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**Assignment 2 - Individual Reflection (80%)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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| Word count (if applicable) | 3500 |
| Weighting | 80% |
| File Format | MS Office or PDF |
| Submission Details | Turnitin – instructions provided on LEARN |

**A2: INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENT (80%)**

Directions:

1. Select an operation (a process) to analyse. The process could be one from a past or current place of work, one you have experienced as a customer or client, or one you are able to observe and collect data from.
2. Produce a detailed map of the current process (a current state map), populated with appropriate data, with explanatory notes, and with a key to the symbols used. (***Kind of a flowchart***)
3. Analyse the process for possible improvements, produce a future state map of the redesigned process, and provide recommendations for the implementation of the process redesign. (***Again, a flowchart with some changes in the previous flowchart making it more efficient in the future)***
4. Identify the benefits, quantitative and qualitative, of your “improved” process.

The individual assignment for this module is an extended project. It accounts for 80% of the total module mark, so it should be detailed, analytical and contain data, facts and figures. Note that it should be analytical and not merely contained at the descriptive level - the assignment should be treated as a serious piece of practical research work. You are urged to start work early on selecting your process and collecting the relevant data.

We are writing this report in perspective of a customer, how a customer is seeing their operations.

“I was thinking of doing a process on **Chaayos or chai point**” as it is exciting and related to chai process, like how many outlets do they have, hoe many customers do they get, how much time do they out in making chai and serving it, etc”

Format - it is recommended that you use the following sub-headings (start each on a new page):

1. Brief introduction of the process
2. Detailed current state process map
3. Analysis of the current process using operations improvement theories
4. Use what are operations model from (01 Intro to OI, page 4)
5. Use the Doughnut model from (01 Intro to OI, page 9-10)
6. Use The four V’s model from (01 Intro to OI, page 11-12)
7. Use the concept of value model from (03 Designing Services & Products, page 9)
8. Use formulation of operations strategies from (06 Managing Operations Strategically, page 4)
9. Use Hayes and Wheelwright model from (06 Managing Operations Strategically, page 5)
10. (Can explain, if necessary, the life cycle of operations in the firm from (06 Managing Operations Strategically, page 7)
11. Use The efficient frontier model from (06 Managing Operations Strategically, page 11)
12. Mention the quality is meeting the requirements of the customer or not
13. Mention if there is any quality system in place for the final product
14. Define capacity from (02 Design Business Processes I (1), page 4,5)
15. Define any process layout or any type of control if applicable from (02 Design Business Processes I (1), page 7-31)
16. A proposed and detailed future state process map
17. Recommendations for the implementation of the process redesign
18. Conclusion – assignment summary stating potential quantitative and qualitative benefits

Use numbers wherein applicable in the process you are choosing, like how many customers in an hour or day, how much it is taking in the entire process (some analytical thinking would be great for this assignment)

Use all references from the original source from google scholar

Also, use references from the David Bamford books I am providing you for definitions or anything related to operations

Also, use references from Google scholar authentic articles for operations within last 3 years that includes articles written by David Bamford.

And use topic headings properly in the assignment

Please note it is highly recommended you use the above six sections. Failure to do so could have a direct impact on the grade awarded.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Important Notes:**

* Your assignment must be word processed in a professional report format and should be 3500 words maximum
* Marks will be allocated on content, evidence of data of process data, quality of process analysis, discussion, and presentation
* Make sure that you include extensive data. You are responsible for collecting this yourself. You will need extensive process data (e.g. processing times, queuing times, length of queues, inventory held, distance of travel, etc, etc.). This means you must select your process with this in mind. Do you have access to such data? Or are you able to observe and collect such data? Or maybe you can ‘simulate’ reasonable data in some cases or the purpose of your analysis. So, make sure you choose a process which you can analyse in sufficient detail to generate a good mark!
* Make sure that if you do source secondary material that this is referenced using the Harvard system (surname, date, page number if appropriate in the main body, alphabetical listing of references at the end)
* Legibility: use minimum 12pt font, and at least 1.2 line spacing

Note: Please refer to the attached Marking Rubric for a qualitative description of expectations at different bands of the Common Marking Scheme.

