

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Syllabi

Course Syllabi

Fall 9-1-2017

GBLD 499.01: GLI Capstone Development

Ulf Johan Eriksson

University of Montana - Missoula, johan.eriksson@umontana.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/syllabi>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Eriksson, Ulf Johan, "GBLD 499.01: GLI Capstone Development" (2017). *Syllabi*. 5568.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/syllabi/5568>

This Syllabus is brought to you for free and open access by the Course Syllabi at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Syllabi by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
GBLD 499: GLI Capstone Development¹
Fall Semester 2017

Course Information:

Meeting time: Fridays at 10:00-10:50am, Liquid Planet by campus.

Credits: credit, traditional letter grade

Team Mentor: Dr. Johan Eriksson, School of Music, Room 201, johan.eriksson@umontana.edu

Overview: The purpose of this experience is to facilitate the development of your GLI capstone project. The project should integrate the knowledge and skills you have developed in your GLI and college experience, such as research, teamwork, educated discussion and connecting interdisciplinary content. These skills are in high demand, and your project will ultimately serve as documented example of your capabilities. Examples of such project could include creating website or video, or writing a play or white paper that deals with a real-world challenge.

This course will facilitate the design and first steps of the group project. The project proposed by the end of this term will then be implemented in the second semester. The capstone project encourages students to work closely with other students, stakeholders, and a faculty mentor to investigate an interesting, globally relevant practical problem and demonstrate the diverse skills and backgrounds the group possesses. Each student is expected to actively contribute to the group.

The capstone project will result in concrete and documented product. Students can share that documentation with potential employers or graduate programs. Employers are particularly interested in whether students have the ability to solve semi-structured problems and whether they can work productively in groups with people from different backgrounds. The documentation of your project will demonstrate these skills to prospective employers.

Learning Outcomes:

The capstone project should demonstrate that students can:

1. understand and apply distinct disciplinary perspectives to a particular real-world problem;
2. work productively in a multidisciplinary group;
3. document the global context of the problem;
4. plan a complex project; and
5. apply logic and appropriate scholarly methods and analytical tools to the problem.

Prerequisites: Enrolled in the GLI program and consent of GLI advisor.

¹This syllabus has been formatted and customized by Dr. Eriksson using the template syllabus provided to the capstone mentors by the Global Leadership Initiative (GLI) program.

Readings and Resource Guide: Readings are determined by mentor and team as necessary.

The [GLI Capstone Resource Guide](http://libguides.lib.umt.edu/glicapstone) (<http://libguides.lib.umt.edu/glicapstone>) is an online guide that houses a variety of resources, including collaborative tools, campus resources, research guidance, databases, and honor college information.

Form and Format:

Beyond documenting the project, the form and format of the capstone project is not narrowly specified; in the fall, the group will create a plan and outline that plan in written proposal. Projects may range from research reports / white papers to websites, films or public presentations. The binding requirements are that the capstone project be:

1. group project;
2. multidisciplinary and global in context;
3. feasible and/or implementable;
4. well researched and of academic quality appropriate to college seniors; and
5. made available to the public through a presentation of the project.

The capstone proposal outlines the project that will be undertaken in the spring (and may be started in the fall). The capstone proposal is not the project itself, but rather a description of a project that will be implemented in the second semester. As such, the form of the capstone proposal is specific. Your group is required to produce a paper, properly cited, that includes a statement of the problem, the global context of the problem, review of existing literature, a proposed method, and a description of the proposed work product that will be created in spring semester, including the real-world implications of successful completion of the project.

Global Context:

What does “global” look like in the context of a successful capstone project?

project with a strong global connection accomplishes the following:

- **Considers the problem in context** identifies and analyzes how the problem is expressed similarly or differently in other geographic, cultural and historical contexts;
- **Provides diverse perspectives** incorporates perspectives from other countries or cultures, ideally through direct contact and collaboration;
- **Examines interrelationships** recognizes the connections between the self and larger local and global communities and/or recognizes the complex interrelationships among worldwide natural and human phenomena;
- **Applies global knowledge in designing a solution** uses this global knowledge (of contexts, of different perspectives, and of interrelationships) to propose a solution that reflects the student’s awareness of the problem’s global nature.

Presentations:

During the last week of classes in the fall semester, you will be required to make a presentation of your capstone proposal to your classmates, your instructor and other faculty. Each team will have minutes to present their work and 5 minutes for Q&A. A panel of faculty judges will evaluate your presentation using the presentation rubric provided in the appendix. Their scores and comments will be given to each team. Your faculty mentor will evaluate your presentation and may consider judges' scores/comments.

