

# **CASE STUDY - UTILISING A 'CASE STUDY' APPROACH TO INTEGRATIVE LEARNING AND TEACHING**

## **Tutor Guidelines/Staff Development**

### **Dr. Paul Watson, School of Environment & Development, Sheffield Hallam University**

Peer Review, integrative teaching, and group project work whilst acting as external consultants.

## **Introduction**

This Case Study is related to a 'Case Study' application for the teaching of commercial and construction management. It is designed to employ an integrative approach by mixing Construction Management and Quantity Surveying students by undertaking the role of external consultants to the Managing Director of a medium sized construction company. Peer assessment of their performance/contribution is incorporated within the assessment strategy. The advantages to students were that they gained valuable experience of applying taught material to real-world problems. This approach addresses one of the main aims of our School's objectives related to professional bodies and that is for us to produce 'Reflective Practitioners'.

A reflective practitioner learns from previous experience in a drive for continual improvement. With specific reference to the attainment of being a 'Reflective Practitioner' greater emphasis is placed on problem-based learning. This is well suited to our integrated project where students are confronted with real world problems, requiring multi-disciplinary solutions. This concept is incorporated into the Learning, Teaching and Assessment (LTA) methodology. Further underpinning of the approach adopted is provided by the fact that most of the 'Common Learning Outcomes Framework' established by the Construction Industry Board are addressed. The outcomes are focused upon 'Communication Skills, Group Dynamics and the attainment of Professional Awareness.' (CIC, 1999).

Staff advantages included savings in delivery time and the opportunity to bring to life Unit content such as financial analysis (this advantage is not mutually exclusive from students). Staff were also engaged in some team teaching and this provided the opportunity for staff development and peer observation.

## Teaching Context

### Subject Area

The project revolved around a pre-documented 'case study'. The Unit is 'Integrated Project A' and is a final year semester one Unit. Both Construction Managers and Quantity Surveying students study this Unit. Therefore, in line with Latham (1994) and Egan (1998) a truly integrative Learning, Teaching and Assessment strategy was deployed. The content of the Unit includes:

- Financial analysis of construction companies
- Capital investment appraisal
- Corporate strategy and the business environment
- Quality issues

All of the above are related to the Built Environment and, as opined by Wilson (1997) "Effective teamwork is an important ingredient for the success on any construction project (cited by ABE, 1997). Within the context of the above, students learn better by the application of unit content supported by timely formative and summative feedback. Thus the LTA strategy reflected these requirements. Students were exposed to 'real life' issues of interdisciplinary group working, co-ordinating, peer assessment, communication, written presentations (reports), conducting meetings with senior staff and analysis and evaluation of documentation with recommendations. Finally a formal group presentation was made to the Managing Director and his associate (staff).

**Keywords:** Evaluation, Assessment and Teaching Method

### Participants

The project is part of the final year of BSc (Hons) Construction Management and BSc (Hons) Quantity Surveying at Sheffield Hallam University. Approximately 60 students completed the project in equal proportion of Construction Managers and Quantity Surveyors. They were supervised by two lecturers.

### Study Mode

Students on both full-time and part-time routes were involved.

### Pedagogical Approach

The 'Case Study' approach employed simulates, as far as is possible, industrial practice with students being required to work in groups of four (mixed Construction Managers and Quantity Surveyors). After an initial introduction to their fellow students they formed their own groups. Students

were then talked through the Unit Guide, concentrating on LTA strategies and the actual Case Study. They then worked through the specific questions, these being in four parts, three of which are written reports and the final one consisting of a presentation.

This approach enabled students to learn through mixed peer group discussions whilst being supported by Unit tutors. The importance of 'group maintenance' was explained to them in some detail.

### **Teaching Methods**

The 'Case Study' involved the following learning outcomes:

- Development of a critical self awareness within the context of team working.
- Demonstrate the ability to develop and employ written and verbal communication and presentation skills.
- Define, analyse, evaluate and report on the different management and commercial business functions related to the Built Environment.
- Evaluate and report on business functions and information relating to technological, business, economic and management topics.

Work submitted should demonstrate original thinking within the context of recognised expertise and existing practices. To achieve this students had to read around the subject area and bring referenced material into their work. This work, supported by a comprehensive discussion, calculations and graphs, where appropriate, must demonstrate analysis and evaluation of the problem domain, and provide considered conclusions leading to recommendations for the Managing Director.

Lecturing staff on the Unit were available for consultation and teaching consisted of a composite of lectures and group workshops in which student activity and participation played a key role. Workshops provided the opportunity for the application of taught material.

