Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

APPENDIX GA36a

LEVEL 4 ASSESSMENT SPECIFICATION

Student name:		**Student ID number:**	
Programme:	**Cert HE Business Skills for the Workplace**		
Module:	**Effective Teamwork and Communication**		
Module code:	**LCLM4003**	**Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):**	50%
Module Leads:	Lloyd Beharry - London Fatima Hashmi -Birmingham	**Internal Verifier:**	Dr Lizeta Demetriou Yohan Mendis
Assignment Title:	**Case Study – KEEPSAFE**	**Word count (or equivalent):**	1500 equivalent
Submission deadline:	**Week 5** Taking place in the week beginning: **3rd of November 2025**	**Return date of provisional marks &written feedback:**	**5th December 2025**
Submission method:	All written assessments, where practical and possible, must be submitted via Turnitin unless otherwise instructed by the Lecturer. (Please DO NOT put this assessment specification into Turnitin or it will match many similarities with other students' submissions.) **Alternative submission method (if applicable):** **Late submission of the assessment will result in a late penalty mark:** Work which is submitted up to 1 week late will be capped at 40% for the first attempt and will be awarded a mark of 0% for re-assessment. Late submission penalties may be lifted only if there is an approved extenuating circumstances claim. Work submitted more than 1 week late will be considered as a non-submission and will not be marked. The work may be considered as a submission for reassessment if offered by an Examining Board or if there is an approved extenuating circumstances claim.		
Academic honesty / referencing:	Academic honesty is required. In the main body of your submission, you must give credit to authors on whose research and ideas your work is based. Appen to your submission a reference list that indicates the books, articles, etc. that you have used, cited or quoted in order to complete this assessment.		

Module Learning Outcomes (from module syllabus)

Upon the successful completion of this module, the student should be able to:

- Apply the main theories relating to group dynamics and team working to a business context.
- Demonstrate key communication skills in a business context

TASK DESCRIPTION

In-class assessment – 2,5 hours. Team work at KEEPSAFE (50%).

In **week 5** you will be required to answer 10 questions of equal value on the Case Study below which is based on the topics covered in the first 4 weeks of term. This will test your knowledge and understanding of the theories such as Tuckman, Belbin, and Thomas and Kilmann, and their interaction in promoting the success of Teams.

You are expected to provide detailed answers to each of these questions. You should aim at writing approximately 100 words for each question. You are not **allowed** to bring your handwritten notes or printed copies to this assessment. No use of other materials or electronic resources will be permitted during this assessment.

This assessment will be done under exam conditions.

The Case - Team work at Keepsafe

In 2024, the new owners of KEEPSAFE a company that produces fridges, freezers and cold rooms for domestic and industrial uses, were surprised to discover that the company's system of working and decision making was based on individual effort rather than on teamworking.

'I could not understand how a company of this size could operate effectively on individual efforts alone rather than on reaping the benefits of teamwork, so I engaged a consultancy that specialises in Teamwork to assess how best we could move forward,' said the Managing Director.

'On their advice, we decided to form a team of the leaders of all our departments – Production, Sales, Legal, IT, Human Resources, Customer Services, Security and Facilities - to see how we could make this system work.'

As I was new and wanted to meet everyone together, I chaired the first meeting and explained why we were going to operate as a team, and I gave them the objective towards which they must work. While our company was doing well, we were facing competition from many new companies entering the market and we needed to find new ways of doing things. I pointed out that so far, we have been catering for businesses in warm/tropical countries and we needed to think outside the box. The team's brief was therefore to explore ways in which we could target neglected markets like Alaska, Siberia and Iceland and I expected them to report in 3 months.

I appointed the Head of Engineering (Nick) as team leader until they could decide on who they wanted as leader, and I also gave them a secretary (Sarah) to record their discussions, but she would not participate, and I would keep informed of the team's progress through her notes. However, I made it clear that I did not want to hear about team discussions or problems from them because I expected them to deal with everything as a team.

MEETING 1: (Sarah's Notes). It was strange because all the people around the table have either met each other, spoken on the phone or emailed each other, yet, gathered in a room together, they seemed to find it difficult to talk to each other. It was as if they were strangers. They didn't seem to know why they were there, and they were very formal with each other.

