

# Assignment 1

---

Description	Marks out of	Wtg(%)	Due date
A1 Case study 1 (Group)	20	20.00	20 August 2007
A2 Case study 1 (Group)	30	30.00	8 October 2007

## On-line assessment

### Assessment objectives

- Demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical and conceptual underpinnings of knowledge management through **online discussion** of real-world case studies.
- Demonstrate an ability to work cooperatively within a CoP to generate, codify, coordinate, and transfer knowledge.
- Demonstrate an ability to present and support valid arguments and to synthesis a range of viewpoints using a professional standard of written expression and presentation.
- Demonstrate an ability to work effectively within a group.

### CoP group tasks

In the first week you will register yourself in an online group (CoP). Then you will need to start to develop a working relationship with the other members of the group immediately.

Then in the weeks documented in the schedule below, a case study or reference to a case study in one of your textbooks will be posted to the discussion list together with some topics for discussion. You are required to discuss each of these case studies in your online CoP group.

Each group has to discuss each case study and post a summary of your discussion. Approximately 1000 words for the first group case study and 3000 words for the second group case study. The summary should be developed to stimulate further discussion by either individual students or other groups. The quality of each student's contribution to the group communication space will be monitored and marked. Individual students who do not contribute adequately to their group's discussion and the development of their group's summary may have up to 100% of the group marks deducted from their mark.

The initial task for each group is to nominate a leader, time keeper, and scribe for each of the group case studies. As there are two group case studies, each member of the team must perform one of these roles in either the first or second case study.

The task of the **leader** is firstly to define, in conjunction with group members, the protocols and standards for discussions within the group and then to coordinate the discussions of the case study. S/he should encourage each member to put their views forward and to make constructive comments in the process of synthesising individual contribution into the group posting. The leader has the responsibility and authority to control the conduct of the group to ensure a cooperative learning environment is maintained. S/he should encourage the quieter members of the group to contribute and ensure that no member dominates the group discussions.

The task of the **time keeper** is to schedule regular discussions to ensure that sufficient time is allowed for the group posting to be developed. In developing the schedule s/he will need to take into account any outside commitments members may have, (other course assignments, work commitments, family commitments, etc.) and develop a schedule in cooperation with group members that works around any such commitments while ensuring over the period of the case study development each member has the opportunity to contribute equally to the development of the final posting.

The **scribe** has the task of writing up the individual group discussions and posting these to the group's communication space for further discussion and synthesis during the development phase of the group posting. When the posting is ready for submission to the class communication space, s/he has the responsibility for preparing and posting the final version by the due date. Where, after extended discussion, there are disagreements about the content and/or format the scribe has editor's rights, i.e. 'the final say'.

The task of each group member is to ensure that after having studied the relevant topics they contribute thoughtfully to the group discussions. All members of the group have both a responsibility to contribute to the discussion and to give others the space to give their views. They should ensure they are open to the views of others and in making comments that they do so in a constructive manner. The more vocal members of the group should recognise that they may have a tendency to dominate the conversation so they should ensure that they give space to the quieter members to put their views. The quieter members of the group should ensure that they find space to put their views even if it means pushing yourself forward against your 'natural tendencies'.

Within the group's private discussion list (communication space) each posting should include the name and student number of the student doing the posting. This identification is required so that your contribution to the final group posting may be assessed. Where it is not clear that individual students have contributed to the ongoing discussion up to 100% of the group mark for that case study may be deducted from their mark.

When posting the group's contribution to the public area, use the 'compose message' button to post the group's contribution and ensure that the group's posting is signed with the group number e.g. Group 11.

## Individual tasks during the development of the group's case study

As part of the development of the group postings, each student is required to contribute at least two individual postings for each case study. You may consult as many sources as you wish in the time allocated but you are required to develop your answers from your understanding and knowledge of Knowledge Management concepts and how to apply them to the particular case study. Your individual contribution will be marked on the quality of its contribution to group's development of the case studies.

## Weekly schedule of your assignment tasks

### Week 1

1. Each student is requested to register him/herself to one of the course's online CoP groups. Each CoP group will have a maximum of 6 students.
2. Post an introduction of yourself to your group's discussion list and commence developing a working relationship with the other group members. The group should start developing a schedule of tasks, identify a leader, time keeper, and scribe for each of the group case studies.

3. The task of the **leader** is to coordinate the discussions of each case study. S/he should encourage each member to put their views forward and to make constructive comments in the process of synthesising individual contribution into the group posting. The leader has the responsibility and authority to control the conduct of the group to ensure a cooperative learning environment is maintained. S/he should encourage the quieter members of the group to contribute and ensure that no member dominates the group discussions.
4. Each CoP will have an area (accessible via the *USQConnect* course home page) where they can discuss the assignment case studies within their group. This area is only visible to group members.