### **Assessment and Feedback Strategy**

The Unit is concerned with the application of theory to relevant core studies and therefore the workshops provided the opportunity for students to work collectively on problem solving exercises. The workshops were used to introduce each new topic area. Assessment was based upon work undertaken in mixed groups over one semester (12 weeks). The 'Case Study' required the completion of a comprehensive report and its formal presentation. Topics incorporated in the reports and presentation included:

- financial accounts analysis
- capital appraisal
- cash flow analysis
- budgetary control
- corporate planning
- quality issues

Students were expected to explore and evaluate the relationships between the various techniques/issues. Student support and formative feedback was provided during the workshops.

Unit assessment consisted of:

- Financial Analysis and Capital Investment Appraisal (25%)
- Project Cost Control (25%)
- Corporate Strategy and Quality (25%)
- Presentation (25%)

Detailed feedback was provided both orally and in writing on each group submission.

The fundamental rationale for this approach to assessment was to allow for timely formative advice and feedback supported by summative assessment and feedback. This allowed students to fully engage in the educational process of learning by application. To this end the work was marked and returned within one week. This enabled a cumulative approach to be adopted to the LTA strategy. Students were able to build on and incorporate ‘timely feedback’ and also subject material from one report could be related to succeeding reports.

However, group work usually creates some problematic issues and the main one is equity of contribution by group members. This issue was overcome by the introduction of an element of peer assessment and the production of a reflective statement.

### **The project (Case Study)**

In designing the ‘Case Study’ staff were concerned to ensure that the Unit material was delivered within the context of the learning outcomes. A ‘learning outcome’ is defined as being something that students can do now that they could not do previously (Ecclestone, 1995). Thus learning outcomes can be regarded as changes within a person as a result of the learning experience. Therefore an integrative LTA strategy built around a ‘Case Study’ was developed. The rationale for adopting this approach was that it not only covered the integrative nature of the learning outcomes but it also enabled

mixed group working and the development of a 'reflective practitioner' approach in conjunction with the CIB common learning outcomes.

### **'Case Study' Material**

This contains:

- the 'Case Study' utilised on the delivery of the Unit;
- a sample 'Coursework Assessment Summary' Proforma;
- a sample 'Coursework Assessment' Proforma;
- a sample 'Peer Appraisal' Proforma

[Please see Appendix for full details]

It should be noted that each individual assessment contained its own set of the above proformas (4 sets in total).

The data provided within the 'Case Study' and the assessment profiles provides the input to the Unit delivery. However, it should also be pointed out that the introduction of the 'Peer Assessment' was a vital component of the LTA strategy. Students appreciated this aspect of the Unit and did take full advantage of its application. How to apply the 'Peer Review' process was fully explained by the Unit tutors. It was pointed out that they could not boost their own marks but could comment (in confidence) upon the contribution of fellow group members. A further quality check is incorporated as all group members had to produce a 'group' "Reflective Statement" about their contributions to the assessment and a further comment upon what they had gained from the assessment. They could comment upon any associated problematic issues encountered. The thoughts of Brown and Atkins (1996) were considered before the 'Case Study' design and it should be evident from examining the 'Case Study' material that they have been incorporated into the LTA strategy. "The essential skill of effective lecturing is preparation not presentation. Obviously presentation is important but without a clear, coherent lecture structure a presentation may have a short-lived affect." (Brown and Atkins, 1966.35).

### **Project Evaluation**

#### **1. *Mixed Groups***

It was foreseen by the Unit tutors that getting mixed groups to work together could be a difficult issue, but in practice, the students did not hesitate in getting together and establishing a working relationship. I believe this was a result of reassurance regarding the peer assessment process. Students were assured that a group would obtain varied marks if the individual contributions merited this action. In fact, this did happen on one occasion with one group

(on one assessment) and individual student's marks were allocated accordingly.

## **2. Workload**

There was some trepidation by students that the workload for the Unit was too demanding. However, when it was explained that the whole Case Study would be broken down into four components with each being interlinked, their unease was removed. They appreciated the lecturers' promise to return all assessments incorporating a comprehensive written feedback within one week and a verbal summary/discussion with students. This promise was kept. This process did enable the incorporation of feedback from one assessment to be noted and if required action taken to improve the next assessment.

Due to the overarching objective of concentrating on the 'application' of taught material, students were coached in ensuring they made the material relevant to the 'Case Study' Company. 'What does it mean to the Managing Director?' was always the guiding principle.

## **3. Progress**

Staff, students and external examiners were pleased with the way the project and assessment process progressed. It was a critical point that tutors supported the innovative LTA strategy. There could have been problems if tutors had not done their very best to ensure the project's success. On many occasions they gave extra surgery times to assist in the development of a 'professional' approach by students. Utilising this approach is what the tutors would call 'added value'. Students not only completed the Unit and obtained good grades but, because of the extended and close relationships with tutors necessitated by the 'Case Study' they gained an insight into how 'professionals' conduct themselves and communicate at the highest level. For example, students kept records/minutes of meetings with the Managing Director (tutor).

