

ENGR 401 Assignment 1

Case Study: Communication and Teamwork

Due Date: 26 March 2017, 24:00 (midnight)

Value: 20% of final grade (marks returned will be out of 100).

Workload Estimate: 7-8 hours (10 hours maximum)

Length Limits: 1000 words (900 words minimum, 1200 words maximum).

Submission: ECS Submission System.

This assignment addresses course learning objectives:

1. Communicate at a professional level orally and in writing, to a varied range of audiences.
2. Function effectively in a team in a variety of roles.

using the recruitment exercise for the ENGR 301 projects as the subject. In the recruitment exercise you have been asked to form selection panels and consider aspects of communication between applicants and panel. The first assignment is to write a short report on your personal experiences in the recruitment exercise, focussing on communication and functioning in a team. Aspects of communication and team roles you should give thought to are:

- verbal communication, both written and oral, and both applicant and panel.
- nonverbal communication, both applicant and panel.
- conflict resolution within the panel.
- the asymmetry between applicants and panel (e.g. in numbers, knowledge, power, communication, etc.)

Communication with the project client and even the written communication in the project descriptions are legitimate subjects for examination in the report. Some *suggested* questions which might be reflected upon in the assignment are:

- What was it like to be on the other side of the table?
- What were the good things and the bad things you saw in the Project Applications you read?
- What were the good things and bad things you observed during the interviews?
- Were there any insights or realisations which you recall in particular?
- How were panel discussions conducted, particularly when there were disagreements?
- How did the panel communicate with the applicants
- What was it that, in hindsight, the panel communicated?

A case study which focusses on one, perhaps two, aspects in depth, and with accuracy, will align better with the marking schedule than a broad “once-over-lightly” treatment. Remember, also, that the focus of a case study is people, not technical problems.

You are expected to appropriately support claims, and reference sources of information, with citations. The scheme required is the IEEE Citation Reference scheme, available from <https://www.ieee.org/documents/ieeecitationref.pdf> (PDF; 451 KB).

The marking scheme appears on the following page, with a supplemental guide to written communication assessment. Please submit your assignment as a PDF file with file name convention **ENGR 401 Assignment 1 first name lastname.pdf** where *firstname* and *lastname* are your first and last names.

ENGR 401 Assignment 1

Case Study: Communication and Teamwork

Case Study Marking Scheme

[Please Note: under moderation; subject to minor change]

Trait	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Identifies and describes the main issues. [20 marks]	Identifies and demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the main issues in the case study, making a makes thorough and accurate selection of relevant evidence	Clearly identifies, and demonstrates an accomplished understanding of all the issues, with a fully accurate description of the situation and selection of evidence for task at hand.	Identifies and demonstrates acceptable understanding of some of the issues, with an adequate and largely accurate description of the situation and selection of evidence for task at hand.	Does not identify or describe the main issues, or does so with significant omissions and/or inaccuracies in description of situation and/or evidence.
Analysis and evaluation of issues [20 marks]	Presents an insightful and thorough analysis of all issues, interpreting the evidence systematically and with justification.	Presents a thorough analysis of all the issues identified, with an accurate and convincing interpretation of evidence.	Presents a reasonable but limited analysis of most of the issues identified, with a plausible interpretation of the evidence.	Analysis is superficial or incomplete and/or the interpretation of the evidence is, inaccurate, distorted or misused.
Draws valid conclusions and/or makes effective recommendations for solutions/strategies [20 marks]	Draws thorough conclusions, presenting a balanced and critical view, with a reasonable and objective interpretation supported with evidence.	Conclusions are clear, logical, appropriate, and aligned with the analysis in the case study.	Draws sensible but pedestrian conclusions, generally in line with the analysis but somewhat one-sided; limited engagement with issues.	Conclusions are poorly defined, illogical, inappropriate or misaligned with the evidence and analysis in the case study.
Links to course lectures, readings and/or additional research [20 marks]	Connections between the issues identified and the course concepts are appropriate and powerful, the research is relevant and thoughtful.	The issues identified are appropriately and convincingly linked to lectures, readings and/or additional research.	Makes appropriate but vague connections between identified issues and concepts studied in the course, limited research.	Makes superficial, inappropriate or no connections between issues identified and course concepts, no supplemental research
Written Communication [20 marks]	See the supplementary guide on the next page.	See the supplementary guide on the next page.	See the supplementary guide on the next page.	See the supplementary guide on the next page.

ENGR 401 Assignment 1

Case Study: Communication and Teamwork

Written communication traits assessment scheme

[Please Note: under moderation; subject to minor change]

Trait	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Technical writing skills: Spelling, capitalisation, punctuation, grammar, general proofreading.	No spelling errors, no discernible flaws in punctuation, grammar and sentence construction.	Very few spelling errors, correct punctuation, grammatically correct, complete sentences.	Lapses in spelling, punctuation and grammar, but not enough to seriously distract the reader.	Numerous spelling errors, absent or incorrect punctuation, and/or severe grammatical errors.
Vocabulary: Originality, breadth, variety and appropriateness.	Sophisticated use of vocabulary, choice of words and discipline-specific terminology.	Consistently appropriate vocabulary, consistently correct word choice and discipline-specific terminology.	Generally appropriate vocabulary; not overly repetitive. Generally chooses correct words and terminology.	Excessively limited, inappropriate or repetitive vocabulary. Misuses words and discipline-specific terminology.
Structure and style: Document, paragraph and sentence structure, flow and layout, appropriate to audience.	Elegant and thoughtful sentence and paragraph construction, which enhances the reader's understanding.	Variety of sentence construction; logical flow; style and structure appropriate for task, audience and genre.	Not overly repetitive; some variety in sentence construction; generally flows well; some awareness of audience and genre.	Repetitive and/or simplistic sentence structure; consistently disjointed, lack of flow; style/structure inappropriate for audience.
Clarity and conciseness: Answers the question, succinct, appropriate complexity.	Displays clarity of thought through a cogent argument focussed on the question, enlightening the reader.	Argument is effectively conveyed, addressing the question in an easily understood manner.	Argument reasonably clear; occasionally misses the point but answers the question; not excessively elaborate or complicated.	Main point and/or argument confused or unclear. Irrelevant information, no transition between ideas. Unclear conclusion.
Academic integrity and Appropriate use of referencing	Sources and citations are carefully chosen to concisely support the work, and the IEEE referencing system is used skilfully and effectively.	Others' work acknowledged in-text and/or with citations. Uses IEEE referencing system consistently and correctly.	Other sources appear to be acknowledged. Uses IEEE referencing system but with occasional errors or omissions.	Work appears to be not adequately referenced or attributed. Does not attempt to use IEEE referencing system.