Evaluation:

Assignment	Individual or Group	Weight	Evaluator	Due Date
Assignments	Individual/Group	25%	Instructor	As assigned
Proposal Presentation	Group	25%	Instructor	Week before finals
Written Proposal	Group	25%	Instructor	As assigned. Due to GLI by last day of finals week.
Individual Contribution	Individual	25%	Instructor based on Team Evaluation and observation	As assigned

Required Assignments:

1. **Written proposal** (see proposal rubric in appendix), which must include:
 - a. **Introduction** description/statement of the problem that identifies the current global context of the situation.
 - b. **Literature Review:** 5-10 page rationale or justification for your project that typically includes abstract, theoretical background information offering broad view of the issue using major and/or important citations. The literature review should also address the global significance of the issue with examples that could include information from community stakeholders.
 - c. **Proposed Method** 1-4 page description of your approach to solving the problem. This is where you narratively describe the process that you will follow to conduct your project. More specifically, you should describe here the people who will need to be involved, any specialized tools or instrumentation you plan to use, and the process you plan to enact for the project. You should also address any additional considerations that are unique to your project. For example, you should include commentary about the process you will follow to address any necessary issues around institutional alignment, such as human subjects review or intellectual property. Overall, this narrative should seem like a logical, well-justified approach or "solution" to the problem that is grounded in the theoretical considerations discussed in the literature review.
 - d. **Project Implementation Plan** A itemized list of tasks that you need to accomplish to finish the project, organized as timeline. This list of tasks should demonstrate a realistic understanding of the project's feasibility.
2. **Presentation** – summary presentation of your written proposal, to be given at the end of the fall semester. See presentation rubric in appendix.
3. **Team Evaluation** – reflective self, peer, and team evaluation. See Team Evaluation document in appendix.

Suggested Assignments:

The following assignments are advisable. Organized by time, they can help systematically accomplish the necessary tasks required for the written proposal and final fall presentation, and help assess the team's progress over the course of the semester. have put more essential assignments in bold.

1. **Project pitch** – find and describe an example of a capstone-like project you want to emulate and pitch your best idea to your team members in three sentences or less.
2. **Problem Statement / Research Question** – 1-2 page document that states the research question, puts it into context and gives the significance at a global level.
3. **Division of Labor Assignment / Group Contract** – written agreement of the ground rules for the group and a tentative division of labor. (Samples provided online at the GLI Capstone Guide.)
4. **Annotated Bibliography / Resource Review** – an itemized list of sources including brief summary of each.
5. **Proposal Outline** – an outline of your project's written report.
6. Draft Literature Review – an essay that provides the state of research and information including global and institutional context to help place your project in the existing work on the issue in question.
7. Draft Methods – description of the methods you will use.
8. Draft Introduction – your research question, why it is important, its global context and how it fits into existing research.
9. **Spring Timeline / Plan** – your plan for completing the project.
Documentation of Contribution – an honest written accounting of your contributions.
Schedule/Calendar: (This schedule may change as need arises)

Week	Topic	Due
1	Introduction and housekeeping	
2	Project brainstorms; Research methods; Review with librarian (across weeks 2-4)	Project pitch; Group Contract
3	Project brainstorms	Problem Statement / Research Question
4	Project brainstorms	
5	Product vision; Define general roles; Team exercise	Annotated Bibliography / Resource Review
6	List of tasks / Assign Tasks	Proposal Outline
7	Problem solving	
8	Group dynamics, problem solving	
9	Roadblocks and stalemates discussion	Draft Literature Review
10	Progress report / Resource allocation	
11	Project proposal work and problem solving	Draft Methods
12	Project proposal work and problem solving	Spring timeline; Draft Introduction
13	Practice presentations	Written Proposal
14	Spring project timeline	Timeline Assignment
15	Presentations	Presentation
16	Wrap up	Team Evaluation; Documentation of Contribution

1. This course is accessible to and usable by otherwise qualified students with disabilities. To request reasonable program modifications, please consult with the instructor. Disability Services for Students will assist the instructor and student in the modification process. For more information, visit the [Disability Services](http://www.umt.edu/disability) website at <http://www.umt.edu/disability>.
2. All students must practice academic honesty. Academic misconduct is subject to an academic penalty by the course instructor and/or a disciplinary sanction by the University. All students need to be familiar with the Student Conduct Code. The [Code](http://life.umt.edu/vpsa/student_conduct.php) is available for review online at: http://life.umt.edu/vpsa/student_conduct.php.