***Postgraduate Taught descriptors according to the University Common Marking Scheme***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Fail** | **Satisfactory for Diploma/Fail for Masters** | **Good** | **Very Good** | **Excellent** |
|  | **Mark range** | **(0-39)** | **(40-49)** | **(50-59)** | **(60-69)** | **(70-100)** |
| 1 | **Relevance to set question** | **Scope:** irrelevant material predominates; demonstrates minimal attention to context and audience. **Purpose:** purpose and focus of the piece are not clear to the reader. | **Scope:** may include omissions and/or irrelevant material; demonstrates some attention to context and audience. **Purpose:** an attempt is made to state purpose of the piece but with lack of focus. | **Scope:** mostly focused on the assigned task(s) with little irrelevant material; demonstrates awareness of context and audience. **Purpose:** features a clear statement of purpose that nevertheless fails to fully address the assigned task(s). | **Scope:** consistently focused on the assigned task(s); fully aware of context and audience. **Purpose:** features a clear statement of purpose that fully addresses the assigned task(s) | **Scope:** consistently focused on the assigned task(s) in an organised and coherent way; thorough and competent understanding of context and audience. **Purpose:** features an excellent and comprehensive statement of purpose. |
| 2 | **Approach** | **Concepts and theories:** missing and / or incorrect. **Method:** missing or not clearly discussed; unable to apply. | **Concepts and theories:** basic and may be incorrect. **Method:** some attempt to outline methods with limited ability to apply. | **Concepts and theories:** somewhat complete and correct. **Method:** outlined in a step-by-step fashion; methods may appear routine and applied uncritically. | **Concepts and theories:** mostly complete and correct. **Method:** outlined in a coherent fashion; methods may appear routine with some argumentation for choices made. | **Concepts and theories:** complete and correct. **Method:** fully outlined in a critical fashion with clear argumentation for choices made. |
| 3 | **Quality of argument** | **Quantitative:** patchy knowledge of appropriate techniques for analysis; disorganised solution to a problem. **Qualitative:** limited / no coherence; concepts are irrelevant and / or poorly applied. | **Quantitative:** some knowledge of key concepts and techniques, but unable to consistently apply this knowledge; may include unsubstantiated assertions. **Qualitative:** arguments may be weak or lack clarity, some statements may be unsubstantiated; more emphasis on description than critical analysis. | **Quantitative:** demonstrates knowledge of key concepts and techniques; evidence of elementary applications. **Qualitative:** arguments are clear, but evaluation of sources and use of theoretical concepts in critical analysis are limited. | **Quantitative:** demonstrates knowledge of key concepts and techniques; evidence of application in simple settings. **Qualitative:** ability to think clearly and critically evaluate ideas, to bring different ideas together and to draw sound conclusions. | **Quantitative:** excellent knowledge and understanding of methods underlying the answer; demonstrates application of methods to complex settings. **Qualitative:** competent thought in critically evaluating and integrating evidence and ideas; deals confidently with complexities and subtleties of the arguments. |
| 4 | **Depth of analysis** | **Analysis:** characterised by irrelevance, brevity and / or superficiality. **Content:** no / little use of appropriate and relevant content in the work. | **Analysis:** makes omissions and / or includes irrelevant material. **Content:** uses some appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work. | **Analysis:** applies knowledge with good evidence of integration and synthesis of material. **Content:** uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work. | **Analysis:** evidence of appraisal, and very good indication of synthesis.  **Content:** uses appropriate, relevant and compelling content to explore ideas with the context of the discipline. | **Analysis:** sophisticated synthesis coupled with evidence of independent insight.  **Content:** uses appropriate, relevant and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject. |
| 5 | **Originality and creativity** | **Presentation:** reworking of other people’s ideas and / or graphics. **Content:** no evidence of original thought. | **Presentation:** somewhat original, but not particularly thoughtful / creative. **Content:** limited evidence of original thought. | **Presentation:** original, may include some thoughtful / creative elements. **Content:** able to state original ideas. | **Presentation:** original, features frequent thoughtful / creative elements. **Content:** able to state and defend original ideas. | **Presentation:** original, thoughtful / creative, and elegant. **Content:** able to state and defend original ideas with flair and imagination. |
