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ABSTRACT
A second-year undergraduate self-directed learning project has previously been ranked relatively low by students, and was recognised as requiring additional support strategies to assist students to develop teamwork and independent learning skills. This paper reports on interventions made to the teaching strategies, and the results of an evaluation project aimed at determining the effectiveness of the new support mechanisms. Key findings were the outcome of re-introducing the input of teaching staff to inform and respond to student queries in the classroom, as one method of improving feedback to students and increasing motivation, and of introducing structured activities on groupwork early in semester, to assist students in forming teams, negotiating roles and improving self awareness and taking responsibility for their learning by reflection. This paper also investigates the applicability of the new learning model in developing and demonstrating employability skills of students in a classroom environment.
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INTRODUCTION
More than ever, universities are under pressure to graduate students who are independent learners, skilled problem-solvers, proficient in teamwork, and have experience in discipline-specific projects, and hence are ready to take responsibility for their work and contribute effectively immediately on entering professional employment (for example, Swinburne University of Technology, http://www.swin.edu.au/ltas/policies.htm). This paper reports on improvements made to a second-year undergraduate self-directed learning project which had previously received relatively low ratings by students. It also reviews the outcome of the evaluation project undertaken to ascertain whether the critical changes implemented have been successful in achieving the objectives of improving student satisfaction, assisting students to become more effective team members and giving them the opportunity to become independent learners. In this unit of study students were required to form teams which worked together, without any direct supervision, to develop a business plan for a venture of their choice. Many students had complained about the lack of contact with the teaching staff. In order to improve student satisfaction with the unit, whilst also encouraging independence in learning and effective teamwork, strategies aimed at providing increased structure and scaffolding, particularly early in the semester, were introduced. The main interventions ensure the presence of teaching staff during all scheduled tutorial sessions and requiring students to submit a weekly reflective journal to encourage reflection on the processes involved in teamwork. To evaluate the program, students’ reflective journals were analysed and students were asked to complete a paper-based questionnaire during the final week of semester. In addition, teaching staff were interviewed in Week 4 and Week 12 of the semester.
Attempts to introduce units, or projects within units, requiring self-directed learning and/or teamwork into the early years of undergraduate programs, thus embedding the development of these graduate attributes into the discipline, as recommended by many, including Bowden et al (2000), have long been made with varying success. Debate continues as to whether second-year students are ready to take responsibility for their learning (Panna, 2006). Supporting and assessing teamwork has always been problematic (see for example, Sharp, 2006). Similarly, motivating students to participate in group work is challenging (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Luca & Heal, 2006), even when personal benefits can be demonstrated (Kemm et al, 2000), and appears heavily dependent on the students’ personal goals (Volet & Mansfield, 2006). Even for students in subsequent years of their degrees, a level of scaffolding is required, and the challenge for teaching staff continues to be how to provide sufficient support for individual students and for teams, while still encouraging and providing opportunities for students to develop the required graduate skills (Kirschner et al, 2006).

Recent debate over the dynamic use of case studies (Eppler & Mengis 2007; Fischer & Chung 2007) are popular in the Business Management education area (originating from the Harvard MBA program), and are often successful at developing students’ problem-solving skills (Lohman & Finkelstein, 2000; Boyce et al, 2001). Where these include an element of role-play, they can help improve team work skills (Herremans & Murch, 2003; Lund Dean & Firbaciari, 2002). However, the cases are often prescribed and/or managed by the teaching staff, may be quite short in duration and generally provide little opportunity for undergraduate students to develop self-directed learning skills.

Rothwell and Ghelipter (2003) achieved some success with strategies designed to encourage students to become critical and reflective learners, but their success was limited to students who chose to actively engage with the program, leading them to state:

> It cannot be assumed that all individuals have an equal predisposition to learning, or even the ability to engage in the process, and that their readiness may be complex and multifaceted, dependent on situational, dispositional and demographic variables. (Rothwell & Ghelipter, 2003, p 252)

At Swinburne University of Technology (Lilydale campus), we were inspired by the work of Roger Putzel (see Romme & Putzel, 2003), to design and implement an experiential learning project using the Class as Organisation Model (Putzel 1992), and variations were introduced to students from 1999 (Lasky & Rajendran, 2005).

