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1 Assessment Guide

There are three main activities in this course:

- **a complexity primer** - a collaborative collection of ideas to solve complex problems that we can share with your peers
- **a grand challenge project** - a group activity that helps your peers understand a “Grand Challenge” problem
- **a research portfolio** - an individual critical or creative research piece that explores a complex problem of your choosing

Each activity has multiple submission points so that you can produce your best work possible, and so that your peers can get maximum benefit from your contribution.

1.1 Proposed Assignments

The following table summarises the assessment activities in Unravelling Complexity.

**Table 1: Break down of assignments and weightings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Stage</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complexity Primer</strong></td>
<td>Individual and Group</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Part I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Draft Primer</td>
<td>Wattle</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>5pm Friday Week 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Peer Feedback</td>
<td>Wattle</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>5pm Friday Week 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Roundtable</td>
<td>In Class</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>Friday Week 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Final Primer</td>
<td>Wattle</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5pm Monday, Break Wk 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Peer Review</td>
<td>Wattle</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>5pm Monday, Break Wk 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Challenge Project</strong></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Activity Co-Facilitation &amp; Secret Plan</td>
<td>In Class</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>During Weeks 8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Idea Proposal &amp; Pitch</td>
<td>Wattle and In Class</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Week 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Portfolio</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Epilogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Roundtable</td>
<td>In Class</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>Week 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Artefact</td>
<td>Wattle/In Person</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5pm Monday Week “13”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.1 Variations:

LAWS4001: see specific instructions in the Portfolio description.

VCPG6001: VCPG6001 students will take a leading role in compiling and editing the Complexity Primer. This will be reflected as an additional task in the Primer. See also specific instructions in Chris.Browne@anu.edu.au
the Portfolio description.

1.2 Detailed Assessment Timelines

This table looks "complex", but it is — rest assured — based on simple rules that give you lots of opportunities for formative feedback.

**Table 2: Indicative timelines for assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wk 1ish</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Start building reflections for portfolio</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 3 (Tue)</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Topic preferences collected on Wattle</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 3 (Wed)</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Topic selections released on Wattle</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 4 (Fri)</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Draft Due on Wattle</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 5 (Thu)</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Workshop and Team Formation in Class</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 5 (Fri)</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Peer Feedback Due on Wattle</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 6 (Mon)</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Peer Feedback Released</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 6 (Fri)</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Roundtable in Class</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (Mon)</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Final Due on Wattle</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 (Mon)</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Peer Review due</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 (Thu)</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Results released</td>
<td>Chris &amp; Louise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 8 (Thu)</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Workshop in Class</td>
<td>Louise + Former Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 7-10</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Tutorial Facilitations Workshops (before your tutorial)</td>
<td>Louise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 8-11</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Tutorial Facilitations</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 8-11</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Facilitation results released</td>
<td>Chris &amp; Louise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 12 (Mon)</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Idea Proposal due on Wattle</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 12 (Thu)</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Idea Pitch in Class</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 12 (Thu)</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project results released</td>
<td>Chris &amp; Louise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 12 (Fri)</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Roundtable</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk “13” (Mon)</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Artefact due</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After “exams”</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Results released</td>
<td>Chris &amp; Louise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Assignment Philosophy

What? Yes. The construction and flow of the assignments have a philosophy.

For each task, there is a drafting stage, a production stage, and a sharing phase. The purpose of the draft is to improve your work. We want you to do well. Then we need you to polish - act on the feedback. We want you to improve between the draft and what you present. Then we want you to share so that the rest of the class can learn about what you have learnt. We want you to celebrate and be proud of your work.
2 Complexity Primer

Co-Creating a “Complexity for Future Leaders” Primer

Prompt: Create a summary that explains how a given topic can be used to “Unravel Complexity”.

Audience: The summary should be written for future leaders with no idea about the topic: it’s a primer. Act as a “wise elder”, and pitch it to an audience of high-school leavers, full of ambition, but with no idea of the ways to think about complex problems.

The primers will be collated together to form a book which will act as our “toolkit” for unravelling complexity.

2.1 Submission Requirements

- a catchy title relevant to the topic
- a 500 word (+/- 1%) explanatory piece on the topic
- a royalty-free image that supplements the piece. We strongly encourage you to create your own image.
- any additional references or readings

All submissions will be via Wattle.

