Assignment Brief and Front Sheet PGT

This front sheet for assignments is designed to contain the brief, the submission instructions, and the actual student submission for any WMG assignment. As a result the sheet is completed by several people over time, and is therefore split up into sections explaining who completes what information and when. Yellow highlighted text indicates examples or further explanation of what is requested, and the highlight and instructions should be removed as you populate 'your' section.

This sheet is only to be used for components of assessment worth more than 3 CATS (e.g. for a 15 credit module, weighted more than 20%; or for a 10 credit module, weighted more than 30%).

To be completed by the student(s) prior to final submission:
Your actual submission should be written at the end of this cover sheet file, or attached with the cover sheet at the front if drafted in a separate file, program or application.

Student ID or IDs for group work	**5569029**

To be completed (highlighted parts only) by the programme administration after approval and prior to issuing of the assessment; to be consulted by the student(s) so that you know how and when to submit:

Date set	22/4/2025
Submission date (excluding extensions)	19th May 2025 by 12pm UK time
Submission guidance	To be submitted electronically via Tabula
Late submission policy	If work is submitted late, penalties will be applied at the rate of **5 marks per University working day** after the due date, up to a **maximum of 10 working days** late. After this period the mark for the work will be reduced to 0 (which is the maximum penalty). "Late" means **after the submission deadline time as well as the date** – work submitted after the given time even on the same day is counted as 1 day late. For **Postgraduate** students only, who started their **current course before 1 August 2019**, the daily penalty is **3 marks** rather than 5.
Resit policy	If you fail this module and/or component, the University allows students to remedy failure (within certain limits). Decisions to authorise resits are made by Exam Boards. These will be issued at specific times of the year, depending on your programme of study. More information can be found from your programme office if you are concerned. If this is **already a resit** attempt, this means you will not be eligible for an additional attempt. The University allows as standard a maximum of two attempts on any assessment (i.e. only one resit). Students can only have a third attempt under exceptional circumstances via a Mitigating Circumstances Panel decision.

To be <u>completed</u> by the <u>module leader/tutor</u> prior to approval and issuing of the assessment; to be <u>consulted</u> by the <u>student(s)</u> so that you understand the assignment brief, its context within the module, and any specific criteria and advice from the tutor:

Module title & code	ES968-15 Project Planning Management & Control
Module leader	Kevin Fielding
Module tutor	Kevin Fielding/David Pontin/Tilimbe Jiya/Dennis Chapman
Assessment type	Essay Assignment Part B
Weighting of mark	30%

Assignment brief
Q1. During the module you were a member of a project team on the project management exercise. Write a report critically evaluating the performance of your team on that exercise. Your report should concentrate on how the team functioned rather than the technical aspects of the project management exercise itself. In particular you must include comments on: a) The team's Belbin profiles. (50%) b) The team lifecycle. (25%) c) Conflict within the team. (25%)

Word count	Recommended Length 1200 words (excluding references, tables etc). No penalties are applied directly for word count if the discussion is all relevant to answering the question, is written as succinctly as possible and provides sufficient depth to the discussion.
Module learning outcomes (numbered)	1. Interpret the requirements for the effective management of projects of different types, scale, complexity, and risk within the organisational environment. 2. In a group setting select, apply and critically evaluate appropriate project planning, management and control approaches and techniques used in different circumstances. 3. Critically evaluate team performance in a group work setting and contribute to the formulation and management of project teams throughout the project life-cycle. 4. Deliver small projects effectively and contribute to the delivery of larger projects.
Learning outcomes assessed in this assessment (numbered)	3
Marking guidelines	https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/sci/wmg/ftmsc/postmodulework/marks/
Academic guidance resources	Further help may be received through links to a reading list, face-to-face sessions, feed-forward, workshops, seminars, Q&A sessions during the module etc.

