UNIVERSITY OF CUMBRIA COURSEWORK REASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT
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| --- |
| **Module Code: HPRO6016** |
| **Module Title: Workplace Industry Study** |
| **Tutor: Module Leader & Tutor: Iain McKend** |
| **Title of the item of work:**  Written Assignment:  A **Report** which encapsulates your review of areas **for potential improvement of project management practices within your workplace.** |
| **Wordcount**: 3500 Words |
| **Details and Criteria**:  The requirement for Reassessment remains largely the same as for the initial (Assessment 1) requirement as briefed in the module. The instructions provided here barely deviate from those on the Blackboard – only where text is written in red.  **Requirement: Provide a report to meet the title requirement as follows:**   1. **General**. The assessment for this module is based on a **Report** which encapsulates your review of areas **for potential improvement of project management practices within your workplace**. The maximum wordcount available for the key sections of the Study Report is **3,500 words** in order that your report remains readable by the heavily-committed senior members of your organisation, whilst also enabling comprehensive discussion of the issue and presentation of recommendations. 2. **Format**. The submission should exploit the report format to enable you to get your justified points and recommendations across most effectively to the reader. You may follow any such effective report format, including one that is in common use in your workplace. 3. **Preliminaries**. The expectation is that your study is as developed and agreed with the tutor during the module and that it, an area for potential improvement, has already been discussed with your Line Manager or relevant Project Management lead. 4. **Ethics**. The nature of the study (for example, whether the research being done formally as instructed by your workplace, therefore requiring input from interviewed colleagues, or for your own academic purposes) will also determine the need, or otherwise, for the completion of an **ethics form**. Where additional surveys are needed you must contact the tutor to establish any updated Ethics Form amendment requirements.   **Assignment Requirement**.   1. For your **assignment you will identify an apparent workplace issue requiring rectification or improvement in the PM environment, justify its selection for study drawing on appropriate theory and complete the study providing supported recommendations. You will write up the study and its recommendations in a report for senior management.** 2. The study will incorporate **a critically evaluative review of relevant professional and academic literature,** as well as including **supporting comparative examples where appropriate.** Your   interpretation of the results of the literature review relative to the issue being studied will be |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| expected to lead to the logical delivery of **conclusions and recommendations for an enhancement in your organisation's Project, Programme or Portfolio Management (P3M) environment**.   1. On conclusion, you are to provide **a short reflective statement concerning your approach to the study**. The assignment is to be submitted as a single document through the Blackboard module link or, if using Pebble Pad, by arrangement with the Module Tutor. 2. The **marking guide** indicates the spread of marks and this should assist in the apportionment of text**. Your report should include**:    * A title page    * Statement confirming that the report is your own work and noting any significant external support    * An abstract (summarising the topic and the outcomes)    * A Contents List    * A Glossary and explanation of abbreviations, where necessary    * **An Introduction**    * **Definition of the issue to be addressed**    * **A critically evaluative review of relevant literature/theory**    * **Discussion of options for improvement**    * **Conclusions including selection of preferred option**    * **A statement of recommendations**    * A Reflection on the approach you have taken (not included in the main wordcount but should be succinct. Aim to get your message across within 250 words).    * Any supporting appendices. (For example evidence; appendices may not be read in full, so key observations should be summarised within the main text).   Only the sections in **bold type** fall within the assignment **wordcount of 3,500**.  Important – This work submitted through your student account on Blackboard should include a Module Title and Code, Student ID Number, Student Name and should include the following declaration of academic integrity:  “I declare that the material contained in this assessment is the result of my own work and that due acknowledgement has been given in the bibliography and references to ALL published and unpublished sources. I confirm that I have reviewed the guidance on academic integrity at [Academic Malpractice](https://my.cumbria.ac.uk/Student-Life/Your-Studies/Assessments/Malpractice/) to ensure that I understand the requirements.” | | | | | | | |
|  | **Marking Guide**: | Distinction  70-100 | Merit  60-69 | Good Pass  50-59 | Pass  40-49 | Fail  0-40 |  |
|  | Introduction and Problem Definition  20% | The problem is defined with outstanding perception and clarity of vision. | The problem is defined with significant justification and is introduced with a high level of perception. | A problem has been justifiably identified and its relevance and importance explained clearly. | A problem has been justifiably identified, however its relevance could have been explained more clearly. | A problem has not been adequately defined or its relevance justified. |
|  | Critical evaluation of relevant theory and advice  20% | An outstanding and consequential critical evaluation of broad and relevant reference material is provided. | A very strong critical evaluation of broad and relevant reference material is provided. | An effective critical evaluation of reference material, directly enabling subsequent discussion, is provided. | Appropriate reference material has been selected and discussed with some limited critical evaluation. | Reference material is insufficiently relevant or is overly limited, and there is poor or no critical evaluation. |
|  | Discussion, including options for improvement and influencing factors  30% | An erudite, impactful and highly effective discussion of enhancement options is balanced by outstandingly perceptive factorial observations. | A very well structured and evidenced discussion involving high levels of critical analysis. | A well structured and evidenced discussion involving good levels of critical analysis. | The discussion of enhancement options is basic with limited critical analysis. | There is insufficient discussion of enhancement options and a lack of effective critical analysis. |
|  | Conclusions, selection of the | Outstanding deductions lead to | Strong deductions reflect a well thought- | A good set of conclusions have been drawn out and | Some conclusions have been reached and these | Illogical or insufficient conclusions limit the |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | preferred option and effective presentation of recommendations  15% | persuasive conclusions and impressive delivery of apposite recommendations. | through set of conclusions which lead to highly appropriate, robust recommendations. | these lead to logical, appropriately-presented recommendations. | link to appropriate, adequately-presented recommendations | effectiveness of recommendations - which may be poorly presented. |  |
|  | Reflection on the study  10% | Highly effectively structured, perceptive and insightful reflection which completely captures the study and its outcomes. | Well-structured, perceptive reflection which captures the lessons from the study and its outcomes to a very good degree. | The reflection demonstrates good levels of perception, rationale and scope for learning. | The reflection shows some perception, rationale and scope for learning. | The reflection fails to capture sufficient implications of the study for effective experiential learning. |
|  | Accurate use of language (Grammar, spelling and syntax)  5% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **SUBMISSION DATE AS PER STUDENT PORTAL**  *(Please tick as appropriate below - must be completed)*  **To be submitted via the appropriate Blackboard site on or before 16:59 on 2nd May 2025 (or as advised on transcript). Use the resubmission link in the assessment tab of the module.**   * To be submitted through the Virtual Learning Environment (e.g., Blackboard) as detailed above, in accordance with instructions given by the course team. | | | | | | | |