## **4. Student Feedback**

Student feedback clearly indicated that they liked the challenges of relating the Unit content to 'real-life' issues. Part-time students were able to bring in their work experiences. However, not all students were employed but the majority had been on a work placement. This had an added advantage because students did appreciate that any conflicts they experienced with their peers were mirrored with those they were likely to encounter in the 'real world' work environment.

## **5. Formative Assessment**

Very few Units within both degree courses allow (or have been designed) for formative feedback. With weekly verbal formative feedback workshops and the opportunity to engage via surgery times with Unit tutors or when 'role playing' the Managing Director, students were able to continually refine their approaches and report content. The Unit tutors feel that this aspect contributed to the 100% success rate of the Unit. Certainly the students did. External Examiners also supported this commitment to the provision of very timely feedback.

## **6. Reflective Statements**

The request by Unit tutors to produce a reflective statement on each assignment certainly did develop the 'Reflective Practitioner' aspect. Students had to reflect upon contributions and problematic issues of producing the assessment. But further, they were asked to reflect upon what they would do 'now' in the light of the previous experience. In other words, how would they address the task again in order to learn from the first experience. Most of the problematic issues related to group communication and dynamics. Out of 15 mixed groups producing four assessments (15 x 4 = 60) there was only one occasion when Unit tutors had to intervene with a group. This was due to the group not being able to come to a consensus about individual contributions. However, by conducting a group meeting (with tutors) agreement was reached and marks allocated accordingly.

## **7. Benefits to Staff**

Time saving was attained due to the integration of two courses. This allowed the teaching of larger groups. However, workshop sessions did require more time than was initially provided by the timetable. Overall there was a 25% reduction in the time usually taken to teach Integrated Project 'A' on the two courses. Having now progressed down the 'learning curve' a further reduction in workshop time can be achieved by providing the recently published text '*Management Systems for Construction*' (Griffith, Stephenson and Watson, 2001). This text includes a chapter specifically designed to address 30% of the Unit content.

Staff also gained in terms of 'intrinsic motivation'. This was because of the interaction with students who asked demanding and innovative questions relating to the 'Case Study'. It was especially the case with the more experienced part-time students. Staff also feel this was reciprocated with the students. Underpinning the advantage of increased motivation was the knowledge transfer that took place during group and tutor discussions. This seemed to bring the material to life.

## **What will be altered for the next delivery**

### **Research**

The Unit will be delivered again next academic year. When next delivered, research conducted by the Unit tutors will be incorporated to support curriculum content. For example, recent publications on the deployment of the European Foundation for Quality Management Business Excellence Model within construction. This will make a valuable contribution to the reference base for students undertaking the Unit.

### **Student Introductions**

An effort will be made to introduce students to each other prior to the first meeting on the Unit. This would be an attempt to allow them to interact and form groups. However, this will be subject to timetabling opportunities.

### **Samples of Work**

At the start of the Unit, staff also intend to put on display samples of previous students' work. This will be done in order for students to benchmark against. Students will be made aware of the grades awarded for the sampled work.

### **Changing Data**

It should be obvious but it will be stated anyway: the figures and data used for the questions will be changed so that previous students' work cannot be used for the production of the answers.

### **Corporate Relevance**

Staff feel that students could place more emphasis on 'what does this analysis mean for the company?' A greater proportion of the introduction of the Unit, therefore, will be spent on getting this across to students.

### **Formative Feedback**

Staff will stress that the provision of formative feedback acts as a quality check. This feedback is of no value unless students act upon it. Students are becoming more aware of the importance of formative feedback but they have been brought up on a diet of summative feedback.

### **Methodology**

There are no issues of reproduction as the methodology is fundamentally sound and limited resources are required for this Unit delivery approach.

## Quality Assurance

All Units delivered within the School are internally moderated before forwarding to external examiners for comment. External's comments are noted and if required action taken. The Unit Guides provide specific learning outcomes and Unit delivery and assessment criteria are specifically related to these. Dual marking by both lecturers on all assessments takes place. Marked work is then subject to Subject and Award Board scrutiny. Both Boards include external examiners.

## Fame

Students will be further encouraged to use the Financial Analysis Made Easy (FAME) database. FAME has to be subscribed to by contacting BUREAU VAN DIJK Electronic Publishing at <http://www.bvdep.com/> Some groups did relate to this database for the benchmarking of the 'Case Study' data/analysis with other similar organisations. This enabled the students' results to be put in the context of our industry. It also made the presentations more valid.