Where to get help:

1. Talk to your module tutor if you don't understand the question or are unsure as to exactly what is required.
2. There are also numerous online courses provided by the University library to help in academic referencing, writing, avoiding plagiarism and a number of other useful resources. https://warwick.ac.uk/services/library/students/your-library-online/
3. If you have a problem with your wellbeing, it is important that you contact your personal tutor or wellbeing support services https://warwick.ac.uk/services/wss

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Introduction

Our team **Project Pioneers** was given a task to successfully run a project. The project was to design and manufacture a prototype for Warwick Prototypes Ltd. We were expected to complete the project within 140 working days with a targeted budget of £800,000. Successful completion of the project would have earned the company £1,000,000 which any delays after 140th day would cost £10,000 in the form of penalties. We were provided with sufficient resources to make the project happen on time. Resources were of two type, internal resources and external resources. In terms of internal resources, we had 12 designers, 5 assemblers, 4 testers, 1 inspector all of them for each period. We had in total of 7 periods where each period consisted 20 days. Externally, we had subcontractors for manufacturing and different suppliers for procurement of materials. Our main task was to plan and use these available resources effectively and efficiently.

We initially planned to deliver the project in 128 days. However, due to various issues like, overuse of resources and supplier delays the project was completed on **178th** day with total cost of £1.388 million, leading to a massive **£588,000 overspend**. This report reflects on how our team performed throughout the simulation. It primarily focuses on team roles, contribution of every team member, how we distributed the work, how we managed the conflicts using real examples from the simulation.

Belbin Roles

We began the simulation the by identifying our Belbin Team Roles (R Meredith Belbin, 2010) Our team had strong representation in Coordinator and Implementor roles, but lacked enough contribution in Monitor Evaluator and Completer Finisher roles. Below figure (fig.1) summarises our team's work and responsibilities distribution.

TEAM ROLE	PRIMARY PREFERENCE	SECONDARY PREFERENCE	TERTIARY PREFERENCE	TOTAL (IN ROW)
Coordinator (CO)		Vedant,Niranjan		2
Shaper (SH)	Felice			1
Plant (PL)			Vedant, Niranjan	2
Monitor Evaluator (ME)		Felice		1
Implementer (IM)	Vedant, Suyash			2
Teamworker (TW)			Suyash	1
Resource Investigator (RI)			Felice	1
Completer Finisher (CF)		Suyash		1
Specialist (SP)	Niranjan			1

Fig. 1 Belbin Roles

As mentioned above, we had a strong presence of Implementers (V.G and S.C) and leadership-oriented roles like Secondary Coordinator (V.G, N.K) and Shaper (F.S) But we still lacked in couple of important roles which surely affected our team's overall performance.

Those vacant roles clearly reflected when we repeatedly selected Bodgyt & Sons as a subcontractor for our **M315** even after they had cancelled our order initially in module 3. This decision was largely supported by F.S who was more concerned about the budget and cost offered by the subcontractor. However, we didn't have anyone naturally challenged this decision and analysed its long-term effects. If we had a one more person as a Monitor Evaluator, we might have reassessed the risk earlier. Similarly, V.G was the one who decided to go with the full resource usage in order to make things happen on time, but this caused rapid budget consumption. I suggested scaling down, but the plan remain unchanged. N.K as a specialist, focused mainly on supplier technical aspect, which indeed helped in evaluation process, however it didn't influence broader planning decisions. We had Plant and Teamworker roles on our tertiary preference, we lacked creative input during planning and maybe it would have supported during tense decisions.

There were moments during the simulation where I felt the team could have performed better if we had contributed to our full potential. Unfortunately, this didn't happen frequently and it eventually reflected on our simulation. We also received a feedback on our overall approach towards simulation by our tutors.

Overall, our team was good at getting things done, but because some important roles were not strongly represented, lack of positive approach from team, some key decisions were not properly questioned. This made it harder for us to adjust when problems came up, which led to delays and extra costs. Our tutors also mentioned in the presentation as a feedback that while our team had a good structure, we didn't make full use of each member's strengths.

Team Lifecycle

We can describe our team's development using Tuckman's Model (Vaida and Șerban, 2021) The Tuckman's model outlines the 5 stages of group development. Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing and Adjourning. These stages help to understand how teams grow, face challenges, resolve differences and improve collaboration as the project progresses.

