ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION

Worth: 35%
Individual/Group: Individual
Due: Week 13 on Friday 01/11/2024 at 23:59
Length: 1000 words (excl. references, and 10% +/- leeway.)
Generative AI: Allowed
Learning outcomes: L01, L02, L03

Details

Objective: Provide a personal evaluation of what you would have done differently with the company analysed by your team, exploring uncertainties and risks in its business environment.

Key Requirements

1. Critically apply knowledge from class, examining limitations of risk analysis and management.
2. Offer an individual perspective on alternative approaches to the company analysis.
3. Reflect on how your analysis differs from your team's approach and why.
4. Provide original reasoning and justification, drawing from group work, lectures, and readings.

Reflection

- If using AI tools: Describe how they assisted in generating ideas, providing information, or offering new perspectives. Clearly distinguish between AI-generated content and your own insights.
- If not using AI tools: Reflect on this decision and its impact on your work process.

General Expectations

- Critically engage with and evaluate information.
- Verify facts and consider alternative viewpoints.
- Provide sources and references.
- Take full responsibility for your submission.

Potential Approaches

- Expand on an underdeveloped risk source from group work.
- Critically evaluate industry uncertainties.
- Provide a different analytical approach to the company.

RUBRIC: Risk management evaluation

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Use of relevant theory, frameworks, tools, concepts, and/or ideas from readings and learning experiences in this Unit.	20 to >16.0 pts	16 to >14.0 pts	14 to >12.0 pts	12 to >8.0 pts	8 to >0 pts	20
	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Fail	
	Applies and integrates theory, frameworks, and concepts with practical elements in a masterful way, that are most suited to the context. A sophisticated, nuanced and comprehensive discussion.	Applies and integrates theory, frameworks, and concepts with practical elements effectively, that are well suited to the context. A high quality analysis and discussion.	Applies theory, frameworks, and concepts with practical elements that are generally appropriate for the context and beneficial to the overall discussion.	Applies basic theories and frameworks, and concepts in a functional way that are suitable for the context, but add minimal value. The overall discussion meets requirements.	Fails to apply theories, frameworks, and concepts appropriately, or the application does not add value to the analysis. Theoretical material may be misunderstood or irrelevant.	
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Critical Analysis and Risk Evaluation	20 to >16.0 pts	16 to >14.0 pts	14 to >12.0 pts	12 to >8.0 pts	8 to >0 pts	20
	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Fail	
	Demonstrates exceptional critical thinking with innovative risk analysis and solutions that go beyond standard approaches	Shows strong critical thinking with effective risk analysis and well-developed solutions,	Shows competent critical thinking with satisfactory risk analysis and reasonable solutions.	Some basic critical thinking with adequate risk analysis and some attempt at solutions.	Lacks critical thinking, with superficial or missing risk analysis and inadequate solutions.	
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome	20 to >16.0 pts	16 to >14.0 pts	14 to >12.0 pts	12 to >8.0 pts	8 to >0 pts	20
	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Fail	

Distinctiveness and originality	Demonstrates exceptional originality, providing in-depth insights that are entirely distinct from group work and offers unique, possibly groundbreaking perspectives.	Shows strong originality, with clear differences from group work. Provides well-considered personal insights into the topic that are not immediately obvious.	Some original ideas that differ from group work but may not be entirely unique.	Minimal distinctiveness from group work, with few original insights.	No discernible difference from group work. Limited or no analysis and originality.	
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Reflects on process	20 to >16.0 pts	16 to >14.0 pts	14 to >12.0 pts	12 to >8.0 pts	8 to >0 pts	20
	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Fail	
	Insightful reflection on their research and writing process, demonstrating innovative use, whether that integrates AI tools or other methods.	Effectively reflects on their research and writing process and its benefits, whether using AI tools or other methods.	Satisfactorily reflects on their research and writing process with some benefits described, whether using AI tools or not.	Basic reflection on aspects of their research and writing process with minimal impact, whether using AI tools or not.	Fails to reflect on their research and writing process, or shows no evidence of their impact, with or without the use AI tools.	
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Innovation in Risk Management Strategies	10 to >8.0 pts	8 to >7.0 pts	7 to >6.0 pts	6 to >4.0 pts	4 to >0 pts	10
	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Fail	
	Proposes highly innovative and practical risk management strategies that could set industry precedents.	Presents creative and practical risk management strategies superior to standard approaches.	Offers some novel and practical risk management strategies, but not groundbreaking.	Proposes risk management strategies with slight departures from standard solutions.	Provides standard or impractical risk management strategies with no evidence of innovation.	
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Communication and Presentation	10 to >8.0 pts	8 to >7.0 pts	7 to >6.0 pts	6 to >4.0 pts	4 to >0 pts	10
	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Fail	
	Presents exemplary writing with compelling argumentation and flawless organisation.	Presents very good writing with effective argumentation and clear organisation.	Evidence of good communication with clear organisation that supports the argument.	Adequate writing and organisation that mostly supports the argument.	Poor writing, disorganised presentation, or lack of clarity. Difficult or impossible to understand.	
Total						100