**THE TEACHING METHOD**

Students studying Bachelor of Business at Swinburne Lilydale undertake an optional unit LTE 200 - Organisations and Management, in the first semester of their second year at university. Key learning objectives of this unit include students gaining experience in developing business plans
for new ventures, and for developing skills in effective team work, and self-directed and team-directed learning.

Prior to 2007, the unit structure involved students forming teams of up to 13 individuals within their scheduled face-to-face tutorial sessions. Teams were required to work together, without supervision, to develop a business plan for a venture of their choice (Lasky & Rajendran, 2005). Teams were expected to elect leaders, assign roles within the team, research and produce their plan, and then present this to their peers at the end of semester. Opportunities were provided for team leaders to consult with staff, in the form of ‘executive management’ meetings, where the unit co-ordinator played the role of Executive Manager; however these meetings were optional, and were poorly utilised by most teams.

The major benefit expected of this role-play strategy was that students would gain experience in both self-directed and team learning (Kozlowski & Ilgen 2006) while undertaking an authentic and relevant business project. It was hoped that students would quickly take responsibility for their own learning outcomes, and would enjoy the practical and relevant nature of their team task. For some students, these objectives were achieved (Lasky & Rajendran, 2005). However, feedback from University-conducted student surveys in 2006 (Strategic Planning & Quality Unit, Swinburne University of Technology) revealed lower-than-expected student satisfaction with the unit. Student reaction to this project was mixed, and seemed to depend on the role that students took within their teams. Team leaders appreciated the meetings with (and accessibility of) the staff; however other students were quite critical of the lack of contact with teaching staff. Feedback from students included several comments from those who enjoyed the challenge of taking responsibility for their own learning, eg:

- “It was good to learn in a different environment, it expanded my abilities.”
- “Awesome subject! Polarised the fact of ‘you only get out what you put in’.”

However, many more students struggled with this added responsibility, and found the experience of working in a team quite daunting, eg

- “No direction of this subject, no clear understanding of what is going on, [and] never even see the tutor”
- “The social loafers managed to get a free ride, not fair”

(Source: Subject level report 2006, Strategic Planning & Quality Unit, Swinburne University of Technology).

Overall, the unit was not rated highly by students in the areas of feedback given, delivery methods, assessment requirements, and the students’ own levels of commitment.

In light of these comments, the unit was redeveloped for 2007. The driving force for the redevelopment was our two objectives of wishing to improve student satisfaction with the unit, whilst also encouraging independence in learning and effective team work. In an attempt to achieve these aims, strategies aimed at providing increased structure and scaffolding, particularly early in semester, have been introduced. Key interventions included:

- Introduction of weekly lectures, addressing basic business knowledge.
Teaching staff were present during all scheduled tutorial sessions (two hours each week), to monitor teams’ progress, record attendance, and to answer questions or address issues as they arose.

Introduction of structured exercises during the first three weeks of the project, designed to help students through their group development stages (Tuckman 1965), and identify and manage issues that may arise within groups.

Teams were reduced in size from 13 to a maximum of 7 students, to increase not only their level of performance but also their co-operation (Seijts & Latham, 2000).

Teams reported on their progress to their peers at each scheduled tutorial session, by giving an oral presentation of the minutes of their team meetings.

Students were required to submit a weekly journal, and feedback (Jorgenson & Papciak 1981) was provided to the class as a whole, rather than to individuals. The rationale for this was to provide ‘face-saving’ ways of addressing team issues such as social loafing and production blocking (Thompson 2003), rather than confronting individual students.

The weekly reflective journal was introduced as a component of the course, as a hurdle requirement, with no marks assigned to it per se. The key objective of the journals was to encourage students to reflect on the processes involved (i.e. collaborating with peers, practicing and applying business management skills, taking responsibility, identifying gaps in their learning, and emotional management). To ensure quality and timely feedback of both class and individuals’ performance, teaching staff gave a brief summary of these journals to the students at the end of the tutorial sessions, discussing anonymously and in a non-judgemental manner, any issues raised by individuals. This exercise not only increased the feedback provided to students, but also provided feedback to staff on the teams’ progress, allowing the introduction of further structured activities or interventions if the need arose.

EVALUATION METHODS

The aim of the evaluation was to determine whether the critical changes implemented had been successful in achieving the following objectives:

1. Improving student satisfaction with the unit overall, and with the team projects in particular.
2. Helping students become more effective team members.
3. Giving students the opportunity to become independent learners.

