

BUSS6000 Simulation Report Marking Rubric

	Fail: 0-49%	Pass: 50-64%	Credit: 65-74%	Distinction: 75-84%	High Distinction: 85-100%		
Demonstrate ability to identify, select and analyse business knowledge. 15 marks	Insufficient attempt to identify, select & analyse appropriate business knowledge. Analysis is absent, missing or severely limited to description. Reference to relevant or appropriate scholarly literature is absent or incomplete.	Demonstrates a basic ability to identify, select & analyse business knowledge. A description is present but may be incomplete, lacking appropriate detail, or contain little analytic insight. Consideration of relevant or appropriate literature is limited.	Demonstrates a sound ability to identify, select & analyse business knowledge. Support for the analysis is adequately reinforced with reference to data and/or observations from the simulation. Includes reference to relevant literature.	A superior level of identifying, selecting & analysing business knowledge. A rich and clear analysis is present. Critical and selective integration of literature, and data and/or observations from the simulation. Demonstrates critical insight and independent thought.	Demonstrates an outstanding ability to identify, select & analyse business knowledge. Sophisticated analysis that balances breadth and depth across critically selective and thoughtfully integrated literature. Creative and critical engagement with education literature and simulation data and observations. Work demonstrates exceptional creativity, originality and critical insight.		
Apply critical thinking to business practice, using materials from the unit tutorials, lectures and readings. 15 marks	Insufficient attempt to critically examine competitive strategy and simulation performance. Insufficient awareness of assumptions. Assertions made without appropriate consideration. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question, or are not considered at all. Contextual factors not considered in relation to the position being taken. Fails to adequately identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusions are simplistic summaries or absolute without nuance.	Demonstrates a basic ability to describe competitive strategy and simulation performance. Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question. Begins to identify some contextual factors when presenting a position. A position is stated but is simplistic and obvious. Conclusions are inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed or the related outcomes are oversimplified.	Demonstrates a sound ability to analyse competitive strategy and simulation performance. An awareness of assumptions and questions some of these. Viewpoints of experts are incorporated with some questioning. Identifies several relevant contextual factors when presenting a position. Specific position acknowledges different sides of an issue. Conclusions are logically tied to information and related outcomes/consequences are identified clearly.	Demonstrates a superior ability to analyse competitive strategy and simulation performance. Identifies own and others' assumptions. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning and limitations acknowledged within position. Several relevant contexts analysed when presenting a position. Carefully considers assumptions and the relevant evidence. Qualifies own assertions. Consequences are considered, integrated and ambiguities acknowledged. Specific position considers the complexities of an issue. Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints.	Demonstrates an outstanding ability to analyse competitive strategy and simulation performance. Thoroughly analyses own and others' assumptions. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly, limitations overcome and/or synthesised within position taken. Carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position. Qualifies own assertions. Consequences are considered, integrated and well developed. Ambiguities are thoughtfully considered. Specific position is imaginative and thoroughly considers the complexities of issues. Limits of position are acknowledged. Conclusions and consequences are logical and reflect student’s informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.		
Solve complex problems through appropriate forms of business analysis. 15 marks	An insufficient attempt at demonstrating appropriate problem-solving skills and business analysis. Description of appropriate target issues absent, missing, or severely limited. Target issues not clearly connected to the contextual description. Little or no definition or scope to target issues identified. Little or no rationale or logical progression between target issues and the proposed solutions. Relevant risks and ramifications of proposed solutions are not identified, evaluated or managed appropriately.	Demonstrates a basic ability to show problem-solving skills and perform business analysis. A basic attempt at identifying and explaining appropriate target issues. Target issues are tentatively connected to the contextual analysis but lacks clear rationale. Limited definition and scope of target issues. Sufficient rationale or logical progression between target issues and proposed solutions but may be weak or flawed. Some attempt made to manage risk or include of ramifications of proposed solutions but may lack depth or suitability.	Demonstrates a sound ability to show problem-solving skills and perform business analysis. Sound identification of appropriate target issues. Target issues are connected to the contextual analysis and reasonable rationale provided. Adequate definition and scope of target issues. The rationale between target issues and proposed solutions are adequately articulated and coherent. Risks and ramifications of the implementation of proposed solutions are reasonably identified. Strategies to manage risk are clearly identified and evidenced.	Demonstrates a superior ability to show problem-solving skills and perform business analysis. Superior identification and analysis of target issues. Clear and logical rationale linking appropriate target issues with the contextual analysis. Target issues are well-defined, and the scope of problems are thoughtfully considered. The rationale between target issues and proposed solutions are clearly articulated and coherent. Risks and ramifications of the implementation of proposed solutions are thoroughly considered and justified. Strategies to manage risk are identified and evaluated.	Demonstrates an outstanding ability to show problem-solving skills and perform business analysis Target issues clearly and expertly defined and the scope of the problem thoughtfully considered. Thoroughly considered rationale behind the selection of appropriate target issues which is logically integrated with the contextual analysis. Target issues may demonstrate novel perspectives on the simulation or theoretical constraints/application. The proposed solutions convincingly address the target issues. The rationale between target issues and proposed solutions are clearly articulated, coherent and concise. The proposed solutions may demonstrate exceptional creativity or originality. Strategies to manage risk are thoroughly considered and evaluated.		
