

SPECIALIZATION REPORT

A2018

Appendix C - A made up example

For the specialist advisor & external examiner

2018.01.02



1/2

Case 1

KEA student Ned Knot (NK) has written a specialization report on "Quality Assurance of Industrialised Buildings - during production and on site".

In his definition of the task, NK has set a number of questions which he will aim to clarify through his work on the specialization report. NK motivates the choice of specialization report by a desire to work on industrialised building as a Bachelor of Architectural Technology and Construction Management. In terms of method, NK will search for information on the internet, in literature and by visiting companies that work with factory produced buildings.

The specialist advisor for the specialization report is a lecturer at Copenhagen School of Design and Technology, Mark Wright (MW). He states that the school has set aside resources for a total of 5 hours of guidance through the process and would prefer NK to plan his work taking this into account.

Through the work on the specialist project, contact between NK and MW is lacking. After the first meeting, which takes place at the beginning of the semester, almost 2 months pass before the next meeting, even though the specialist advisor's intention was preferably to meet NK at approx. two-week intervals.

At the second meeting, NK submits his principal outline of the specialization report and a very large part of the report, almost completely written. NK has found relevant texts and illustrations in publications and on the internet, and also includes minutes of interviews with a production manager and a construction manager. The extent of the text is great and greatly exceeds that stated in the specialization report guidelines. MW points this out and also that it is difficult to perceive NK's independent work. He therefore advises NK to look at his definition of the task again to guide his own work on the material collected. MW also advises NK to differentiate clearly between what are quotations and what is NK's own work, and to mark this clearly in the specialization report with precise references to sources. MW and NK agree to meet again a week later and also that NK can send the revised specialization report to MW by mail for comments no later than 2 days before the meeting.

NK sends his project by mail to MW as agreed. MW reviews it and manages to return his comments to NK before the meeting. The extent of the specialization report is now within the described framework, but there is little independent work and reflection on the information collected. The third meeting therefore concentrates on this, and MW advises NK to focus on this matter.

SPECIALIZATION REPORT

A2018

Appendix C - A made up example

For the specialist advisor & external examiner

2018.01.02



2/2

So much time has passed that there is only 1 month left before the specialization report is to be submitted. NK asks whether MW can accept the remaining meetings to be held by electronic means. MW accepts this, as it is probably the best option under the given circumstances. NK works on, but only manages to send the nearly finished result to his specialist advisor 1 week before it is due to be submitted. MW answers at once and concentrates his guidance on advising NK to reflect and conclude, with reference to the definition set for the task. MW hears no more from NK before receiving the finished result.

Mark Wright prepares his advice to the external examiner and completes the school's standard form. Most of the x's are put in the "Sufficient" column, and some in the "Average or good" column under "Collected documentation - relevance and currency" and "word processing". As a supplementary note, MW writes that detailed independent work on the material is lacking. As specific deficiencies, MW mentions missing references to sources in two significant sections, which are just a rewrite of a section of "report xx". Furthermore, there is a lack of a clear relationship between the questions in the definition of the task and the conclusions.

In the assessment, the external examiner and the specialist advisor consider NK's performance.

The external examiner Kate Clear, indicates that she regards the lack of clarity in references on the two large sections and the weak independent work as a whole as particularly significant shortfalls. She therefore does not consider an sufficient performance to have been demonstrated.

The assessment ends up with the mark 00.