**MARK SHEET – Planning change in the workplace**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Centre Number :** | |  | | **Centre Name :** | | |  | | | |
| **Learner Registration No :** | |  | | **Learner Name:** | | |  | | | |
| **INSTRUCTIONS FOR ASSESSMENT AND USE OF MARK SHEET**  Assessment must be conducted with reference to the assessment criteria (AC). In order to pass the unit, every AC must be met.  Assessors will normally award marks for every AC and then total them into a percentage. However, for greater simplicity, there is the option to not use marks at all and merely indicate with a ‘Pass’ or ‘Referral’ in the box (below right). In order to pass the unit every AC must receive a ‘Pass’.  **Where marks are awarded according to the degree to which the learner’s evidence in the submission meets each AC, every AC must be met, i.e. receive at least half marks (e.g. min 10/20). Any AC awarded less than the minimum produces an automatic referral for the submission (regardless of the overall mark achieved).**  Sufficiency descriptors are provided as guidance. If 20 marks are available for an AC and the evidence in the submission approximates to the ‘pass’ descriptor, that indicates it should attract 10 marks out of 20, if a ‘good pass’ then ca. 15 out of 20. The descriptors are not comprehensive, and cannot be, as there are many ways in which a submission can exceed or fall short of the requirements. | | | | | | | | 1. **Learner named above confirms authenticity of submission.** 2. **ILM uses learners’ submissions – on an anonymous basis – for assessment standardisation.  By submitting, I agree that ILM may use this script on condition that all information which may identify me is removed.**   **However, if you are unwilling to allow ILM use your script, please refuse by ticking the box: □** | | |
| **Learning Outcome / Section 1:** Understand the forces for change in an organisation | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria (AC)** | **Sufficiency Descriptors**  *[Typical standard that , if replicated across the whole submission, would produce a referral, borderline pass or good pass result]* | | | | | | | | **Assessor feedback on AC** | |
| AC 1.1  Identify the forces that may require own organisation to change by conducting a simple PESTLE or SWOT analysis | **Referral [ca. 5/20]** | | **Pass [10/20]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 15/20]** | | |  | |
| * A SWOT or PESTLE analysis is not found or, if given, is incomplete or incorrect * A SWOT or PESTLE is given **but** does not recognisably identify forces that may require change in the organisation **and/or** analyses the change itself rather than forces that may require change | | * A simple SWOT or PESTLE analysis is conducted (and is provided in the submission) that is complete and accurate **and** appropriately identifies forces that may require own organisation to change, although this identification may be more implicit than explicit | | | * A detailed and insightful SWOT and/or PESTLE analysis is given that is complete, accurate and is weighted * Forces are explicitly identified that may require own organisation to change * A wide range of different forces, both internal and external, is identified | | |
| / 20  (min. of 10) | Pass or Referral |
| **Section comments** (optional): | | | | | **Verification comments** (optional): | | | | | |
| **Learning Outcome / Section 2:** Know how to identify and plan change in an organisation | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria (AC)** | **Sufficiency Descriptors**  *[Typical standard that , if replicated across the whole submission, would produce a referral, borderline pass or good pass result]* | | | | | | | | **Assessor feedback on AC** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AC 2.1  Give an example of change required in the workplace reflecting the SWOT or PESTLE analysis | **Referral [ca. 7/28]** | **Pass [14/28]** | **Good Pass [ca. 21/28]** |  | |
| * No example is found of a change required in the workplace * An example is given **but** it is minimal or inappropriate and/ordoes not reflect the SWOT or PESTLE analysis | * The provided example of change required in the workplace is appropriate **and** clearly reflects the SWOT or PESTLE analysis | * A detailed example of required change in the workplace is given and is appropriate, realistic and is put into context * How the example was derived from an analysis of the SWOT and/or PESTLE model is described |
| / 28  (min. of 14) | Pass or Referral |
| AC 2.2  Identify relevant human and financial factors in the consideration of planning change within the context of the example given | **Referral [ca. 5/20]** | **Pass [10/20]** | **Good Pass [ca. 15/20]** | **Assessor feedback on AC** | |
| * Human and financial factors in the consideration of planning change are not recognisably identified or, if identified, are incomplete or unclear * Human **or** financial factors are identified **but** not both | * In the consideration of planning change within the context of the example given for the last AC, at least two human **and** at least two financial factors are briefly identified | * Both human **and** financial factors in the consideration of planning change are identified in detail * Several human **and** several financial factors are described and quantified in detail |  | |
| / 20  (min. of 10) | Pass or Referral |
| AC 2.3  Explain how to communicate with and involve people to facilitate effective change | **Referral [ca. 4/16]** | **Pass [8/16]** | **Good Pass [ca. 12/16]** | **Assessor feedback on AC** | |
| * Nothing is given on how to communicate with and involve people in order to facilitate effective change * A way is explained but is minimal, inappropriate or is merely stated, as opposed to explained | * A explanation is given of how to communicate with **and** involve people in order to facilitate effective change, although the description may be limited | * Methods of both communicating with and involving people are explained in detail and the ways in which they facilitate effective change are made explicit and clear |  | |
| / 16  (min. of 8) | Pass or Referral |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AC 2.4  Use a technique for planning change within the given context | **Referral [ca. 4/16]** | | **Pass [8/16]** | | **Good Pass [ca. 12/16]** | | **Assessor feedback on AC** | |
| * No evidence of a technique for planning change having been used and no recognisable plan is provided * Evidence is given of the use of a planning technique **but t**he produced plan is minimal, incorrect or inappropriate and/orthe planned change has nothing to do withthat identified for AC 2.1 | | * A plan is given, using a recognised technique for planning change (e.g. Gantt chart or network planning) within the context identified for AC 2.1, although the technique may be simple and/or the produced plan may be limited | | * Detailed evidence is given of the application of a technique for planning change and a step-by-step explanation of how it was used for planning change within the given context | |  | |
| / 16  (min. of 8) | Pass or Referral |
| **Section comments** (optional): | | | | **Verification comments** (optional): | | | | |
|  | | | | | | **/ 100**  **TOTAL MARKS** | | |
| **Assessor’s Decision** | | | | **Quality Assurance Use** | | | | |
| **Outcome** (*delete as applicable*): **PASS / REFERRAL** | | **Signature of Assessor:**  **Date:** | | **Outcome** (*delete as applicable*): **PASS / REFERRAL** | | | **Signature of QA:**  **Date of QA check:** | |