VELAGAPUDI RAMAKRISHNA SIDDHARTHA ENGINEERING COLLEGE

(AUTONOMOUS)

KANURU, VIJAYAWADA – 520007



MINI PROJECT ADVANCE COMMUNICATION SKILLS LAB [20HS5153]

Student Name: MOHAMMAD RIZWANULLAH **Submitted To**:

Roll Number: 208W1A1299 Dr. B.V.V Padmavathi

Branch: Information Technology Department Of English

Section: B

COVER LETTER
From:
XXXXXXX
S/O XXXX
D.No:
Vijayawada-5200XX
27th December, 2022
To:
The Sr. Hr. Manager
XYZ India Pvt. Ltd.,
Hi. Tech City
Hyderabad-500012
Sir/Madam,
Sub: Application for the post of Assistant manager reg
Ref: Advertisement dated 16/12/22 on the Official website.
In response to your advertisement on Official website. I am applying myself for the position of SDE in your prestigious organization.
I am pursuing my B. Tech 3rd year in the stream of Computer Science and Engineering at Velagapudi Ramakrishna SiddharthaEngineering College(VRSEC), with a 9.46 CGPA. My streams are Full-stack development, Machine Learning, Deep Learning and Cloud Computing. I have actively participated in organizing several technical and cultural activities at the department level.
I here with endorse copies of my testimonials regarding my academics and co-curricular activities. Enduring you my devoted service if appointed to the post.
Thanking you.

ours sincerely,	
XXXXXX	
Enclosures:	
Resume	
Photocopy of B.Tech Original Degree	
Photocopy of the Internship.	

ANALYZING A CASE:A GENERAL STRATEGY

A case is a story that describes a problematic incident, event, or situation. It typically reports in-depth information about certain aspects of the situation while

under-reporting other aspects, and its conclusion is commonly left open- ended. The mission of case analysis is to make sense of the given material and to identify appropriate actions for handling the case situation.

Successful case discussions begin with an analysis of the key issues in the case. The analysis then serves as the basis for defining the most desirable out- comes and considering what options are available. This process usually results in a diversity of opinion as participants view the case situation from their unique perspectives, stressing different values and promoting different out- comes. Such diversity of opinion is the strength of the group case exercise. Par ticipants should value these differences, recognizing them as essential to learning, and make a special effort to

encourage new opinions about the case. As a result, the case exercise will become an even more profitable learning experience.

In case analysis, participants also evaluate the different opinions about the case and use their evaluations as the basis for forming a common opinion. By working together in this way to build group consensus on case solutions, participants gain a deeper understanding of how they can constructively deal with real-life leadership issues.

The following are case analysis guidelines that constitute a seven-step method for reaching group consensus. These steps provide participants with a common source of direction for addressing case issues.

Case Analysis Guidelines:

Step 1.

What are the key issues or problems of the case?

Any case may suggest several interpretations of what the focal concerns are. It is helpful to begin by identifying as many different interpretations as possible. Have each participant state why he or she identified the issues or problems as key.

Step 2.

Prioritize the problems.

Participants should focus on the key issues of the case. This may involve selecting one of the issues already raised or creating a new statement that identifies the problem. In some cases,

there may be several problems at work, in which case participants may wish to simply rank the problems in terms of either potential importance or timing of impact.

Step 3:

Consider whether it is necessary to determine the "cause" of the problem.

In some cases, it is important to determine what caused the problem in order to identify the appropriate solution(s). In other cases, the cause of the problem is not as important as what to do about it. Therefore, when working on a case, always ask whether it is necessary to decide what the cause is. It should be noted that speculating on the motivations of the individuals in a case seldom does more than sidetrack a case study. By trying to determine why a person acted in a certain way, participants can easily fall into unproductive discussions that revolve around guesswork instead of focusing on the situation at hand. Managers and supervisors often must respond to actions (or lack of actions) made by the people with whom they work, and reflecting on the motivations of others is, in this regard, only a diversion.

Step 4:

Brainstorm the options available to the leader.

There is always one option: Do nothing. However, there are usually several ways to resond to a problem, and helping participants identify those options is an important part of case discussions. Participants should be encouraged to use their best brainstorming skills to determine what the opt.ions are

Step 5:

Evaluate the options.

Each option will have advantages and disadvantages. In management and human resource issues, there are several criteria that may be useful for evaluating different options, including:

- The power of the option to solve the problem
- The impact of the option on organizational performance and/or morale

Legal or regulatory liabilities and requirements Cost of the option

The ability of the person(s) involved to carry out the option (in terms of skill, authority, or basic motivation)

Step 6:

Select the optimum solution

The ideal solution will produce the best outcome at the least cost. In management situations, this may not be possible. Therefore, selecting the best solution may involve balancing

competing opportunities and constraints with an optimum solution that produces satisfactory outcomes on as many criteria as possible.
Step 7:
Describe how the solution should be implemented.
Create a plan or "script" of what the manager or supervisor should do to implement the solution.

CASE STUDY: 4

It Was Really So Simple

Introduction:

As supervisor of the high-profile "Mod Squad" Unit in the Auditing Department, Brenda Galway prided herself on her no-nonsense, direct, and independent management style. She wanted hard-charging, competent auditing personnel who could operate independently.

Her most recent hire, Bill Stanley, had seemed to accept these conditions when she interviewed him for the job. He had acquired some background in this field, but was not the most qualified applicant Brenda had spoken with. Nevertheless, because Brenda had been unwilling to pay the salary that fully qualified applicants wanted, Bill ended up with the job.

Brenda was not pleased when she learned that the Executive Management Committee of the company had authorized a conversion of the auditing process from a manual system to a computerized one. She was given the responsibility of preparing a project implementation plan within three weeks. Brenda and her experienced staff were consumed with ongoing audits that could not be dropped, and she was forced to give the new project to Bill Stanley.

When giving Bill the assignment, Brenda made it clear that he was on his own but could call on her at any time. Subsequently, on two occasions, Bill asked for more details about what she wanted in the report, but he did not receive much specification from Brenda. Quite often she saw him in passing, and he always indicated that things were fine. Otherwise, Brenda had no involvement with him on the project. Bill turned the project in on time, but it was incorrect and needed to be redone.

What is the problem?

There are really two problems here, the apparent problem and the underlying problem. The apparent problem is really a symptom of the underlying one and is the faulty report. The underlying problem is Brenda's inappropriate supervision of Bill on this project. She should attend to both problems.

The faulty report was due, finally, to Brenda's failure to provide adequate direction, support, and control to Bill. That is, the faulty report was ultimately a result of her poor supervision of Bill on the task.

Solution:

Bill had a moderate amount of competence for completing this task. His above average motivation to work independently was offset by limited experience with computers and very
Iimited experience putting together a work plan. Therefore, Brenda should have used a combined directive and participative approach. When giving Bill the assignment, she should have clearly and specifically detailed what the structure of the plan should look like. She should have provided examples, demonstrations, and any published support materials.
Next, she should have set up follow-through meetings with Bill to re- view progress. At first these meetings should have been scheduled daily or every other day. She should have looked over Bill's progress on the project at those points, given him tips and direction, and answered any questions. As he developed more confidence, the meetings could be spaced out more infrequently, although never more than three to five days apart.