

## **Appendix AJ - Assessment Criteria for Industrial Year Reports**

### **Threshold criteria**

In order to pass (i.e. to get a mark of 40% or more) the report must:

- be in a typographically and structurally appropriate format, with comparatively few grammatical, typographical or stylistic errors;
- explain the core purpose or functions of the organisation for which you worked;
- describe the environment – technical and organisational – within which you were working;
- describe what you were doing during your time in industry.

A report that meets all of the criteria listed above will receive a mark of at least 40%; a report that does not meet all of the criteria will receive a mark of less than 40%. It is rare that a student who has completed a placement satisfactorily submits a report that gets a mark of less than 40%.

### **80% upwards**

A report in this range must be of a standard that would do credit to a professional consultant working for a prestigious firm. This means it will:

- be typographically more or less faultless and free from grammatical errors;
- be clear, concise and free of unnecessary jargon, particularly 'management-speak';
- be free from factual errors or misconceptions;
- enable the reader to understand easily and accurately what the organisation you were working for does and what your role in its activities was. To achieve this you will have to select the material you include judiciously and structure it appropriately;
- give a clear picture of the environment in which you worked;
- demonstrate a thorough understanding of both the good and the bad aspects of the environment in which you were working, including, for example, limitations of the organisation's business model.

Few students are capable of producing work of this standard but there are usually one or two in each year.

### **70 to 79%**

A mark in this range indicates a report that would be acceptable from a professional consultant but is definitely capable of improvement. Such a report will have the following characteristics:

- there are few typographical errors and any grammatical errors are minor;
- while the report is generally clear and concise, there are sentences or paragraphs that are too long or complicated, and passages that are obscure because of the jargon they use;
- any factual errors or misconceptions are comparatively minor;
- while the report will give the reader a good overall picture of what the organisation you were working for does and what your role was, there will be some gaps or areas of confusion;
- the description of the environment in which you worked will be generally clear but there may be one or two areas that are confused;
- while the report will demonstrate an understanding of both good and bad features of the environment, the understanding may not extend to some of the more profound issues.

Experience suggests that, in most years, somewhere between 20 and 30% of the reports will be of this quality.

## **60 to 69%**

A mark in this range indicates a report that can be considered a good piece of student work but is not of professional standard. Typically,

- there will be few typographical or grammatical errors;
- the material will be factually correct but there will be significant gaps;
- the description of the work you did and the company's activities will be pedestrian and unselective;
- the assessment of the benefit you obtained from the year out will be sensible and realistic but the critical evaluation of the environment will be superficial.

## **50 to 59%**

A report receiving a mark in this range will give a reasonable picture of the organisation you worked for and what you did during your year but it will have significant shortcomings and would need to be completely rewritten before it could be sent to a client. Examples of likely weaknesses are:

- there will be typographical or grammatical errors on most pages;
- some passages in the report will be difficult to understand because they are badly written;
- the report will contain significant factual errors, misconceptions or gaps;
- the report will give the reader a one-sided view of the organisation or the work you did during your year;
- while the report describes adequately the benefits that you obtained from your year out, there is no assessment of the environment in which you were working.

## **40 to 49%**

A report in this range will contain enough information for the reader to understand in broad terms what the company you worked for does and what you did while working for it. It will, however, have substantial shortcomings, such as:

- frequent typographical and grammatical errors;
- much of the report will be difficult to read because of the way it's written or because it's badly structured;
- there will be significant gaps in coverage, as well as significant errors and misconceptions;
- the report will give a very narrow view of what the company does and what you did during your year;
- the report will contain little, if any, assessment of the environment or the benefits you got from the year.

A mark in this range is usually the result of lack of effort and leaving things to the last minute.

## **30 to 39%**

While containing a significant amount of correct and relevant material, a report that gains a mark in this range will fail to address at least one of the key areas as well as being badly written and difficult to understand.

It is rare that a student who has completed a placement satisfactorily gets a mark as low as this.

## **less than 30%**

A report that fails to address the key areas – what the company does, the environment in which you worked and what you did – will get a mark in this range. It normally indicates that you have failed to take the requirement to produce a report seriously.

MFB

10.5.95

Revised 11.9.96, 1.9.99 MFB

Revised 9.10.03, 7.8.09 AIS

Revised 25.1.11, 27.10.12, MFB

Revised and assessment criteria added 10.1.15 MFB