Nick (Engineering) called the meeting to order and said, 'It appears that we have been put into a team to suggest how we could sell ice to the Eskimos.'

Sylvia (HR) said, 'They prefer to be called Inuits.'

Nick apologised and said that they had a task to do, and they had three months in which to do it. He would be leading the team unless they wanted to have somebody else. They agreed that he should do it. He then introduced each person and gave a short resume of their experience and qualifications. People seemed to relax more and started to ask each other questions about themselves. Nick then explained that they will work in sub-groups with each assigned a task- all related to the main objective, and that it is hoped that by week 8, all teams could report their findings.'

Aslam, (Finance), asked how often they were expected to meet as he had his own department to run. Kasia (Sales) pointed out that other companies work in teams as part of their jobs. This seemed to satisfy Aslam and the others, who nodded their heads. Nick suggested Saturdays, and Marvin from Security said, 'That is fine by me as long as there is no cricket at the Oval. I love my cricket.' Aslam reminded him that the team would be working over three winter months when there is no cricket. They all laughed.
Nick suggested that they should meet every week, but Pinar (**IT)** thought every 2 weeks would be better. This was agreed and the meeting broke up with everyone in good spirits.

MEETING 2 (Sarah's Notes): With the first meeting ending quite pleasantly, I did not expect what happened at the second meeting. Nick started to outline the various tasks, but some people disagreed and made suggestions about different approaches. Nick told them that the best approach was to divide the team into sub-teams, each responsible for researching things such as identifying demand, manufacturing adjustments, marketing, advertisement and sales. He also talked of each sub-team using a PESTLE analysis to identify what the macro-environment is in each target country. This seemed to have been accepted, but when Nick suggested who should lead the sub-teams, there was an almighty row with people shouting at each and complaining that they were better qualified and more experienced than someone else. One or two stopped talking altogether and refused to participate. The atmosphere could be described electric, unpleasant and full of conflict.
As leader/coordinator, Nick had to consider the deadline they were given and needed to resolve these difficulties quickly.

MEETING 3 (Sarah's notes): As the members assembled, there was an air of disquiet, and some members were still mumbling to each other. Nick said that what happened last time was not good for the project as people were all pulling in different directions.
'I cannot please everyone, and we cannot keep going around in circles and wasting time.'
Sylvia (HR) agreed and said that the Director had indicated that this was just the first of a series of projects and that everyone would have a chance to lead a sub-group. This was how teams operated where she last worked and this proved successful, so it should be tried here so everyone should be patient and work with each other.
Kasia (Sales) suggested that the team should have 5 sub-groups and that each should be led by different people for different projects, so that if Aslam leads sub-group A this time, Marvin could lead it for the next project.

“I know that when we get to the stage where we are preparing the final report, I will be given the task of examining it carefully to make sure there are no spelling, grammar, or factual errors because of my expertise in this area. I know people think that I am too fussy, but our report to management should be perfect.”

Aslam said that this was a good idea, and it wasn’t as if the sub-groups will be deciding, but they will be doing research into their own areas and coming up with proposals which we could all discuss calmly before deciding.

‘Yes,’ Tom (Facilities) said. ‘And I could sit in with all the sub-groups and liaise with others if they need clarification.’

‘I don’t really understand how that would work, Tom,’ said Sylvia.

‘For instance, if Team A is discussing the engineering adjustments that need to be made, there is going to be the question of finance. I could liaise with Aslam to find out what money is available. Also, we will need to find out if these proposals are legal, so I will talk to Santos (legal) and feedback to the teams. I could also see how each sub-team is organizing their work and share this with others.’

‘That’s a good idea,’ said Sylvia.

Nick was relieved that people seemed to be consulting and agreeing with each other rather than arguing. They seemed to be embracing the need to work together to achieve their objective.

MEETING 4 (Sarah’s notes)*:*

The next time the team met they reported on their progress. Some reported that everything was going well, but one reported that they were stuck on an engineering problem. Nick (Engineering and Leader) said that even his team, with its engineering expertise, could not solve the problem. Aslam (Finance) suggested that this needed to be solved as the Cost could not be determined unless this was done. It was suggested that they should get outside assistance from a specialist engineering firm. This was done and the problem was solved.

