**MARK SHEET – Critical Thinking and Research Skills in Leadership and Management**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 conduct research in relation to leadership and management** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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   * Undertake research in emerging themes in leadership and management using an appropriate methodology | **Referral [ca.*6/24*]** | | **Pass [*12 marks*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 18/24]** | | | |  | |
| * Research into emerging themes in leadership and management is not undertaken, or the research is insufficient, deficient or inappropriate, or the research methodology is incorrect or inappropriate * The research explores dated, traditional or established themes and models in leadership and management as opposed to emerging themes in leadership and management | | * Limited, but sufficient and appropriate and correct, research into emerging themes in leadership and management is undertaken using an appropriate research methodology | | | * Detailed and appropriate research into emerging themes in leadership and management is undertaken using an appropriate and justified research methodology and a wide range of authoritative sources | | | |
| / 24  (min. of 12) | Pass or Referral |
| AC 1.2   * Evaluate research outcomes and potential implications for own area of responsibility | **Referral [ca.*6/24*]** | | **Pass [*12 marks*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 18/24]** | | | |  | |
| * Research outcomes are not evaluated, or the evaluation is insufficient or inappropriate * Research outcomes are merely described with no evaluation to ascertain the usefulness of the research and to draw conclusions or to make recommendations in terms of potential implications for own area of responsibility | | * Research outcomes are sufficiently and appropriately evaluated to ascertain the usefulness of the research and to draw limited conclusions or to make limited recommendations in terms of potential implications for own area of responsibility | | | * Research outcomes are rigorously evaluated to ascertain the usefulness of the research and to draw detailed conclusions or to make detailed and well-reasoned recommendations in terms of potential implications for own area of responsibility | | | |
| / 24  (min. of 12) | Pass or Referral |
| **Section comments** (optional): | | | | | **Verification comments** (optional): | | | | | | |
| **Learning Outcome / Section 2: Be able to think critically in relation to leadership and management** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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   * Critically review contemporary thinking in respect of leadership and management best practice | **Referral [ca.*6/24*]** | | **Pass [*12 marks*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 18/24]** | | | |  | |
| * There is no critical review of contemporary thinking in respect of leadership and management best practice, or the critical review is incorrect, deficient or inappropriate * The critical review explores dated, traditional or established thinking in respect of leadership and management best practice and does not take account of recent developments in contemporary thinking * Contemporary thinking in respect of leadership and management best practice is merely described with no critical review from different perspectives using a combination of evidence and theory to make a judgement as to its validity or relevance | | * A limited, but sufficient and appropriate and correct, critical review from different perspectives using a combination of limited but sufficient evidence and relevant theory is undertaken of contemporary thinking in respect of leadership and management best practice to make a limited but reasoned judgement as to its validity or relevance | | | * A thorough and rigorous critical review from different perspectives using a combination of a wide evidence base and relevant theory is undertaken of contemporary thinking in respect of leadership and management best practice to make a detailed and well-reasoned judgement as to its validity or relevance | | | |
| / 24  (min. of 12) | Pass or Referral |
| AC 2.2   * Evaluate outcomes and potential implications for own area of responsibility and professional development | **Referral [ca.*7/28*]** | | **Pass [*14 marks*]** | | | **Good Pass [ca. 21/28]** | | | |  | |
| * Outcomes are not evaluated, or the evaluation is deficient or inappropriate, or outcomes are merely described with no evaluation to draw conclusions or to make recommendations in terms of potential implications for own area of responsibility and professional development * The evaluation draws conclusions or makes recommendations in terms of potential implications for own area of responsibility or professional development, but not both | | * Outcomes are sufficiently and appropriately evaluated to draw limited conclusions or to make limited recommendations in terms of potential implications for own area of responsibility and professional development | | | * Outcomes are rigorously evaluated to draw detailed and well-reasoned conclusions or to make detailed and well-reasoned recommendations in terms of potential implications for own area of responsibility and professional development | | | |
| / 28  (min. of 14) | 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:** | |