## Qualitative Assignment Plan Sample

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course/Assignment** | MBUS369 – Business Decision Modelling - Assignment #4 |
| **Lead** | Lara |
| **Second** | Santiago |
| **Due Date** | October 28 @ 11:59:59 pm to Course Portal |
| **Value (%)** | 50% = MAJOR!! |

**Overview**

Purpose of assignment, what is it about, deliverables

* Case Analysis – Eureka: Preparing for the Future vs. Hoover: Leading the Way

Assignment issues/notes/context

* Team assignment constitutes a major course mark, 50% of final grade
* Case study, complex, similar to MBUS436 - TMP and Millennium Computers, which means that face-to-face team contact is crucial in reducing the work load
* Prof has own publications, regurgitating this back to him will look good
* Endnotes are required (WORD Menus: insert, reference, footnote, and change to endnote), see the back of articles for examples

Assignment Requirements:

* 20-page report comparing the strategic decision-making process of the 2 firms
* The report must include several pages of current web-based research

**Execution**

* We will execute this in sub teams as follows:
* Each pair noted below will develop a draft in bullet point format
* Sub Leads are listed first
* Target about 4 double spaced pages, 12-point Arial, 1” margins, plus one exhibit for each Sub team
* Course concepts only, no fluff

|  |
| --- |
| Question 1: Evaluate the extent to which Eureka’s non-market strategy complemented its market strategy in competing with Hoover. (Saleem/Lara)  Check out article Session 3, “Non-market strategy…” |
| Question 2: How has Hoover been able to take market share from Eureka? How should Eureka counter these efforts? (David/Santiago) |
| Question 3: What lessons does this commercial rivalry hold for others businesses? (Inez/Michael)  Compare especially to other business outlines in the course, and also your own businesses (Inez and Michael both work for Global businesses) |
| Question 4: The two assigned cases present very different views of the Eureka-Hoover rivalry. Weigh the evidence from both cases against your *own background research* in presenting your arguments, recommendations for Eureka, and the implications for business more generally.  (Sanket/Olga)  You will have to communicate regularly with sub teams to put this stuff together. |

**Timeline**

October 2 – October 15

* Work on sub team drafts

October 15 at 6:00pm

* Distribute sub team work for review prior to working session

October 16 at 1:30 pm - Team Working Session

* Working session – come prepared with all pre-work done as per the above sub-team list
  + Come with a soft copy of your work – bullet points in Word – each sub team should update their file and email to Lara, upload to shared drive at the end of the working session

October 20 at 9:00pm

* Lara (Lead) sends the 80% draft to Santiago (Second)

October 24 at 8:00-9:00pm

* Santiago and Lara collaborate to create the 95% draft – Skype for Business

October 24 at 9:00pm

* Lara sends the 95% draft to the team

October 26 at 9:00pm

* Team sends any final comments to Lara

October 28 (Due date) at 11:59:59 pm local time

* Lara submits 100% Final to Queen’s

November 1 at 8:30 am

Lara leads assignment debrief at Administrative Meeting