Course: DVM 3108 - Humanitarian Action
Description: 3 credits, third year undergraduate course for the International Development and Globalization Program at the University of Ottawa
Instructor: Christine Gibb, Assistant Professor, School of International Development and Global Studies, University of Ottawa
Email: cgibb2@uottawa.ca
Session: Winter 2021
Due: Various dates throughout the semester
Points Possible: 40 (10 individual mark + 30 group mark)

CREATE A TRAINING MODULE ASSIGNMENT

Course learning objectives targeted:

- Explain the role of humanitarian assistance in the global geo-political context;
- Appreciate the operational challenges faced by humanitarian assistance providers;
- Prepare clear and succinct written communications aimed at humanitarian actors;
- Reflect on how the global COVID-19 pandemic has further shaken the humanitarian system and pointed to the need for change

What do you get out of the assignment?

This assignment simulates the group work that is part of all humanitarian work (including the challenges of working under constrained time frames, and perhaps with technological, logistical, and other difficulties). Developing the training module will help build your research and writing skills by clearly and concisely communicating key points in an accessible format.

If all members of your group agree, your module may be shared with the training module developers at CONVERGE. It may become the basis for a training module used by disaster and humanitarian practitioners and scholars around the world.

This assignment has 3 parts. Parts 1 and 3 are individual assignments. Part 2 is a group assignment.

Part 1, evaluating a training module (5%, an individual mark)

Overview:

Complete one of the CONVERGE Training Modules and complete a 2-page evaluation of the module. To do so, you must first register with the CONVERGE project and complete the training module of your choice.

CONVERGE is a National Science Foundation-funded initiative led by Dr. Lori Peek and headquartered at the Natural Hazards Center at the University of Colorado Boulder. CONVERGE has developed a series of training modules to advance the ethical conduct and scientific rigor of hazards and disaster research.

Submit your Certificate of Completion and your evaluation by 11:59 pm EST on February 12, 2021, on Brightspace.

Detailed instructions:

1   CONVERGE TRAINING MODULES I ASSIGNMENT BANK

CONVERGE I **Natural Hazards Center** I **CU Boulder**
483 UCB I Boulder, CO 80309-0483 I (303) 735-5844
converge@colorado.edu I hazards.colorado.edu

1. Register and create an account with CONVERGE
2. Complete one training module
3. Take the final quiz (get 8 out of the 10 questions correct to receive a certificate of completion)
4. Complete a 2-page evaluation of the module. Your evaluation should answer the following questions. Write your evaluation in a concise narrative (paragraph) format (1.5 spacing, Arial font, 12 point).
    a. What is the purpose of the module? Did it achieve its aim(s)? Why or why not?
    b. What are the 3 most important points of this module? Explain why you chose these points and not other points made in the module.
    c. Did the quiz test the main points in the module? Were the questions fair and appropriate? If not, what would have made them better?
    d. Is the module missing any critical points? If so, what are they?
    e. Does the module provide clear, evidence-based claims? Is the evidence clearly linked to the module aim(s) and topic? How is the evidence presented? Is the presentation of the evidence effective? Why or why not? If it wasn't effective, what would have made it more effective?
    f. How is the module structured overall? Does the way the information is organized and sequenced help you learn the material? Why or why not? If it wasn't effective, what would have made it more effective?
    g. Is the language of the module appropriate for a practitioner audience?
    h. What are 2 questions you have after completing the training module?
5. Upload a copy of your certificate and your evaluation to Brightspace
6. Add the certificate to your resumé

Part 2, designing the training module (30%, a group mark):

Overview:

As a group (5), please pick one topic that you think can help better prepare humanitarian workers who work in disaster or conflict contexts, or both. You, as a team, will prepare a training module and a quiz. The module should be the equivalent of 20-25 pages. The training module must include a minimum of 10 peer-reviewed references.

Please select your team and submit all the names of your team members by 11:59 pm EST on February 5, 2021, on Brightspace.

Please submit a group contract and your team's topic by 11:59 pm EST on February 12, 2021, on Brightspace.