The evaluation sought feedback from both students and teaching staff. Staff were asked to read students’ reflective journals, and to categorise and record the number of positive or negative comments on a wide range of issues. It was hoped that this data would provide a holistic view of teams’ progress (rather than highlight issues experienced by one or two teams) early enough in the semester to allow intervention if required, and would also allow analysis of the key issues raised by students as the project progressed. A simple tally system was used to record how often major themes were discussed by students in their logs, and whether these were positive or negative comments. Eight separate tutorial classes (of approximately 25 students in each) were followed over a period of six weeks (Weeks 3 to 8 during semester), totalling approximately 1100 logs (averaging around 180 logs submitted each week).
In addition, students were asked to anonymously complete an optional, paper-based questionnaire during the final week of semester, comprising eight open-ended questions. Feedback was sought on the team-development activities, about how their team functioned, and what they enjoyed or disliked about the project. A total of 165 responses were received, which was 94% of the attendance for that week, and 90% of the total student enrolment for the unit.

The teaching team were interviewed twice during the semester – initially in Week 4 (immediately following the structured class activities), and again at the end of semester (following submission of business plans). Interviews were conducted by an educational development advisor, separate from the teaching team. Teaching staff (both the tutors and the unit co-ordinator) were asked for feedback on the student groups’ progress, the level of assistance requested from and provided to students, and their impressions on whether the students appeared to be achieving the aims of the project (i.e. team works skills, team-directed learning and reflection). Staff were also asked for any suggestions on improvements to the way the unit was structured or resourced.

RESULTS

1. Comments from reflective journals

Data from the most common themes discussed are presented in Figures 1 – 3.

**Figure 1** shows the frequency of positive and negative comments on key themes related to team building and group work issues. By far, most comments in the student logs related to their team’s objectives and project planning. This is not surprising, as instructions to students did ask for their reflections on their individual learning in terms of group dynamics, communication delegation and leadership. The key aspect of this, from a teaching perspective, is that these comments were almost overwhelmingly positive, and remained high for the duration of the semester.

Comments that related to formation of groups and assigning roles decreased after the first few weeks of semester, and it was heartening to see that the positive comments far outweighed the negative comments on this issue. Initial concerns from some students about group dynamics were again far outnumbered by positive comments, and the concerns appear to have been largely addressed by Week 8 of the semester. Similarly, a few early comments related to conflicts within groups early in semester appear to have been addressed by around Week 6. There was little change over the course of the semester in the frequency of comments related to the leadership of student groups, but it was reassuring to see that positive comments outnumbered the negative ones.

Most negative comments were related to the non-attendance of team members, which remained a hot issue all semester. Students noted that their teams’ progress was impeded by the non-attendance at tutorial sessions of key members, even though students often reported in advance to their team that they were unable to attend. This was corroborated by feedback from teaching
staff, and the wider issue of compulsory attendance at scheduled classes is currently being addressed at the Faculty level.

**Figure 2** shows the frequency of student comments on themes related to individual learning skills. Students included fewer comments about these themes than about the group dynamics, indicating a higher concern with teamwork aspects than with personal issues. Student reflections on their own learning and on their problem solving and decision-making skills were predominantly positive, as hoped. Time management skills were hardly mentioned at all by students, indicating that there were few time pressures in this project. Similarly, there was little discussion about motivation, from either a positive or a negative perspective. A similar theme of enjoyment was discussed slightly more, with predominantly positive comments. The low number of responses in these two categories was disappointing, as it was hoped that the authentic nature of this project and the teamwork aspects would make the project enjoyable and hence highly-motivating for students (Biggs 1989).

The final figure (**Figure 3**) displays the frequency of student comments on broad teaching areas. Student comments on the support from staff were very low, although all comments were positive. Given the negative feedback on the teaching of this subject prior to 2007, the lack of comments in this area is very positive feedback for the teaching team, indicating that this is now a non-issue for students. Students appreciated the feedback on their logs given during the tutorial sessions, although the frequency of comments in this area decreased over the duration of the semester. Very few comments related to the scheduled class activities introduced early in the semester, although these were predominantly positive. Surprisingly, the comments related to assessment were similarly low, but were affirmative, indicating that students were relatively unconcerned about the assessment requirements and deadlines for the unit.

