

SIM335 Managing Projects

Faculty of Business and Law

Level: 3

Module: SIM335 Managing Projects

Assignment Code: SIM335

Module Leader: Brian Morrison

Hand in date:- 7th April 2014

Contribution to module assessment: 100%

This is an individual assignment - complete both tasks 1 and 2

Background: The assignment is intended to bring out the benefits and limitations of different approaches to project planning and control by relating these to the circumstances in the cases outlined. It is also intended to allow students to demonstrate their learning and competence in respect of the management of resources generally, but in particular elements of time, finance and human resource.

Case 1: Cassop Ltd is an organisation which produces products for the engineering industry. These products include: pumps, valves, automatic control systems, filters, and heat exchangers. As part of your job as the Cassop Ltd Special Projects Manager, you have produced a list of activities that need to be addressed to design a new product – an erosion chemical feeder - for the company . The details are shown in the table provided. Please note: You must use the methodology detailed above table 1 headed “**essential methodology**”.

Task 1 (40% marks)

- 1) Draw the network diagram (use activity on the node). (8 marks)
- 2) Explain how you determined the timing of activities and the total float. (6 marks)
- 3) Explain how you determined the project duration and the critical path. (6 marks)
- 4) If the project starts on the 28th April ‘14 what is the earliest date it can be completed using a 5 day working week? Assume no other holidays (explain how you calculated the figure). (4 marks)
- 5) If the following happened what would be the effect on the duration of the whole project? Explain the reasons. (6 marks)
 - a) A 1 day delay during activity J.
 - b) Activity P is completed 1 day before schedule.
 - c) A 3 day delay during activity M .
- 6) Explain and discuss the limitations of network diagrams. (10 marks)

SIM335 Managing Projects

Essential methodology (activity on the node):

- All the timings (i.e. earliest start, earliest finish, latest start, latest finish, total float, duration and activity) must be included within each node of your diagram. This essential methodology is detailed in the text: Project Management, Field and Keller (2007. p. 197,p.198 & p. 391)
- All timings must be in days – **not dates**
- To complete your network diagram assume that:
 - If task A has a duration of 4 days (task A, earliest finish would be day 4), therefore, task B earliest start time will be day 4.
- This essential methodology is detailed in the text: Project Management, Field and Keller (2007. p. 197,p.198 & p. 391),

Table 1

Activity (Tasks)	Duration (Days)	Preceded By
A	4	-
B	4	A
C	2	A
D	5	B,C
E	6	D
F	3	D
G	1	E,F
H	2	G
I	8	G
J	2	G
K	10	H,I,J
L	10	K
M	6	K
N	10	L,M
O	10	N
P	8	O
Q	2	O
R	1	P,Q

SIM335 Managing Projects

Case 2: Thompson Ltd is an SME company specialising in the supply of training courses to the business community. They provide their services to organisations who contract out aspects of staff training. Specifically, training courses provided by Haskell includes: fire safety, customer service, leadership and supervision, and management development.

At present, the company has a medium sized head office (3,300 square metres) employing 9 administration staff, and 48 operational employees. As part of a strategy of expansion, Haskell are to move to a larger premises (4,500 square metres). This new premises will allow a new consultancy division to be created and housed at the new location. This new division will consist of an additional 6 administration staff and 8 business consultants. This division will attempt to win contracts to provide business consultancy services to new and existing businesses.

Task 2 (60% marks)

As Project Manager responsible for the opening of the new base, you are contracted at the feasibility stage. You are required to prepare a report (2,000 words). Outline the activities required to successfully manage this major project of opening the new base, ensuring that it opens on time, and within budget.

The analysis should include the skills and competencies required by the Project Manager, along with the project management process. Use examples of the concerns, stages, processes, leadership, and administration and control problems associated with managing the lifecycle of this major project.

Assignment presentation and assessment

The answers to both tasks are independent and should be addressed separately.

Task 1 (i.e. the network diagram information – (600 words) – completed as an individual task

Task 2 a report that is produced for task two (2000 words) – completed as an individual task

For your convenience both tasks should be submitted as one document, which contains both individual tasks.

The criteria for assessing the first task - the network diagram tasks – are detailed on page 6.

The criteria for assessing the task two report will be:

Report presentation (20%)

The extent to which the assignment represents an effective report. This will be judged on:

Appearance: Is a word count included at the end of the report? Is it within the specified amount? Is the text double spaced?

