



## PTE 2023 - Exam Mark Sheet

**JQS**

Student Name	Total mark	Marker Name

### Mark Allocation

	Max	Marks	As a result of
Identification of Issues	10		
Evaluation of Issues	20		
Options for evaluation / implications / Ethical Theories	30		
Recommendation(s)	20		
Code of Ethics etc	10		
Communication	10		

### Additional Comments to Student

(Guidance on areas impacting on overall mark / areas for improvement etc)

--

**Requirements:**

1. Identify the public trust & ethical issues in this scenario.
  2. Evaluate the public trust & ethical issues, considering the impact on relevant stakeholders.
  3. Evaluate possible courses of action / inaction including implications of each, including consideration of relevant ethical theories.
  4. Recommend the action(s) to be taken.
- Throughout: - consideration of ICAS Code and relevant legislation / regulations, and communication  
- appropriate structure and communication

**NOTE:** Markers should refer to marking guidance for full list of issues, and options for actions which may be discussed.

	Highly Competent	Clearly Competent	Competent	Approaching Competence	Insufficiently Competent	MARK
1	All issues clearly identified.	Most issues identified.	Some issues identified.	Few issues identified.	Very few issues identified.	
2	Excellent evaluation of issues, including highly relevant assessment of impact on all stakeholders.	Good evaluation of issues, including relevant assessment of impact on majority of stakeholders.	Satisfactory evaluation of issues, including satisfactory assessment of impact on some stakeholders.	Limited evaluation of issues, with unsatisfactory assessment of impact on some stakeholders.	Inadequate evaluation of issues, with little or no assessment of impact on stakeholders.	
3	Excellent evaluation of possible options for action / inaction, including excellent evidence of understanding of ethical theories. Analysis has excellent linkage to implications for individual(s) and to organisation(s).	Good evaluation of possible options, including good evidence of understanding of ethical theories. Analysis has good linkage to implications for individual(s) and to organisation(s).	Satisfactory evidence of ability to evaluate possible actions, including satisfactory evidence of understanding of ethical theories. Analysis has satisfactory linkage to implications for individual(s) and to organisation(s).	Limited evidence of ability to evaluate possible actions, including limited understanding of ethical theories. Analysis has limited linkage to implications for individual(s) and to organisation(s).	Inadequate or no evidence of ability to evaluate possible actions, including inadequate or no evidence of understanding of ethical theories. Analysis has inadequate or no linkage to implications for individual(s) and to organisation(s).	
4	Excellent recommendation of actions to be taken, with excellent conclusions.	Good recommendation of actions to be taken, with good conclusions.	Satisfactory recommendation of actions to be taken, with satisfactory conclusions.	Poor recommendations of actions to be taken, with poor conclusions.	Inadequate or no recommendations of actions to be taken, with inadequate or no conclusions.	
5	Excellent consideration of ICAS Code of Ethics and relevant legislation / regulations.	Good consideration of ICAS Code of Ethics and relevant legislation / regulations.	Satisfactory consideration of ICAS Code of Ethics and relevant legislation / regulations.	Limited consideration of ICAS Code of Ethics and relevant legislation.	Inadequate or no consideration of ICAS Code of Ethics and relevant legislation.	
6	Excellent structure with highly developed written skills. Clear, concise with excellent conclusions. Excellent use of appropriate professional language.	Good structure with well-developed written skills. Clear, concise with good conclusions. Good use of appropriate professional language.	Satisfactory structure with acceptable written skills. Reasonably concise with satisfactory conclusions. Satisfactory use of mostly appropriate professional language.	Poor structure and style of writing makes difficult to follow. Long winded with poor conclusions. Poor use of professional language. Some careless errors.	Inadequate or no structure. Inadequate or no conclusions. Inappropriate use of professional language. A number of careless errors.	
<b>TOTAL MARK AWARDED</b>						