The sub-teams met again and prepared a report for management.

ALLOWABLE USE OF AI

Allowable Use of Generative AI in this assessment

RESEARCH	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to support you in research and data analysis.	Yes ☐ No ☒
STRUCTURE	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to support you in structuring your submission, including creating a draft argument structure, identifying parts and headings, etc.	Yes ☐ No ☒
PROOFREADING	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to check your own text/creation for grammatical and syntactical mistakes, including getting suggestions to rephrase your work.	Yes ☐ No ☒
WRITING	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to create text for submission.	Yes ☐ No ☒
CREATIVE	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to create creative materials, such as images.	Yes ☐ No ☒
PROGRAMING	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to create and check code.	Yes ☐ No ☒
NONE	For this assessment, you are not allowed to use **any** type of Generative AI support. This includes research support, structure support, writing/proofreading support and creative support.	Yes ☒ No ☐

GUIDANCE FOR STUDENTS IN THE COMPLETION OF TASKS

NOTE: The guidance offered below is linked to the five generic assessment criteria overleaf.

1. Engagement with Literature Skills

Your work must be informed and supported by scholarly material that is *relevant* to and *focused* on the task(s) set. You should provide evidence that you have accessed an appropriate *range* of sources, which may be academic, governmental and industrial; these sources may include academic journal articles, textbooks, current news articles, organisational documents, and websites. You should consider the *credibility* of your sources; academic journals are normally highly credible sources while websites require careful consideration/selection and should be used sparingly. Any sources you use should be current and up-to-date, mostly published within the last five years or so, though seminal/important works in the field may be older. You must provide *evidence* of your research/own reading throughout your work, using a suitable referencing system, including in-text citations in the main body of your work and a reference list at the end of your work.

Guidance specific to this assessment:

- Not applicable for this task.

2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills

At level 4, you should be able to demonstrate knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with your area(s) of study. *Knowledge* relates to the facts, information and skills you have acquired through your learning. You demonstrate your *understanding* by interpreting the meaning of the facts and information (knowledge). This means that you need to select and include in your work the concepts, techniques, models, theories, etc. appropriate to the task(s) set. You should be able to explain the theories, concepts, etc. to show your understanding. Your mark/grade will also depend upon the *extent* to which you demonstrate your knowledge and understanding.

Guidance specific to this assessment:

- You should be able to respond to all questions provided in the case study.
- In your answers you should be able to refer and explain key theoretical concepts related to the case study such as the stages of team formation, team roles, conflict management etc.

3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills

You should be able to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of your subject(s) of study. You should be able to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to your area(s) of study and/or work. Your work must contain evidence of logical, analytical thinking. For example, to examine and break information down into parts, make inferences, compile, compare and contrast information. This means not just describing what! But also justifying: Why? How? When? Who? Where? At what cost? You should provide justification for your arguments and judgements using evidence that you have reflected upon the ideas of others within the subject area and that you are able to make sound judgements and arguments using data and concepts. Where relevant, alternative solutions and recommendations may be proposed.

Guidance specific to this assessment:

- You should be able to evaluate the information provided in the case study to reach meaningful conclusions.
- You should also be able to show that you can combine different information both from the case study provided and your knowledge of relevant theories when responding to each question.

4. Practical Skills

At level 4, you should be able to apply the basic underlying concepts and principles to evaluate and interpret these within the context of your area of study. You should be able to demonstrate how the subject-related concepts and ideas relate to real world situations and/or a particular context. How do they work in practice?

You will deploy models, methods, techniques, and/or theories, in that context, to assess current situations, perhaps to formulate plans or solutions to solve problems, or to create artefacts. This is likely to involve, for instance, the use of real world artefacts, examples and cases, the application of a model within an organisation and/or benchmarking one theory or organisation against others based on stated criteria.

Guidance specific to this assessment:

- You should be able to apply the teamworking models, theories and techniques related to team development and conflict resolution in your responses.

5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice

Your work must provide evidence of the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility. This includes demonstrating: that you can communicate the results of your study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments; that you can initiate and complete tasks and procedures, whether individually and/or collaboratively; fluency of expression; clarity and effectiveness in presentation and organisation. Work should be coherent and well-structured in presentation and organisation.

