

2.2 Team dependencies and a repaired handover

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

Total: 24 marks**KEY WORDS** team roles 团队角色 • dependency 依赖关系 • ground rules 基本规则

Objective

Use a task dependency to repair a team handover, distinguish an agreement from a checked result and write a bounded review. This is original GAC006-aligned practice, not an official assessment. All records and course instructions are fictional.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

■ Key knowledge: coordination needs evidence

Team roles 团队角色 describe contributions; people can share or change them. Give each task an owner, required input, handover time and quality check. A **dependency** 依赖关系 means one task needs another task's result.

Ground rules 基本规则 record practical arrangements. Confirm availability and revise a plan when needed. Naming an owner or writing a contract does not prove completion. Raise a delay by naming the event, its effect and a specific request, then record the answer.

Forming, storming, norming and performing are labels in Tuckman's proposed model, not a fixed timetable every team must follow. A leadership label describes how decisions are made; it does not prove that a decision is safe, permitted or correct. Original model.

■ Source A: fictional task brief and plan

The group must submit an accurate survey report by Friday 16:00. The course permits agreed task changes but requires the group to keep its decision record. Unresolved missing work must be raised through the teacher's stated course process.

Mei supplies survey questions. Arun supplies the raw response list. Chen checks the list for duplicate entries and sends the checked totals to Wei by Wednesday 16:00. Wei must use those totals in the findings and send a report draft to the group by Thursday 16:00. Each member must check their own section before Friday's submission.

The group has agreed to report likely delays as soon as they are known. No record gives a rule that one person may change everyone else's task alone.


■ Source B: delay, revision and observed result

At Wednesday 16:20 the checked totals have not arrived. Wei cannot draft the findings from checked figures. He says, “Chen is lazy; the whole report will fail.” The reason for the delay is not yet known.

Wei then asks, “The checked totals were due at 16:00 and the findings depend on them. What is ready, and when can we receive the checked file?” Chen reports that his device was offline. He can download the raw list at 16:40 and needs twenty minutes to check it. Wei confirms he can start the findings at 17:10. The group records a revised 17:00 handover; Thursday’s draft deadline remains unchanged.

Chen sends the checked file at 17:00. Wei confirms receipt at 17:05. The file records twelve entries, including three duplicates, leaving nine unique responses. The team compares it with the raw list and confirms those counts. The report draft and Friday submission have not yet been checked.

■ Worked example: a repaired handover is not a finished report



Revised totals handover: Wednesday 17:00
Thursday draft still needs a recorded accuracy check

Known: the original handover was missed, the findings depended on it, and the group agreed a revision after checking availability. Why check the file? A delivery time proves receipt, not accuracy. The raw-list comparison supports the twelve-entry, three-duplicate and nine-unique counts.

The revised handover happened. This does not establish that the findings or final report are accurate. Wei should compare the draft’s figures and claims with the checked totals before the Thursday handover, record any correction and retain Friday’s section checks.

2 Practice

2.1 Identify the owner of the checked totals and the task that depends on those totals.[2]

2.2 State the observed problem at 16:20 and ONE unsupported judgement in Wei’s first statement. [2]

2.3 Identify the event, task effect and specific request in Wei’s later question. [3]

2.4 Explain why the revised 17:00 handover is feasible using THREE time or availability facts from Source B. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Evaluate THREE claims: “An owner in the plan proves the task was done”; “Sending at 17:00 proves the counts are correct”; “Correct totals prove the whole Friday report is ready”. Give an evidence-based correction and a relevant next check for each. [6]

Solutions

2.1 Chen owns the checked totals; Wei's findings need them. Accept the report findings, not an unrelated task.

2.2 The checked totals had not arrived at 16:20 after the 16:00 deadline. Laziness or inevitable whole-report failure was not established. No reason had yet been recorded at that point.

2.3 Event: the checked totals were due at 16:00 and are missing. Effect: the findings depend on them. Request: identify what is ready and when the checked file can arrive. The question invites information rather than diagnosing a motive.

2.4 Chen can download the list at 16:40; twenty minutes of checking reaches 17:00; Wei is available to start at 17:10, after the revised handover. The later recorded delivery and receipt confirm the handover actually happened; an agreement alone would not prove that.

3.1 Award 2 per claim: correction linked to evidence, relevant check. An assigned owner is a plan: compare the actual delivery with the recorded handover. Sending proves delivery, not accurate counting: compare entries and duplicates with the raw list, as the team did. Correct counts do not establish a finished accurate report: check the findings against the totals and complete the section reviews before submission. Accept equivalent specific checks; do not credit a promised success as evidence.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: missed handover; findings dependence; unsupported judgement corrected; agreed revision; observed delivery/receipt; checked counts and final-report limit; specific next task with recorded accuracy check; coherent truthful 80–110 word review. Example: "The checked totals missed Wednesday's 16:00 handover, so I could not draft the findings from checked figures. I called Chen lazy without knowing the reason. After asking what was ready, we agreed a 17:00 handover and recorded that I could start at 17:10. Chen sent the file at 17:00 and I confirmed receipt. Comparing it with the raw list supported twelve entries, three duplicates and nine unique responses. This does not prove the final report is ready. Before Thursday's draft deadline I will compare its figures and claims with the checked totals and record corrections for the group's section review."