

November 2002 – Assessment Matrix for Case Study – Constro

	Criterion	Marks*	Clear Pass	Pass	Marginal Pass	Marginal Fail	Fail	Clear Fail
Process	Prioritisation (of issues)	10	Clearly prioritised in a logical order and based on a clear rationale. 9-10	Issues prioritised with justification. 6-8	Evidence of issues being listed in order of importance, but rationale unclear. 5	Issues apparently in priority order, but without a logical justification or rationale. 3-4	Little attempt at prioritisation or justification or rationale. 1-2	No attempt at prioritisation or justification. 0
	Knowledge	10	Thorough display of relevant technical knowledge at an appropriate level. 9-10	Some display of relevant knowledge at an appropriate level. 6-8	Identification of some relevant knowledge, but largely lacking in depth. 5	Knowledge displayed without clear application. Some sections appear unreferenced. 3-4	Some knowledge displayed, but little attempt to justify it or use it in context. 1-2	Little evidence of knowledge displayed. Fundamental misconceptions. 0
	Numerical skills	15	Relevant data clearly identified. Calculations correct. Workings clearly shown. 13-15	A few relatively minor technical inaccuracies. Calculations mainly clear and logical. 9-12	Some results not supported by workings. Occasional errors. Some calculations avoided. 8	Some inappropriate or incorrect analysis carried out. Frequent errors or omissions. 6-7	Little analysis offered. Calculations often unclear or irrelevant. Workings incomprehensible. 3-5	A general absence of calculation or analysis, or calculations incorrect and often misleading. 0-2
Presentation	Structure (recommendations)	20	Good evaluation of options. Conclusions stated clearly with valid recommendations. 17-20	Fair evaluation of alternatives. Some recommendations omitted. 11-16	Limited evaluation of alternatives, or poorly supported recommendations. 10	Very few alternatives evaluated and with unsupported recommendations. 8-9	Little consideration of alternatives. Few or no conclusions. Unclear recommendations. 4-7	No identification of alternatives and no recommendations offered. 0-3
	Business communication	5	Excellent and appropriate communication in good business style. Messages clear and effective. 5	Good communication skills, with occasional lack of clarity and some weaknesses in style. 4	Some lack of clarity in communication and understandability. General business style is weak. 3	Business style is weak and, in general, answer is poorly conveyed. 2	Use of language ineffective; communication generally poor. Of little use to recipient. 1	Lack of evidence of suitable language and failure to communicate ideas. 0
	Format	5	Precise professional format and structure, with good use of relevant appendices. 5	Clear and recognisable format with a logical structure. 4	Recognisable format and structure, although occasionally unclear. Limited use of appendices. 3	Recognisable format but poor use of structure. Difficult to navigate. 2	Little attempt to use the appropriate format. Little attempt to structure content. 1	No attempt made to use appropriate format. Content unstructured. 0
Overall	Business awareness	15	High level of business awareness and appropriate use of real-world examples. 13-15	Good business awareness and use of real-world examples. 9-12	Some business awareness shown, plus occasional use of real-world examples. 8	A general lack of business awareness shown. Some use of real-world examples, occasionally unrealistic or irrelevant. 6-7	Little business awareness evident. Very few real-world examples, some clearly unrealistic or irrelevant. 3-5	No business awareness evident and no obvious attempt to use real-world examples. 0-2
	Breadth	10	Most key issues identified, covering a range of views. 9-10	A number of key issues identified, covering a slightly narrower range of views. 6-8	A few important issues identified, expressing a fairly limited point of view. 5	Several important issues omitted, or too many issues considered. 3-4	Many important issues omitted, or a series of diverse points made. 1-2	Very few issues considered, or a long list of points covered. 0
	Depth	10	Each issue covered to an appropriate level of detail. Answer is comprehensive and evidences critical thinking. 9-10	Several issues covered to an appropriate level of detail. Some evidence of analysis and critical thinking. 6-8	A number of key issues raised, although occasionally lacking detailed analysis. 5	Several important issues lacked the level of analysis required. 3-4	Only very brief analysis of the issues identified. 1-2	Little or no attempt to analyse the issues identified. 0
	TOTAL	100	<p>*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.</p> <p>© CIMA – Sept 2002</p>					