## Lessons Learned

### Teamwork

Students need to be made aware of the demands of our industry in relation to the importance of 'team working'. It would be worthwhile running through the CIB Common Learning Outcomes. This would reinforce the necessity for engaging in group activities.

### Reflective Skills

Further encouragement is required to ensure a critical reflective statement to be produced for each assessment with an overall Unit reflective statement. Some very good reflective statements were produced but some lacked a critical edge.

### Student Briefing

It is vital that students are fully briefed on the Unit and its LTA strategy. To some students this will be a new approach, certainly the inter-course aspect.

## Conclusions

The only real barrier is forming groups at the outset, mixing construction managers and quantity surveyors. This can be overcome by having each student present a brief outline of themselves at the start of the Unit. One of the most useful enablers to reassure students about group working was the utilisation of Peer Review Proformas.

The 'Case Study' deployment was so successful that other courses will be brought into the mix in the future. This will require some staff development and may involve staff to staff mentoring. Support of its success is provided in Student Review Questionnaires and external examiners' comments.

## Relationship between Approaches and Outcomes

Ramsden (1992) reported that many research studies have shown that the outcomes of students' learning are associated with the approaches they use. In other words, *what* students learn is closely associated with *how* they go about learning it. Biggs (1993) has developed the SOLO ('Structure of the Observed Learning Outcomes') taxonomy which has allowed the link to be made between approaches to learning and learning outcomes, curriculum design and assessment in many different subject areas. In answering questions students can adopt one of five levels: first, prestructural, where there is the use of irrelevant information or there is no meaningful response; secondly, unistructural, where the answer focuses on one relevant factor only; thirdly, multistructural, where the answer focuses on several relevant features but they are not co-ordinated together; fourthly, relational, where several parts are integrated into a coherent whole, details are linked to conclusions and meaning is understood; and, finally, extended abstract, where the answer generalises the structure beyond the information given and higher order principles are used to bring in a new and broader set of issues. The dividing line is between the third and fourth levels, above which the students' answers involve evidence of understanding in the sense of integrating and structuring parts of the material to be learned.

Staff lecturing on the course realise that if students are to be able to respond at levels four and five they must be empowered to do so by the assessment criteria. The mode of assessment should therefore ask questions that require answers to be provided in a holistic way. This approach is most definitely adopted on the Integrated Project.

It is obvious that for professionals to function at a high level of competence they should be operating at the fourth and fifth levels. Therefore we must consider how best to incorporate the learning outcomes into a course profile. Thus the 'Case Study' approach linked to integrative content and mixed groups was deployed.

Upon reflection the decision to adopt the 'Case Study' approach did produce the desired results. This fact has been corroborated by student feedback and external examiners' comments.

## References

- Biggs, J B and Moore, P J (1993) *The Process of Learning*, 3rd edition, Englewoods, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, G and Atkins, M (1996) *Effective Teaching in Higher Education*, Kings Lynn: Thomson Publishing Company ITP.
- Construction Industry Council (1999) *Memorandum of Understanding, Accreditation/Validation*. London: Draft Report to the Construction Industry Board.
- Ecclestone, K (1995) *Learning Outcomes*, Sheffield: Centre for Further and Higher Education, Sheffield Hallam University.
- Egan, E (1998), *Re-thinking Construction*. A Task Force Report, HMSO, London.
- Journal of the Association of Building Engineers*, November (1997), p. 30.
- Latham, M (1994), *Constructing the Team - Final Reports of the Government/Industry Review of Procurement and Contractual Arrangements in the UK Construction Industry*, HMSO, London.
- Ramsden, P (1992), *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*, London: Kogan Page.



*Sheffield Hallam University*  
*School of Environment & Development*

Appendix

**INTEGRATED PROJECT 'A' SED 3301.**  
**CASE STUDY AND GUIDANCE NOTES**

**Produced By:**

**Paul Watson MBA, MSc, PhD, FBEng,  
MCIQB, MASI, CertEd, ILTM.**

**&**

**Andrew Knight BSc, MSc, ARICS,  
PGCFHE.**

**Date: September 2001**  
**Contents Page**

**Page No.**

|     |                           |    |
|-----|---------------------------|----|
| 1   | Introduction              | 3  |
| 1.1 | Tasks                     | 3  |
| 2   | Part One                  | 3  |
| 2.1 | Balance Sheet Data        | 3  |
| 2.2 | Part One Questions        | 7  |
| 3   | Part Two                  | 8  |
| 3.1 | School Contract Data      | 8  |
| 3.2 | Part Two Questions        | 8  |
| 4   | Part Three                | 12 |
| 4.1 | Part Three Data Questions | 12 |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This Unit is based upon a case study of A Smith Plc which is a medium sized contracting company. Smith's sphere of operations is mainly restricted to the North East of England.

