

Assessment for IS3S661: Strategic IS Management, Milestone 2: Propose a strategy

	Fail (0/29)	Narrow Fail (30/39)	3rd Class / Pass (40/49)	Lower 2nd Class / Pass (50/59)	Upper 2nd Class / Merit (60/69)	1st Class / Distinction (70/100)	Mark
A brief introduction (5%)	☐ Missing or very superficial introduction	☐ Superficial introduction	☐ Gives a basic insight into the aim and content of the report	☐ Provides a reasonable explanation of the topic and its relevance	☐ Clear explanation of the aim, content and conclusions of the report	☐ Exceptionally clear explanation of the aim, content and conclusions of the report	5
Analysis of problem situation (PS) (25%)	☐ Research into PS absent ☐ No explanation of PS ☐ No justification for choice of problem-solving technique	☐ Research into PS cursory ☐ Unclear explanation of PS ☐ Unclear justification for choice of problem-solving technique	☐ Basic research into PS presented ☐ Weak explanation of PS ☐ Some pertinent roles and values identified ☐ Weak justification for choice of problem-solving technique	☐ Evidence of some research into PS ☐ Reasonable explanation of PS ☐ Relevant roles and values identified ☐ Reasonable justification for choice of problem-solving technique	☐ Evidence of good research into PS ☐ PS explained clearly ☐ All relevant roles and values identified in a way that demonstrates some insight into PS ☐ Clear justification for choice of problem-solving technique	☐ Evidence of detailed research into PS ☐ PS explanation well formed ☐ All relevant roles and values credible and demonstrates excellent insight into PS ☐ Very strong justification for choice of problem-solving technique	14.5
Application of problem-solving technique (50%)	☐ Missing ☐ No recognisable elements of the technique present	☐ Cursory application of technique ☐ Few recognisable elements of the technique present	☐ Some pertinent uses of core aspects of the technique ☐ There may be some gaps and/or errors	☐ A reasonable use of core aspects of the technique that produces a reasonable solution ☐ Basic modelling constructs used	☐ Validated use of the technique to produce a solution that has few errors and/or omissions ☐ Most modelling constructs used ☐ Some supporting documentation provided	☐ Comprehensive use of the technique to produce a solution that is likely to ring true to someone working in the field ☐ Supported by good documentation	35
Presentation, Spelling and Grammar (10%)	☐ Very unclear structure to report ☐ Many major spelling mistakes in each paragraph very poor grammar ☐ Writing style unreadable	☐ Unclear structure to report ☐ Many spelling mistakes in each paragraph poor grammar ☐ Writing style unclear inappropriate for audience	☐ Some structure to report and most of the text has a clear message ☐ Numerous spelling mistakes generally weak grammar ☐ Basic sentence construction rules followed/Some text may be verbose mainly inappropriate for audience	☐ Clearly structured to report/Text has a clear message ☐ Some spelling mistakes some grammatical errors ☐ Basic sentence construction rules followed sometimes inappropriate for audience	☐ Clearly designed and written report ☐ Few spelling mistakes mainly good grammar ☐ Brief but informative writing style mainly appropriate for audience	☐ Well formulated structure to report ☐ None or very few spelling mistakes excellent grammar ☐ Writing style clear and informative without being verbose appropriate for audience	8
Use of references (10%)	☐ No relevant background reading with many statements unsubstantiated ☐ References and citations missing or contain many errors	☐ Little relevant background reading with many unsubstantiated statements ☐ Few sources cited and referenced in Harvard format with several errors	☐ Evidence of reading only websites and class notes with some unsubstantiated statements ☐ Main sources cited and referenced in Harvard format with several errors	☐ Evidence of reading relevant sources (eg. books and quality web sites), with a few unsubstantiated statements ☐ All sources cited and referenced in Harvard format with a few errors	☐ Evidence of reading several quality and relevant academic sources (eg. journals, books and quality web sites), used to justify points ☐ All sources cited and referenced in Harvard format with only minor errors	☐ Evidence of reading many high quality and relevant academic sources (eg. journals, books and quality web sites), used to justify points clearly ☐ All sources cited and referenced correctly in Harvard format	6
Global:							69%



Feedback

A brief introduction

Excellent intro, very clear and thorough

Analysis of problem situation (PS)

Good use of a reference to provide context to the problem which is concisely presented. Although it is later expanded upon, you could have added more detail at this stage. Also, although the explanations of the laws are accurate, remember the advice in the assignment brief: "Don't waste words *discussing* the technique; *use* it!"; much of this section is discussing the technique. You could have, for example, explained what work in progress is in this context to help relate the theory to practice here.

The justification of why lean thinking fits this problem might also be linked more explicitly.

Application of problem-solving technique

Although terminology has been used accurately, you could have demonstrated your knowledge more thoroughly with better explanations. For example, muda is not defined, nor do you explain the difference between type 1 and type 2. However an effective value stream mapping is shown and you have used references to support you in places. The analysis has resulted in a suitable solution that shows an ability to apply the technique with justifications for why decisions have been made. Again, the 5 laws mentioned previously could have been better included here, where you could have pointed out where each one has affected the decision making process.

Presentation, Spelling and Grammar

A well written and clearly presented document that is easy to follow.

Use of references

Good sources help to give context and some academic underpinning of theory.

Citation style is good.

Formatting in the reference list (eg italics, use of brackets) does not match the USW style, see the guide: <https://library.southwales.ac.uk/collections-subject-guides/referencing/>

Summary

A good application of the technique, but the explanation could have drawn more effective links between the theory and practice to show complete understanding and earn a few more marks.

Self-assessment review

	Maximum	Lecturer Grade	Student Grade	Difference	Summary
A brief introduction	5	5	3	2	You underestimated your work in this area.
Analysis of problem situation (PS)	25	14.5	17	-2.5	Accurate
Application of problem-solving technique	50	35	29.5	5.5	You underestimated your work in this area.
Presentation, Spelling and Grammar	10	8	7.5	0.5	Accurate
Use of references	10	6	5	1	Accurate
Total	100	69	62	abs = 11.5 final = 7	You underestimated how well you would do on this coursework. The ability to self-assess accurately is important moving forward to avoid disappointment. Ensure you take a look at the categories you exceeded to understand why.

Overview

You achieved 69% in this assessment, this contributes **17.25%** to your final mark for the module out of a potential 25%.

Provisional mark only: subject to change and/or confirmation by the Assessment Board.

Assessed by Paul Jarvis (paul.jarvis@southwales.ac.uk)