

Assessment Detail

GB519 Assessment 1: Case Study 1

Weighting: 20%

Length: 1000 words

Due: End of Week 2 – due on 26th September 2014 (Friday) at 11:59 PM (AEST)

Note: Students in Adelaide and Brisbane – please allow for time difference

Description: Information, decisions, frameworks and responsibilities

The case study has been drawn from Chapter 1 of Jackson et al (2008).

Elaine Shumate has been working for GSM, a pharmaceutical research company for more than seven years. It is her first job since finishing her graduate work in molecular biology and her performance evaluations have been exemplary. Unfortunately, she is not prepared for the situation facing her now. GSM has invested heavily in a molecular identification process (MIP) that top management believes has great promise for the future.

If all goes well, the company plans to patent the process and license it to pharmaceutical companies to use in medication production. Elaine is the lead manager on MIP, and she fears that latest research results are not as promising as appeared earlier. Blake Walton, Vice President of Research, is to meet Elaine to discuss results. After a brief discussion, Blake suggests that Elaine should take another look at the latest results. He does not believe that her interpretation of the data is correct.

Elaine looks over the company's earlier cost estimates and operating income projections. At that time the estimated research and development costs were \$140 Million and annual operating income was expected to be \$25 million. However, the latest results indicate that MIP may have fewer pharmaceutical applications than was originally believed.

Elaine speaks with Richard Lawrence, Vice President Sales, who suggests that MIP is likely to generate operating income of \$17.5 million a year if the recent results continue after further testing. Elaine knows that Blake will not be pleased.

Blake is scheduled to meet with the board of directors next week to discuss the need for additional investment capital in the next year, and the company's plans for a public stock offering in the next several years. Elaine stands to benefit substantially from stock options if the company goes public. GSM's future may ride on the outcome of that meeting.

Question: Elaine has to decide what stance she is going to take and how strongly she will support that stance.. What should she decide? Why?

Feedback: Comments and a mark will be returned to you by the end of Week 3.

The Assessment Rubric for Assessment 1 Case Study is set out below.

GB 519 Assessment 1 Rubrics: Responsibilities

To achieve the best in your assessment and improve your level of mastery of the subject learning outcomes, review both the assessment and subject mastery level rubrics in this document.

The assessment rubric sets out the specific criteria that will be used to assess this task and descriptions of different levels of achievement for those criteria. The different levels of achievement for each criterion have a range of marks attached.

It is important to note that this task has been designed to measure in whole or in part the subject learning outcome(s) following the assessment rubric. The subject mastery level rubric describes different levels of performance against the learning outcome. Reviewing the subject mastery level rubric(s) in conjunction with the assessment rubric will give you better understanding of the requirements of this task.

Assessment 1 Marking Criteria: Individual: Case Study.