1. **Forming** – Forming being the initial stage makes people come together to get to know each other and begin to understand the task. In our case, this stage started off with a positive atmosphere and strong motivation. Each member from our team started contributing according to their areas of strength. F.S naturally took the lead in the discussion, V.G looked after planning the resources and schedules. I and N.K looked into supplier evaluation and Gantt chart preparation.
2. **Storming** – This is the stage where differences in opinions and working styles may lead to conflicts of thoughts in the group. Even our group experienced this when selecting suppliers and subcontractors. After **Broot-Forse PLC** caused delay on the very first module, I decided to go with some other alternative which were more reliable. However, F.S decided to stick with them only considering their cost. This somehow created a disagreement in the group discussion but still remained task focused.
3. **Norming** – At this stage, the team starts to collaborate more effectively by improving communication in the group. By around period 2, the communication between the team members had noticeably improved. For instance, N.K highlighted the inefficiencies in how testing resources being used and how could we do better in next period. This eventually improved our workflow and led to constructive changes in the manpower allocations. This happened because of the healthy and meaningful communication within the group.
4. **Performing** – It basically refers to a high functioning stage where the team is productive, problem solving and working towards the same goal. This became evident when we chose Strait & Trooe as the subcontractor for M315. The lesson we learnt from our previous mistakes where we kept looking at the price offered by the subcontractor and ignored the main aspects like reliability and delivery dates. This decision resulted in timely delivery of our order. This showed that our team had developed more balanced and evidence-based approach in decision making.
5. **Adjourning** – This is the final stage where project concludes and team reflects on its performance. After the simulation ended and we got the results, we engaged in a team meeting where we discussed what went well and what could have been improved. We also discussed about the things which were not in our hands but if we had managed our resources and teams' overall approach we would have seen better results.

Conflict in the Team

Conflict within our team mainly were in the form of task-related disagreements rather than personal disputes. That helped keep discussions professional and focused. These conflicts, when we managed them properly, often led to improved decisions and a more collaborative working environment.

One of the two major conflicts was around the **supplier selection**. Since we were already running over the budget, F.S wanted to go with the low-cost suppliers and subcontractors. Even though we had worst experience ordering from Bodgyt & Sons because our order got cancelled for straight two times from them which made us wait for a long period and the cost associated with resources we had booked, had to bear us. Whereas, I was more concerned about the reliability and delivery schedule of the supplier. Later, when we had to choose a new supplier for M315, we selected **Strait & Trooe** instead of Bodgyt & Sons. This decision was more balanced and resulted in timely delivery of our order which showed that our earlier conflicts made us to take this decision.

Another major conflict between our team was **In-House manufacturing debate**. When it became clear that we are exceeding our budget, in the middle of the simulation, we started rethinking about our decision of outsourcing the materials. I suggested, instead of outsourcing we should go with in house manufacturing. I got opposed by all of my teammates. I was more concerned about the cost associated with the suppliers and subcontractors and their reliability issues. However, after doing some important calculations, we compared both costs and finalised our decision to stick to our original plan and go with the outsourced manufacturing.

Conclusion

This report evaluated our team's performance during the PME simulation by reflecting on our team roles, group development, and conflict handling. Our team worked well in areas like leadership and task execution, but lacked key roles such as Monitor Evaluator and Completer Finisher, which affected our ability to assess risks and review decisions. Although we had a clear team structure were able to complete tasks we didn't really use the full potential of our team. This limited our ability to take important decision on crucial points of the simulation. AS discussed in the Belbin roles, tutors also highlighted that if had showed some better and positive approach, we could have improved overall performance.

As we moved through the project, we followed the stages of Tuckman's model. While early conflicts slowed progress, they led to better communication and improved decisions later on. Disagreements, especially around supplier choices and resource use, were managed through open discussions and helped us learn and adapt as a team. Although we did not complete the project within time or neither in allocated budget, the experience gave us a deeper understanding of how role balance, teamwork, and constructive conflict contribute to effective project management.

References

1. R Meredith Belbin (2010). *Team Roles at Work*. Routledge.

2. Vaida, S. and Șerban, D. (2021). Group Development Stages. a Brief Comparative Analysis of Various Models. *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai Psychologia-Paedagogia*, [online] 66(1), pp.91–110. doi:https://doi.org/10.24193/subbpsyped.2021.1.05.