

## November 2001 – Assessment Matrix for Case Study – IRS Ltd

	Criterion	Marks*	Clear Pass	Pass	Marginal Pass	Marginal Fail	Fail	Clear Fail
Process	Prioritisation	15	Clearly prioritised in a logical order and based on a clear rationale. <b>13-15</b>	Issues prioritised with justification. <b>9-12</b>	Evidence of issues being listed in order of importance, but rationale unclear. <b>8</b>	Issues apparently in priority order, but without a logical justification or rationale. <b>6-7</b>	Little attempt at prioritisation or justification or rationale. <b>3-5</b>	No attempt at prioritisation or justification. <b>0-2</b>
	Knowledge	10	Thorough display of relevant technical knowledge at an appropriate level. <b>9-10</b>	Some display of relevant knowledge at an appropriate level. <b>6-8</b>	Identification of some relevant knowledge, but largely lacking in depth. <b>5</b>	Knowledge displayed without clear application. Some sections appear unreferenced. <b>3-4</b>	Some knowledge displayed, but little attempt to justify it or use it in context. <b>1-2</b>	Little evidence of knowledge displayed. Fundamental misconceptions. <b>0</b>
	Numerical skills	10	Relevant data clearly identified. Calculations correct. Workings clearly shown. <b>9-10</b>	A few relatively minor technical inaccuracies. Calculations mainly clear and logical. <b>6-8</b>	Some results not supported by workings. Occasional errors. Some calculations avoided. <b>5</b>	Some inappropriate or incorrect analysis carried out. Frequent errors or omissions. <b>3-4</b>	Little analysis offered. Calculations often unclear or irrelevant. Workings incomprehensible. <b>1-2</b>	A general absence of calculation or analysis, or calculations incorrect and often misleading. <b>0</b>
Presentation	Structure	15	Good evaluation of options. Conclusions stated clearly with valid recommendations. <b>13-15</b>	Fair evaluation of alternatives. Some recommendations omitted. <b>9-12</b>	Limited evaluation of alternatives, or poorly supported recommendations. <b>8</b>	Very few alternatives evaluated and with unsupported recommendations. <b>6-7</b>	Little consideration of alternatives. Few or no conclusions. Unclear recommendations. <b>3-5</b>	No identification of alternatives and no recommendations offered. <b>0-2</b>
	Business communication	10	Excellent and appropriate communication in good business style. Messages clear and effective. <b>9-10</b>	Good communication skills, with occasional lack of clarity and some weaknesses in style. <b>6-8</b>	Some lack of clarity in communication and understandability. General business style is weak. <b>5</b>	Business style is weak and, in general, answer is poorly conveyed. <b>3-4</b>	Use of language ineffective; communication generally poor. Of little use to recipient. <b>1-2</b>	Lack of evidence of suitable language and failure to communicate ideas. <b>0</b>
	Format	5	Precise professional format and structure, with good use of relevant appendices. <b>5</b>	Clear and recognisable format with a logical structure. <b>4</b>	Recognisable format and structure, although occasionally unclear. Limited use of appendices. <b>3</b>	Recognisable format but poor use of structure. Difficult to navigate. <b>2</b>	Little attempt to use the appropriate format. Little attempt to structure content. <b>1</b>	No attempt made to use appropriate format. Content unstructured. <b>0</b>
Overall	Business awareness	15	High level of business awareness and appropriate use of real-world examples. <b>13-15</b>	Good business awareness and use of real-world examples. <b>9-12</b>	Some business awareness shown, plus occasional use of real-world examples. <b>8</b>	A general lack of business awareness shown. Some use of real-world examples, occasionally unrealistic or irrelevant. <b>6-7</b>	Little business awareness evident. Very few real-world examples, some clearly unrealistic or irrelevant. <b>3-5</b>	No business awareness evident and no obvious attempt to use real-world examples. <b>0-2</b>
	Breadth	10	Most key issues identified, covering a range of views. <b>9-10</b>	A number of key issues identified, covering a slightly narrower range of views. <b>6-8</b>	A few important issues identified, expressing a fairly limited point of view. <b>5</b>	Several important issues omitted, or too many issues considered. <b>3-4</b>	Many important issues omitted, or a series of diverse points made. <b>1-2</b>	Very few issues considered, or a long list of points covered. <b>0</b>
	Depth	10	Each issue covered to an appropriate level of detail. Answer is comprehensive and evidences critical thinking. <b>9-10</b>	Several issues covered to an appropriate level of detail. Some evidence of analysis and critical thinking. <b>6-8</b>	A number of key issues raised, although occasionally lacking detailed analysis. <b>5</b>	Several important issues lacked the level of analysis required. <b>3-4</b>	Only very brief analysis of the issues identified. <b>1-2</b>	Little or no attempt to analyse the issues identified. <b>0</b>

	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>
--	--------------	------------

**\*Note** The number of available marks allocated to each criterion may vary from paper to paper. A criterion could have a minimum mark of 5 and a maximum mark of 20.

© CIMA – January 2002