**MARK SHEET – Managing the analysis of secondary data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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:** Be able to gather and evaluate complex data from diverse secondary sources | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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**  *[comments not necessary in every box]* | | |
| AC 1.1  Identify a research topic which is relevant to the organisation | **Referral [ca. 2/*8*]** | | **Pass [*4/8*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 6/*8*]** | | | | |  | | |
| * There is no evidence that the research topic is relevant to the organisation * No objectives are set for the research | | * There is limited evidence that the research topic is relevant to the organisation * Limited but sufficient research objectives are set | | | * There is clear evidence that the research topic is relevant to the organisation * Detailed research objectives are set that cover the full scope of the research | | | | |
| / 8  (min. of 4) | | Pass or Referral |
| AC 1.2  Collect secondary data from a wide range of academic, official and commercial sources, ensuring that all sources are acknowledged | **Referral [ca. 6/24]** | | **Pass [*12/24*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 18/24]** | | | | |  | | |
| * Secondary data has not been collected, or secondary data collection is limited and does not reflect the range of sources available for the topic * Secondary data collection is limited and is restricted to one media, e.g. web sites * Sources are not acknowledged and/or a recognised referencing system is not used or is used inappropriately | | * Secondary data collection reflects the range of sources available for the topic * Secondary data has been collected from a range of sources, and is not restricted to one media * The majority of sources are acknowledged and a recognised referencing system is used appropriately | | | * Secondary data collection fully reflects the wide range of current sources available for the topic and is collected from a variety of media * Sources are always acknowledged and referencing is comprehensive and always accurate using a recognised referencing system | | | | |
| / 24  (min. of 12) | | Pass or Referral |
| AC 1.3  Analyse collected data to judge its relevance and validity, make deductions, and draw conclusions | **Referral [ca. 6/24]** | | **Pass [*12/24*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 18/24]** | | | | |  | | |
| * The relevance and validity of the data is not clear * Deductions and conclusions not provided, are insufficient, or are not justified by an analysis of the data | | * The relevance and validity of the data is clear, although not all data collected is necessary * Deductions and conclusions are derived from a good analysis of the data | | | * The relevance and validity of all data is clear * Deductions and conclusions are derived from an accurate and comprehensive analysis of the data | | | | |
| / 24  (min. of 12) | | Pass or Referral |
| **Assessment comments** (optional): | | | | | **Verification comments** (optional): | | | | | | | | |
| **Learning Outcome / Section 2:** Be able to review the findings from own analysis of data | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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**  *[comments not necessary in every box]* | | |
| AC 2.1  Lead a group discussion on the findings from own analysis | **Referral [ca. 3/12]** | | **Pass [*6/12*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 9/12]** | | | | |  | | |
| * No evidence of leading a group discussion is provided, or the group discussion is not based on the findings of the candidate’s own analysis | | * Limited but sufficient evidence of leading a group discussion of the data analysis is provided | | | * Comprehensive evidence of leading a group discussion of the data analysis is provided | | | | |
| / 12  (min. of 6) | | Pass or Referral |
| AC 2.2  Evaluate the outcomes from the group discussion of the data analysis | **Referral [ca. 3/12]** | | **Pass [*6/12*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 9/12]** | | | | |  | | |
| * Evidence is provided of participating in a group discussion on the findings of the candidate’s own analysis, but no outcomes from the discussion are provided, or outcomes are merely listed or described rather than evaluated | | * Outcomes from the group discussion are evaluated (rather than listed or described) to provide a limited solution, conclusion or recommendations | | | * Outcomes from the group discussion are evaluated to provide a focused solution, conclusion or recommendations | | | | |
| / 12  (min. of 6) | | Pass or Referral |
| **Section comments** (optional): | | | | | **Verification comments** (optional): | | | | | | | | |
| **Learning Outcome / Section 3:** Be able to review research activity and identify areas for future self-development | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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**  *[comments not necessary in every box]* | | |
| AC 3.1  Review the effectiveness of the research activity against the objectives set | **Referral [ca. 3/12]** | | **Pass [*6/12*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 9/12]** | | | | |  | | |
| * Review of the effectiveness of the research activity is limited in scope, or the effectiveness of the research activity is described rather than reviewed | | * The research activity is reviewed using limited but sufficient evidence and considers what worked well and what didn’t work well | | | * All aspects of the research activity are reviewed using detailed evidence to detail what worked well and what didn’t work well | | | | |
| / 12  (min. of 6) | | Pass or Referral |
| AC 3.2  Prepare and justify a self-development plan to improve own performance when managing research activities | **Referral [ca. 2/8]** | | **Pass [*4/8*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 6/8]** | | | | |  | | |
| * A self-development plan is not prepared, or the self-development plan is not justified, or the self-development plan is not based on own performance when managing research activities * Areas for improvement are not identified, or lack focus and are generic | | * The self-development plan is justified by reference to the review of own performance when managing research activities, although further work is required for full implementation of the plan * Areas for improvement are specific and linked to the research activity and indicate what would be done differently next time | | | * The self-development plan is justified by reference to the review of own performance when managing all aspects of research activities and requires no additional work for full implementation * Areas for improvement are specific, linked to the research activity, and detail what would be done differently next time | | | | |
| / 8  (min. of 4) | | 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 of QA Check:** | | | **Outcome** (*delete as applicable*): **PASS / REFERRAL** | | | | | **Signature of QA:**  **Date of QA check:** | | | |