

# 1. Assessment Task Detail and Instructions:

You will produce a report (This element 010) and give a presentation (Element 011) on your findings as you critically reflect on the people, roles, processes, problematic areas and, therefore the potential research challenges of your DProf by:

- Critically reflecting on your professional practice - exploring new developments in your field and engaging with the body of knowledge in your field.
- Putting your research into context by engaging with limited literature (theoretical and empirical) [but remember this is NOT your literature review - which is explored further in the next module MOD006047 *Advanced Professional Theory*]
- Interpreting primary (experiential) evidence from practice and secondary evidence from the literature [No data collection required as this would require ethics approval]
- Constructing coherent arguments based on this evidence (invoking a quality of peer discussion)
- Identifying a research focus by ending your paper with a series of well-structured research questions [beginning to identify your research Aim and Objectives - but this is NOT your research proposal!]
- Writing in an academic form appropriate to doctoral studies (academic writing and structure)

## 1.1 Report Requirements (Element 010)

The main purpose of this assessment is to form the foundation of your doctoral journey by homing in on the key research question and supplementary research questions founded in your professional context. They should substantiate your main Aim and Objectives and, therefore, provide structure to the assessment in Module MOD006047 (Advanced Professional Theory [Literature Review]) and, ultimately, the first chapter of your evolving thesis.

Your report must be professionally formatted in an appropriate academic style. It must feature:

- Informative Title (not a yes/no type question!), Paper number, your name and SID number, submission/draft date. On the title page, why not include the total word count, the wordcount without appendices and the wordcount without appendices and inserted tables)
- Abstract (4 paragraphs in the format of Purpose, Method, Findings, Conclusion; implication to the next stage).
- Acknowledgements
- Hyperlinked Table of Contents (with page numbers)
- \*Introduction (Introduce the paper as well as the topic)

- \*Main sections with numbered headings and subheadings
- Full use of Harvard referencing throughout the content\*\*
- \*Conclusions
- List of References (NOT a bibliography of uncited works)
- Appendices where necessary

The ***final*** submitted WORDCOUNT of the items marked \* MUST NOT EXCEED 5000 words

### 1.1.1 Intended learning outcomes for the assessment

The Learning Outcomes are described in the Module Definition Form provided in the left hand menu. These are set at the outset of the module design and have been ratified by an independent panel of academics from ARU and external institutions. As such, they cannot be changed without application to the Academic Registry.

- Examine the nature of tacit and explicit knowledge
- Explore the possible ethical implications of your intended research project
- Critically reflect on your current and past professional activity within the context of your intended research topic, your organisation, and your professional practice
- Identify an initial idea, a research focus, and the main research question, all of which should emerge from this reflection on practice and your desire to make changes and improvements
- Explore the opportunities and limits of your initial ideas against the backdrop of a minimal range of relevant theoretical and/or empirical studies (practice-theory engagement)
- Systematically formulate a preliminary set of possible sub-questions derived from your initial idea, research focus or the lack in current practice, which could guide your further research

### 1.1.2 Other skills and competencies.

You must:

- Master Microsoft Word or other professional document production software with professional pagination, headers, footers, page & sub-section numbering, and formatted text using paragraph styles, etc.)
- Demonstrate the use of a hyperlinked Table of Contents (automatic table of contents).
- Deploy Harvard referencing as a key skill (see the excellent [ARU Library guide to Harvard referencing](#))

- Experiment with an appropriate academic voice - consider present tense, subject-specific active writing (NB Paper one is the ONLY paper where use of the first person is acceptable)

### 1.1.3 Marking Scheme

Your work will be assessed as follows:

- Critical Reflexivity: 20 marks
- Critical Analysis of Own Practice: 20 marks
- Use of Literature: 20 marks
- Developing your Research Questions: 20 marks
- Research Ethics: 10 marks
- Writing Style: 10 marks

TOTAL: 100

### 1.1.4 Marking Rubric

Please see the table below to give you some more ideas about what these aspects should incorporate and what the different levels of attainment look like.

CRITICAL REFLECTIVITY	
SCALE 1 (70-100%)	An excellent critical reflection on your practice which is descriptive, analytical and evaluative. You have made a good case for your research. Good use of the literature on reflective practice to support your understanding of the issues
SCALE 2 (50- 69%)	A good reflection on your practice which is descriptive, analytical and evaluative. More use of the literature on reflection to aid your understanding would have been helpful. Reflection on practice is a very important aspect of professional research. Keep working on it
SCALE 3 (0-49%)	Although you have discussed your practice, the work is too descriptive and needs to be more critical. You could have been more analytical and evaluative when making the case. More use of the literature on reflection to aid your understanding would also have helped. Reflection on practice is a very important aspect of professional research. Keep working on it