2.1.1 Topic Selection and groups

Topics will be preference in Wattle. You will be allocated a topic based on these preferences, and allocated into a group of 4-6 people. The groups will be used for peer review allocation.

Hint: your groups could be used effectively to help develop your pieces, and we encourage your groups to get together for this purpose.

2.1.2 Draft and Peer Feedback

A camera-ready (that is, ready to be published) draft is to be submitted for peer review. Peer reviewers will provide 200-300 words of constructive, actionable and accurate qualitative feedback per review, and provide an indication of perceived quality through quantitative feedback.

2.1.3 Final and Peer Review

The final portfolio piece will be reviewed by your peers and feedback will be collated and returned, much in the same way as the Draft and Peer Feedback.

2.1.4 Referencing Requirements

As this is an “explainer”, we would like it to not be an academic piece. In fact, typical referencing would look out of place. Instead, please include a list of further reading (which may include the
readings that were given) so that someone could explore the topic further.

### 2.2 Marking Criteria

The Draft and Final will be reviewed against three criteria:

- Quality of ideas [misses the point <-> deeply insightful] *distill the key ideas of the reading/topic*
- Accessibility [convoluted <-> clear] *is easily accessible to an educated but general audience*
- Quality of narrative [threadless <-> imaginative] *quality of insights and engaging narrative in your own words about the reading/topic*

These criteria will be viewed from the perspective of Bloom’s Taxonomy. See Marking Indication for all assessment for details.

#### 2.2.1 Calculation of Effectiveness Factor

We expect all students to engage faithfully in the review process, including the on-time submission of the Draft, Peer Feedback, Roundtable and Peer Review. Late submissions will not be accepted, so that we can run the next part of the process.

**Table 3: Factors for the Effectiveness Factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Effectiveness Factor</th>
<th>Description/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late submission of Draft/Final</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>Peer feedback will not be given, reviewers will be reallocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Draft</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>Incomplete drafts waste reviewers time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late submission of Feedback/Review</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>Reviews will have a hard deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Feedback/Review not constructive/actionable/accurate</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>Judgements made on a case-by-case basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On time and complete submissions</td>
<td>+0%</td>
<td>Well done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed and exemplary feedback</td>
<td>+2 to +5%</td>
<td>Judgements made on a case-by-case basis for exemplary feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Effectiveness Factor will start at 100%, and will be adjusted based on the above table. We expect the vast majority of students to end up with a Effectiveness Factor of 100% or higher.
2.2.2 Determination of Primer Grade

The Peer Review process will provide information back to Louise and Chris to calibrate the grades for the primer, but peers will have no direct input into the final grade. Only the “Final” artefact will be assessed for a grade.

The final individual grade for the primer will be calculated using the formula:

\[ \text{Final grade} = (0.75 \times \text{Individual Piece} + 0.25 \times \text{Ave Group’s Pieces}^\ast) \times (\text{Effectiveness Factor}) \]

\( ^\ast \text{not including your contribution} \)

For example, Jane receives an individual grade of 20/25, in a group where the average was 18/25, and where her Effectiveness factor was 105% due to the exemplary feedback that she gave. Jane’s final grade would be calculated as:

\[ \text{Final grade} = (0.75 \times 20 + 0.25 \times 18) \times 1.05 = 20.475 = \text{approx 20.5/25} \]

John is in the same group as Jane, and receives an individual grade of 15/25. His Effectiveness factor was 95% due to a late draft submission. John’s final grade would be calculated as:

\[ \text{Final grade} = (0.75 \times 15 + 0.25 \times 18) \times 0.95 = 14.9625 = \text{approx 15/25} \]
3 Grand Challenge Project

Unravelling a Grand Challenge

Deliver a Tutorial and Pitch an Idea for Australia’s future around topics at the “Grand” scale.

The class will be divided up into 7 groups (one for each topic); however, each group is free to self-organise and manage the work and tasks required in their own way. This might involve everyone doing everything, or establishing a team structure around the activities. We strongly recommend not taking a “divide-and-conquer” approach, as this tends to lead to misalignment of ideas.

3.1 Tutorial Co-Facilitation & Secret Plan

Deliver an awesome and well-planned tutorial about a Grand Challenge

The primary purpose of the Tutorial Co-Facilitation is to help your peers appreciate the nuance and complexity of the problem at hand.

