|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Appropriate and accurate business  performance data analysis    ULO1, ULO2, ULO3,  GLO1, GLO5, GLO3    (50 marks) | 0 points    Does not use appropriate data  analysis techniques.    There are many errors in the analysis.    Conclusions are incomplete and have  multiple errors and are typically not  appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Does not provide an appropriate and  accurate charts/graphs  (where appropriate), and with formatting  and accuracy errors.    The analysis is not provided, typically  poorly presented and disorganised.    Workings frequently appear in the  Reporting (e.g. Output) sections, and key  analysis frequently appears in the  Workings (or similar) section.      (0 - 12.4 marks) | <25 points    Uses inappropriate (or irrelevant) techniques  to analyse the data.    There are many errors in the analysis.    Conclusions are incomplete and/or  have multiple errors  and/or are typically not appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Does not provide an appropriate and  accurate charts/graphs  (where appropriate), with formatting, and/or accuracy  exceptions or errors.    The analysis is incomplete, and/or  poorly presented and/or highly  disorganised.    Workings frequently appear in the  Reporting (e.g. Output) sections, and/or key  analysis appears in the  Workings (or similar) section.    (12.5 - 24.9 marks) | >25 points    Uses appropriate techniques to analyse  the data, but there are many errors in the analysis.    Conclusions have multiple errors and/or  are not appropriate for  a specialist audience.    Does not provide an appropriate and  accurate charts/graphs  (where appropriate), or with formatting, and/or accuracy  exceptions or errors.    A basic presentation of the analysis.    Workings frequently appear in the  Reporting (e.g. Output) sections, and/or key  analysis appears in the  Workings (or similar) section.                (25 - 29.9 marks) | >30 points    Uses appropriate techniques to analyse  the data, but there are some errors in the analysis.    Provides broadly correct conclusions,  with some errors, and/or generally  appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Provides appropriate and accurate  charts/graphs (where appropriate), with some formatting, and/or accuracy  exceptions or errors.    An good presentation of the analysis.    Workings often appear in Reporting (e.g.  Output) sections, and/or key analysis appears in the  Workings (or similar) section.            (30 - 34.9 marks) | >35 points    Comprehensive  analysis of the data using appropriate  techniques to produce accurate results, with only minor errors.    Provides broadly correct conclusions appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Provides appropriate and accurate  charts/graphs (where appropriate), with  good formatting, and/or minor  exceptions or errors.    An well organised presentation of the analysis.    With few exceptions appropriate analysis appears in the  Reporting (e.g. Output) sections, with most  supporting workings confined to the  appropriate location  (e.g. Workings section).        (35 - 39.9 marks) | 50 points    Clear and complete analysis of the data using appropriate  techniques to produce accurate results.    Provides concise and correct conclusions that are clear,  coherent, logical and appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Provides appropriate and accurate  charts/graphs (where  appropriate), with clear formatting.    An exemplary presentation of the  analysis, appropriate for a professional analyst.    Only appropriate analysis appears in the  Reporting (e.g. Output) sections, with all  supporting workings confined to the  appropriate location  (e.g. Workings section).        (40 - 50 marks) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Insightful interpretation of the analysis    ULO2, ULO4, GLO5,  GLO2    (50 marks) | 0 points    No explanation the main findings of the analysis.    The answers to questions do not draw  on (make reference to) any analysis.    Explanations/ reasoning are  incomplete and have substantial logic and  coherence errors.    The technical argument is unclear, incoherent, has  substantial logic errors,  and is not appropriate for a specialist audience.    Does not provide clear recommendations.    Recommendations are not supported by good explanations.    Narrative makes no reference to  appropriate analysis.    The narrative is unclear, illogical and | <25 points    Does not adequately explain the main findings of the analysis.    The answers to most questions does not draws on (make  reference to) any  substantial analysis.    Explanations/ reasoning are  incomplete and have logic and coherence errors.    The technical argument is unclear, incoherent, and has  logic errors, and is not appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Does not provide TWO clear recommendations.    Recommendation are not supported by good explanations.    Recommendations do not draw on (make reference to)  appropriate analysis. | >25 points    Adequately explains the main findings of the analysis.    The answers to most questions only draws  on (make reference to) basic analysis, with some significant errors.    Explanations/ reasoning are  incomplete and/or  have logic/coherence errors.    The technical argument is often  unclear, incoherent,  has logic errors and/or  is not appropriate for a specialist audience.    Does not provide TWO clear recommendations.    One recommendation is not supported by good explanations.    Only one recommendation  draws on (make  reference to)  appropriate and good | >30 points    Accurately explains the main findings of the analysis.    The answers to most questions draws on  (make reference to) good analysis, with  only some errors.    The answers to most of the questions are  supported by good,  coherent, and logical explanations/  reasoning.    The technical argument is generally  clear, coherent, logical and appropriate for a specialist audience,  with some exceptions.    TWO clear recommendations.    Each recommendation is supported by good explanations.    Each recommendation draws on (make  reference to)  appropriate and good analysis. | >35 points    Provides detailed explanations and  insightful answers to all questions.    The answers to most questions draws on  (make reference to) appropriate and comprehensive  analysis, with only minor errors.    The answers to most of the questions are  supported by very good, insightful,  coherent, and logical explanations/  reasoning.    With minor exceptions the technical argument is clear, coherent,  logical and appropriate for a specialist audience.    TWO clear and succinct recommendations.    Each recommendation is supported by very good and insightful explanations. | 50 points    Provides an outstanding  explanation and  insightful answer to all questions.    The answers to all questions draws on  (make reference to) appropriate and comprehensive analysis.    The answers to all questions are  supported by carefully considered, insightful,  coherent, and logical explanations/  reasoning.    The technical argument is clear,  coherent, logical and appropriate for a  specialist audience.    TWO clear and succinct recommendations.    Each recommendation is supported by an outstanding and insightful explanation.    Each recommendation |
|  | not appropriate for a non-specialist audience.    The written communication is  poorly structured, has  grammatical errors and does not adhere to the  appropriate format.                            (0 - 12.4 marks) | The recommendations and supporting  arguments are unclear, illogical and not  appropriate for a non-  specialist audience.    The written communication is  poorly structured, has  grammatical errors and does not adhere to the  appropriate format.                      (12.5 – 24.9 marks) | analysis.    The recommendations and supporting  arguments are often  unclear, illogical and/or  not appropriate for a non-specialist audience.    The written communication is typically not well structured, has  grammatical errors  and/or does not adhere to the  appropriate format.            (25 - 29.9 marks) | With some notable exceptions, the  recommendations and supporting arguments are clear, logical and  generally appropriate for a non-specialist audience.    With some exceptions the written  communication is well structured, generally free of grammatical  errors and adheres to the appropriate format.            (30 – 34.9 marks) | Each recommendation draws on (make  reference to)  appropriate and very good analysis.    With only minor exceptions, the  recommendations and supporting arguments are clear, coherent,  logical and appropriate for a non-specialist audience.    The written communication is well structured, generally free of grammatical  errors and adheres to the appropriate format.    (35 - 39.9 marks) | draws on (make reference to)  appropriate and comprehensive analysis.    The recommendations and supporting  argument is clear,  coherent, logical and  appropriate for a non-  specialist audience.    The written communication is well structured, free of  grammatical errors and adheres to the  appropriate format.          (40 - 50 marks) |