Please submit your module by 11:59 pm EST on March 19, 2021, on Brightspace.

Each team will present their module, answering the questions and responding to the comments in the peer evaluations, on 7 or 9 April, 2021, on Zoom during class.

Detailed instructions:
1. Make a group of 5 who will work together in creating a training module on a topic that you think can help better prepare humanitarian workers who work in disaster or conflict contexts, or both
2. Create a group contract that formalizes the expectations of group members. Your group contract should include the following 6 elements. Sample contracts are posted in Brightspace. We will have a group contract-making workshop during the 10 February class.
    a. Group members' names and contact information
    b. Training module focus area (e.g. gender-inclusive WASH in refugee camps, food aid that respects local food sovereignty, 21st century updates to the humanitarian principles, etc.)
    c. Goals (What do we want to accomplish? What skills do we want to develop or refine?)
    d. Roles & responsibilities (Who is responsible for each section of the training module?)
    e. Expectations (What do we expect of one another regarding attendance at meetings, preparation for meetings, frequency of communication, quality of work, etc.)
    f. Consequences (How will we respond if a team member is not abiding by the team's ground rules?)
3. Pick a topic and research it
4. Prepare a training module and a quiz

5. The module should be the equivalent of 20-25 pages (not including your title page, table of contents, and references)
6. Formatting: 1.5 spacing, Arial font, 12 point
7. The training module must include a minimum of 10 peer-reviewed references and be referenced APA style
8. Each team will present their module, answering the questions and responding to the comments in the peer evaluations, on 7 or 9 April, 2021, on Zoom during class. Each presentation should be 15 minutes long.

Part 3, peer review (5%, an individual mark):

Overview:

Between 20-30 March, 2021, you will review a minimum of two other modules, and will post on the discussion board two questions per module. Once your questions are posted, we will rank the questions to decide which ones each group will answer during a live 15 min Q&A the following weeks (7 and 9 April, 2021).

Please submit your reviews by 11:59 pm EST on March 30, 2021, on Brightspace.

Detailed instructions:
1. Between 20-30, March, 2021, complete a minimum of 2 other modules
2. Evaluate two training modules created by other students in DVM 3108. Use the same evaluation criteria from Part 1. Write your evaluation in a concise narrative (paragraph) format.
3. Submit these evaluations on Brightspace
4. Post 2 questions for each of the 2 modules you evaluated on this google doc (you may post your questions anonymously)
5. Contribute to the group ranking of the questions during the 31 March class

Grading Rubrics:

Part 1

EVALUATION CRITERIA - EVALUATE A MODULE	
5 points	A 5/5 is reserved for comprehensive and well thought-out evaluations. The evaluation addresses all questions in an insightful way. The evaluation is also well written, with no errors in spelling, or punctuation. There is sophisticated sentence structure, diction, and tone. The evaluation provides constructive feedback that would be helpful to the module writing team. The evaluation includes 2 thoughtful questions inspired by the module. Certificate of completion is included.
4 points	Relative to a 5/5, any of the following apply: The evaluation is less insightful. The overall clarity, tone, diction, spelling, punctuation, or sentence structure need some improvement. The evaluation provides feedback to the module writing team. The evaluation includes 2 questions inspired by the module. Certificate of completion is included.
3 points	The evaluation needs significant improvement in multiple dimensions. The evaluation provides limited feedback that would not be helpful to the module writing team. The evaluation includes 1 question inspired by the module. Certificate of completion is included.

Part 2

EVALUATION CRITERIA - GROUP CONTRACT	
5 points	A 5/5 is reserved for comprehensive and well thought-out group contracts. The group contract addresses all key questions in an original and insightful way. The expectations are clear and reasonable, and the consequences are fair to all parties involved. The group contract is also well written, with no errors in spelling, or punctuation. There is sophisticated sentence structure, diction, and tone.

