

## **Assessment of Team Working**

### **Group members:**

- ❖ Dipankar Raj Sharma
  - ❖ Shristimaa Khanal
  - ❖ Aashna Regmi
  - ❖ Alish Mahat
  - ❖ Dipesh Gurung
- 

### **Introduction**

Our team, comprised of five students with diverse strengths and weaknesses, embarked on the challenging journey of researching and analyzing the legal case of A v B (Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co v Manchester Technology Data (Holdings) Ltd). Our goal was to compile a comprehensive report detailing our study and findings regarding the legal standings of the case. Through this collaborative effort, we not only delved into the intricacies of the legal system but also broadened our understanding of Cyber Security and Digital Forensics legislation within the English domain. This collaborative experience is reflected through the lens of a SWOT analysis.

### **SWOT Framework**

The SWOT analysis is an analysis used to identify the key internal and external factors important to achieving an objective by a group. SWOT stands for **Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats**. SWOT, a time-tested strategic planning tool, helps to analyze and understand what a company is doing now and devise a successful strategy for the future. SWOT helps to examine the factors within our control along with factors which are not, as an organization or a group. SWOT can be considered a situational analysis framework in comparison to SOAR which is more future optimistic and doesn't quite fit the situation here, which being a single group task.

### **Strengths**

#### **1. Collaborative Presentation:**

Diversified strengths among team members complemented the collaborative process, enriching our research and presentation preparation. The regular presentation of substantial findings during weekly meetings was a cornerstone of our teamwork. These sessions not only facilitated collective input but also enriched the depth of our work. The collaborative nature of these presentations encouraged a dynamic exchange of ideas, refining our understanding of the case.

**2. Early Initiative:**

Starting our research well in advance was a strategic move that significantly contributed to the depth and breadth of our analysis. Early initiation of the research process was facilitated by our familiarity with the UWE library and database, ensuring efficient progress. It allowed us ample time for individual contributions, fostering a comprehensive and well-informed approach.

**3. Cohesive Editing:**

Regular sharing of substantial findings and valuable material occurred during scheduled group meetings, enhancing collaboration. The emphasis on collaborative editing and rephrasing narratives before the final report showcased our commitment to quality assurance. This approach enhanced the overall cohesion and quality of our work, ensuring a polished and professional final output.

## **Weaknesses**

**1. Varying Opinions:**

Divergent strengths led to varying opinions on the group's focus and approach, requiring effective communication and compromise. While the early initiative allowed for efficient flow of work, other deadlines scheduled during the course of research proved to be a challenging obstacle.

**2. Division for Research:**

Research division on the case proved challenging, particularly as it involved relatively new legal concepts, leading to varying levels of difficulty among team members. A more thorough understanding of each team member's strengths and preferences during the initial planning phase might have contributed to a more equitable distribution of tasks.

**3. Resource Utilization Uncertainty**

The initial research phase posed difficulties, stemming from uncertainty about effective utilization of the UWE library resources.

## **Opportunities**

**1. Vast Research Area:**

A proactive start provided sufficient time for an in-depth study of the case and English statutes, allowing for comprehensive research beyond UWE library resources.

**2. Collaborative Experience:**

Extra time allowed for additional research and thorough preparation of presentation slides, offering valuable insights into real-time legal cases between corporations. The early start not only provided spare time for individual research but also presented an opportunity for team members to assist each other with challenging aspects of the

research. Leveraging this time for collaborative learning and skill-sharing can strengthen team bonds and enhance overall project quality.

**3. Chance to widen our knowledge:**

Challenges were embraced as opportunities for exploration and learning, contributing to a more profound understanding of the subject matter. At the end of the coursework. Every member gained valuable experience and knowledge which'll surely prove to be beneficial in the future.

## **Threats**

**1. Resource Limitation:**

Research faced resource limitations at times, with the university's online library providing insufficient material, demanding adaptation to alternative sources.

**2. Scheduling Setbacks:**

Managing group dynamics within our set schedule proved challenging due to divergent personal commitments and deadlines to meet, necessitating flexible coordination. Identifying alternative scheduling methods or having contingency plans for unexpected scheduling conflicts can help mitigate this threat in future projects.

**3. Immaturity in Understanding Legal Concepts:**

The need to re-write portions due to a lack of maturity in understanding legal concepts posed a significant challenge. To address this threat, incorporating additional training or resources to ensure all team members have a solid understanding of complex legal concepts is imperative.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, our team's journey through the research and analysis of Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co v Manchester Technology Data (Holdings) Ltd has been a learning experience filled with successes and setbacks. Despite facing threats, weaknesses, and challenges due to our limited experience in the subject matter, we believe to have managed to shown resilience and adaptability to collaboratively produce a satisfactory result. The collaborative effort of each team member, despite varying levels of input, showcased dedication and cooperation, ensuring the quality of our group project. This reflection serves not only as a testament of our growth but also as a roadmap for continuous improvement in our collaborative endeavors.