This tutorial run by students will be in the second-hour of class during the grand challenge weeks. The tutorial activity should:

- engage in activities that make the tutorial “awesome”, such as engagement of peers, hands-on activities, lively discussion, inclusive debate, and scholarly learning.
- avoid activities that make the tutorial “awful”, such as closing up debate, avoiding discussion of controversial issues, encouraging single or dominant viewpoints
- be well prepared and building on the grand challenge seminar, and give everyone someone to rave about as a take-home message
- be aware and sensitive of alternative viewpoints and perspectives
- most of all, the tutorial should be fun and engaging.

3.1.1 Developing a Secret Plan

In order to assist with your planning to run the tutorial, each team is required to develop a Secret Plan for facilitation. This should be done in consultation with Louise and after discussing the topics and themes with the Guests (ahead of time), and you should plan to meet with Louise at least one week before your facilitation.

Please bring spare copies of your “Secret Plan” to your tutorial to give to Louise and Chris. This plan should demonstrate your thinking and preparedness for the task. An example will be provided. The plan should be between 2-3 pages, but may be longer as appropriate. The plan should include:

A Secret Plan would normally include:

- a one-sentence take-home message (ie what do you want the students to learn today)
- a one-sentence SMART+ Goal (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, timely and positive - ie, we want everyone to participate)
- an overview of the plan, including timing and roles
- a logical and detailed plan, including prompts, resources required or activity contingencies
• ideas for how to increase or decrease time, depending on the flow of the tutorial

It is important to note that you may (and probably should) deviate from the Secret Plan, though it should be clear as to why you are deviating (eg, you should be running “off the plan”, and not “off the cuff”).

3.1.2 Marking criteria for Tutorial Co-Facilitation

The activity co-facilitation and secret plan will be assessed using the following criteria:

• **Ideas** [imitation <-> novel] encourages *high-quality exchange of ideas*

• **Connections** [untethered <-> highly connective] *effectively relating the activity to the course themes in a way that maximises learning*

• **Timing** [poorly managed] <-> well managed *maintaining clarity and logical progressions of ideas to an effective conclusion within the allocated time*

• **Instructions** [unhelpful <-> highly helpful] *instructions clear instructions that assist in achieving above points*

• **Questions** [unhelpful <-> highly helpful] *ability to respond well to questions including the explanation of concepts*

These criteria will be viewed from the perspective of Bloom’s Taxonomy. See Marking Indication for all assessment for details.

3.2 Idea Proposal & Pitch

Form an idea on how “we” can “unravel” an issue related to this Grand Challenge

The primary purpose of the Idea Proposal is to show your peers your best guess at how this problem could be resolved.

Put together an idea to unravel your problem. There are two components to this task:

• An “Idea Proposal”
• A “Policy Pitch”, alongside a 1-pager

3.2.1 Idea Proposal

Put together an Idea Proposal that would be publishable as a “Perspectives” piece in the “Solutions Journal”, a journal that is published by the Crawford Centre. As described on their website:

*We are looking for solutions that are seriously creative: they should be novel, perhaps even surprising, but also well-thought out and credible.*

The Author Guidelines are provided here: https://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/for-authors/

Adapting the requirements from their website, we would like to see:

• Length: Approximately **1,250-1,500** words of text.
• Description: A perspective aims to fuse the conversational style of a New Yorker “Talk of the town” editorial with colorful reportage. The aim is to immerse the reader in new points of view from practitioners on the ground who are working on bold solutions. Articles submitted to the Perspective section of Solutions may include the following (specifically we’ve chosen the options 1 or 2, not 3):

1. A personal account of a solution you are working on. Article could describe the problem being addressed, the genesis of the potential solution, challenges faced in implementing the solution, and a discussion of the overall success of the solution. An effort to explain how this particular solution could be applicable on a larger scale is appreciated. Note: only about 1/3 of any piece for Solutions should describe the problem. The majority of the piece should focus on the proposed solution.

2. An editorial analyzing a particular solution or proposing solutions to a certain issue (see Ernest Callenbach’s “The Coming Eco-Industrial Complex”: The Coming Eco-Industrial Complex).

Writing should be clear and engaging. Solutions’ articles should be accessible to members of the educated public who are not experts in the field. Author should be willing to work with a Solutions editor to this end.

