**Assignment 2 (For BS-SE: Section B & C)**

**(SS-2043–Civics and Community Engagement Spring-2025)**

**Due Date and Time: Monday, 14th April, 2025 (02:00 PM)     Marks: 35**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | **Roll No.: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **Date:** **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | **Section:** **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
|  | **Submitted To:** Ms. Saira Khan |

*Instructions:*

* *Late submissions will not be graded.*
* *You must write accurate roll number and name along with section on your submitted draft.*
* *Only the hardcopies submitted to the teacher (till the due date & time) will be considered, i.e., the submissions that will be slided beneath instructors’ office doors or submitted elsewhere will not be graded.*
* Students must create the document without the assistance of AI tools or software. Submissions generated or refined by AI will be penalized.
* Submission should be done in hard and soft both forms.
* **Assignment is not a group work but an individual task.**
* **Attach Plagiarism report (Similarity and AI index) generated from library along with assignment.**

1. Identify at least one case study from authentic sources that highlights various aspects of community engagement in Pakistan. Briefly describe the context and the community involved in that case study. What were the goals of the engagement initiative? How was the engagement carried out? What methods and strategies were used? Identify any obstacles encountered and how they were addressed. Evaluate the success of the initiative. What changes did it bring to the community?
2. Based on the case study, discuss the overall effectiveness of community engagement. What lessons can be learned, and how can these insights be applied in different contexts? Propose recommendations for future community engagement efforts.

| **Criteria** | **Excellent (5)** | **Good (4)** | **Satisfactory (3)** | **Needs Improvement (2)** | **Poor (1)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Case Study Selection & Context** (Authenticity, relevance, and clarity in the description) | Case study is highly relevant, well-justified, and from a credible source | Case study is relevant and justified with minor gaps | Case study is somewhat relevant but lacks strong justification | Case study is weakly justified and lacks credibility | Case study is unclear, irrelevant, or missing |
| **Community & Goals of Initiative** (Clear identification of target community and project objectives) | Community is well-defined; goals are clear, measurable, and relevant | Community and goals are mostly well-defined with minor gaps | Community description or goals lack depth | Community and goals are vaguely mentioned or unclear | Community and goals are missing or completely irrelevant |
| **Engagement Methods Used** (How the initiative was carried out, strategies applied) | Methods are clearly described, well-reasoned, and effectively implemented | Methods are well-explained with minor gaps in reasoning | Methods are mentioned but lack clarity in execution | Methods are weakly explained, missing key details | Methods are unclear, unsupported, or missing |
| **Challenges & Solutions** (Obstacles faced and how they were addressed) | Challenges are well-identified, solutions are practical and well-justified | Challenges and solutions are mostly clear with minor gaps | Challenges are mentioned, but solutions lack depth | Challenges are weakly analyzed, and solutions are vague | Challenges and solutions are missing or unclear |
| **Effectiveness & Impact** (Evaluation of success, measurable impact on the community) | Success is well-evaluated with strong evidence of positive impact | Success is analyzed with reasonable evidence | Impact is mentioned but lacks depth and strong evaluation | Impact is weakly assessed, lacking supporting details | No clear evaluation of impact provided |
| **Critical Reflection** (Lessons learned and insights on effectiveness of community engagement) | Deep, well-supported reflection with strong critical insights | Good reflection with reasonable critical insights | Some insights are provided but lack depth | Weak reflection with minimal analysis | No critical reflection provided |
| **Recommendations for Future Engagement** (Feasible, practical, and well-justified suggestions) | Recommendations are realistic, innovative, and strongly supported | Good recommendations with minor gaps in justification | Basic recommendations but lack strong feasibility | Weak or vague recommendations | No recommendations provided |
| **Presentation & Organization** (Clarity, coherence, and logical structure of the report) | Well-structured, clear, and logically organized | Mostly well-structured with minor inconsistencies | Somewhat organized but lacks coherence | Poorly structured with unclear sections | Disorganized, unclear, and difficult to follow |
| **Reference of Case Study** | Authentic reference mentioned |  |  |  | Reference not mentioned |
| **Plagiarism Report** | Attach Plagiarism report (Similarity and AI index) generated from library |  |  |  |  |