Effective communication in the form of professional writing skills. 15 marks	An insufficient attempt at demonstrating professional writing skills. Written language does not adhere to the principles of academic writing nor include scholarly perspectives. Citations and references to scholarly work are absent, inappropriate, or incomplete. Grammar and spelling pose a significant barrier to the reader’s comprehension. Figures and/or tables are used inappropriately or incorrectly. Ideas and information need substantial work in order to organise a logical narrative.	A basic attempt at demonstrating professional writing skills. Structure and written language are interpretable but sometimes unclear. References to scholarly works are limited, poorly cited, or poorly selected. Written language presents some barrier to the reader’s comprehension. If used, figures and/or tables are generally clear but poorly selected or displayed. A basic attempt at organising ideas and information to form a logical narrative.	A sound attempt at demonstrating professional writing skills. Clear written structure and appropriate scholarly language. References to scholarly works are appropriate. There may be some grammatical or spelling errors, but none that pose any significant barrier to reader comprehension. If used, figures and/or tables are clear and integrated appropriately. A sound attempt at organising ideas and information to form a logical narrative.	A superior demonstration of professional writing skills. Clear and logical written structure and progression of argument. References to scholarly works are appropriate, subjected to some critical review, and are largely well integrated. Written language demonstrates precision, clarity, and concision. If appropriate, figures and/or tables are well designed and used. Ideas and informational form a logical narrative that is engaging and thoroughly considered.	An outstanding demonstration of professional writing skills Exceptional written structure and progression of argument. References to the scholarly literature demonstrate exceptional grasp of the subject area, critical selection, and consideration. Citations are well referenced and integrated into the wider work. Written language demonstrates outstanding precision, clarity, and concision. If appropriate, figures and/or tables serve to clarify, complement the written dialogue, and are well integrated. Ideas and information are presented in an exceptionally clear, thoughtful, and engaging narrative.		
Evidence of consideration of group effectiveness. 20 marks	Insufficient evidence of appropriate consideration group effectiveness. Complexities of teamwork are absent or oversimplified. Insufficient or absent evaluation of how well the group managed the processes and outcomes. If present, target issues and/or proposed solutions do make not make appropriate use of related theory or are described without critical insight or appropriate evaluation.	Basic evidence of consideration of group effectiveness. Complexities of teamwork are included at a basic level but lacking nuance. Mainly descriptive of the group’s processes and outcomes. Target issues and/or proposed solutions are basic and not sufficiently analysed or evidenced using appropriate related theory.	Sound evidence of consideration of group effectiveness. Relevant complexities of teamwork are included. A fair evaluation of how well the group managed the processes and outcomes. Target issues and proposed solutions are justified by use of related theory.	Superior evidence of consideration of group effectiveness. Relevant complexities of teamwork are integrated and acknowledged. Thoughtful evaluation of how well the group managed the processes and outcomes. Target issues and proposed solutions are analysed and evidenced by appropriate related theory.	Outstanding evidence of consideration of group effectiveness. Demonstrates thoughtful and critical engagement with key teamworking processes at a group level. Complexities of teamwork are thoughtfully integrated and acknowledged. Novel and insightful evaluation of how well the group managed the processes and outcomes. Target issues and proposed solutions are analysed and evidenced by a creative and thorough use of appropriate related theory.		
Reflection on individual contribution and learnings. 20 marks	Insufficient evidence of appropriate reflection and self-assessment. The reflections on your contribution and learnings did not indicate that the experience was meaningful. Reflections are superficial only, and do not provide sufficient insight into the individual’s role and contribution in the teamworking processes. If any lessons learned are present, they are simplistic or unsubstantiated.	Basic evidence of reflection and self-assessment. The reflection on your contribution and learnings indicated a somewhat meaningful experience. Reflections are largely superficial and only demonstrate minor insight into the individual’s role and contribution in the teamworking processes. Basic lessons learned, but lack depth, detail, or effective use of related theory.	Sound evidence of reflection and self-assessment. The reflection on your contribution and learnings indicated a meaningful experience. Reflections are critical at times and demonstrate insight into the individual’s role and contribution in the teamworking processes. Some lessons learned making use of related theory.	Superior evidence of reflection and self-assessment. The reflection on your contribution and learnings indicated a substantially meaningful experience. Reflections demonstrate thoughtful and critical insight into the individual’s role and contribution in the teamworking processes. Lessons learned are considered and make use of related theory, with some applicability to future scenarios.	Outstanding evidence of reflection and self-assessment. The reflection on your contribution and learnings indicated an enlightening teamworking experience. Reflections demonstrate creative and critical insight into the individual’s role and contribution in the teamworking processes. Lessons learned are novel, well considered, make thoughtful use of related theory, with applicability to future scenarios.		
Word Count Penalty		Late Penalty		Referencing Penalty		Appendix/Appendices	
The word limit for this assessment is 2000 words. Where a student exceeds the word length, the student will lose 10% of the total marks when the submission is 10% above the word length and 10% for each 10% over-length thereafter.		A penalty of 5% (equating to 5 marks out of a total 100 marks) per day applies for each day (24 hours) after the submission date.		A 5% penalty for no references. 1% for every missing or incorrect reference up to a total of 5%.		Any appendices are included in the word count and will not be considered where these exceed the word limit.	