### 1.1 Tasks

In groups you are to assume the role of external consultants to A Smith. your task as external consultant has been split into four parts. However in order to provide a holistic final report every effort should be made to relate back to previous reports. Upon completion you are to present your findings to the Managing Director.

#### Note

Submissions shall be marked and consist of written reports and a formal presentation. Mr A Smith is available for consultation during this unit and his role will be played by the Unit Tutors.

### ASSESSMENT STRATEGY

The summative assessment is composed of 4 parts.

Formative feedback shall be provided throughout the semester during tutorial sessions.

Part 1: Company financial status/comparison and capital investment appraisal.

Part 2: School contract and project cost control.

Part 3: Corporate planning and business environment.

Part 4: Presentation

## 2. PART ONE

### 2.1 Balance Sheets Data

The following are the summarised balance sheets at 30 April 2001 and 2002 for A Smith's Plc

#### Balance Sheets as at 30 April

|                            | 2000<br>£          | 2001<br>£          |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Issued Capital</b>      |                    |                    |
| Ordinary shares            | 450,000            | 450,000            |
| Revenue resources          | 357,000            | 237,000            |
| 11 per cent debentures     | 300,000            | 300,000            |
|                            | -----<br>1,107,000 | -----<br>987,000   |
| <b>Current Liabilities</b> |                    |                    |
| Creditors                  | 683,000            | 641,000            |
| Overdraft (secured)        | 266,200            | 432,000            |
| Taxation                   | 33,800             | -                  |
|                            | -----<br>983,000   | -----<br>1,073,000 |
|                            | <u>2,090,000</u>   | <u>2,060,000</u>   |

### Balance Sheets as at 30 April

|   | 2000<br>£        | 2001<br>£        |
|---|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Fixed Assets</b>                               |                  |                  |
| Freehold property<br>(at cost, 1992)              | 336,000          | 336,000          |
| Plant and equipment<br>(less depreciation)        | 410,000          | 260,000          |
|   | 746,000          | 596,000          |
| <b>Current Assets</b>                             |                  |                  |
| Stocks  | 192,000          | 90,000           |
| Work in progress<br>(jobbing work)                | 132,000          | 123,000          |
| Uncompleted contracts<br>(less progress payments) | 480,000          | 588,000          |
| Debtors   | 540,000          | 663,000          |
|   | 1,344,000        | 1,464,000        |
|   | <b>2,090,000</b> | <b>2,060,000</b> |

The following information was obtained from the trading and profit and loss accounts at 30 April

|  | 2000<br>£      | 2001<br>£        |
|--|----------------|------------------|
| Completed contracts                                  | 2,400,000      | 2,130,000        |
| Completed jobbing work                               | 100,000        | 100,000          |
|  | 2,500,000      | 2,230,000        |
| Less cost of sales                                   | 1,950,000      | 1,875,000        |
| <b>Gross Profit</b>                                  | <b>550,000</b> | <b>355,000</b>   |
| Less general expenses<br>(including depreciation)    | 385,000        | 375,000          |
| <b>Net profit/loss before tax</b>                    | <b>165,000</b> | <b>( 20,000)</b> |
| Taxation for year                                    | 82,500         | -                |
| <b>Net profit/loss<br/>after taxation (retained)</b> | <b>82,500</b>  | <b>( 20,000)</b> |

### Further information for balance sheet analysis

- (a) Maximum overdraft facility is set at £450,000
- (b) There have been no sales of plant and equipment.
- (c) Smith's have tendered for a £1,154,450 school contract, which they are likely to obtain. If Smith's start the contract then initial spending of £200,000 for materials and preparation must be made by 30 June 2003 (this is due to their precarious financial position).
- (d) There is no possibility of further financial support from the bank.
- (e) Assume that market investment interest rate is 10 per cent net of tax.

### 2.2 Part One Questions

From data provided: Mr A Smith has asked you as consultants to:

1. Explain the current financial situation of the company using financial ratios and any other relevant information making special reference to:
  - (a) The overdraft limit
  - (b) Depreciation
  - (c) Profitability
  - (d) Liquidity
2. Mr Smith has been advised by the Finance Director, that there is still £80,000 left in the Capital Expenditure budget for this financial year. So Mr Smith has sent a memo to all departmental Heads inviting proposals for the investment of this sum.

The first bid was from the Plant Department who proposed buying four new fuel efficient lorries as replacements for ten-year-old ones. Each would cost £20,000 and should last four years, after which time they would have a second hand value of £5,000. The new lorries should save £11,000 each per year on fuel and maintenance costs.