Appendix 1: Evaluation Rubrics

Evaluation of the capstone written proposal:

The written proposal will be evaluated by your mentor using the following rubric (drawn from Washington State University Honors College):

	Very Poor/Poor		Fair/Good		Very Good/Excellent	
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Clear Explanation of the Problem	No single clear problem stands out or the technical language used obscures the problem. Literature is not used to explain the problem.		The problem is clearly stated, but analysis appears to drift from the stated problem. Literature may be used but sometimes is irrelevant.		The problem is clearly explained in non-technical language. Literature is effectively synthesized to explain the problem.	
Organization	The organization of the sections or of the ideas within each section detracts significantly from the project's logic.		The organization of the paper sections or of the ideas within each section does not enhance the project's logic.		The organization of the sections and of the ideas within each section lead to an easy understanding of the project's logic.	
Methodology	Inappropriate methodology is proposed, or the proposed analysis addresses different issue; hence, the analysis will not support the logic of the project.		Appropriate methodology is proposed but not fully developed. The proposed analysis does not integrate into the logic of the project.		Appropriate methodology is proposed that will offer support for the project's success.	
Global Context	The project's global context, perspectives and interrelationships are not articulated.		Connections to global context, perspectives and interrelationships are vague or minimally explained.		Connections to global context, perspectives and interrelationships are well-explained.	
Grammar and Mechanics	Grammatical or mechanical errors significantly impede understanding.		Grammatical or mechanical errors are limited and do not interfere with understanding.		The paper uses correct grammar and mechanics throughout.	
Feasibility	Feasibility is not adequately addressed.		Feasibility is addressed but relevant constraints are ignored or not handled adequately.		Feasibility is clearly addressed and considers the relevant constraints.	

Evaluation of the capstone proposal presentation:

The fall semester proposal presentation will be evaluated by your mentor. A panel of judges will provide general feedback. Your mentor and the judges will use the following rubric (drawn from Washington State University Honors College):

	Very Poor/Poor		Fair/Good		Very Good/Excellent	
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Clear Explanation of the Problem	No single clear problem stands out or the technical language used obscures the problem.		The problem is clearly stated, but analysis at times appears to drift from the stated problem.		The problem is clearly explained in non-technical language and remains consistent throughout.	
Organization	The organization of the sections or of the ideas within each section detracts significantly from the project's logic.		The organization of the presentation or of the ideas within each section supports the project's logic, but may be inconsistent at times.		The organization of the sections and of the ideas within each section leads to an easy understanding of the project's logic.	
Content	The presentation that did not cover context or state of existing literature. May also have been incomplete or overly technical.		non-technical presentation that was missing an important piece such as context or tie to existing literature.		clear, non-technical presentation that incorporated the literature and context.	
Global Context	The project's global context, perspectives and interrelationships are not articulated.		Connections to global context, perspectives and interrelationships are vague or minimally explained.		Connections to global context, perspectives and interrelationships are well-explained.	
Delivery to a Broad Audience	Unprepared, uncomfortable or lacking engagement with the audience. Visual aids detracted from presentation.		Clear overall, but somewhat uneven. Visual aids occasionally detracted from presentation.		Smooth, clear, articulate, and engaged. Visual aids, if used, enhanced the presentation.	
Feasibility	Poorly implemented and/or did not demonstrate feasibility.		Implementation/feasibility was addressed but several real-world constraints not well considered.		Implementation and feasibility are clear and well-thought through and real-world constraints are addressed.	
Responses to Questions	Inadequate given the research presented.		Logical but not clearly presented.		Clear and logically connected to the research presented.	

Team Evaluation Sheet

Evaluate your own contributions first and then evaluate the contribution of every other team member. On the back page, you will rate your team as a whole and can provide additional comments. Complete this form by yourself. ALL of your ratings and comments will be kept confidential.

Name of student # 1: (This is YOU) _____

Name of student # 2: _____

Name of student # 3: _____

Name of student # 4: _____

Name of student # 5: _____

Name of student # 6: _____

Name of student # 7: _____

Please rate your contributions to the team project and the contributions of each team member named above in the boxes below, using the following scale:

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7.....8.....9.....10
 Weak/never Average/occasionally Strong/always

Contribution	YOU	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7
[1] Clearly expressed ideas							
[2] Completed responsibilities on time							
[3] Sought consensus on project decisions							
[4] Listened to others' contributions							
[5] Recognized and used special talents of other team members							
[6] Communicated with team members promptly and effectively							
[7] Helped to resolve conflicts							
[8] Participated in all phases of the project							
[9] What percentage of the total workload (100%) did each member do? (If 5 members contributed	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

equally, then each would contribute 20% of the total workload.)							
[10] If you had to give this person a percentage grade, what overall grade has (s)he earned on this project? (For example, 95%, 68%, etc.)							

How would you rate the **team as a whole** on the following scale (1-9 circle one)?

= We did project tasks separately and did not put them together in a cohesive way; the project is a collection of individual work that is not well integrated.

2

3

4

= We did the project tasks separately and put them together in the end in a somewhat cohesive way.

6

7

8

= We developed ideas and created the project with involvement of all team members, with tasks done separately being brought to the team for critique and revision.

Please write any comments you care to share about the team, any clarifications of ratings, and any other aspect of the team or project on the back of this page. ALL COMMENTS MADE ARE CONFIDENTIAL – you do not need to share your ratings with any of your team members.