EVALUATION CRITERIA - GROUP CONTRACT	
4 points	Relative to a 5/5, any of the following apply: The group contract is less original (e.g. limited work adapting the sample). The expectations are mostly clear and reasonable. The consequences may not be fair to all parties involved. The overall clarity, tone, diction, spelling, punctuation, or sentence structure need some improvement.
3 points	The group contract needs significant improvement in multiple dimensions.
0 - 2 points	The group contract fails to meet almost all criteria.

EVALUATION CRITERIA - TRAINING MODULE			
Criteria	**Excellent**	**Satisfactory**	**Unsatisfactory**
Relevance 5 points	Clearly demonstrates the relevance of topic for humanitarian workers and how training on topic will improve humanitarian assistance	Introduces relevance of topic, and notes how training on topic will improve humanitarian assistance	Inappropriate topic or missing, inappropriate or irrelevant justification
Accuracy & sophistication of evidence 10 points	Provides a rich description of all key aspects of module topic, supported by specific and illustrative examples; evidence draws on multiple sources and multiple cases	Describes most key aspects of module topic with some illustrative examples	Description of the module topic is vague, unconvincing, and/or draws on few examples
Accuracy & sophistication of analysis 10 points	Provides strong evidence-based explanations that connect theory and research with the lessons and recommended actions of module	Provides plausible explanations that connect theory and research with the lessons and recommended actions of module	The module does not connect theory and research with the lessons and recommended actions of module
Substantive coherence & originality 10 points	The authors' train of thought is easy to follow thanks to effective use of paragraphs, sequencing of sub-topics; module is visually appealing and engaging; module creatively and effectively uses examples, images, videos, sounds; module is written for practitioner audience; quiz effectively tests key points of the module	The authors' train of thought is mostly easy to follow; module is visually appealing; module uses examples, images, videos, sounds; module is written for practitioner audience; quiz tests key points of the module	The authors' train of thought is difficult to follow; module is not visually appealing; module uses few or inappropriate examples, images, videos, sounds; module is not written for practitioner audience; quiz does not test key points of the module
Form 5 points	Writing is free of errors in spelling, punctuation, word choice, or sentence structure; includes a minimum of 10 relevant peer-reviewed references; citations are virtually flawless; module follows formatting guidelines perfectly	Writing is mostly free of errors; includes a minimum of 10 peer-reviewed references but some may not be relevant; despite some errors, the module largely observes APA style; module mostly follows formatting guidelines	Writing is difficult to understand due to many errors; includes fewer than 10 peer-reviewed references; errors persist that suggest a lack of understanding of APA style; module does not follow formatting guidelines

EVALUATION CRITERIA - GROUP PRESENTATION	
5 points	A 5/5 is reserved for comprehensive and well thought-out group presentations. The group presentation addresses all top-ranked questions in an original and insightful way. The group presentation gives a brief overview of the training module and why it is needed. Group members are well-prepared to answer questions. Explanations are clear. Presentation respects time restrictions.
4 points	Relative to a 5/5, any of the following apply: The group presentation is less original. Too much time is spent giving an overview of the module. Questions are not clearly answered. Group members are not prepared to answer all top-ranked questions.
3 points	The group presentation needs significant improvement in multiple dimensions.
0 - 2 points	The group presentation fails to meet almost all criteria.

Part 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA - EVALUATE A MODULE	
5 points	A 5/5 is reserved for comprehensive and well thought-out evaluations. The evaluation addresses all questions in an insightful way. The evaluation is also well written, with no errors in spelling, or punctuation. There is sophisticated sentence structure, diction, and tone. The evaluation provides constructive feedback that would be helpful to the module writing team. The evaluation includes 2 thoughtful questions inspired by the module.
4 points	Relative to a 5/5, any of the following apply: The evaluation is less insightful. The overall clarity, tone, diction, spelling, punctuation, or sentence structure need some improvement. The evaluation provides feedback to the module writing team. The evaluation includes 2 questions inspired by the module.
3 points	The evaluation needs significant improvement in multiple dimensions. The evaluation provides limited feedback that would not be helpful to the module writing team. The evaluation includes 1 question inspired by the module.
0 - 2 points	The evaluation fails to meet almost all criteria.