

- Whenever you use a course concept to make a point, provide enough descriptive detail or concrete evidence to show that you understand the concept and that it applies in the way you claim.
- Avoid listing multiple concepts within a sentence. Only use a concept when applying it to make an analytical point about the event or about an improvement step. If concepts are presented adjacently, they are typically just being listed rather than applied in an adequately evidence-based manner.

An overarching principle to keep in mind is that because good management is evidence-based (see Unit 2), it is important to provide evidence for the statements you make in all assignments.

Assessment Criteria

%	Criterion	Fail	Pass	Credit	Distinction	High Distinction
20%	Analysis of Organisational Context	No concepts or irrelevant concepts used in analysis. No identification of key organisational elements.	Limited application of course concepts. Inappropriate interpretation of the concepts. Limited identification of key organisational elements.	Appropriate application of concepts, but poor choice, limited range or too many concepts chosen. Generic identification and description of key organisational elements.	Good choice and application of concepts for analysing the organisation. Good and careful identification and description of key organisational elements.	Insightful choice of concepts for analysing the organisation. Clear analysis that apply concepts in an insightful and compelling way. Insightful integration of the conclusions of different tools and concepts. Excellent identification and description of key organisational elements.
25%	Analysis of Specific Incident	Minimal to no clarity about how relevant course concepts illuminate cause and effect relationships Description rather than analysis Very sketchy and incomplete causal analysis No concepts or irrelevant concepts used in analysis.	Description only. Unsupported assertions, limited or no use of course concepts to analyse cause, effect, and outcomes Major gaps in the analysis of the challenge(s) and what you did to handle them. Major gaps in the causal analysis Uses only a few relevant course concepts	Reasonably tight logic about cause and effect relationships. Some gaps in the causal analysis Some gaps in the analysis of the challenge(s) and what you did to handle them Applies a range of relevant concepts to demonstrate application of course materials	Tight logic about a range of cause and effect relationships Sound depth and breadth in the analysis of the challenge(s) that you faced and the key elements in what you did Some attempts at critical evaluation of concepts and frameworks Applies a wide range of relevant concepts to demonstrate appreciation of the course materials	Outstandingly tight logic about a range of interrelated cause and effect relationships Very strong depth and breadth in the analysis of the challenge(s) that you faced and the key elements in what you did Considerable reflection and insight Applies a wide range of relevant concepts to demonstrate appreciation of course materials Plus one or more of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovative and insightful use of concepts • Critique of the limitations of the concepts Extension/development of course concepts
5%	Description of Specific Incident	Discussion of an issue, aspiration, predicament, habit, or saga (i.e. chain of events), rather than a specific incident	Verbose in alluding to the incident(s) that you (and/or others) might have handled more effectively and/or and what resulted	Reasonably succinct and clear about your action(s) and outcome(s) in the focal incident	Very succinct and clear about your action(s) and outcome(s) in the focal incident	Extremely succinct and clear about your specific action(s) and outcome(s) in the focal incident

%	Criterion	Fail	Pass	Credit	Distinction	High Distinction
			from your actions			
20%	Improvement Planning	Few or no specific personal improvement initiatives No connection between plan and analysis No obstacles identified No criteria or procedure to monitor or evaluate progress.	Minimally logically-derived SMARTER + personal action plans The steps do not follow a logical sequence and has minimal connection to the analysis A marked lack of specificity in the identified obstacles or obstacles are not identified. Limited account of how to monitor and evaluate progress	Reasonably logically-derived SMARTER+ personal action plans Some lack of logic in the sequence of steps and steps only partly justified and connected to the analysis Some lack of specificity in the identified obstacles and in the strategies for overcoming them. Lack of specificity or practicality in monitoring and evaluating progress.	Logically-derived SMARTER+ personal action plans Steps are outlined in logical sequence and justified and connected to the analysis Specific obstacles are identified and strategies for overcoming them are outlined. Identifies specific and practical methods for monitoring and evaluating progress with clear and comprehensive evaluation criteria	Exemplary logically-derived SMARTER+ personal action plans Steps are outlined in logical sequence and justified and connected to the analysis A number of specific obstacles are identified Specific practical strategies for overcoming them are described Strategies for overcoming obstacles are innovative and insightful Identifies specific and practical methods for monitoring and evaluating progress with clear and comprehensive evaluation criteria
10%	Organisation, clarity of expression	Unclear, disorganized, or incoherent writing. No or incorrect citation of sources. Very poor use of paragraphs and other structural devices Numerous errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar Format inconsistent with submission guidelines	Some attempt to organise in a logical manner but lacking clarity of expression. Sections disjointed or contradictory. Missing citation of sources, and sources are cited and referenced with some errors or missing detail. Some errors in spelling, punctuation and/ or grammar Very limited attempt to meet formatting, length and referencing requirements	Good organisation and coherence and mostly written clearly. Minor errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation Sources are cited and referenced with some errors or missing detail. Format consistent with all assignment submission guidelines	Carefully and logically organised and written clearly. Good internal flow. No errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation Citations and references list almost fully complete and correct, but with occasional errors Format consistent with all assignment submission guidelines	Shows a polished and imaginative approach to the report with compelling clarity of expression. Report is structured very clearly. No missing citation of sources and cited sources are cited correctly. No errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation Format consistent with all assignment submission guidelines
20%	Quality of arguments: logic and integration	Arguments aren't logical, justified or integrated. Logic unclear. No concepts mentioned or concepts applied inaccurately No linkages made between concepts	Arguments are logical but evidence to support arguments is weak No consideration of alternative viewpoints. Includes instances of inaccurate concept usage Concepts used individually without attempts at establishing linkages	Logical argument with some evidence (data, theory, benchmarking or comparison to alternatives) given to justify the argument. Little consideration of alternative viewpoints. Most concepts applied accurately Some attempt at linking and integrating concepts	Coherent logical arguments which are strongly justified by evidence. Good consideration of alternative viewpoints. Concepts applied accurately Consistent linking and integration of concepts	Strong logical arguments with excellent evidence that support consistent and coherent analyses. Concepts consistently applied with exemplary accuracy. Excellent consideration made of different sides of the argument using evidence. Highly insightful linking and integration of concepts