Guidance specific to this assessment:

- You need to ensure that your responses are written in fluent English with coherent arguments and reasoning.
- You should avoid repeating sentences from the case study provided unless it is essential.

STUDENT FEEDBACK FORM

This section details the *extent* to which the assessment criteria are demonstrated by you, which in turn determines your mark. The marks available for each category of skill are shown. Lecturers will use the space provided to comment on the achievement of the task(s), including those areas in which you have performed well and areas that would benefit from development/improvement.

Generic Assessment Criteria	Marks available	Marks awarded
1. Engagement with Literature Skills	0	
2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills	30	
3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills	30	
4. Practical Application Skills	30	
5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice	10	

Assessment Mark (Assessment marks are subject to ratification at the Exam Board. These comments and marks are to give feedback on module work and are for guidance only until they are confirmed.)	**Late Submission Penalties (tick if appropriate)**		**%**
	Up to 1 week late (40% Max)		
	Over 1 week late (0%)		

GENERIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Level 4

In accordance with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, at the end of Level 4 students will be expected to have demonstrated knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and principles of a subject, and an ability to evaluate and interpret these within the context of that area of study. They should be able to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study. They will have learned how to evaluate different approaches to solving problems, and will be able to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments. They will be able to undertake further training and develop new skills within a structured and managed environment and will have the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.

Level 4	FAIL	MARGINAL FAIL	SATISFACTORY (3rd / Pass)	GOOD (2.2 / Pass)	VERY GOOD (2.1 / Merit)	EXCELLENT (1st / Distinction)	EXCEPTIONAL (1st / Distinction)
Category	**0-29%**	**30-39%**	**40-49%**	**50-59%**	**60-69%**	**70-84%**	**85-100%**
Engagement with literature (including reading, referencing, academic conventions and academic honesty)	Little or no evidence of reading and/or reliance on inappropriate sources. Views and findings mostly unsupported and non-authoritative. Referencing conventions used incoherently or largely absent.	Poor engagement with essential reading. No evidence of wider reading. Reliance on inappropriate sources, and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Heavily reliant on information gained through class contact. Inconsistent and weak use of referencing.	Engagement with a limited range of mostly relevant and credible sources but with some reliance on information gained through class contact. Some omissions and minor errors. Referencing conventions evident though not always applied accurately or consistently.	Engagement with an appropriate range of literature, including sources retrieved independently. Some over-reliance on texts rather than other sources. Referencing may show minor inaccuracies or inconsistencies.	Engagement with a wide range of literature, including sources retrieved independently. Selection of relevant and credible sources. Generally sound referencing, with no/very few inaccuracies or inconsistencies.	Engagement with an extensive range of relevant and credible literature. Consistently accurate application of referencing.	Exceptional engagement with an extensive range of relevant and credible literature. High-level referencing skills consistently applied.
Knowledge and understanding (Knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and principles of a subject.)	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of the basic underlying concepts and principles of the subject matter. Inclusion of irrelevant material. Substantial inaccuracies.	Gaps in knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and principles, with flawed or superficial understanding. Some significant inaccuracies and/or irrelevant material.	Limited knowledge and understanding of the basic underlying concepts and principles within the subject area. Some elements may be missing.	Knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and principles is accurate with a good understanding of the field of study but lacks depth and/or breadth.	Competent knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and principles. Exhibits very good understanding.	Excellent knowledge and understanding of the basic underlying concepts and principles of the subject.	Exceptional, detailed knowledge and understanding of the basic underlying concepts and principles

