

# Level 7 Assessment Rubric

| Criteria                           | 0-39%  | 40-49%  | 50-59%   | 60-69%  | 70-79%   | 80-89%   | 90-100%   |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Knowledge and understanding</b> |  |   |  |   |  |  |   |
| Content knowledge (10%)            | Demonstrates significant weaknesses in knowledge base, and/or simply reproduces knowledge without any evidence of understanding. | Demonstrates superficial knowledge of the field and awareness of current evidence and issues, but with notable weaknesses. Lacks knowledge and understanding of some key areas. | Demonstrates systematic knowledge and understanding of a specialised field, much of which is at or informed by the forefront of the field of study.        | Work with a well defined focus of the module. The work may include evidence of originality, much of which is at or informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. | Authoritative and tightly-focused work, which demonstrates systematic, in-depth, and specialised knowledge and sophisticated conceptual understanding of the key issues/concepts/ethics, at the forefront of the field of study. | Produces work of outstanding standard, reflecting outstanding understanding of key issues/concepts/ethics.   | Produces work of exceptional standard, reflecting excellent understanding of key issues/concepts/ethics. The work is of publishable level with minimal or no further feedback.                      |
| Critical approach (10%)            | No evidence of a critical approach to the knowledge base.  | Little evidence of a critical approach to the knowledge base.   | Demonstrates sufficient understanding of current theoretical and methodological approaches and how these affect the way the knowledge base is interpreted. | Demonstrates a systematic knowledge, understanding and critical awareness of current problems   | Demonstrates critical awareness of the complexity of contemporary issues in the field, with an original perspective.   | Displays mastery of a complex and specialised area of knowledge and skills, with notable critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the field. | Displays exceptional analysis of a complex and specialised area of knowledge and skills, with critical addressing of current problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the field.            |
| <b>Skills</b>                      |  |   |  |   |  |  |   |
| Use of evidence and sources (5%)   | Not demonstrating an ability to select or use appropriate sources.   | Reliance on a limited selection of sources. They have not demonstrated an ability to critically evaluate research and scholarship in the discipline.                            | Ability to select, evaluate and critique current research and scholarship in the discipline.   | Autonomous selection and critical evaluation of current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline.  | Autonomous and comprehensive selection and critical evaluation of current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline. Creation of coherent substantiated and  | Autonomous and comprehensive selection and outstanding critical evaluation of current research and scholarship in the discipline. Creation of outstanding and highly persuasive    | Autonomous and comprehensive selection and exceptional critical evaluation of current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline. Creation of exceptional and highly persuasive arguments. |