SIM335 Managing Projects

Structure: Does the report follow the conventions of the format? Does it have a clear introduction, explaining how it answers the questions? Do the sections of the report develop ideas in a logical sequence? Are diagrams or other subsidiary information shown in appendices?

Spelling and grammar: Are all words spelled correctly and is the meaning of sentences clear?

Referencing: Have appropriate references been included in the report. Has a recognised referencing system been used for notation? (see relevant section in the Guide to Basic Study Skills)

Use of relevant theory (40%)

Has the right theoretical content been chosen as the basis for answering the questions? Is there evidence of the use of course notes and books? Is the theory that is selected significant to the questions?

Analysis (40%)

This measures the extent to which students develop a structured argument for the points they make, by combining relevant theory with the information provided in the questions.

Any work submitted is subject to the University's rules and procedures governing infringement of assessment regulations.

Module Leader Brian Morrison

Moderated by Ian Carr

Grading Criteria SIM335 Managing Projects Individual Assignment

First Class (70 – 100%)

A creative and original response to the question. Critically reflecting on perceived theory and experiences. Wide and appropriate use of sources (theory and practice) based on reading and experiences. Answer written fluently, with evidence of a highly developed capacity to structure work systematically and argue logically.

Upper Second Class (60 – 69%)

Comprehensive knowledge of concepts and theories. Appropriate application of theory and experience to the question answered. Ability to inter-relate concepts and ideas. Some originality in approach and awareness of scope and limitations. Answer systematically structured and coherent.

Lower Second Class (50-59%)

Evidence of knowledge of concepts and theories. Attempts to relate and balance theory and practice. Main issues addressed appropriately. Mainstream texts and lecture notes used. Work presented in a structured form but arguments weak in places.

Third Class (40-49%)

Evidence of uncritical knowledge of main concepts and theories. Limited attempts to relate theory and practice relying on personal opinion or assertions. Limited evidence of reading. Presentation and structure weak in several places.

Fail (0 – 39%)

Some knowledge of main concepts and theory but major omissions and / or misunderstandings. Style and structure weak and overly descriptive. Considerable limitations in ability to perceive the relationship of theory and practice. Limited reading.

SIM335 Managing Projects

SIM335: Management of Projects (Academic Year 2013/14)

Task 1

1. **8 marks.** 1 points to be taken off for each wrong node.
A maximum of 5 wrong nodes, after which the student gets 0 for the question.
No common start, 1 points off.
No common end, 1 points off.

Please note: Marks are only awarded if the methodology for Activity on the Node - detailed in Project Management, Field and Keller (2007. p. 197. p.198 & p. 391) is used.

Please note; Marks are only awarded if the timings are in days – **not dates**

2. **3 marks** for explaining how the timings were determined .
3 marks for explaining how the float was determined.

Please note: Marks are only awarded if timings for all activities are included on the network diagram, and the explanation given. This approach is detailed in Project Management, Field and Keller (2007. p. 197. p.198 & p. 391)

3. **3 marks** for correct project duration and explanation.
3 marks for correct critical path and explanation.
4. **4 marks** for correct earliest date (and explain how the figure was calculated).
5. a) **1 mark** for the correct identification of the effect on the duration of the whole project, **1 mark** for right reason
b) **1 mark** for the correct identification of the effect on the duration of the whole project, **1 mark** for right reason
c) **1 mark** for the correct identification of the effect on the duration of the whole project, **1 mark** for right reason
6. **10 marks** for the discussions of limitations of network diagrams. 1 mark will be awarded for each mentioned limitation and 1 mark for the explanation of it.

Total: 40 marks

SIM335 Managing Projects

SIM335: Management of Projects (Academic Year 2007/08)