2. **Feedback from student questionnaires**

The first question asked students about any problems getting started with their Business Plans. Responses to this question were varied, not only between groups, but interestingly, between individual members of the same group, indicating that perhaps some groups were not communicating progress to all members, or involving all individuals in the decision-making processes. A common response was that the only real problem was deciding on an appropriate business venture, not the quality of the output. Several students reported difficulties that occurred as a result of students enrolling late into the unit, in Weeks 2, 3, or even later.

Students were also asked for specific feedback on the value of the structured activities provided in the first few tutorials, designed to help the processes of assigning roles and tasks within the team. Again the responses were mixed between groups, and between individuals within a group, varying from comments such as “Yes. We based our roles on these activities.” to others like “No.
We decided easily on our own”. However, some students could not recall the exercises at all, or were simply indifferent.

To a question about feedback from teaching staff, and the usefulness of this in achieving team goals, the general response seemed to indicate that little feedback had been given. This was particularly frustrating to the teaching team, given the efforts expended to ensure regular and useful feedback. However, there was some clear variation between groups, with some groups giving resoundingly positive responses to the question compared with the overall cohort. This may reflect some variation in the quality of feedback given by some tutors, or it may indicate that the feedback was phrased so that students did not identify it as feedback. Some students commented that valuable feedback was received on their individual work, whereas others expressed concern that only team leaders were receiving feedback from staff.

Students were generally positive about how participation in the project had impacted on their team skills, (for example “Absolutely. I have learned specifically how to motivate people and work with others better”). While a minority felt the experience didn’t improve their team skills, in general most students claimed that various elements were improved, including; general team work, improved confidence, communication and listening skills, and leadership and delegation skills.

Students were also asked if they felt they were given enough opportunity within their team to explore areas that interested them personally. The responses to this question varied between groups; however it was generally consistent within a group, indicating that different groups were more open and self-referential (Smith & Comer 1994) when it came to catering to individual interests. This is illustrated by student comments such as “The team was very accommodating when it came to team roles and personal areas of interest. For example we worked on areas of the plan that interested us.” However, a minority of students did complain that they got “stuck” with sections they were not interested in.

A question asking what aspects students enjoyed about the project elicited an array of surprising and encouraging responses. The most common response was that students enjoyed the teamwork and group interaction aspects, and benefited from meeting and working with new people and developing new friendships (for example, “Everything, it was really interesting & fun & I enjoyed working with such a great group of people.”) Students also enjoyed the creativity and flexibility that comes with taking more responsibility for their learning, and were happy not to have to rely solely on the teaching staff (for example, “The capacity to express your passion. And strive to the level of your own learning.” This was backed up by many other students who claimed to enjoy the freedom of the project and enjoyed taking on greater responsibility for their own learning and that of their group. Finally, several students expressed both great pride in their final product, and relief in having completed such a large project.
Despite the positive responses to the team project, clearly for some students, working in groups remained a challenge. Problems were identified with the equitable distribution of work, member influence, students who talk excessively or dominate discussion, and the challenge of clashing personalities within the teams (for example, “Not all members putting in a fair share of effort, and members leaving it to the last minute.”). Other unpopular aspects identified were the repetitiveness of preparing and submitting weekly logs, and some students did not enjoy being required to present their work as part of an oral presentation. However, in general, the number of positive responses clearly outnumbered negative comments.

A final question asked for student suggestions for improving the project, and raised a number of interesting points. Clearly some students are reluctant to adopt self- or team-directed learning strategies, as indicated by a large number of students requesting greater guidance and/or structure in the project. Several students suggested incorporation of a review during the semester; perhaps during mid-semester, to ensure all the groups were on track and provide greater feedback. Some students suggested the journals be either discontinued after their first individual assignment, or scrapped altogether.

However, overall the comments were very favourable, with many students choosing to conclude with positive comments and congratulations to the teaching team (“… I love this subject! Very well planned & great help!”), rather than practical suggestions.

