moving?" on the Epistemology of Reflection, *Phenomenology & Practice*, Vol 2 No.1, pp. 4 – 23.
- Newman S.(1999) Constructing And Critiquing Reflective Practice, *Educational Action Research*, Vol 7, No.1, pp145-163, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650799900200081>
- Rick Szostak, "Communicating Complex Concepts" in Michael O'Rourke et al., *Enhancing Communication and Collaboration in Interdisciplinary Research*, Sage, 2013, 34-55
- Ryan, M., & Ryan, M. (2013). Theorising a model for teaching and assessing reflective learning in higher education, *Higher Education Research & Development*, 32(2), 244–257. DOI:10.1080/07294360.2012.661704
- Reich, S. M., & Reich, J. A. (2006). Cultural Competence in Interdisciplinary Collaborations: A Method for Respecting Diversity in Research Partnerships. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 38, 51-62.
- Wood, J (2012). *Transformation through Journal Writing*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers. [Chapter 7: 'Reflective Frameworks and Models']

Format for the document: Font: 12; Line spacing: 1.5 times.

Rubric

The rubric for this assessment is available on Canvas.

3.Group Project Report (5000 words or equiv.) 50%

Assessment	Type	Weighting	LO	Assessor	Due
Group Project Report	Group	50%	1,2,3,4,5,6,8,	Project Supervisor	Week 13
5000 words (or equivalent)			10,11,12		06/06/2021, 11.59pm Sunday)

(Includes an individual contribution mark worth 10/50 marks*)

Description

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

The Report should clearly communicate the Project background, method, results, analysis, conclusions and recommendations, and references. Grading will be based on the same criteria described for the Report and must demonstrate a scope and depth of research equivalent to 5000 words collated through group inputs.

The information in your report should clearly address the points below and be organised into the relevant sections (please also consult the rubric). Word counts are provided as a guide only to highlight relative weighting of the sections. Please note, a maximum word-count applies and submissions that exceed this word-count will be penalised.

Title Page (not included in word count)

This should include a descriptive title for your research report, the names of each team member and a word-count (excluding references and appendices).

Contents Page (not included in word count)

This should include a list of the individual sections of the report.

Executive Summary (200 words)

In this section you provide a summary of the work you have performed in the project that can be read independently of the rest of the report. It should be provided on a stand-alone page within the report.

- Provide a clear, succinct summary of the overall context, problem, approach, results and recommendations of the report.
- State the usefulness of the recommendations, and possible future work that may be required.
- Please note: Referencing is usually not required in an Executive Summary, however, where specific concepts, theory or data are referred to, conventional referencing rules apply.

Introduction and Project Aims (800 words)

In this section, you analyse the context and complexity of the problem, and identify a relevant aim(s) and objectives for your project.

- Analyse the complexity of the problem. This should include a well-supported integration of the available published information on your group's specific topic, drawing out multiple disciplinary perspectives and contexts.
- Based on this analysis, clearly state the problem or opportunity that your group focused on and explain why this is a significant area for exploration.
- Specify the aim(s) or research question(s) investigated by your group, together with the objectives of your project (i.e., steps that helped you achieve your aim(s)).

Approach and Methods (800 words)

In this section, you describe the processes you followed to achieve the aim(s) and objectives of your project (these should have developed since your Group Plan), drawing on appropriate scholarly literature to support. Note, this section should not focus on recommendations to the complex problem.

- Describe the overall approach taken in the execution of this project and explain why it is appropriate to the context of the problem you explored.
- Justify the particular methods or techniques (for research or problem-solving) and sources of evidence that you used. Your justification should demonstrate how these methods or techniques are aligned with your aim(s) and objectives, and also discuss any limitations.
- Describe how you identified relevant disciplinary knowledge, attributes and skills in your group and how you combined these in designing and executing the specified approach and methods of your project.

Findings (1400 words)

In this section, you report the findings of your project. Depending on the nature of your project, you may choose to combine the Findings and Discussion sections of your Report.

- Present the results, data, evidence, etc., obtained through your chosen approach and methods/techniques.
- You may present the findings using visual elements (e.g., images, text, figures, tables, illustrations, and diagrams; please note, these all contribute to word-count).
- Any primary research instruments (e.g., interviews or survey questions) should be included in an appendix. Transcripts of interviews and raw data from surveys should be available on request. Refer to these as necessary in your Report.

Discussion (1100 words)

In this section, you integrate, interpret and evaluate the findings in reference to your aim(s) to develop a solution or set of recommendations based on your research.

- Explain the relevance of your findings in the context of the problem statement.
- Develop a solution and/or set of recommendations based on your findings.
- Critically evaluate your recommendations in relation to the context of the problem.
- Analyse and discuss the feasibility of your solution/recommendations and develop a high-level implementation or execution plan (e.g., what are your suggested next steps for the Industry Partner?).
- Identify and discuss any limitations of your research and project work.

Interdisciplinary collaboration (300 words)

In this section (which may be incorporated as a sub-section with the Discussion), evaluate the interdisciplinary dimensions of findings and any solutions/recommendations by your group. Note: this can include a critical discussion of the limits to interdisciplinary collaboration, where this is the case.

- Drawing on appropriate scholarly literature on interdisciplinary research, critically evaluate the ways in which different disciplinary methods/concepts and/or sources of evidence are synthesised in the development of your solution/recommendations.
- Identify any limitations or opportunity to further develop the interdisciplinary scope and analysis of your research.

Conclusions and Recommendations (400 words)

In this section, you contextualise the key recommendations of your Report in reference to the problem and aim(s) of your project.

- Provide a compelling summary of your solution/recommendations and actions to be taken.
- Discuss the significance of your solution/recommendations for the problem and its context. Does the outcome improve understanding, suggest a novel or innovative approach/product, or have potential to transform current practice?
- Identify the future work that should be done to address unanswered or new questions arising from what the project, as appropriate.

Referencing

- All statements or claims should be supported with evidence by citing published literature, relevant industry or community reports, materials supplied by the Partner, etc.
- A reference list should be included at the end of the Group Project Report and the style should be consistent with the APA 6th Referencing Style:
<http://libguides.library.usyd.edu.au/c.php?g=508212&p=3476096>

Format for the document: Font: 12; Line spacing: 1.5 times.

Rubric

The rubric for this model assessment is available on Canvas.

4. Group presentation (10%)

Assessment	Type	Weighting	LO	Assessor	Due
Group Presentation 20 min	Group	10%	2, 3,5, 6,	Project Supervisor with regard to peer assessment.	Week 13

Final presentation

Description

A presentation with the Project Partner is scheduled in Week 13, where the groups selected by the Project Supervisor present their work to the Partner.

All students in a group should present or answer questions. Assessment will take contribution of all students into account.

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

The presentation is marked by the Project Supervisor and Partners. Partners and Project Supervisors will each fill out marking sheets for each group. The Project Supervisor will assign the final mark, taking into account the Partners marks.

Where appropriate, presentations (e.g. PDFs) must be submitted via Canvas drop box for marking purpose.

Rubric

The rubric for this assessment is available on Canvas.

Suggested Readings

1. Interdisciplinarity

Augsburg, T., and Chitewere, C. (2013); Starting with worldviews: A five-step preparatory approach to integrative interdisciplinary learning. *Issues in Interdisciplinary Studies* 31, 163-180.

Ashby, I., & Exter, M. (2019). Designing for Interdisciplinarity in Higher Education: Considerations for Instructional Designers. *TechTrends: Linking Research and Practice to Improve Learning*, 63(2), 202–208.

Keestra, M. M., & S. (2017). Complexity: the main driving force behind interdisciplinarity. In *An Introduction to Interdisciplinary Research: Theory and Practice* (pp. 34–40). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Klein J. (2005). Interdisciplinary Teamwork: the Dynamics of Collaboration and Integration. Chapter 2 in *Interdisciplinary Collaboration: An Emerging Cognitive Science* edited by Derry, S. J., Schunn, C. D., & M.A. Gernsbacher. New York & Hove: Psychology Press.

Lattuca, L., Knight, D., & Bergom, I. (2013). Developing a measure of interdisciplinary competence. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 29(3), 726–739.

National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine of The National Academies (2004) *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research*. Washington, D.C. The National Academies Press.

Nikitina, S. 2006, Three strategies for interdisciplinary teaching: contextualizing, conceptualizing, and problem-centring, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38:3, 251-271.

Reich, S. M., & Reich, J. A. (2006). Cultural Competence in Interdisciplinary Collaborations: A Method for Respecting Diversity in Research Partnerships. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 38, 51-62

Szostak, R. (2013) “Communicating Complex Concepts” in Michael O’Rourke et al., *Enhancing Communication and Collaboration in Interdisciplinary Research*, Sage, 34-55.

2. Building effective teams

Duhigg, C. (2016) ‘What Google Learned From Its Quest To Build the Perfect Team’, *The New York Times Magazine*, 26 February: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/28/magazine/what-google-learned-from-its-quest-to-build-the-perfect-team.html>.

Edmondson, C. & Roloff, S. (2009). Overcoming Barriers to Collaboration: Psychological Safety and Learning in Diverse Teams. In *Team effectiveness in complex organizations cross-disciplinary perspectives and approaches* edited by Salas, E., Goodwin, G., & Burke, C. New York: Routledge.

Edmondson, C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological Safety: The History, Renaissance, and Future of an Interpersonal Construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 23–43.

Klein, J. (2005). Interdisciplinary Teamwork: the Dynamics of Collaboration and Integration. Chapter 2 in *Interdisciplinary Collaboration: An Emerging Cognitive Science* edited by Derry, J., Schunn, D., & M. Gernsbacher. New York & Hove: Psychology Press.

3. Research approaches and relevant theories

Bryman, A. (2008) Chapter 1 Social Research Strategies, in *Social Research Methods* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford.

Bryman, A. (2012) Chapter 4 Planning A Research Project and Formulating Research Questions. Section: Formulating suitable research questions in *Social Research Methods*. 4th Ed, Oxford University Press, New York.

Bjørn, P., and Østerlund, C. 2014. *Sociomaterial-Design: Bounding Technologies in Practice*. Copenhagen: Springer. [Please read Chapter 2, Sociomateriality & Design, pp.15-40]

Creswell, J.W.& Creswell, J.D (2018), *The Selection of a Research Approach, in Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, London: Sage.

Knapp, J., Zeratsky, J., & Kowitz, B. (2016). *Sprint: How to Solve Big Problems and Test New Ideas in Just Five Days*: London: Transworld Publishers ('Preface' and 'Introduction', pp. 1-17).

Kumar, R. (2012) *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE. [Please read chapter 4: 'Formulating a Research Problem', pp. 43-59]

May, T. *Social Research*, McGraw-Hill Education, 2010. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy1.library.usyd.edu.au/lib/usyd/detail.action?docID=729519> (Chapter 3: Values and ethics in the research process, pp 46-70).

Orlikowski, W. (2007), *Sociomaterial Practices: Exploring Technology at Work, Organization Studies*. 28(09): 1435–1448.

O'Leary, Z., & Hunt, J.S. (2016). *Workplace Research: Conducting Small-Scale Research in Organisations*, Sage: London. [Please read chapter 8: 'Producing Effective Deliverables']

Slevitch, L. (2011), *Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies Compared: Ontological and Epistemological Perspectives, Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 12: pp. 73–81.

Van Krieken, R., Smith, P. Habibis, B., Smith, P., Hutchins, B., Martin, G. & Maton, K. (2017) *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*, 6th Edition, Sydney, Pearson [Read 'Future Trends: The Rise of Knowledge', pp. 174–9]

4. Value of reflection

Ghanizadeh, A (2017). The Interplay Between Reflective Thinking, Critical Thinking, Self-Monitoring, And Academic Achievement in Higher Education, *High Educ* (2017) 74:101–114.

Lew, M & Schmidt, H. Self-reflection and Academic Performance: Is There a Relationship? *Adv in Health Sci Educ* (2011) 16:529–545.

Molander, B. (2008), "Have I kept inquiry moving?" on the Epistemology of Reflection, *Phenomenology & Practice*, Vol 2 No.1, pp. 4 – 23.

Wood, J (2012). *Transformation through Journal Writing*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers. [Chapter 7: 'Reflective Frameworks and Models'].

5. Critical thinking

Belluigi, Z., & Cundill, G. (2015). Establishing Enabling Conditions to Develop Critical Thinking Skills: A Case of Innovative Curriculum Design in Environmental Science. *Environmental Education Research*, 23(7), 950-971.

Durton, R. 2006, *Critical Thinking Framework for Any Discipline, International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Volume 17, Number 2, 160-166.

Thompson, C., (2011). Critical Thinking Across the Curriculum: Process Over Output, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 1 No. 9 [Special Issue – July 2011]

Ralston, A., & Bays, L. (2015). Critical Thinking Development in Undergraduate Engineering Students from Freshman Through Senior Year: A 3-Cohort Longitudinal Study. *American Journal of Engineering Education*, 6(2), 85-98.

Policies

Policies and procedures in relation to special consideration, simple extensions, academic dishonesty and plagiarism, use of similarity detection software, submission of assessments, attendance and academic appeals are set out in the Unit of Study Outline.