The only other detailed proposal came from the Marketing Department, requesting the establishment of a new customer services department. It would cost £75,000 to set up and its £20,000 a year running costs should generate extra contribution from sales amounting to:

Year 1 £35,000  
Year 2 £45,000  
Year 3 £80,000  
Year 4 £80,000

A speedy decision is required, so Mr Smith has asked you to prepare a report and present it at the next Board meeting.

Your brief is to produce the necessary calculations to enable a choice to be made based on financial grounds only. However, any other objective comments would be welcomed.

You are to select a cut off rate of 10%. It is also suggested that you confine your financial analysis to the following capital investment evaluation methods:

- (a) Pay back period
- (b) Average annual percentage rate of return
- (c) Net present value
- (d) Internal rate of return

Present in the written format to the Managing Director.

**3. PART TWO**

**3.1 School Contract Data**

The following data appertains to the school contract identified in Part One of this case study.

**SCHOOL CONTRACT PROGRAMME**

**START DATE: 1 AUGUST 2002**

| Month                      | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>ACTIVITIES</b>          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>To DPC</b>              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>DPC to first floor</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>First floor to roof</b> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>Services</b>            |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>Internal finishes</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>External works</b>      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>Total Cost</b>          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>Total Revenue</b>       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

**SCHOOL CONTRACT BUDGET ALLOCATION TABLE**

| <b>ACTIVITIES</b>          | <b>LABOUR</b>  | <b>MATERIALS</b> | <b>PLANT</b>   | <b>SITE OVERHEADS</b> | <b>TOTALS</b>  |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| <b>To DPC</b>              | 127,050        | 92,400           | 10,395         | 1,155                 | 231,000        |
| <b>DPC to first floor</b>  | 46,200         | 62,947           | 5,775          | 577                   | 115,499        |
| <b>First floor to roof</b> | 57,750         | 62,947           | 5,775          | 577                   | 127,049        |
| <b>Services</b>            | 15,708         | 40,425           | 1,155          | 462                   | 57,750         |
| <b>Finishes</b>            | 58,558         | 42,735           | 1,732          | 924                   | 103,949        |
| <b>External Works</b>      | 92,400         | 68,145           | 92,400         | 1,155                 | 254,100        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>               | <b>397,666</b> | <b>369,599</b>   | <b>117,232</b> | <b>4,850</b>          | <b>889,347</b> |

## SCHOOL BUILDING CONTRACT

Breakdown of contract costs and revenues:

| Budgeted Cost   | Work Element        | Value of Work     |
|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 231,000         | To DPC              | 288,200           |
| 115,499         | DPC to first floor  | 138,600           |
| 127,049         | First floor to roof | 161,700           |
| 57,750          | Services            | 98,175            |
| 103,949         | Internal finishes   | 150,150           |
| 254,100         | External works      | 317,625           |
| <u>£889,347</u> |                     | <u>£1,154,450</u> |

### Contract Conditions

Payment will be from valuations taken at the end of each month and paid one month later. Retention will be **2.5%** half paid on practical completion; the remainder, 6 months later.

As consultants, Mr Smith requests that you calculate and produce accompanying graphs/tables for:

1. The cash flow for the project.
2. Plotting cumulative cash in and out against time.
3. Calculate the variance analysis using the following data:  
(actual costs at the end of month 6 January 2002)

|                |          |
|----------------|----------|
| Labour         | £300,300 |
| Materials      | £287,595 |
| Plant          | £ 39,847 |
| Site overheads | £ 3,344  |

Elements completed or partially completed:

|                     |      |
|---------------------|------|
| To DPC              | 100% |
| DPC to first floor  | 100% |
| First floor to roof | 95%  |
| Services            | 85%  |
| Internal finishes   | 50%  |
| External works      | 25%  |

4. Make any comments regarding the school project you feel are necessary.
5. Explain fully for Mr Smith the importance of the Plan, Do, Check, and Act control cycle in relation to his company.

### 4. PART THREE

#### 4.1 Part Three Data and Questions

Smith's are concerned that their strategic situation is unsatisfactory. Your brief is to design a system for strategic analysis. You are to explain by way of a report and as part of your presentation to Mr Smith:

1. Why a strategic analysis is necessary.
2. How a strategic analysis should be implemented within his company.
3. Identify the logical stages that should be followed after conducting a strategic analysis and the advocated advantages of such an approach.

4. Mr Smith is very concerned that his organisation needs to develop through a strategy of continual quality improvement. Therefore as part of your consultants remit you are asked to outline how the European Foundation for Quality Excellence Model (EFQM) could be advantageous to Smith's. Also you are requested to suggest a suitable deployment strategy for the EFQM Excellence Model.