| 6 | **Use of course readings and literature** | **Engagement:** little or no evidence of engagement with course readings, support material (e.g. data and/or evidence), and literature. **Use:** little or no use of relevant sources to support ideas. | **Engagement:** shows some evidence of engagement with course readings, support material (e.g. data and/or evidence), and literature. **Use:** an attempt is made to use relevant sources to support ideas, but contains flaws. | **Engagement:** shows evidence of engagement with course readings, support material (e.g. data and/or evidence), and literature.  **Use:** appropriate use of relevant sources to support ideas, but may reflect limited independent reading. | **Engagement:** shows a broad based engagement with course readings, support material (e.g. data and/or evidence), and literature.  **Use:** very good use of relevant sources to support ideas with evidence of substantial independent reading within the discipline. | **Engagement:** extensive and comprehensive grasp of course readings, and state-of-the-art support material (e.g. data and/or evidence) and literature.  **Use:** skilful use of high quality, relevant sources from both within in and outside the discipline. |
| 7 | **Use of figures, tables and examples** | **Figures/tables:** inappropriate or incorrect use of figures and/or tables.  **Examples:**  Irrelevant or no use of examples. | **Figures/tables:** not well embedded in the narrative and/or poorly labelled. **Examples:** poorly chosen and/or explained examples. | **Figures/tables**: correctly labelled, but occasionally not effective in the context of the narrative.  **Examples:** standard examples from within the discipline that are well-explained. | **Figures/tables:** correctly labelled; contribute to supporting the narrative.  **Examples:** tailored examples from within the discipline that are well-explained. | **Figures/tables:** excellent (possibly original) figures and tables that enhance the narrative. **Examples:** richly enhance and add to clarity of argument and may include comparative examples from outside the discipline. |
| 8 | **Structure** | **Organisation:** disorganised; introduction, body and/or conclusions missing or confusing; inability to formulate and communicate ideas. **Sections:** inappropriate use of headings, sections and paragraphs. **Length:** Work is considerably shorter/longer than what stated in assignment brief. | **Organisation:** partly disorganised; introduction, body or conclusion underdeveloped or confusing. **Sections:** headings may be placed inappropriately; sections and paragraphs may be too short or overly long; ineffective use of word count. | **Organisation:** generally organised; introduction, body or conclusion may be underdeveloped but present ideas and information in a logical way.  **Sections:** headings and sections demarcate the narrative; paragraphs and sections are of appropriate length and demonstrate effective use of word count. | **Organisation:** clear and easy to follow; introduction, body and conclusions are defined and aligned with purpose. **Sections:** headings, sections and paragraphs support the narrative. | **Organisation:** organisation of material enhances audience understanding; introduction, body and conclusion are well defined, effective and aligned with purpose. **Sections:** headings, sections and paragraphs enhance the narrative. |
| 9 | **Writing** | **Syntax:** poor use of English. **Grammar:** errors in spelling and grammar that hinder comprehension. | **Syntax:** occasionally poor use of English. **Grammar:** some errors in spelling and grammar that occasionally hinder comprehension. | **Syntax:** minor flaws in writing technique that do not detract from precision and clarity. **Grammar:** little / no error in spelling; grammatically correct. | **Syntax:** very good use of English and well-thought out writing. **Grammar:** precise and clear writing with no grammatical flaws. | **Syntax:** clear and succinct writing style that reinforces precision and clarity. **Grammar:** precise and clear writing with no grammatical flaws. |
| 10 | **Citations** | **Use:** work poorly or not supported through citations; use of cited evidence is misleading or wrong. **Style:** inconsistent use of bibliography / references style. | **Use:** work partly supported with cited evidence; some citations used are misleading or wrong. **Style:** some flaws in presentation of bibliography / references. | **Use:** work supported through cited evidence; occasionally citations are misleading or wrong. **Style:** generally consistent and correct bibliography / references. | **Use:** work correctly supported by references. **Style:** consistent and correct bibliography / references. | **Use:** work clearly referenced; draws on a wide, relevant literature base. **Style:** consistent and correct bibliography / references following an established referencing style, e.g. Oxford. |