Evaluative criteria	Levels of achievement			
	Outstanding	High	Sound	Limited
<p>Quality of the analysis and the decision</p> <p>(8 marks)</p>	<p>Provides a clear, well considered, insightful and convincing stance.</p> <p>Provides a broad and in-depth analysis with insightful and convincing rationale supporting the stance.</p> <p>Fully and skilfully supported by relevant evidence from research and forum postings.</p> <p>7–8 marks</p>	<p>Provides a well considered and insightful stance.</p> <p>Provides a broad analysis with insightful rationale supporting the stance.</p> <p>Well supported by relevant evidence from research and forum postings.</p> <p>6–6.5 marks</p>	<p>Provides a stance with some gaps in knowledge and insight.</p> <p>Provides a basic analysis with reasonable but limited rationale supporting the stance.</p> <p>Supported by some evidence from research and forum postings but relevance and depth of research is not strong.</p> <p>4–5.5 marks</p>	<p>Poor or no stance.</p> <p>Provides poor or no analysis.</p> <p>Limited to no evidence from research and forum postings.</p> <p>0–3.5 marks</p>
<p>Interpretation of data and other factors in the decision-making process</p> <p>(7 marks)</p>	<p>Provides logically organised, highly relevant information/data and critically interprets that data.</p> <p>Provides an in-depth and logical explanation and skilful integration of how various factors impact on the decision-making process.</p> <p>Fully and skilfully supported by relevant evidence from research and forum postings.</p> <p>6–7 marks</p>	<p>Provides logical and relevant information/data. Provides a clear and meaningful interpretation of the data.</p> <p>Provides a broad and logical explanation of how various factors impact on the decision-making process.</p> <p>Well supported by relevant evidence from research and forum postings.</p> <p>5–5.5 marks</p>	<p>Reasonable attempt at interpretation, but with some gaps and possible misinterpretation. Some relevant data, but may lack clarity.</p> <p>Provides little explanation of how factors impact on the decision-making process, but with some gaps and/or inconsistencies in logic.</p> <p>Supported by some evidence from research and forum postings but relevance and depth of research is not strong.</p> <p>3.5–4.5 marks</p>	<p>Provides little or no data with poor attempt of interpretation.</p> <p>Provides poor or no explanation.</p> <p>Limited to no evidence from research and forum postings.</p> <p>0–3 marks</p>
<p>Structure and organisation of the response</p> <p>(5 marks)</p>	<p>Clear and logical structure and organisation with a clear and well integrated introduction, body and conclusion. Conclusion is convincing and logical, clearly and skilfully draws from the body of the report.</p> <p>Adheres to the word limit.</p> <p>Accurately applies Harvard referencing standard.</p> <p>4.5–5 marks</p>	<p>Clear and logical structure and organisation with a clear introduction, body and conclusion. The conclusion is logical and clearly draws from the body of the report.</p> <p>Adheres to the word limit.</p> <p>Accurately applies Harvard referencing standard.</p> <p>3.5–4 marks</p>	<p>Basic structure and organisation, lacking some clarity and logic. The conclusion is reasonable but lacking in some logic and clarity. It draws from the report but not strongly.</p> <p>Adheres to the word limit.</p> <p>Applies Harvard referencing standard but may not be consistent.</p> <p>2.5–3 marks</p>	<p>Poor structure and organisation. Introduction, body and conclusion are missing or not clear. If there is a conclusion it is not clear and may not draw from the body of the report.</p> <p>Doesn't adhere to the word limit.</p> <p>Harvard referencing standard not, or often not, applied.</p> <p>0–2 marks</p>

Subject mastery level rubric relevant to Assessment 1

Subject learning outcome 1: Evaluate leadership approaches to the process of decision-making Covered in Weeks 1 and 2

Level of mastery	Evaluative criteria
Mastery	Demonstrates a very deep and very broad understanding of how key elements in decision-making assist an organisation achieve its aims. Fully evaluates more than one leadership approach in the process of decision-making. Skilfully integrates analysis of the strengths and limitations of these approaches and draws logical conclusions and makes well supported recommendations.
Proficient	Demonstrates a very broad understanding of how key elements involved in decision-making assist an organisation achieve its aims. Fully evaluates one leadership approach in the process of decision-making. Very good analysis of the strengths and limitations of this approach and draws logical conclusions.
Practiced	Demonstrates broad knowledge of how key elements involved in decision-making assist an organisation achieve its aims. Partially evaluates one leadership approach in the process of decision-making. Good analysis of the strengths and limitations of this approaches and draws some relevant conclusions.
Emergent	Demonstrates a basic understanding of how some elements involved in decision-making assist an organisation achieve its aims. Cannot evaluate but can provide a basic explanation of one leadership approach in the process of decision-making. Cannot evaluate but can provide a basic analysis of some of the strengths and limitations of this approach without drawing conclusions.
Introductory	Demonstrates limited understanding of how some elements involved in decision-making assist an organisation achieve its aims. Cannot evaluate but can provide a very basic explanation of one leadership approach in the process of decision-making. Cannot evaluate or analyse but can provide a minimal identification of the strengths and limitations of the approach without being able to drawing conclusions.
No progress	Demonstrates little or no understanding of how elements involved in decision-making approaches assist an organisation achieve its aims. Little or no explanation of any leadership approach in the process of decision-making. Little to no identification of any strengths and limitations of any approach.