

Flipped-Classroom Presentation Series

Emerging Technology & Finance

Prof. Dr. Andre Guettler

Oliver Padmaperuma

Overview

Six in-class group presentations across six emerging-tech topics, graded cumulatively. **There is no separate exam or final-pitch event.** Each session = **50% peer-allocated tokens + 50% lecturer evaluation.** Final course grade = mean of the six session scores.

Group size: 4 students (lecturers allocate stragglers). **Form your group** by the end of Week 1 (Moodle sign-up). **Weight:** 100% of the final grade.

You will present six times — once per flipped week — each time on the topic that the **previous regular lecture** introduced. Every group presents every flipped week (there is no topic-ownership). The lecturer's score and the peer-token score combine 50/50 to give each session's grade; the six session grades are averaged to give the final mark.

The six sessions

Flipped week	Date	Topic
W2	29 October 2026	Foundations: Digital Disruption in Financial Services
W4	12 November 2026	Agentic AI & LLMs in Finance
W6	26 November 2026	Blockchain, Crypto, DeFi & Tokenisation
W8	10 December 2026	Fintech Business Models: Neobanks, Embedded Finance & Open Banking
W10	7 January 2027	RegTech, Cybersecurity & Privacy-Preserving Compute

Flipped week	Date	Topic
W12	21 January 2027	CBDCs & the Future of Money

Group formation

- Form a group of **4** by the end of **Week 1** via the Moodle sign-up sheet.
- If you don't sign up by the deadline, the lecturers will allocate you to a group with open seats.
- Group composition is **fixed** for the entire term — you cannot change groups between sessions.

Per-session deliverable

Every group prepares for every flipped session. The deliverable is a **6-minute presentation** + **2-minute Q&A** that covers:

1. **Specific angle** — choose one application, business model, technology, regulatory question, or case study within the week's topic. Don't try to cover the whole topic; go deep on one slice.
2. **Concrete example** — name a real company, real product, real protocol, real regulation, real incident. Show a screenshot, a chart, or (where feasible) a live demo. "*In theory, X could enable Y*" is weaker than "*Anthropic Claude has been used by [bank] for [purpose] — here's how it works.*"
3. **Critical evaluation** — what works, what doesn't, what's missing, who loses. Avoid sales-pitch tone; you are appraising, not endorsing.
4. **Discussion prompts** — 1–2 questions you want the room (or the lecturers) to react to. Strong prompts earn peer tokens.

Submission format

- **Slide PDF** uploaded to Moodle **before the flipped session begins** (5 minutes prior is the absolute deadline; earlier is better).
- File name: **ETF_W<NN>_group-<id>.pdf** (e.g. **ETF_W04_group-3.pdf**).
- 6 minutes is **firm** — practice. The lecturer will signal at 5:30 and stop the presentation at 6:00 regardless of where you are.
- Late slide submissions are graded down by 10 percentage points per started 30-min period (i.e. an upload 5 min after the session start loses 10 points).

Token allocation rules

Each group receives **20 fresh tokens at the end of every flipped session** to distribute among the *other* groups.

- **No self-allocation.** The Moodle quiz rejects submissions where the group allocates to itself.
- **Total must equal 20.** Distribution at the group's discretion — all 20 to one group, evenly split, anywhere in between.
- **5-minute window.** The Moodle quiz opens when the last group finishes presenting and closes 5 minutes later. Allocations submitted after the window are discarded; that group's tokens for that week count as zero (i.e. you lose your influence on the peer ranking, but you don't penalise anyone).
- **One submission per group.** The group nominates a representative for each session; the representative submits on behalf of the group.
- **The allocation rubric** — weigh each candidate group on:
 - *Insight*: did they teach you something you didn't know?
 - *Originality*: did they pick a fresh angle or critique?
 - *Clarity*: could you follow them?
 - *Critical depth*: did they appraise honestly or pitch uncritically?

Anti-collusion check

The lecturers audit peer-token patterns at the end of the term. Coordinated token-trading between two groups (e.g. “*you give us 15, we give you 15, every week*”) undermines the grading structure and is treated as an academic-integrity issue. Flagged cases trigger a review; in the worst case, peer-token scores are replaced by the lecturer score for the affected weeks.

Grading formula

For each session s :

$$\text{session-score}_s = 0.5 \times \frac{\text{tokens received by your group}_s}{\max(\text{tokens received by any group}_s)} \times 100 + 0.5 \times \text{lecturer-score}_s$$

The lecturer-score is on a 0–100 scale, applied with the same rubric (*insight · originality · clarity · critical depth*) and an additional *delivery* axis (timing discipline, slide quality).

Final course grade:

$$\text{final-grade} = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{s=1}^6 \text{session-score}_s$$

mapped to the German scale (1.0 best, 5.0 fail; 4.0 passing).

Recommended preparation flow

Day	Activity
Regular-lecture week (T-7 days)	Attend the regular lecture. Pick your group's angle by Sunday.
Flipped-week Monday–Wednesday	Research the angle. Find a concrete example. Draft slides (10 slides).
Flipped-week Wednesday evening	Internal dry-run: 6 minutes max, sharp critique among group members.
Flipped-week Thursday morning	Upload the slide PDF to Moodle before 14:00.
Flipped-week Thursday 14:00	Session: present in your slot; allocate tokens after; capture lecturer feedback.
Flipped-week Thursday evening	Brief internal retro: what would the next session do differently?

Honor code

By submitting slides each week, you confirm that the work is your group's own, that all sources are cited, and that any AI assistance has been disclosed (one footnote per slide deck stating tool and use).