Task 2

Criteria	70% +	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	<40%
Use of relevant theory Indicative weighting = 40% of 60 mark (24 marks)	The report identifies all the relevant theories to answer to complete the task. The theories used are described in detail. There is clear evidence that course notes, books and other sources are used. Theories used are significant in listing the activities required to successfully plan and manage a major project.	The report identifies most of the relevant theories to answer to complete the task. On the whole, the theories used are described in detail. There is clear evidence that course notes and books are used. Theories used are largely significant in listing the activities required to successfully plan and manage a major project.	On the whole, the report identifies the relevant theories required to answer to complete the task. The theories used are sometimes described in detail. Overall, there is clear evidence that course notes and books are used. Theories used are significant in listing the activities required to successfully plan and manage a major project.	The report identifies some of the relevant theories to answer to complete the task. The theories used are partly described. There is some evidence that course notes, and books are used. Theories used are sometimes significant in listing the activities required to successfully plan and manage a major project.	The report fails to identify the relevant theories to answer to complete the task. The theories used are not described. There is no evidence that course notes, books or other sources are used. Theories used are not significant in listing the activities required to successfully plan and manage a major project.
Analysis Indicative weighting = 40% of 60 mark (24 marks)	There is evidence of extensive research from a variety of sources to provide better understanding to the background of the task. A structured argument is taken for the points made by combining relevant theories with information researched or provided in the task. The conclusions are clear and link into the requirements of the task.	There is evidence of some extensive research from a variety of sources to provide better understanding to the background of the task. A structured argument is taken for the points made, often by combining relevant theories with information researched or provided in the task. The conclusions on the whole are clear and link into the requirements of the task.	There is evidence of some research to provide better understanding to the background of the task but sources are not extensive. There is some structured argument taken for the points made. The relevant theories are not always combined with information researched or provided in the task. The conclusions are not clear and have only limited linkages into the requirements of the task.	There is evidence of limited research being conducted to provide better understanding to the background of the task but sources are not extensive. There is limited structured argument taken for the points made. There are only limited combinations of the relevant theories with information researched or provided in the task. The conclusions are descriptive and do not link into the requirements of the task.	There is no evidence of research from a variety of sources to provide better understanding to the background of the task. There is no structured argument taken for the points made. The relevant theories are not combined with information researched or provided in the task. The conclusions are unclear and only descriptive. Conclusions also do not link into the requirements of the task.
Presentation and Structure Indicative weighting = 20% of 60 mark (12 marks)	<p>The presentation is clear. There are no or few spelling or grammatical errors. The report has been referenced correctly, using the Harvard style of referencing. A word count is provided at the end of the report and is within the limit of 2000 words. The report is text double-spaced.</p> <p>The structure of the project is clear, cohesive and logical. Each section has been clearly structured using sub-headings (signposts) and these follow a logical order. Additional diagrams and other subsidiary information are shown in the appendices and properly referenced. Appendices are relevant and are able to provide a better understanding to the report.</p>	<p>The presentation is on the whole clear, there are no or few spelling or grammatical errors. The project has been referenced correctly, using the Harvard style of referencing. A word count is provided at the end of the report and is within the limit of 2000 words. The report is text double-spaced.</p> <p>The structure of the project is on the whole clear, cohesive and logical. Each chapter has been clearly structured using sub-headings (signposts) and these on the whole follow a logical order. Additional diagrams and other subsidiary information are shown in the appendices and properly referenced. Appendices are mostly relevant and are able to provide a better understanding to the report.</p>	<p>The presentation is partially clear. There are occasional spelling and or grammatical errors. The project has not always been referenced correctly, using the Harvard style of referencing. A word count is provided at the end of the report but is not within the limit of 2000 words. The report is text double-spaced.</p> <p>The structure of the project is not entirely clear, cohesive or logical. Each section has partially been clearly structured using some sub-headings (signposts) but it is difficult to follow. Additional diagrams and other subsidiary information are sometimes shown in the appendices but not always properly referenced. Appendices are occasionally relevant and are at times able to provide a better understanding to the report.</p>	<p>The clarity of the presentation of the project is limited. There are spelling and or grammatical errors. The project has not been referenced correctly, using the Harvard style of referencing. The layout is loose and was difficult to follow.</p> <p>The structure of the project is not clear, cohesive or logical. Each chapter has been limited structured using some or no sub-headings (signposts), which made it very difficult to follow. Additional diagrams and other subsidiary information are not shown in the appendices and not properly referenced. Appendices are irrelevant and are not able to provide a better understanding to the report.</p>	<p>The presentation is unclear. There numerous spelling or grammatical errors. The report has not been referenced correctly, using the Harvard style of referencing. A word count is not provided at the end of the report and is not within the limit of 2000 words. The report is not text double-spaced.</p> <p>The structure of the project is unclear, inconsistent and illogical. Sections are not clearly structured using sub-headings (signposts) and do not follow a logical order. Additional diagrams and other subsidiary information are not shown in the appendices and not properly referenced. Appendices are irrelevant and are not able to provide a better understanding to the report.</p>

Total: 60 marks