

ENGG 513 – Winter 2017 – Case Study Report

1. Introduction

This assignment for ENGG 513 is worth 10% of the final grade and is a case study report based on APEGA Discipline Committee Decision, Case No.: 11-008-FH¹ involving Mr. Pybus and DFK Engineering Ltd. The report will be graded out of 10 marks.

2. Requirements

The requirements for the report are listed below:

2.1. The format of the report shall be as follows:

- Maximum 5 pages, plus title page, plus references
- 12 pt font
- Page numbers
- The title page must have:
 - Course Name
 - Report Title
 - Student Name and Student Number
 - Date
 - Instructor Name

2.2. There must be citations and references as appropriate. Use quotations only when necessary and the intent of this report is for you to summarize and paraphrase the case. Please be mindful of University policies on plagiarism².

¹ <https://www.apega.ca/assets/PDFs/discipline-decisions/11-008-FH.pdf>

² <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/k-2.html>

2.3. The report must follow the following template, including section headings. Use subheadings as appropriate.

Introduction

(approximately 0.25 page) Introduce the report and give a very brief overview.

Stakeholders

(maximum 0.25 page per stakeholder) Describe the key stakeholders associated with this case. It is up to the student to identify stakeholders.

Case Summary

(approximately 1-2 pages) Describe the background to the case and the charges to the professional engineer. Describe the findings and the disciplinary orders. Do not try to reproduce every detail, but rather, summarize the main points to form a coherent narrative.

Investigation and Analysis

(approximately 1-2 pages) This section is the most important part of the report. Provide your opinion on whether the professional engineer violated any of APEGA's rules under the Code of Ethics and under APEGA's definition of Professional Misconduct. Include the violations identified by APEGA's Disciplinary Committee, but also try to determine if any other violations also occurred.

- Explain what is meant by the principle of “ball park justice” as referred to in the Disciplinary Orders.
- Explain what is a Professional Practice Management Plan.
- State the APEGA rule(s) you believe the engineer violated (write them out in *italics*) as a reference. Provide justification for why you believe the rule(s) was violated.
- Explain what the engineer could have done to prevent any disciplinary action for this case.

References

Select an appropriate referencing and citation format (IEEE, APA, MLA, etc.).

2.4. Due date Monday February 13. Submit a PDF version of your report to the course's Dropbox (ASSESSMENTS > Dropbox > Case Study Report). Please do not submit a paper copy and do not email a copy to the instructor, these will not be graded.

3. Rubric

The grade will be interpolated from the following guidance.

(10 marks)

Grade	Performance
3	Poor. Report has major flaws or it is apparent that minimal effort has been taken; or has very poorly done or missing sections; or writing quality is poor and significantly detracts from the report.
6	Good. The report is complete and there are minor flaws with some sections; or writing quality detracts from the report.
8	Excellent. All features of the report are present and there are minor flaws with at most one report section, but has a good investigation and analysis section. The writing quality is good with at most minor flaws.
10	Outstanding. Report is complete, and has a very strong investigation and analysis section. Report is very well-written with excellent structure and organization, including appropriate headings and subheadings.