|  |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|
|  |  |  |   |   | persuasive arguments.   | arguments.   |   |
| Logical argument, explanation and evaluation of perspectives (10%) | Lacking an argument, or substantial inconsistencies in line of reasoning.<br><br>Not acknowledging alternative perspectives. | Arguments and explanations are limited, weak and/or poorly constructed.<br><br>Limited ability to evaluate and use alternative perspectives. | Ability to develop a logical argument, with some critical consideration of appropriate evidence.<br><br>Ability to evaluate and use alternative perspectives. | Ability to create coherent substantiated arguments.<br><br>Ability to consider, critically evaluate and use alternative perspectives. | Ability to comprehensively consider, critically evaluate and synthesise complex and unfamiliar information and ideas.   | Outstanding ability to comprehensively consider, critically evaluate and synthesise complex and unfamiliar information and ideas.                            | Exceptional ability to comprehensively consider, critically evaluate and synthesise complex and unfamiliar information and ideas.                                       |
| Problem-solving (10%)  | Does not show ability to identify key aspects of complex problems or to use appropriate resources to address them.           | Little evidence of an ability to isolate the key elements of complex problems and deploy appropriate resources to address them.              | Limited ability to identify the key aspects of complex problems and use appropriate resources to address them   | Shows ability to identify key aspects of complex problems and shows effectiveness in using appropriate resources for addressing them. | Shows ability to identify key aspects of complex problems and shows effectiveness, initiative and autonomy in using appropriate resources for addressing them | Confident in identifying key aspects of complex problems and applying appropriate approaches to their solution, showing initiative, autonomy and creativity. | Expert in identifying key aspects of complex problems and exceptionally applying appropriate approaches to their solution, showing initiative, autonomy and creativity. |
| Communication (10%)  | Shows very limited awareness of the ways communication needs to be adapted for different audiences.                          | Shows limited awareness of the ways communication needs to be adapted for different audiences.   | Shows some awareness of ways that communication needs to be adapted for different audiences.  | Can communicate effectively to a range of audiences, using a wide range of media as appropriate.                                      | Can communicate effectively to a range of audiences, using a wide range of media as appropriate.  | Can communicate effectively to a range of audiences in an engaging and professional manner, using a wide range of media as appropriate.                      | Can communicate effectively to a range of audiences to recommend application, using a wide range of media as appropriate.   |
| Academic Skills (5%)   | References to literature/ evidence and use of academic conventions are flawed/irrelevant.                                    | References to appropriate literature/ evidence and use of academic conventions are insufficient and/or inconsistent.                         | Consistently sound use of appropriate academic conventions and academic honesty.  | Consistently good use of appropriate academic conventions and academic honesty.   | Consistently excellent use of appropriate academic conventions and academic honesty.  | Consistently outstanding use of appropriate academic conventions and academic honesty  | Consistently exceptional use of appropriate academic conventions and academic honesty.  |
| <b>Competencies</b>  |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |
| Specialist skills, techniques and                                  | Little or no skill demonstrated in   | Demonstrates some skill in selected  | Demonstrates understanding of and   | Displays a comprehensive  | Conducts research highly effectively,   | Conducts research of outstanding quality,  | Conducts research of exceptional and  |

|   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| research (10%)                          | selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship.                                 | techniques and/or approaches applicable to own research or advanced scholarship, but with significant areas of weakness. | skills in selected techniques/ approaches applicable to own research or advanced scholarship.   | understanding of and skills in techniques/approaches applicable to own research or advanced scholarship.   | using technical and/or professional skills as appropriate.   | using highly effective technical and/or professional skills as appropriate.  | publishable quality, using highly effective technical and/or professional skills as appropriate.   |
| Managing in uncertain environment (10%) | No evidence shown of ability to make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances.              | Little evidence shown of ability to make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances.                           | Shows limited ability to make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances.   | Confident in adapting to changing and unfamiliar or challenging circumstances and making evidence based decisions.   | Confident in adapting to changing and unfamiliar/challenging circumstances and making effective, evidence-based decisions  | Shows confidence and creativity in adapting to changing and unfamiliar/challenging circumstances.  | Shows confidence, innovation and creativity in adapting to changing and unfamiliar/challenging circumstances.  |
| Autonomy of self learning process (10%) | Shows very limited awareness of own strengths and weaknesses.   | Displays limited awareness of own strengths or weaknesses.   | Shows some ability to identify own strengths and weaknesses. Some evidence of capacity to plan self development to improve practical and professional skills. | Confident in self reflection and expressing own strengths and weaknesses and able to take a proactive approach to self development to improve practical and professional skills. | Demonstrates ability to work autonomously and assess own strengths and weaknesses. Demonstrates ability to identify and implement an effective programme of self-development to improve practical and professional skills. | Shows confidence in working autonomously and setting own goals. Can assess own strengths and weaknesses. Able to identify and implement an effective programme of self development to improve practical and professional skills. Can provide effective feedback to others to aid their self development. | Shows exceptional confidence in working autonomously and setting own goals. Can assess own strengths and weaknesses. Able to identify and implement an effective programme of self development to be able to master practical and professional skills. Can provide exceptional feedback to others to aid their self development. |
| Self Management (10%)                   | Shows very limited evidence of self organisational skills and behaviours and ability to meet deadlines. | Shows limited evidence of self organisational skills and behaviours and ability to meet deadlines.                       | Shows some evidence of self-organisational skills and behaviours. Able to complete most tasks by deadlines.   | Demonstrates good self-organisational skills and behaviours. Has a professional attitude to completing tasks.  | Works autonomously demonstrating very good self organisational skills and behaviours. Has a professional attitude to completing tasks.   | Works autonomously demonstrating outstanding self organisational skills and behaviours. Has a professional attitude to completing all tasks.   | Works autonomously demonstrating exceptional self organisational skills and behaviours. Has an exceptional professional attitude to completing all tasks in an exceptional manner.   |