3. Feedback from teaching staff

Results from the first round of interviews, held in Week 4, indicated that students were forming teams, negotiating roles, and beginning work on their business plans. Several teams had found difficulty reaching consensus on the type of business they wanted to work on, but the teams worked through this, sometimes by scheduling additional team meetings to allow further negotiation. In other teams, staff noticed that not all members were participating equally, either from a personal reluctance, or from a dominant team member not allowing equal participation. In these cases, staff met individually with the elected team leaders and reminded them of their responsibility to encourage and facilitate equal contribution from all team members. In all cases observed, this was sufficient to remedy the situation. This anecdotal evidence from the tutors indicates that despite the many individual personality and learning types present in the groups, overall team-work skill and cohesiveness was being developed, and that tutorial classes quickly became team-led rather than tutor-led sessions. Debriefs at the end of the tutorial sessions, where team leaders read out minutes, proved an opportunity for cross-team motivation – introducing a competitive aspect and opportunities for peer- & self- feedback on their own team’s progress, and knowledge sharing.

The structured class activities (introduced into Weeks 2-4) were seen by the tutors to have been good ‘ice-breakers’, and to pave the way for students to negotiate roles within their teams. One
experienced tutor noted that there was now more discipline in the tutorial sessions but that this was team-imposed, not tutor-imposed. Teaching staff felt that students were interested in the activities when the relevance was easily recognised, and that part of the challenge for teaching staff was to make the purpose of the activities absolutely clear to students.

Staff read the journals submitted weekly and provided general feedback to the class the following week. The depth of the reflections varied widely, from some students who obviously took the process seriously, to others who completed the bare minimum. Teaching staff reported that the journals were invaluable to them, in providing insight on how individual students were managing within their teams, particularly for some more reserved students who felt more able to share their thoughts in a written one-on-one forum. However, staff were undecided about the usefulness of the journal activity for students – given that these are submitted so cannot be considered true personal reflections.

One interesting and surprising aspect that arose during the staff interviews was a disparity in the tutors’ satisfaction with the tutorial sessions. While all staff reported that the learning process for the project was greatly improved on previous years, and took great pride in seeing their student teams progress with their plans, one tutor lamented that he/she no longer felt as ‘needed’ by the students for technical support, and felt that as the consultation with students decreased during the semester, there was little chance for staff to self-evaluate their own teaching. Anecdotal evidence suggests that learning by reflection is often considered as an outlet for emotional outbreaks and not as an identification of ‘learning gaps.’ At times, the deferred learning practices (Keegan & Turner, 2001) were commonly found amongst the project teams, which led to their dysfunctional behaviour.

**DISCUSSION**

Overall, the results from the various evaluation methods (teaching staff interviews, student questionnaires, and student weekly logs) indicates a much improved level of satisfaction amongst the students, when compared with the previous cohort. (At the time of writing this article, official data from the university-administered Student Feedback Survey was not yet available).

The re-introduction of teaching staff into the tutorial sessions appears to have helped, both in providing an opportunity for feedback as required by students, and in providing an external motivation for students, and has certainly helped the teaching team monitor students’ progress and intervene if required. While students are unclear in their opinions of the value of the structured learning activities introduced into the first few weeks of the semester, teaching staff are quite adamant that these activities were invaluable in assisting students to get started with their project teams. It may be that the time lapse between the completion of these activities, and our consultation with the students (around nine weeks) meant that students had simply forgotten most
of the activities, even though they had incorporated the skills learnt in the weeks immediately following.

Other interventions introduced for this cohort included smaller team sizes, which has improved the situation, and the requirement for each team to report on their progress to the rest of their tutorial class on a weekly basis. Requiring teams to report on their progress to their peers appears to have wide-ranging positive effects. Teaching staff report that this activity introduced a competitive aspect between the teams, providing an additional motivational factor. Interestingly, few students commented on this, indicating that at least they did not find this task onerous or irrelevant.

Submitting weekly logs remains a contentious issue. Teaching staff found this a very useful exercise for them, as an opportunity to gain feedback from individual students (which might not be apparent from observing students in a group setting), and giving verbal feedback to the class gave the opportunity to address team-specific issues without identifying individuals or teams. However, students either did not identify this aspect of the project as ‘feedback’, or were unsatisfied with the processes involved, as the weekly logs remained relatively (although not uniformly) unpopular. From a teaching perspective, we found the information in the logs useful (not just for providing feedback to students but also as an evaluation tool), but it is difficult to claim at this stage whether there were any learning benefits for the students from this exercise. Given the nature of emotional outbreaks found in the learning logs, more specific guidelines may need to be provided to students so they can focus on closing their learning gaps. This will also enable staff to provide students with timely critical interventions and assistance with achievable goals (Barclay, 1996).