Level 4	FAIL	MARGINAL FAIL	SATISFACTORY (3rd / Pass)	GOOD (2.2 / Pass)	VERY GOOD (2.1 / Merit)	EXCELLENT (1st / Distinction)	EXCEPTIONAL (1st / Distinction)
Category	**0-29%**	**30-39%**	**40-49%**	**50-59%**	**60-69%**	**70-84%**	**85-100%**
Cognitive and intellectual skills (Evaluate underlying concepts and principles of a subject and interpret qualitative and quantitative data in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements.)	Wholly or almost wholly descriptive work. Little or no evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Failure to develop arguments, leading to illogical or invalid judgements. Minimal or no use of evidence to back up views.	Largely descriptive work, with superficial evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Weak interpretation of data, flawed development of arguments and judgements. Information accepted uncritically, uses generalised statements made with scant evidence and unsubstantiated opinions. Ideas sometimes illogical and contradictory.	Limited attempt at evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles, tending towards description. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data but with some errors. Some evidence to support emerging arguments and judgements but these may be underdeveloped or with a little inconsistency / mis-interpretation.	Good evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data, with minor errors. An emerging ability to use evidence to support the argument. Mostly valid arguments and logical judgements.	Sound evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data accurately. Ability to devise arguments using evidence to make mostly appropriate and valid judgements.	Excellent evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data accurately and with some insight. Excellent ability to devise arguments using evidence and make appropriate and valid judgements.	Exceptional evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles based evidence. Outstanding interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data. Exceptional ability to devise arguments using evidence and make wholly appropriate and valid judgements.
Practical skills (Different approaches to solving problems in particular contexts.)	Limited or no use of taught, basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Little or no appreciation of the context of the application. Very weak evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts.	Rudimentary application of taught, basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques but without consideration and competence. Flawed appreciation of the context of the application. Weak evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts.	An adequate awareness and mostly appropriate application of basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Basic appreciation of the context of the application. Can identify problems in particular contexts and propose basic alternative approaches or solutions though there may be errors.	A good and appropriate application of basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Clear appreciation of the context of the application. Good evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts and proposes mostly appropriate solutions.	A very good application of a range of basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Very good consideration of the context of the application. Very good evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts and proposes	An advanced application of a range of taught, basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. The context of the application is well considered, and insightful. Excellent evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts and proposes	Exceptional levels of application and deployment skills in particular practical contexts. Outstanding identification of problems in particular contexts and formulation of wholly appropriate, thoughtful solutions / different approaches.

Level 4	FAIL	MARGINAL FAIL	SATISFACTORY (3rd / Pass)	GOOD (2.2 / Pass)	VERY GOOD (2.1 / Merit)	EXCELLENT (1st / Distinction)	EXCEPTIONAL (1st / Distinction)
Category	**0-29%**	**30-39%**	**40-49%**	**50-59%**	**60-69%**	**70-84%**	**85-100%**
					appropriate solutions.	appropriate solutions.	
Transferable skills for life and professional practice (Communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments; the qualities needed for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility within a structured and managed environment.)	Work is poorly structured, disorganised, inaccurate and/or confusingly expressed. Very weak use of language and/or very inappropriate style. Failure to work effectively individual or as part of a group. Little or no evidence of the skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.	Work is poorly presented in a disjointed manner. It is loosely, and at times incoherently, structured, with information and ideas often poorly expressed. Weak use of language and/or inappropriate style. Flawed approach to individual or group work, meeting only partial obligations to others. Limited evidence of the skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.	Mostly ordered presentation and structure in which relevant ideas / concepts are reasonably expressed. Work may lack coherence and/or accuracy in places. Can work as part of a group, meeting most obligations to others but perhaps with limited involvement in group activities. Demonstrates the basic skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility, with some areas of minor weakness.	Mostly coherent, organised and accurate work, in a suitable structure and is for the most part clearly expressed. Can work effectively independently and/or as part of a team, with clear contribution to group activities. Demonstrates the skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility, with some areas of strength and some of minor weakness.	Work is accurate, coherent, fluent, well-structured and organised. Can work effectively independently and/or as part of a team, with very good contribution to group activities. Demonstrates very good skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility, with just occasional minor weakness.	Work is coherent, very fluent and is presented professionally. Can work effectively independently and/or as part of a team, with an excellent contribution to group activities. Demonstrates excellent skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility with an appetite for further development.	Work is accurate, exceptionally coherent, very fluent and presented well. Can work effectively independently and/or as part of a team, with an exceptional contribution to group activities. Demonstrates exceptional skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility with an appetite for further development.

THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE IN WELSH