Source: https://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/for-authors/

3.2.2 Policy Pitch

Present your idea back to the class. The Pitch should be a distillation or reflection of your Idea Proposal. Pitch your Idea at the same level as the Idea Proposal. This task includes:

• a strict 3-minute pitch, with 7 minutes for questions
• a supplementary 1-page brief to be presented with the pitch

The pitch can be done by 1 team member or all team members. Teams may choose to do a pre-recorded pitch, or deliver it live on the day. No other supplementary material is allowed. The pitch will be to a single external “experts”, or a “panel of experts”. The panel will have no influence on the final grade.

The 1-pager should complement the ideas pitched in the Ideas Proposal, and be suitable for giving to the experts on the day. There are many ways to provide a brief, and there is no restriction on format or approach, other than it needs to fit on a single (single-sided!) page. We recommend keeping the page less detailed, and “referring to your Idea Proposal for more information”. A common way to frame a brief is “What is the Governing Idea? And below that, What is the situation? What is the complication? What is the resolution (your idea).”

3.2.3 Marking Criteria

The activity co-facilitation and secret plan will be assessed using the following criteria:

• **Ideas** [imitation <-> novel] demonstrates high-quality, well-thought through and novel ideas, based on evidence where possible
• **Connections** [untethered <-> highly connective] *effectively building on the course themes to address the problem*

• **Timing** (pitch only) [poorly managed] <-> well managed* maintaining clarity and logical progressions of ideas to an effective conclusion within the allocated time*

• **Questions** (pitch only) [poorly addressed <-> well addressed] *ability to respond well to questions including the explanation of concepts where necessary*

### 3.3 Topic/Group Selection

The groups will be formed in and around the Week 5 class on Group Projects.

### 3.4 Peer moderation

We understand that groups sometime work equally, and at other times, don’t. We will collect qualitative and quantitative feedback from individuals in the team about their team contribution after both tasks (the Tutorial and the Pitch). This is to furnish Louise and Chris with information about contributions within the team, so that we can make judgements about any grade modification that needs to be applied. Teams will be passed this information back anonymously at each stage, and we are open to having discussions about this at any stage.

Please note: as described above, the team may decide to allocate roles in such a way that means that people focus on one task, rather than both. This is OK, and will be understood on a case-by-case basis.

At both stages, we may apply an individual multiplier on this task aligned with the following expectations at both times:

**Table 4: Factors for Individual Moderation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus View</th>
<th>Individual Moderation</th>
<th>Description/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>case-by-case</td>
<td>Team members who are absent from their team can expect a significantly lower grade, down to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well below expectations</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>Probably not genuinely contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>Could be contributing more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About expectations</td>
<td>+/-0%</td>
<td>Good team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above expectations</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td>Great team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well above expectations</td>
<td>+2 to +5%</td>
<td>Judgements made on a case-by-case basis for exemplary team contribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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On the whole, we would prefer to see the teams performing at a higher level, than for there to be differences within the teams. Great team members will include everyone.
4 Research Portfolio

Critically reflect on the nature of complex problems

Produce a major work that connects your experience in the course and the course themes. You should be in the “swamp” of interdisciplinary complexity!

We recommend framing your portfolio as a reflection or response:

• based on a single complex problem or area, connecting to many different course themes
• based on the nature of complexity itself, connecting to many different complex problems
• as a reflective piece describing your journey through the course

4.1 Portfolio artefact/reflection

This brings together your experiences in the course. The broad guidelines are:

• produce a physical or digital artefact that can be consumed in 10 minutes (equivalent c.3,000 words)
• format is completely open-ended. It could take the form of— but is not limited to—an essay, paper, report, poster, digital presentation, video, website, podcast, blog series, magazine article, scholarly work, travel guide, exhibition, teaching tool, physical object, artwork or demonstration
• the artefact should demonstrate scholarly activity, such as evidence, research and inquiry, as well as higher-order thinking, reflection and synthesis
• where the artefact is open to interpretation (for example, as an artwork), we recommend providing a rationale or exegesis to orientate the reader to your thinking

4.2 Themes

The portfolio topic can be as free-ranging as you like. If you’re looking for inspiration, you could consider:

• making connection to the themes from relevant tutorials, activities, group work and sessions
• connection or reflections on a contemporary and source of knowledge you have engaged with through semester, such as listening to the radio or following a news source
• connection to learning outside of the class, such as personal development programs or other courses

There are a wealth of example portfolio on the public webpage.