When students’ weekly logs were analysed for thematic content, it was possible to ascertain changes in the key issues facing students over the duration of the project. This analysis revealed few surprises: organisational and team-forming issues predominated early in semester, and greatly outweighed any other issues. The positive nature of comments related to group formation and group dynamics was supported by the staff observations, and indicates that the recent interventions are likely to have improved these processes for students. Absenteeism and late enrolments remained hot issues throughout the semester, and are currently being addressed at the Faculty level. It was encouraging to observe some teams scheduling additional team meetings outside class times to accommodate team members’ participation. This is a situation which further indicates the level of motivation and effectiveness within some of these self-managed teams (Smith & Comer 1994).

Increased motivation within the teams appears to be the key improvement made. Although few students identified motivation as a particular theme (either positively or negatively) in their weekly logs, it was apparent from the responses to the questionnaire that motivation was much
higher than was apparent in previous cohorts, and this is confirmed from staff observations. Biggs (1989) states that working in teams, in itself, helps motivate students to adopt a deeper learning approach to employability skills (DEST, 2004). Our experience indicates that at least for undergraduate students, additional support is also required to facilitate the groups to feel a sense of progress and remain motivated in this process (Engleberg & Wynn 2003).

One interesting issue that arose from consultation with teaching staff was the personal satisfaction gained from teaching in this unit. All staff were happy with their students’ progress, and took pride in their students’ achievements; however, one tutor felt that his/her skills and expertise were no longer as important, as students took more control of the learning process. We have all been aware of the changing teaching role, moving from the didactic ‘sage-on-the-stage’ model to more of a supportive facilitator, and nearly all teaching staff view this is a positive and rewarding move. Much like the self-directed learning adopted by students, teachers must also learn to adapt to this new approach to teaching, to enable both parties to gain maximum benefit from the experience.

The final question considered in this evaluation project addresses whether students are still being given sufficient opportunity to become independent learners. Teaching staff believe that this is definitely the case – teams are still self-managed and are required to address problems within their team, albeit with support from teaching staff if required. Staff have observed a high level of team-directed learning, and high levels of motivations imposed on and by individuals from the team rapport. Students reported that they enjoyed the challenge of the additional responsibility, and in most teams, were able to explore areas of specific interest to them as individuals. Levels of participation appear higher, although we cannot be sure of this, since teaching staff were not observing student groups in action in the previous cohort. Disappointingly, the Business Plans produced by the student teams at the end of the project are similar in standard to those developed by the previous cohort.

CONCLUSIONS

Evaluation of the interventions to the experiential learning project, introduced as a result of dissatisfaction expressed by previous students, indicates a much improved level of motivation and satisfaction amongst the students. The key modification appears to be the re-introduction of teaching staff to the classroom, although it is impossible to clearly separate the effects of one change from the effects of other concurrent interventions. Having teaching staff present while students are working on their team projects means that feedback is available if required, to gauge the success or otherwise of teams and intervene if necessary and to facilitate the reporting of team work to their peers. The presence of the teaching staff adds value to the learning process and enables true observation of student motivation, be it self determined by the student or due to the
influence of the social environment (Ryan & Deci, 2000). We believe that, overall these interventions have improved the learning processes for students, in that they have improved their team work and independent learning skills and therefore their employability skills, but we have been disappointed to note no significant improvement in the standard of the submitted group assessment work.

The changes have certainly made the teaching of this unit more satisfying for the teaching team, as expressed by one tutor,

“(I am) liking this unit 500% more than last year. Being in class has made it easier to answer questions and monitor progress – the greater time together is providing more opportunity for questions and feedback in a just-in-time manner. Students are not angry or frustrated, are more relaxed, and their enjoyment is making it a lot easier for the tutor”.

The official feedback from students has not yet been released by the university. At this stage the study clearly indicates that more research needs to be conducted to deepen the understanding of the best practices that could be adopted to develop in students employability skills that are applicable across all disciplines, and how to empower students to adapt themselves to learn-as-you-go (Gartner, 1988 in Pittaway & Cope, 2007) learning environments. Substantive evidence could be gathered from employers of our students and graduates about their experiences of this learning model and its applicability in the workplace. Such findings will enable us to revisit the relevance of the current learning model for undergraduate students and extend it to other discipline areas.
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Figure 1: Student comments on aspects of team building

Figure 2: Student comments on individual learning skills

Figure 3: Student comments on teaching issues