**MARK SHEET – Providing quality to customers**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 importance of quality within the organisation [52 Marks] | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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  Explain the importance of quality to the customer | **Referral [ca.5/20]** | | **Pass [10/20]** | | | **Good Pass [ca.15/20]** | | | | |  | | |
| * The importance of quality to the customer is merely stated as opposed to being explained * An explanation of the importance of quality to the customer **but** is incorrect, inappropriate or minimal | | * An explanation is given of the importance of quality to the customer although the explanation may be limited | | | * A thorough and detailed explanation is given of the importance of quality to the customer | | | | |
| / 20  (min. of 10) | | Pass or Referral |
| AC 1.2  Explain the difference between quality assurance and quality control | **Referral [ca.5/20]** | | **Pass [10/20]** | | | **Good Pass [ca.15/20]** | | | | |  | | |
| No explanation is given of the difference between quality assurance and quality control  An explanation is given of the difference between quality assurance and quality control **but** the explanation is incorrect, inappropriate or minimal  Quality assurance and quality control are explained but the difference between them is not made clear | | The difference between quality assurance and quality control is explained although the differences may be limited | | | Several differences between quality assurance and quality control are explained in detail | | | | |
| / 20  (min. of 10) | | Pass or Referral |
| AC 1.3  Outline a quality system relevant to the organisation | **Referral [ca.3/12]** | | **Pass [6/12]** | | | **Good Pass [ca.9/12]** | | | | |  | | |
| * One quality system relevant to the organisation is merely stated as opposed to being briefly described * A brief description is given ofone quality system relevant to the organisation **but** the description is inappropriate, minimal or is not recognisably related to the organisation | | A brief description is given of one quality system relevant to the organisation | | | * A brief description is given of one quality system relevant to the organisation which may be accompanied by examples or illustrations | | | | |
| / 12  (min. of 6) | | Pass or Referral |
| **Assessment comments** (optional): | | | | | **Verification comments** (optional): | | | | | | | | |
| **Learning Outcome / Section 2:** Know how to deliver quality within the organisation [48 Marks] | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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  Outline a method of monitoring the quality of the team’s work | **Referral [ca.3/12]** | | **Pass [6/12]** | | | **Good Pass [ca.9/12]** | | | | |  | | |
| One method of monitoring the quality of the team’s work is merely stated as opposed to being briefly described  A brief description is given ofone method of monitoring the quality of the team’s work **but** the description is inappropriate, minimal | | A brief description is given of one method of monitoring the quality of the team’s work | | | A brief description is given of one method of monitoring the quality of the team’s work which may be accompanied by illustrations drawn from the workplace | | | | |
| / 12  (min. of 6) | | Pass or Referral |
| AC 2.2  Outline things the team could do to improve quality | **Referral [ca.3/12]** | | **Pass [6/12]** | | | **Good Pass [ca.9/12]** | | | | |  | | |
| * Two things the team could do to improve quality are merely stated as opposed to being briefly described * A brief description is given oftwo things the team could do to improve quality **but** the description is inappropriate, minimal or is | | A brief description is given of two things the team could do to improve quality | | | * A brief description is given of two things the team could do to improve quality which may be accompanied by examples or illustrations drawn from the workplace | | | | |
| / 12  (min. of 6) | | Pass or Referral |
| AC 2.3  Describe a way that the team could measure an improvement in quality | **Referral [ca.6/24]** | | **Pass [12/24]** | | | **Good Pass [ca.18/24]** | | | | |  | | |
| One way that the team could measure an improvement in quality is merely stated as opposed to described  A description is given of one way that the team could measure an improvement in quality **but** the description is incorrect inappropriate or minimal | | * A description is given of one way that the team could measure an improvement in quality although the description may be limited | | | * A thorough and detailed description is given of one way that the team could measure an improvement in quality | | | | |
| / 24  (min. of 12) | | Pass or Referral |
| **Assessment comments** (optional): | | | | | **Verification comments** (optional): | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | **/ 100** | | | **TOTALMARKS** | |
| **Assessor’s Decision** | | | | | **Quality Assurance Use** | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome** (*delete as applicable*): **PASS / REFERRAL** | | | **Outcome** (*delete as applicable*): **PASS / REFERRAL** | | | | | | | | **Date of QA check:** | | |
| **Outcome** (*delete as applicable*): **PASS / REFERRAL** | | **Signature of Assessor:**  **Date:** | | | **Outcome** (*delete as applicable*): **PASS / REFERRAL** | | | | | **Signature of QA:**  **Date of QA check:** | | | |