# Level 7 MQF Capstone Consulting Project – Assessment Rubric

| Criteria                       | 0-39%  | 40-49%  | 50-59%   | 60-69%   | 70-79%  | 80-89%  | 90-100%   |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Introduction (5%)</b>       | Problem statement is unclear or absent. No relevant organisational context, conceptual framework, or research gaps identified.   | Presents a vague or unclear problem statement with minimal discussion of the organisational context, framework, or research gaps. | Provides a problem statement and objectives but lacks originality and depth. Organisational context, conceptual framework, or methodology is present but underdeveloped. | Articulates a well-structured problem statement and research objectives. Outlines the organisational context, conceptual framework, and methodology with evidence of research gaps, though requiring more depth. | Defines the research focus effectively, providing a clear and well-structured problem statement and objectives. Presents relevant organisational context and conceptual framework with strong methodological justification. Identifies research gaps and limitations effectively. | Demonstrates a highly sophisticated understanding of the topic, with a clear, original, and impactful problem statement. Integrates the organisational background with strong practical relevance, a comprehensive conceptual framework, and robust methodological justification. Clearly identifies research gaps and significant stakeholder value. | Demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the topic, with a clear, original, and impactful problem statement. Integrates the organisational background with an excellent practical relevance, an exceptional conceptual framework, and robust methodological justification at MBA level. Clearly identifies research gaps and significant stakeholder value. |
| <b>Literature Review (20%)</b> | Minimal or insufficient literature review, lacking synthesis, critical analysis, or alignment with research objectives. No clear theoretical framework or justification. | Presents a limited literature review with weak critical analysis, minimal sources, or unclear methodological relevance.           | Provides an adequate literature review, though lacking depth in critical analysis or justification of research models. Industry insights are limited.                    | Reviews a relevant body of literature, identifying key research gaps and demonstrating some critical evaluation. Industry insights and theoretical frameworks are present but require further synthesis.         | Examines a broad and relevant body of literature, demonstrating critical analysis and a clear connection to research goals. Shows good industry insights and theoretical models with well-argued justification for methodologies.   | Conducts an advanced, well-synthesized review of scholarly and practitioner literature with a sophisticated literature search strategy. Critically evaluates and connects findings to industry and organisational insights. Identifies theoretical models and research gaps with strong justification for methodologies.                              | Conducts an excellently synthesized review of scholarly and practitioner literature with an exceptional literature search strategy. Critically evaluates and connects findings to industry and organisational insights. Identifies theoretical models and research gaps with an exceptional justification for methodologies.                                    |
| <b>Methodology (20%)</b>       | Methodology is insufficient, lacking clear alignment, justification, or ethical considerations.  | Research methods are vague or inadequately justified. Limited discussion on data collection and ethics.                           | Outlines basic research methods but lacks clear justification or alignment with research objectives. Ethical considerations are addressed superficially.                 | Provides a coherent methodological approach, outlining research methods and ethical considerations but requiring more justification.   | Applies appropriate research methods, effectively justifying their selection. Provides well-explained data collection and analysis details. Strong ethical assurances.  | Designs a rigorous methodology, clearly justifying the selection of methods and their alignment with research objectives. Provides step-by-step details of data collection and analysis, demonstrating exemplary ethical considerations.  | Designs an exceptional methodology, clearly justifying the selection of methods and their alignment with research objectives. Demonstrate mastery in proving step-by-step details of data collection and analysis, considering ethical issues and recommend possible alternatives to address them.  |