## School of Environment and Development

# COURSEWORK ASSESSMENT Summary Proforma

To be issued to students with all coursework briefs

|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| PROGRAMME:                               | BSc (Hons) Construction Management  |   |  |
|  | BSc (Hons) Quantity Surveying   |   |  |
| UNIT TITLE:                              | Integrated Project 'A'  |   |  |
| UNIT NUMBER:                             | SED 3301  |   |  |
| TUTOR:                                   | Dr P Watson and A Knight  |   |  |
| ASSESSMENT TYPE:                         | Written Submission  |   |  |
| BRIEF DESCRIPTION:                       | Conduct a financial analysis of a case study                                      |   |  |
| WORD OR OTHER LIMIT:                     | Include all necessary calculations and a limit of 2000 words                      |   |  |
| SUBMISSION DEADLINE:                     |   |   |  |
| OTHER ASSESSMENT ON THIS UNIT            | Two written and one presentation  |   |  |
| SUPPORT AVAILABLE                        | Course handbook, text book and reference material.<br>Also academic staff support |   |  |
| LEARNING OUTCOMES TO BE ASSESSED:        | Evaluate business information and communicate findings                            |   |  |
| SKILLS TO BE ASSESSED:                   | As indicated on the criteria sheet for this assessment                            |   |  |
| OTHER INFORMATION<br>Tick as appropriate | Single sided  | / | A4 /   |
|  | Word Processed  | / | Hand-written                                   |
|  | Double spaced   | / | Loose binding<br>(NOT stapled or spiral bound) |
|  | Other: Professionally presented and comb bound                                    |   |  |