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF YOUR OWN PRACTICE	
SCALE 1 (70-100%)	Excellent use of examples from practice to make the case for the research. You have a good understanding of how to use your professional experience to support your research.
SCALE 2 (50-69%)	You have made the case for the research from the use of examples from practice
SCALE 3 (0-49%)	You need to make a better case for the research by using examples from practice to illustrate the problems you are intending to explore
USE OF LITERATURE	
SCALE 1 (70-100%)	Sound intellectual grasp of evidence from theory to support the case made from practice. A strong link is established between theory and practice. The theoretical engagement forms a sound basis for future research
SCALE 2 (50-69%)	Although you have made sufficient links between theory and practice in Paper 1, your arguments need further development. More theoretical underpinning should be explored in Paper 2
SCALE 3 (0-49%)	Theory has been discussed but stronger links to practice are required. The theoretical discussion does not sufficiently underpin your arguments. See comments on your script for further clarification
DEVELOPING YOUR RESEARCH QUESTIONS	
SCALE 1 (70-100%)	A sound research focus with a good main research question at this stage. A logical set of possible sub-questions derived from your initial consideration of practice. These questions are suitable for a doctoral study
SCALE 2 (50-69%)	A good main research question and set of sub-questions at this stage. These will develop further as you consider Papers 2 and 3 in Stage 1.

SCALE 3 (0-49%)	Your research questions still need some work before they can be considered suitable for doctoral-level study
RESEARCH ETHICS	
SCALE 1 (70-100%)	A good discussion of the potential ethical issues arising from your research. Addressed to a good standard at this stage.
SCALE 2 (50-69%)	The potential ethical issues arising from your research have been identified and addressed to a limited extent in this paper. However, further consideration is likely
SCALE 3 (0-49%)	The ethical issues arising from your research are not fully articulated and addressed. They need much further work
WRITING STYLE	
SCALE 1 (70-100%)	An excellent writing style with good use of your professional experience and the reference material. Sound arguments developed and supported by the evidence presented. A professional approach to your work
SCALE 2 (50-69%)	Your writing style is acceptable for this paper but needs further development. Although you are citing the evidence you need to improve your work to a professional standard. Academic writing is more demanding than the report writing you may be used to at work. Discuss this with one of the academic staff. Keep working on it
SCALE 3 (0-49%)	Your writing style needs to improve. Doctoral work demands very high professional standards. You need to work on how you express your ideas from the evidence, Citing others needs to be consistent and referenced using the Harvard method. Seek guidance from our digital library. Keep working at it.

## 1.2 Presentation Requirements (Element 011)

You will prepare and deliver a 15-minute, timed, professional quality presentation upon 'Indicative Contextual Research - People, Processes and a Conceptualisation of the Research Challenge.'

As this is your first main doctoral presentation, it will be informally presented to the December Workshop, where you can secure formative feedback, and then formally presented to the February workshop as a summative assessment. It is pass/fail graded, but you will get fine-graded feedback: you need to achieve more than 50% in every sub-section of the marking rubric to pass. Remember, the audiences are critical friends and their comments are there to help you make your next module assessment more achievable higher quality, and so you benefit from their past mistakes!

### 1.2.1 Assessment Task Detail and Instructions:

- So it MUST be professional, feature academic content, and have a clear beginning, middle and end.
  - You must use MS PowerPoint or equivalent, and your slides must be well-illustrated with images and diagrams and feature Harvard references where appropriate.
  - By all means, use bullet points or similar succinct devices, but NEVER read these out verbatim!
- Remember the tips from the Formative assessment.

The Marking Scheme for this element broadly follows the scheme for Element 010 (the coursework) to maximise the feedback's utility, so reflect on comments about your presentations when preparing your report.

### 1.2.2 The Marking Scheme is:

1. Critical reflexivity - of the self (20 marks)
2. Critical reflexivity - of the corporate and professional practice (20 marks)
3. Effective use of literature (20 marks)
4. Systematic development of the Research Questions (20 marks)
5. Awareness of ethical challenges (10 marks)
6. Structure, timekeeping, flow, quality of slides and presentation (10 marks)

**TOTAL: 100 marks**

NB: the summative presentation is pass/fail, but the following rubric will be used to provide detailed feedback. Note that scoring less than 50% in any sub-category would lead to failure of the Element. The above fine-graded rubric will be used for formative (informal) and summative (formal) presentations.

### 1.2.3 Intended learning outcomes for the assessment

The Learning Outcomes are described in the Module Definition Form in the left-hand menu. These are set at the outset of the module design and have been ratified by an independent panel of academics from ARU and external institutions. As such, they cannot be changed without application to the Academic Registry.

