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FOCUS FOR THIS SESSION

The rationale for the RiT project at SU

• Why have on-line systems have become important in the support of teaching and learning activities, research, and research-related skills?
• But are the systems being used effectively? If not, what can be done to provide better usage?
• The role of reflection and use of journals in structured learning eg in tracking and assessing enquiry-based assignments and skills
• Helping students to learn/research the law, eg through improved electronic database usage and bespoke experiential software Mylegaexperience (MLX) - and not forgetting the need for staff development

Some results...
Reflective Journal for Portfolio

If a Blog or Journal can be graded, a grade assigned to an individual member is applied only to that individual. More Help

Journal Instructions

You are required to keep a self-reflective record of how you approached your portfolio assessment including:

1. The reasons for choosing your topic area
2. Any issues encountered in finding your research material.
3. Why you chose your particular sources to annotate for Task 2.

Friday, 17 April 2015

Task 2 © New

Posted by PAUL GAFFNEY at Friday, 17 April 2015 10:09:15 o'clock BST

The three sources were chosen for the following reasons:--
Each provided a different type of source, ie article, book and internet.
The article was entirely dedicated to the subject of development risks defence, so was highly relevant.
The book whilst not a recent edition, provided an incite into academic writing on the subject.
The author was referred to in the key case of A v NBA and she was also criticised in the selected article, which made it an ideal source for both the assignment and Task 2.
The Internet article provided a very easy read, in depth review of the key case, which was instructive in gaining an understanding of the defence and the main issues surrounding its inclusion.

A Comments: 1 New

Judith Tillson said... New ©

Sunday, 26 April 2015 17:31:14 o'clock BST
Very good justification for choice of sources.
## Results breakdown: past 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison between use/non-use of journals for Portfolio Assessment for Consumer Protection law

**Year: 2014/15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Journals (31)</th>
<th>No Journals (17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9 (18.75%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7 (14.4%)</td>
<td>4 (8.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15 (31.25%)</td>
<td>7 (14.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison between use and non-use of journals for Portfolio Assessment for Consumer Protection law

Year: 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals (20)</th>
<th>No Journals (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2 (6.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1 (3.12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pattern: journal keeping as part of assessment seems to have a positive effect on grade band.
Changes after 2015-16

We have started to evaluate the impact on performance and results of the extension of reflection requirements, journal keeping, and reflection and completion of entries in most of the modules we work with: Consumer, Employment, etc.

• **Journal reflection** a mandatory part of the assessment regime: eg no mark for preparation, attendance and contribution in Employment & Equalities Law without a journal entry

• **From 2016-17** we are evaluating impact of raising PAC mark (30%) coupled with better guidance
# Contract of Employment Journal

## Workshop 1 - "Employee" Status

### Reflective Assessment - Checklist

Listed below are a number of key points/tasks in Workshop 1 that you should have considered in your preparation for the Workshop and at the Workshop using online systems and other research sources and tools. Please complete this reflective assessment form which is designed to help you monitor your progress.

NB: Completion of your journal entries after each workshop and before submission of your assignment is mandatory and you will have to complete these to obtain your workshop and assignment marks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop 1</th>
<th>Research Pre-Workshop? Brief record</th>
<th>Systems and sources used Brief record</th>
<th>Journal entry V/N?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Q.1 Key requirements of employee status?
Examples of where "employee" status is essential in order to assert a particular employment right?

#### Q.2 Employee shareholder status?
First, what is it, and legal framework?
Second, well received by lawyers?
Key concerns?

#### Q.3 The requirement of "mutuality of obligation" and "reciprocity"

#### Q.4 Importance of migration status?
What are the risks a worker runs if she or he undertakes employment without being entitled to be here, or without a right to work?
St. Prix. Who won?

#### Q.5 Angela’s status and situation?
- After she started?
- After she worked from home?

Would it make a difference if she signed a statement "I is understood by both parties..."

### Reading/Other Actions

From your reflections above you should also make notes as to:
- What are the biggest challenges you experienced in relation to this topic?
- Will the work you have done on this workshop contribute to your assignment? If so how?
- How well do you think you prepared for and contributed to the workshop?
- Have you, at this stage of the programme, started to use online systems to help your research (important in gaining a good workshop mark for preparation and contribution).
Employment/Equality & SWL
Findings to Date

Sem 1
• Greater usage of on-line systems, assisted by excellent introductory session by Lexis Nexis team member. Marked improvements in quality of workshop contribution: helped by PAC assessment (worth 20% for 15 Credit, 10% for 30 Credit)

Sem 2
• Significantly less attendance/preparation in Semester 2 where there was no mark for workshop participation, attendance, contribution perhaps supporting the case for assessing PAC. Similar considerations/outcomes with SWL (also no PAC mark)

Results
• Overall marks in Employment/Equality very good, with significant proportions of 2:1s and 1sts. The obvious comparator was with SWL where a very similar form of assessment and assessment criteria. Results were good but not at such a level.
Changes since 2015-16 in SWL and Employment & Equality

Composition of the SWL and Employment & Equality cohorts the same or very similar to previous year

Yet results in E & E better at all levels, especially in the quality of materials used, current awareness, etc.

Responses?

• To extend same assessment regime to SWL by 2017-18: then monitor the effects, results, etc

• Make other improvements by 2017-18, eg clearer guidance, comparable requirements to the PAC regime, journals, etc

• Evaluate the effect of improving the reward for Preparation, Attendance, Contribution (PAC) mark in similar courses, but also 2016-17 programmes like MA Employment & HR
Wolfvision - Visualiser
RiT Project Blog
2013-16

https://blogs.staffs.ac.uk/euap/
MyLawFirmExperience

Level 4
MLX Research & Findings

• We wished to ascertain what effect the use of MLX might have had on the students’ achievement bearing in mind that the use of MLX was voluntary rather than compulsory.

• A comparison was made between the final examination grades of those students who had used MLX (53) and those who had not (63).
Exam marks (%)
Findings

There was a positive correlation between module exam performance and use of MLX. The mean grade value for those students who did use MLX was 50.5% whereas the mean grade value for those who did not use MLX was 45%.
Findings

It is too early to conclude that this difference was due to use of MLX: it may be that the more motivated students used MLX. However, this does indicate the need to assess performance under conditions where use of MLX is mandatory rather than voluntary.

It is proposed to integrate MLX into the curriculum design and possibly assessment, undertake further evaluations.
BOOK CHAPTER
Routledge Text/Chapter: HE Pedagogy

• Introductory section on Institute of Industrial Law projects, including Enquiring Minds, information (IL)/digital literacies (DT), and Research Informed Teaching project (2013-16)
• Development of themes in earlier project articles, books, papers – see ‘References & Information below’
• Evaluation of applications of on-line systems for teaching, learning and curriculum development
• Critical assessment of progress since the introduction of improved training and usage of systems, assisted by collaborations with publishers – Lexis, Thomson-Reuter, and Pearson – and facilitated by extended Blackboard usage, tracking of work, use of ‘journal’ records
• Evaluations of MLX and work with Pearson
Thanks for your kind attention!

Questions...
RiT Project Information, Outputs & References

RiT Project: https://blogs.staffs.ac.uk/euap/

• Meet the Team: https://blogs.staffs.ac.uk/euap/project-aims-and-objectives/meet-the-team/

• Enquiring Minds: http://www.staffs.ac.uk/research/iils/minds/
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