

Instructions for Project II expertise building skills and seminar report including evaluation criteria (45% of the total course grade)

One of the key outcomes of your academic education is your skills and ability to search for relevant existing knowledge and public (research) information on any problem area related to your field of studies. You should also show skills on evaluating the applicability of this information in relation to your current problem. Later you should also be able to reflect your own experiences against the previously known information. These are the key practices by which you build and develop your (academic) expertise in any subject area. In real-life project work this expert way of working becomes visible in the ways you acquire and apply existing knowledge in your project's problem area. Partly you have gained this background information through your previous studies. Partly you will acquire new knowledge as part of your project work. During the implementation of the project, subject area experts will evaluate the existing knowledge against their project experiences. Therefore, in a learning project one should pay attention especially on the development of these key practices for becoming skillful expertise: building expertise in the subject area, updating the knowledge gained, and evaluating previous knowledge against one's own experiences. Academic expertise is built by reflecting one's own experiences against existing academic knowledge (previous research publications).

During this course work the expert way of working becomes visible through the following outcomes:

- a pre-study report (compulsory) = building the expertise at the beginning of the project
 - o list of the core publications found in the problem area (min 20 references) and a short description of each; why included, how will be used
 - o forms the basis for the seminar report (introduction + previous knowledge)
 - o work done alongside the project planning work, ready at the same time with the project plan until the I SG meeting
 - o your supervisor will give comments and feedback
- potentially a wiki page which will be updated during the project lifecycle
- the problems faced during the project and previous knowledge used while solving these problems
- the seminar report (compulsory) in which you state clearly
 - o the subject area of your (academic) expertise built in the project
 - o the previous knowledge on your subject area (by referring to your literature)
 - o the way you have used the previous knowledge in your project work
 - o your own experiences related to your subject area
 - o your evaluation of the previous knowledge against your own experiences (reflection)

The seminar report is a story of your expertise building process of your subject area during your project work; it is a subsequent analysis of your project experiences supported by the previous knowledge in the subject area. The report should be 15-20 pages long and the structure of the report should follow the basic structure of any academic writing: an abstract, introduction to the subject area (by referring to your research literature), previous knowledge of the subject area (by referring to your research literature), your own experiences, the reflection of your experiences against the literature, conclusions and a summary as well as references. The formal guidelines of TOL (and APA) should be followed.

Evaluation (45% of the total course grade)

Evaluation criteria for an expected outcome (grade 3):

- you have learned to acquire relevant and existing knowledge (previous research) in your subject area (academic expertise)
- the pre-study is delivered in time and by following the guidelines given
- you have learned to apply existing knowledge during a real-life project work
- you have learned to evaluate your real-life experiences against existing knowledge (previous research) in the subject area
- the subject of your seminar report is well formulated and focused, your subject has been discussed from various viewpoints and your arguments are supported by references to existing literature
- formal guidelines have been followed and the structure is following the basic structure of academic writing (note e.g. page recommendations, layout, references in the text and the list of references)

Evaluation criteria for outcomes over expectations (grades 4 or 5).

- nothing to complain
- shows real acquaintance of and understanding about the subject area
- your own experiences have been reflected in a critical and mature way
- the use of the references shows skills of analyzing and classifying literature typical for academic literature review

Evaluation criteria for outcomes under expectations (grades 1 or 2).

- more or less faults and shortcomings
- weak reasoning and argumentation
- the use of the references is accidental, summative and irrelevant concerning the subject area
- misspellings and errors in argumentation