- Examine the nature of tacit and explicit knowledge
- Explore the possible ethical implications of your intended research project
- Critically reflect on your current and past professional activity within the context of your intended research topic, your organisation, and your professional practice
- Identify an initial idea, a research focus, and the main research question, all of which should emerge from this reflection on practice and your desire to make changes and improvements
- Explore the opportunities and limits of your initial ideas against the backdrop of a very limited range of relevant theoretical and/or empirical studies (practice-theory engagement)
- Systematically formulate a preliminary set of possible sub-questions derived from your initial idea, research focus or the lack in current practice, which could guide your further research

### 1.2.4 Other skills and competencies

The presentation to a live audience ultimately prepares you for presenting in other modules, the Application for Confirmation of Upgrade of Registration (due within 36 months of initial registration) and, of course, for conference presentations. Presenting to an academic audience can be quite different to your normal industrial or workplace presentations because you now need to develop an academic argument fully informed using Harvard references.

### 1.2.5 Links to Supporting Materials

The three main sources of academic support are from the reading list accessible in the left-hand menu, the DProf workshops where you will be expected to give formative presentations and gain critical feedback from peers and directly from the Module Leader during DProf workshops.

- Don't forget [Study Skills Plus](#). Who are able to offer 1:1 and group support relating to academic writing, Harvard referencing and presentation skills as a few examples.
- The library includes supporting information, including [referencing guides](#), [information skills](#) and [personalised support](#).
- [Student Advisors](#) and the [Students' Union](#) also have a large number of supportive resources to help you during your studies.
- Finally, remember your personal tutor can be contacted for support outside of the module.

## 2 Links to important regulations

### 2.1 Late submissions.

#### 2.1.1 Extensions

- You may apply for a **short** or **long extension** if you are unable to meet a deadline due to valid reasons (e.g., illness, caring responsibilities, unforeseen work changes).
- Extensions must be **requested in advance** and supported by **evidence**.
- submit the request to Student Adviser
- If approved, you must submit by the **new deadline** without a penalty.

#### 2.1.2 Late Submission Without Extension

- If you **miss the deadline** and **do not have an approved extension**, you may still submit within a **limited late submission window** (usually up to **two working days**).
- Penalties may apply:
  - **Submitted on the same day but after 2:00pm:** 10% mark deduction.
  - **Submitted up to two working days late:** Mark capped at **50%**.

Note: These penalties are more commonly applied to **taught postgraduate modules**. For **doctoral-level work**, especially presentations and reports, late submission may result in **automatic failure** or require **reassessment**, depending on the module leader's discretion.

---

#### 2.1.3 Important Considerations

- Always **communicate early** with your supervisor or module leader if you're facing difficulties.
- **Formative assessments** (like the December presentation) may be more flexible, but **summative assessments** (like the February presentation) are strictly regulated.

### 2.2 Artificial Intelligence Tools:

**Agreed Category of AI Use:** This assessment is a Category Two: Independent Use of AI as a Research Tool assessment

**What does this mean for this assignment:** You are allowed to use AI tools in the creation of your summative submission in the same way as you would use other learning tools, such as books, webpages, and journal articles. You should always use any of these tools in a responsible and

ethical way that is consistent with our academic rules and regulations. For more information, please visit your library webpage resource for AI tools here: <https://anglia.libguides.com/AI/>

**AI Use Declaration (*Tick one box*)**

I declare that no part of this submission includes contributions from Artificial Intelligence (AI) software. The content is entirely my own original work.

I declare that I have used AI tools solely as a research aid in the preparation of this submission. My use of AI complies with Anglia Ruskin University's guidelines for Category 2 – Independent Use of AI as a Research Tool. I acknowledge the following:

- AI tools were used to enhance my understanding of the topic and to assist in identifying relevant academic sources and materials.
- No substantial sections of this submission were generated by AI.
- AI was not used to improve the writing style, translate large portions of text, or perform any tasks deemed inappropriate under ARU's AI use policy.
- All content presented is my own original work. Any ideas or insights derived from AI tools have been critically assessed and appropriately referenced where applicable.
- AI software used (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

I understand that failure to comply with ARU's AI use policy may be considered academic misconduct.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## 2.3 Re-Assessment Arrangements:

If reassessment is required for any element of the module, it will follow the same format as the original assessment. You will be notified via E-Vision if you need to resubmit any assessed element.

- **Element 010 – Report (5,000 words).** This element is fine-graded. You must achieve at least 50% to pass. If your mark is below 50%, you will be required to resubmit the report.
- **Element 011 – Presentation.** This element is assessed on a pass/fail basis. To pass, you must achieve at least 50% in each individual criterion of the marking rubric. If you do not meet this threshold, you will be required to present again at a newly agreed date.

Note: To progress to the Research Stage, students must pass all taught modules and achieve **at least 60% in Element 010** of the final module (**MOD006049**).