4.3 Opportunity for formative feedback

We will run a portfolio session towards the end of semester. You should bring your draft (or at least your ideas) to this session. We highly recommend starting work on your portfolio early in semester.
4.4 Assessment variations

LAWS4001 students must demonstrate a strong connection to a legal perspective in their portfolio. VCPG6001 students must base their portfolio within the scholarly literature when framing their portfolio.

4.5 Portfolio Roundtable

More a celebration – share what you have learnt in your portfolio with the class. * oral presentation, time divided equally amongst participants * no slides, but you may use physical props * will likely happen in a roundtable format

Brief feedback will be collected from your peers about your ideas for inclusion in the final portfolio.

4.6 Marking Criteria for Artefact and Roundtable

Portfolios and the showcase presentations will be marked against the following criteria:

- **articulation** - effective explanation of the portfolio topic pitched to an educated but general audience
- **reflection** - on the knowledge in relation to the course themes
- **connection** - to different perspectives around the topic, your discipline, and to the course themes
- **narrative** - ability to create an engaging narrative around the topic
5 Marking Indication for all assessment

These criteria will be viewed from the perspective of Bloom’s Taxonomy. The list below gives example activity that we would expect to see at different levels.

These levels broadly correlate to the grade bands as follows:

Table 5: approximate mapping of grade bands to Bloom’s Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Band</th>
<th>Cognitive Band</th>
<th>Psychomotor</th>
<th>Affective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest level</td>
<td>Integration across levels</td>
<td>Combinations as sustained skills</td>
<td>Combinations as sustained skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction - High Distinction</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Create</td>
<td>Articulating</td>
<td>Organising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit - Distinction</td>
<td>Apply &amp; Analyse</td>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>Valuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass - Credit</td>
<td>Understand &amp; Remember</td>
<td>Manipulating/Imitating</td>
<td>Receiving/Responding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Cognitive domain

Best for describing activities such as written assessment submissions

Evaluate & Create (Highest level)

Generate new ideas, defend opinions and decisions, justify a course of action by making judgements about information

- Associated verbs: Argue, Assemble, Assess, Compose, Construct, Create, Criticise, Debate, Defend, Deside, Design, Develop, Estimate, Evaluate, Formulate, Invent, Judge, Justify, Measure, Plan, Predict, Produce, Propose, Recommend, Test

Apply & Analyse

Examine and break information, explore relationship, use existing knowledge to solve new problem, apply knowledge in new situation

- Associated verbs: Analyse, Apply, Articulate, Calculate, Categorise, Change, Choose, Classify, Compare, Complete, Conclude, Contrast, Correlate, Deduce, Differentiate, Distinguish, Execute, Illustrate, Interpret, Investigate, Operate, Practice, Relate, Select, Separate, Show, Solve, Teach, Use

Understand & Remember (Lowest level)

Demonstrate an understanding of facts, explain ideas or concepts, recall facts, concepts or answers

- Associated verbs: Cite, Convert, Define, Demonstrate, Describe, Discuss, Explain, Extend, Find, Identify, Interpret, Label, List, Locate, Name, Outline, Paraphrase, Predict, Quote, Recall, Reproduce, Review, Summarise
5.2 Psychomotor domain

*Best for describing activities involving physical spaces, eg Facilitations, Group activities*

- **Articulating**: construct, solve, integrate, adapt
- **Precision**: demonstrate, complete, perfect, control
- **Manipulating/Imitating**: build, perform, execute, implement, copy, follow, replicate, repeat

5.3 Affective domain

*Best for describing activities involving interactions, eg Facilitations, Discussions*

- **Organising**: choose, consider, prefer, discriminate, depict, exemplify
- **Valuing**: express, conduct, show, express
- **Receiving/Responding**: listen, notice, tolerate, comply, enjoy, follow
6 Version Control

2019-05-23: * fixed formatting errors around criteria descriptions

2019-05-06: * hmm. Updated “Capstone Project” to “Unravelling Complexity”.

2019-03-27: * inclusion of Grand Challenges activity * change title of portfolio showcase to portfolio roundtable

2019-03-14: * Primer tweaks (addition of reference field, inclusion of prompt and audience * inclusion of Portfolio assessment * separation out of Bloom’s * included referencing requirements for Primer

2019-03-07: * Initial version based on Week 1 course discussion