*Sheffield Hallam University*

**SCHOOL OF CONSTRUCTION**

**BUILT ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME  
COURSEWORK ASSESSMENT PROFORMA**

**UNIT TITLE:** SED 3301 Integrated Project 'A'

**UNIT LEADER:** Dr Paul Watson

**TOPIC AREA:** Financial Analysis

**DATE OF ISSUE:**

**QUESTIONS AS PROVIDED WITHIN CASE STUDY NOTES.**

**PLEASE PRINT GROUP MEMBERS NAMES BELOW:**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

**Dr P Watson**

**PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR MARKING ASSIGNMENTS**

|    | Skill  | Skill Assessed | 1st Class   | 2.1  | 2.2   | 3  | Refer/Fail  |
|----|--|----------------|---|--|---|--|---|
| 1  | Presentation of assignment & Clarity of Expression | *              | <p>Presentation shows a polished and imaginative approach to the topic.</p> <p>Thoughts and ideas - clearly expressed. Grammar and spelling accurate. Fluent academic writing style.</p>  | <p>Presentation carefully and logically organised.</p> <p>Thoughts and ideas clearly expressed. Grammar and spelling accurate and language fluent.</p> | <p>Presentation satisfactory, showing organisation and coherence.</p> <p>Language mainly fluent. Grammar and spelling mainly accurate.</p>                            | <p>Presentation shows an attempt to organise in a logical manner.</p> <p>Meaning apparent but language not always fluent. Grammar and spelling contain errors.</p> | <p>Presentation is disorganised/incoherent.</p> <p>Purpose and meaning of assignment unclear and/or language. Grammar and spelling contain error.</p> |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 2  | Referencing  | *              | <p>Referencing is consistently accurate using the Harvard system.</p>   | <p>Referencing is mainly accurate using the Harvard system.<br/>← (continuum) →</p>  |   |  | <p>Referencing is absent/unsystematic/ Harvard system not used/work suggests plagiarism.</p>  |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 3  | Use of literature                                  | *              | <p>Has developed and justified using own ideas based on a wide range of sources which has been thoroughly analysed, applied and discussed.</p>  | <p>Able to critically appraise the literature and theory gained from a variety of sources; developing own ideas in the process.</p>                    | <p>Clear evidence and application of readings/theory relevant to the subject/uses indicative texts identified.</p>  | <p>Literature is presented uncritically and indicates limitation of understanding/literature has been used in a purely descriptive way.</p>                        | <p>Literature either not consulted or irrelevant to assignment set.</p>   |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 4  | Use of theory                                      | *              | <p>Assignment demonstrates integration and innovation in the selection and handling theory.</p>   | <p>Insightful and appropriate selection of content/theory in key areas.</p>  | <p>Most key theories are included in the work in an appropriate straight forward manner.</p>  | <p>Selection of theory is appropriate but some aspects have been missed or misconstrued.</p>   | <p>Inaccurate or inappropriate promotion of content or theory.</p>  |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 5  | Critical analysis of theory                        | *              | <p>Assignment consistently demonstrates application of critical analysis well integrated in the text.</p>   | <p>Clear application of theory through critical analysis/critical thought of the topic area.</p>   | <p>Demonstrates application of theory through critical analysis of the topic area.</p>  | <p>Some evidence of critical thought/critical analysis and rationale for work.</p>   | <p>Lacks critical thought/analysis/reference to theory.</p>   |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 6  | Conclusions  | *              | <p>Analytical and clear conclusions well grounded in theory and literature, showing development of new concepts.</p>  | <p>Good development shown in summary of arguments based in theory/literature.</p>  | <p>Evidence of findings and conclusions grounded in theory/literature.</p>  | <p>Limited evidence of findings and conclusions supported by literature and theory.</p>  | <p>Unsubstantiated/invalid conclusions based on anecdotes and generalisations only.</p>   |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 7  | Conceptualisation                                  | *              | <p>Able to recognise consistency and reconcile inconsistency between information using cognitive and hypothesising skills.</p>  | <p>Consistent understanding demonstrated in a logical, coherent and lucid manner.</p>  | <p>Demonstrate s understanding in a style which is mostly logical, coherent and flowing.</p>  | <p>attempts to demonstrate a logical and coherent understanding of the subject area but aspects become confused or undeveloped.</p>                                | <p>Understanding of the assignment not apparent or lacks a logical and coherent framework or the subject is confused or undeveloped.</p>              |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 8  | Problem solving / computer usage                   | *              | <p>Able to critically analyse many sides of a complex issue and resolve informational conflicts. This student uses a process centred approach to problem solving/needs assessment activities.</p> <p align="center">← (continuum) →</p> |  | <p>Able to critically analyse simple issues and to recognise conflicts. Evidence of a process approach to problem solving/awareness of needs assessment apparent.</p> | <p>Some aspects of the work shows an attempt to be critical but is not consistent or informational conflicts are not addressed or recognised.</p>                  | <p>No evidence of attempt to be critical or to recognise/address informational conflicts. Problem solving/needs assessment is absent.</p>             |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 9  | Attention to the purpose of the assignment.        | *              | <p>Has addressed the purpose of the assignment comprehensively and imaginatively.</p>   | <p>Has addressed the purpose of the assignment coherently and with some attempt to demonstrate imagination.</p>  | <p>Has addressed the purpose of the assignment.</p>   | <p>Some of the writing is focused on the module focus, aims and themes of the assignment.</p>  | <p>Writing makes no attempt to address module aims or fails to address the task set.</p>  |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 10 | Conforms to assignment requirements.               | *              | <p>Work has been submitted within time boundaries and within the prescribed parameters.<br/>← (continuum) →</p>   |  |   | <p>Work has been submitted late but with reasonable negotiation or does not conform to the required parameters.</p>  | <p>Work has been submitted late without suitable negotiation or does not conform to the required parameters.</p>                                      |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 11 | Application of theory to practice.                 | *              | <p>Topic applied to personal, social and professional practice relevant and innovative.</p>   | <p>Well considered and appropriate application of theory to personal, societal and professional practice.</p>  | <p>Begins to show appropriate application to personal, social and professional practice.</p>  | <p>Superficial or inappropriate application to personal, societal and professional practice.</p>   | <p>Fails to apply topic to personal, societal and professional practice.</p>  |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 12 | Evaluation   | *              | <p>Evaluation carried out in a rigorous and appropriate manner throughout.</p>  | <p>Good evidence of evaluation carried out within assignment.</p>  | <p>Evaluation reasonably well carried out.</p>  | <p>Some attempt at evaluation within assignment.</p>   | <p>No attempt at evaluation within assignment.</p>  |
|    |  |                | Class Awarded   |  |   |  |   |
| 13 | Summary Total                                      |                |   |  |   |  |   |

**Overall Grade Awarded**

\_\_\_\_\_

*Peer Appraisal*  
**INTEGRATED PROJECT GROUPS**

Group number.....

Submission number.....

Submission date.....

BSc (Hons) Construction Management and BSc (Hons) Quantity Surveying

Your name.....

Grade the contribution each member of the group made to the submission.

Also note: For each submission a group statement of reflective practice of no more than two pages of A4 should be included to describe which members of the group contributed what and how you worked as a team. Further, reflect upon how you would alter your approach in the light of the experience gained.

| <b>Other group members names (alphabetical order)</b> | <b>Contribution Ranking</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|
|   |                             |
|   |                             |
|   |                             |
|   |                             |
|   |                             |

A = a full contribution to the group effort

B = a significant contribution to the group effort

C = a marginal contribution and in your opinion should not gain the same mark as others in the group

D = a very low level of commitment to group activities adding little to the group effort and in your opinion should not gain the same mark as others in the group

E = no input to the group project assignment

Any other comments: