PEARSON MASTER CLASS

ANZAM Conference

Perth, December 5-7, 2012

Presenter: ***April Wright***

2011 ANZAM Pearson 'Management Educator of The Year'

Senior Lecturer

UQ Business School

University of Queensland

Email: a.wright@business.uq.edu.au

NOTE: This master class is based on the tutorial program I designed for the first-year course, Introduction to Management, at the University of Queensland.

PEARSON MASTER CLASS

This master class tackles a common challenge facing all management educators – how to get students to learn effectively in groups. In this master class, you will be introduced to a team-based learning approach that minimises the problems of students fragmenting their learning by dividing up group tasks and/or free-riding. Evidence shows the approach substantially increases student preparation, in-class participation, exam performance, and evaluation feedback. Through a series of interactive activities, you will be shown how the team-based learning approach works in the classroom and provided with learning and assessment resources to adapt the approach for use in your own course teaching.

The interactive activities are designed to step you through the team based learning approach that I use in the course, *Introduction to Management*, at the University of Queensland. During the activity, you will be asked to discuss the following three statements with your group:

(i) The major challenge with groupwork is that students divide up tasks between the group members, which means individuals gain only a fragmented understanding of concepts and theories.

(ii) The major challenge with groupwork is stopping individual students from free riding on the group, which leads to student complaints and dissatisfaction.

(iii) The major challenge with groupwork is getting students from different cultural backgrounds to actively participate.

To assist you in adapting the team-based learning approach to your own classes, I have provided examples of the teaching resources I developed for the course, *MGTS1301 Introduction to Management*, at the University of Queensland on the pages that follow.

INTRODUCTION TO THE MGTS1301 TUTORIAL PROGRAM

Case studies are well established for teaching a business way of thinking (Reynolds, 1978). However, traditional case teaching methods limit the potential for students to learn through dialogue with each other (Argyris, 1980). If students are split into small groups to prepare and present a case analysis, students will often seek to minimise work by dividing the case questions between them, which leads to fragmented learning (Bacon, 2005; Cannon & Newble, 2000). To resolve these problems, we have designed the MGTS1301 tutorial program based on team-based learning, developed by Michaelson, Knight and Fink (2004).

Team-based learning deepens student learning of course content through repeating phases of pre-class preparation, readiness assurance tests and application of course concepts. The essential principles are that (i) groups are properly formed, managed and permanent; (ii) students are made accountable for individual and group work; (iii) group tasks promote both learning and team development by not requiring complex outputs which groups can divide up and complete as individuals outside of class; and (iv) students receive frequent and timely feedback (Michaelsen et al., 2004). These principles are best achieved when individuals and groups work on the <u>same task</u>, when individuals and groups are required to make a <u>specific choice</u>; and when groups report choices <u>simultaneously.</u>

This workbook contains the activities that form the basis for our adaptation of team-based learning in the MGTS1301 tutorial program. Each week students are asked to (i) pre-read a case study, consider a set of statements applying theoretical concepts introduced in the lecture to the case, and choose the most appropriate statement; (ii) discuss and defend their chosen statement with other team members in class to reach a team consensus, with individual positions and team consensus justified on a tutorial work sheet submitted at the end of the class; and (iii) discuss and defend their team consensus against other teams in a tutor-facilitated class debrief. The table on the next page shows how we have adapted the team-based learning model for use in our tutorial program. Tutorials 1 and 2 are used to introduce you incrementally to the team-based learning approach and to facilitate and finalise permanent team formation. Tutorial 3 provides a full-scale ‘practice run’ in your permanent team. Formal assessment begins in Tutorial 4 and occurs a further four times during the semester. Students should attend all lectures and tutorials to consolidate their learning of course content in preparation for the mid-semester and final exams and to assist you in writing your reflection on the tutorial program, due June 1.

References:

Argyris, C. 1980. Some limitations of the case method: Experiences in a management development program. ***Academy of Management Review***, 5: 291-298.

Bacon, D. R. 2005. The effects of group projects on content-related learning. ***Journal of Management Education***, 29(2): 248-267.

Cannon, R., & Newble, D. 2000. ***A Handbook for Teachers in Universities and Colleges: A Guide to Improving Teaching Methods***. London: Kogan-Page.

Michaelsen, L. K., Knight, A., & Fink, L. D. 2004. ***Team-Based Learning: A Transformative Use of Small Groups***. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Reynolds, J. I. 1978. There's method in cases. ***Academy of Management Review***, 3(1): 129-133.

The Team-Based Learning Model as used in MGTS1301

Phases	**Timing**	**Activity**
Phase 1: Preparation	Pre-Tutorial	Students attend the lecture and read the lecture materials and textbook. They then read the relevant case study activity and prepare their answer to the case study statements.
Phase 2: Individual Readiness Assurance	In-Tutorial: First 5 minutes	Students join their team of four and write their individual responses in the designated sections of the activity sheet. <u>These responses need only be one dot point on each statement.</u> The purpose of the individual responses is to provide evidence to the tutor, and to fellow team members, that a student has done some preparation before the tutorial. Team members should try to position their chairs around the desk to write simultaneously on the worksheet to maximise time for the next phase, which is where most learning will occur. Note: Phases 2 and 3 may overlap as teams may write and discuss simultaneously.
Phase 3: Application Discussion	In-Tutorial: Next 25 minutes	Students discuss their answers as a team to reach consensus on <u>one</u> statement. Justification, which integrates ideas from individual responses, is written in the central box on the tutorial worksheet. The tutor moves around the teams to (i) probe for more theoretically grounded reasoning to deepen learning, and (ii) assure that individual students are contributing to the group discussion.
Phase 4: Feedback	In-Tutorial: Final 20 minutes	Tutor facilitates a class debrief in which teams discuss and defend their positions. This enhances learning through comparison and immediate feedback. Tutor provides verbal feedback on team performances. ***Note:*** The tutor will award marks to each team based on their observation of the team's in-group and whole-class discussion, as well as what is written as the team consensus in the middle section of the tutorial worksheet. The tutor may moderate individual students up or down from the team mark based on their individual contribution to the discussion and also on their individual section of the worksheet (ie was there evidence of some pre-class preparation?). A copy of the assessment rubric is provided on the next page. An example of an assessment task and a worksheet completed by students in a previous semester is provided in the Appendix.
Phase 5: Formal feedback and reflection	Next class	Tutor returns assessment rubrics from previous week's class if it was a formal assessment week. Students respond to formal feedback by modifying learning behaviour through further practice before the next assessment. Research shows feedback is especially important for first-year students.

MGTS1301 TUTORIAL ASSESSMENT MARKING CRITERIA

Tutorial Group: **Student Name:** **Student No.**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
GROUP:				
Knowledge of Course Theory	The group discussion included little or no reference to theory from the lecture.	The group discussion included some reference to theories from the lecture.	The group discussion included reference to most of the relevant theories from the lecture.	The group discussion included reference to the relevant theories from the current lecture topic and to relevant theories from other lectures.
Application of Theory to the Case	The group discussion of each statement was superficial and did not apply theory to the case study.	The group attempted to apply some theory to the case study to justify their agreement or disagreement with each statement.	The group provided an in-depth application of theory to the case study to justify their agreement or disagreement with each statement.	The group applied theory to the case study in original and insightful ways to justify their agreement or disagreement with each statement.
Team Work	The group did not work well together. There was little evidence of collaborative discussion about the statements.	The group communicated relatively well, although at times some students dominated the discussion and others did not appear to be engaged.	The group worked well with each other. Some members participated slightly more than others.	The group worked very well together and all group members contributed equally to the final choice of statement.
GROUP MARK:				
INDIVIDUAL:				
Preparation	The student did not appear to have read the tutorial activity prior to class and wrote very little on the activity sheet or appeared to copy notes from other group members.	The student had read the tutorial activity prior to class and wrote comments on the activity sheet which demonstrated a sound understanding of both the case study and theory.		The student was well prepared and wrote insightful comments on the activity sheet.
Participation	The student's contribution to the discussion appeared to be below the standard of the group.	The student's contribution to the discussion in class was of a similar standard to the group.		The student's contribution to the discussion in class was above the standard of the group.
INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT:				
FINAL MARK OUT OF 5:				

SAMPLE OF A TEAM-BASED LEARNING ACTIVITY

The following pages contain a sample of a tutorial activity completed by students in my Introduction to Management course in a previous semester, including a completed worksheet (Note: This worksheet was written up by my tutors as an illustration of the kind of work students produce in class). Please note:

- The example provided is from the topic of Innovation and Change.
- The worksheet contains one individual box for each of the students in the group and one consensus box in the centre.
- Students were given five minutes to write in their individual box on the worksheet. Note how students wrote one comment on each statement and how they wrote upside down and sideways so they could all write on the worksheet at the same time.
- Students were given twenty five minutes to discuss their individual positions and reach a team consensus which they recorded in the centre box on the worksheet. Note how teams have applied theoretical concepts from the course to the case study to support their preferred statement (note: FE is Fuzzy Eyes). Note, too, how the argument in the centre box has been developed and deepened during discussion time. A more comprehensive answer has emerged from the combined insights in the individual answers through the process of discussion. This is why it is particularly important to ensure all group members are given a voice in the discussion.

TASK DESCRIPTION (as provided to students in the tutorial workbook)

Prior to attending your tutorial, read the Case Study on Fuzzyeyes Studio printed below. In your tutorial, your group will be asked to consider the statements listed below and to select the statement you agree with most strongly. You must be able to justify your selected statement by drawing on theory from the lecture and applying it to the Fuzzyeyes Studio case study. Your group can choose one statement only (either A, B, C, or D) and you must be able to defend your choice to other groups.

A. The most important factor in the success of Fuzzyeyes Studio is how the competitiveness of the market for gaming products drives innovation.

B. The most important factor in the success of Fuzzyeyes Studio is the small size of the organisation, which ensures that the steps in the innovation process are completed in a short time frame.

C. The most important factor in the success of Fuzzyeyes Studio is the culture of the organisation, which ensures that all of the roles in the innovation process are performed.

D. The most important factor in the success of Fuzzyeyes Studios is the use of external collaborations to manage the uncertainties of the innovation process.

CASE STUDY: Fuzzyeyes Studios

South-east Queensland has become a little-known hub for the rapidly emerging and highly profitable computer-gaming industry in Australia. One company in the hub is 'Fuzzyeyes Studios', based in Brisbane. Sonny Lu started Fuzzyeyes in 2001 as a young entrepreneur with a vision to build a successful multimedia software development company focusing on PC and PS2 games development. Fuzzyeyes' products focus on lighthearted fun and they include AussieAdventure, OzFighter, Battle Wombat, Super Oz Kart, Crazy Fire Fighters and NHLA (New Human Liveable Atmosphere, HotDogs HotGals). The philosophy of Fuzzyeyes is 'we create fun' and this is reflected in the creation of games that are easy to play, stress free and entertaining.

Fuzzyeyes has found that its main markets are in the US and Europe, rather than in Australia. The company takes on larger US competitors by cooperating with other games developers in Australia through associations such the Game Developers Association (GDAA) of Australia and Electronic Games Queensland (EGQ). The GDAA helps to coordinate the Australian game industry's presence at major international trade shows and also helps to develop the industry through conferences, conventions and government lobbying. As a small to medium-sized enterprise (SME), Fuzzyeyes also copes with the challenges of the external environment through involvement with Queensland Games Developers, a cooperative group that works together with local and state governments to promote the talent and skills of firms internationally and win new business. The external environment, however, is full of promise, with interactive entertainment software sales of over $US6 billion, currently exceeding movie box-office turnover in the United States. The industry is also regarded as being relatively 'recession-proof', with no slowdown in industry growth from the 1980s to today.

The company's internal environment is characterized by an organizational culture where innovation, creativity and passion are rewarded. The company has a flat management structure where the chain of command evolves to adapt to the changing needs of different projects. Sonny says, "We are sort of a cell, with lots of bubbles acting in their own functions and the company is like a big bubble putting them altogether." Hierarchy is replaced with the chain of command similar to the reactions of a biochemical pathway occurring inside a cell. Sonny says that 80 per cent of people work in the industry because they are interested in the work and they find it fun, rather than just for monetary rewards. Workers in Fuzzyeyes are rewarded for their efforts, however, with a bonus pay system rewarding hard-working and creative staff. Sonny gives credit to his parents who taught him to empower and trust his employees, especially when it comes to decision making in management. The company's website warmly proclaims, "We take pride in our creative and innovative staff members who work passionately on inventive and original game concepts." With such a positive work environment and motivated staff, Fuzzyeyes is poised to continue producing games that are both educational and lots of fun."

(Source: Bartol, K., Tein, M., Matthews, G., Ritson, P. and Scott-Ladd, B. 2006. *Management Foundations – A Pacific Rim Focus*, McGraw-Hill Irwin, p.69.)

Name: ✓
Student #: 4

A = Disagree. Not the only aspect that drives innovation but does play a part with its competition against competitors.

B = Disagree. F.E. is competing with giants such as Sony ∴ something greater must be driving the company.

C = Disagree. F.E must delve beyond the org. culture to ensure all roles are performed.

D = Agree. Associations such as GDAA help to co-ordinate the industry's presence in major international trade shows & collaborates through conferences, conventions & government lobbying to manage the uncertainties. Provides a link bringing info. from external environment

Name: A
Student #: 1

A = Disagree. Not the only aspect that drives innovation but does play a part with its competitors.

B = Disagree. F.E. is competing with giants such as Sony ∴ something greater must be driving the company.

C = Disagree. F.E must delve beyond the org. culture to ensure all roles are performed.

D = Agree. Associations such as GDAA help to co-ordinate the industry's presence in major international trade shows & collaborates through conferences, conventions & government lobbying to manage the uncertainties. Provides a link bringing info. from external environment

Choice: A B (C) D

Justification: for C:
- Idea generators work with external sources such as GDAA & EGQ to create new insights as well as promote innovation & excellence through internal discovery.
- Informational gatekeepers → external sources mentioned above.
- Product champions → empower & trust employees. Core & observable culture both positive & rewards for innovation & creativity
- Product management → flat management structure, structured chain of command adapts to changing needs
- Innovation leaders → rewards passion 80% find it fun

Not A → unique market, even with new ideas without external links the innovations cannot go global.
Not B → if they do not expand & stay small FE is limiting their innovations with lack of technical & expert knowledge.
Not D → External collaborations is only a step in the innovation process, needs internal factors for success

Name: B
Student #: 2

A DISAGREE. IT IS A COMPETITIVE MARKET, BUT SO CALLED RECESSION PROOF! THEREFORE THREATS FROM ECONOMY OR FROM COMPETITORS MAY NOT HAVE BIG EFFECT.

B DISAGREE. IF ANYTHING SMALL SIZE LIMITS THE AMOUNT OF NEW INNOVATIONS. ALL ROLES MUST BE FULFILLED. FIRST MOVER ADVANTAGE MAY BE A DISADVANTAGE.

C AGREE CULTURE REWARDS INNOVATION & CREATIVITY. SUPPORTS EMPLOYEE DECISION MAKING EMPOWERMENT & TRUST LEADS TO FLEXIBILITY AMONG STAFF TO PERFORM THE ROLES OF THE INNOVATION PROCESS.

D DISAGREE. USES OUTSIDE HELP. GDAA & EGQ TO PROMOTE THROUGH-OUT THE WORLD. THIS IS ONLY A SMALL PART OF EFFECTIVE & SUCCESSFUL INNOVATION. USE TO GAIN INSIGHT INTO NEW TECHNOLOGY CHANGES/MARKET RESPONSE

Name: Pea. Nut.
Student #: 12345678

D - Agree, Due to the majority of F.E. success coming from US + EU markets its links w/ external collaborators eg. GDAA, EGQ, for primary success. They assist F.E. in coping w/ external challenges. Without these even great innovation could prove unsuccessful.

(A) (B) + (C) - Disagree. These points are vital, even with driven innovation, small size & the greatest organisation culture success is not guaranteed. Small size = fewer products moving through innovation process therefore fewer reach final appreciation