|  |  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Data Analysis &amp; Findings (20%)</b>                          | Fails to provide sufficient data collection or coherent analysis. Findings are irrelevant or poorly interpreted.     | Minimal data collection or weak analysis, lacking strong connections to research objectives.                | Provides basic data collection and analysis, with weak interpretation or limited alignment to objectives.  | Implements sound data collection and analysis, showing relevance to objectives but requiring more critical insight. Interpretation is valid but lacks deeper analysis.                      | Conducts well-executed data collection and analysis, demonstrating strong alignment with objectives. Provides clear and relevant interpretations, effectively connecting findings to research goals. | Executes meticulous data collection and advanced analysis, clearly aligned with research objectives. Provides a critical and innovative interpretation of findings, integrating them with literature and demonstrating significant insight into MBA practice.  | Executes exceptional data collection and advanced analysis, clearly aligned with research objectives. Provides an excellent critical and innovative interpretation of findings, integrating them with literature and demonstrating exceptional insight into MBA practice.  |
| <b>Recommendations, Implementation Plan &amp; Conclusion (20%)</b> | Fails to present coherent conclusions or practical applications. Recommendations are absent, unclear, or irrelevant. | Offers unclear recommendations and a weak conclusion, with minimal relevance to findings.                   | Summarizes findings with limited coherence or relevance. Provides basic recommendations and a weak discussion of limitations or future research. | Draws relevant conclusions and offers practical recommendations, showing clear alignment with findings. Addresses limitations but requires more critical insight or innovative application. | Connects findings to practical recommendations, demonstrating professional insight. Constructs a sound application-to-practice report and discusses limitations and future research effectively.     | Synthesizes findings into actionable recommendations with significant impact on business practice. Provides a comprehensive application-to-practice report with well-argued implications, reflective limitations, and clear future research recommendations. The Executive Summary is precise and impactful. | Synthesizes findings into actionable recommendations with an exceptional impact on business practice. Provides a comprehensive application-to-practice report with excellently argued implications, reflective limitations, and clear future research recommendations. The Executive Summary is of professional level. |
| <b>Academic Structure &amp; Organisation (10%)</b>                 | Disorganised and incoherent structure, with significant formatting, citation, or logical flow issues.                | Poor structure with unclear flow, frequent formatting mistakes, and weak adherence to academic conventions. | Exhibits basic organisation, but structure is somewhat disjointed, with frequent formatting and citation errors.                                 | Provides a sound structure, though minor inconsistencies in organisation, formatting, or citations are present.   | Organises content clearly, with logical flow and consistent formatting. Adheres to citation standards with minor inconsistencies.  | Demonstrates exemplary organisation and clarity, with a logical flow, professional formatting, and strict adherence to citation standards. All sections are well-integrated into a seamless narrative.   | Demonstrates exceptional organisation and clarity, with a logical flow, professional formatting, and strict adherence to citation standards. All sections are well-integrated into a seamless narrative.   |
| <b>Ethics &amp; Professionalism (5%)</b>                           | Fails to address ethical considerations, showing minimal or no alignment with MBA standards.                         | Limited attention to ethical concerns, with weak adherence to professional research standards.              | Ethical considerations are acknowledged superficially, with limited relevance or application to the study.                                       | Acknowledges and addresses ethical considerations adequately but lacks comprehensive application or depth. Meets minimum ethical standards.   | Integrates ethical frameworks effectively, with clear reasoning and adherence to MBA standards. Addresses ethical risks professionally.  | Incorporates exemplary ethical considerations, addressing complex ethical issues and ensuring comprehensive risk mitigation. Demonstrates strong alignment with MBA standards.   | Incorporates exceptional ethical considerations, addressing complex ethical issues and ensuring exceptional risk mitigation. Demonstrates exceptional alignment with MBA standards.  |

## Common Marking Scheme

| Grades         | Individual Modules   | Capstone Consulting Project                            | Overall  |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| <b>0-39%</b>   | Fail   | Fail (Needs significant improvement)                   | Fail (Needs significant improvement)                   |
| <b>40-49%</b>  | A marginal pass in module outcome(s) but must achieve overall 50% to pass Masters degree | Fail (Some reasonable elements but needs improvements) | Fail (Some reasonable elements but needs improvements) |
| <b>50-59%</b>  | Pass   | Pass   | Pass   |
| <b>60-69%</b>  | Good Pass  | Good Pass  | Good Pass  |
| <b>70-79%</b>  | Merit  | Merit  | Merit  |
| <b>80-89%</b>  | Distinction  | Distinction  | Distinction  |
| <b>90-100%</b> |  |  |  |