## Week 2

1. Students who have not registered themselves to a group by Wednesday of the **second week of semester will be assigned to a group**. These students will know which group they belong to because the group icon will appear on their *USQConnect* home page for this course. See and complete week 1 tasks.
2. **By the completion of week two, each CoP should have allocated the task of leader, time keeper, and scribe for each case study; defined the protocols and standards to be followed within the group communication space; developed the schedule framework for discussions; and commenced discussions about the first case study.**
3. **Case Study 1 posted** for discussion within each CoP. While CoP's may use any communication media available to the group for discussion, sufficient must take place within the group's communication space to enable each member's contribution to be assessed.

## Week 5

1. CoP's considered discussion of Case Study 1 must be posted to the assignment discussion topic 'Case Study 1' by the 20th August.
2. **Case Study 2 posted** so that each CoP may start discussions early on this case if they choose to.

## Week 8

Supplementary topics may be added to Case Study 2 for CoP discussion if appropriate.

## Weeks 9 & 10 – No new materials (catch up time)

## Week 12

1. CoP's considered discussion for Case Study 2 must be posted to the 'Case Study 2' discussion topic by 8th October.

## Assessment weighting

See Course specification for details.

## Grading

### Case Study 1 Group postings will be marked as follows:

Quality of contribution	Mark range	Your mark
<b>Group Case 1</b>		
Excellent contribution – insightful comments that demonstrate an excellent understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Group number included in posting, excellent presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	8.5 to 10	
Very good contribution – insightful comment that demonstrate a very good understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Group number included in posting, very good presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	7.5 to 8.4	
Good contribution – insightful comment that demonstrate a very good understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Group number included in posting, good presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	6.5 to 7.4	
Sound contribution – useful comments that demonstrate a sound understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Group number included in posting, good presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	5.0 to 6.4	
Limited contribution – comments that demonstrate a limited understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance or in a wider context. Group number included in posting, sound presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	3.5 to 4.9	
Minimal contribution – comments that do not demonstrate an understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study or how they are applied in this instance or a wider context. Group number included in posting, variable presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	0 to 3.4	
No contribution or no group number is included in posting.	0	
<b>Penalties</b>		
Up to 100% applied for inadequate contribution to the group discussion within the communication space.	–10.0 to 0	

**Case Study 1 Individual contributions will be marked as follows:**

Quality of contribution	Mark range	Your mark
<b>Group Case 1 – Individual contribution</b>		
Excellent contribution – insightful comments that demonstrate an excellent understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Excellent presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	8.5 to 10	
Very good contribution – insightful comment that demonstrate a very good understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Very good presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	7.5 to 8.4	
Good contribution – insightful comment that demonstrate a very good understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Good presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	6.5 to 7.4	
Sound contribution – useful comments that demonstrate a sound understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Good presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	5.0 to 6.4	
Limited contribution – comments that demonstrate a limited understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance or in a wider context. Sound presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	3.5 to 4.9	
Minimal contribution – comments that do not demonstrate an understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study or how they are applied in this instance or a wider context. Variable presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	0 to 3.4	
No contribution or no group number is included in posting.	0	

**Case Study 2 Group postings will be marked as follows:**

<b>Quality of contribution</b>	<b>Mark range</b>	<b>Your mark</b>
<b>Group Case 2</b>		
Excellent contribution – insightful comments that demonstrate an excellent understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Group number included in posting, excellent presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	17–20	
Very good contribution – insightful comment that demonstrate a very good understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Group number included in posting, very good presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	15–16.9	
Good contribution – insightful comment that demonstrate a very good understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Group number included in posting, good presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	13–14.9	
Sound contribution – useful comments that demonstrate a sound understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Group number included in posting, good presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	10–12.9	
Limited contribution – comments that demonstrate a limited understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance or in a wider context. Group number included in posting, sound presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	7–9.9	
Minimal contribution – comments that do not demonstrate an understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study or how they are applied in this instance or a wider context. Group number included in posting, variable presentation, and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	0–6.9	
No contribution or no group number is included in posting.	0	
<b>Penalties</b>		
Up to 100% applied for inadequate contribution to the group discussion within the communication space.	–20 to 0	

**Case Study 2 Individual contributions will be marked as follows:**

<b>Quality of contribution</b>	<b>Mark range</b>	<b>Your mark</b>
<b>Group Case 2</b>		
Excellent contribution – insightful comments that demonstrate an excellent understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Excellent presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	8.5 to 10	
Very good contribution – insightful comment that demonstrate a very good understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Very good presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	7.5 to 8.4	
Good contribution – insightful comment that demonstrate a very good understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Good presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	6.5 to 7.4	
Sound contribution – useful comments that demonstrate a sound understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance as well as in a wider context. Good presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	5.0 to 6.4	
Limited contribution – comments that demonstrate a limited understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study and how they are applied in this instance or in a wider context. Sound presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	3.5 to 4.9	
Minimal contribution – comments that do not demonstrate an understanding of the underlying theory applied in the case study or how they are applied in this instance or a wider context. Variable presentation and posting is within the prescribed word limits.	0 to 3.4	
No contribution or no group number is included in posting.	0	

---

